

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING
Thursday, December 7, 2017; 3:30 pm
Business Administration Building, room 3046

Present: Barbara Anderson, Jack Ayres, Andy Bennett, Durant Bridges, Lynn Carlin (Provost Liaison), Jessica Falcone, Byron Jones, Gary Leitnaker, Laurel Littrell, Jessica Meekins, Jackie Spears, and Jeffrey Stevenson

Absent: Barnett, Crawford, and Duncan

Guests: Ethan Erickson, Karin Westman

1. Laurel Littrell, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
2. The November 2, 2017 minutes were approved as submitted.
3. Library Resolution – Guests from University Library Committee
Littrell welcomed and thanked Karin Westman for attending. Westman provided some context regarding the resolution that Faculty Senate received in June regarding maintaining Library support. The Library serves the entire university community in a variety of ways. Faculty Senate deferred the resolution to FSCOUP for further review. Littrell and other available FSCOUP members attended the University Library Committee meeting last week to get feedback and input. The desire is for a resolution from FSCOUP to move forward. The resolution will be redrafted and will come from FSCOUP. Recommendations and input provided from the University Library committee and originators of the first resolution will be incorporated as well. This document will be worked on over the winter break.
4. Budget related items – Ethan Erickson, Guest
 - A. City/University Fund update, questions
Littrell reported that the city is recommending the same two projects as the ones recommended by the joint leadership committee to President Myers. These are 1) Campus creek drainage repairs and 2) cross walk upgrades around the campus perimeter.
 - B. Budget Model Review
Members thanked Ethan Erickson for being present to answer questions today regarding budget.

Tuition rates: Littrell brought up the flat rate tuition discussion from the last meeting. Banded tuition versus per credit hour rates were reviewed. Erickson mentioned other universities who have moved to banded tuition, such as Oklahoma State. It was asked what K-State's recommendation will be for future years. Erickson referred to recent committee work regarding this topic. The charge of the committee was twofold: 1) Do no harm to revenue and 2) simplify the structure). The working group recommended a consolidated single rate for each college. For

example, the College of Agriculture would have a single rate comprising the base tuition and the existing college fee, which would be assessed to students taking classes within the College. The College of Engineering would have a different rate comprising the base tuition with their existing college fees. A comment was made that this might work well for Engineering, but what about for colleges such as Arts and Sciences or Human Ecology. Erickson indicated the committee has heard some of these concerns from deans' council; however, the report has been turned into the Provost and VP Cindy Bontrager. Deans were specific that they want the college fees to stay in place. No changes will be made to the existing tuition and fee structure without additional review and feedback.

Comparisons: It was inquired what other Kansas Regents schools are doing. Erickson responded that they have data from all the peer institutions information and their 2025 comparison schools in order to easily compare between schools; however, there is still work to be done.

Enrollment management: Members agree there needs to be careful thought about this. One facet is making use of any excess capacity; however, there was recognition this is not necessarily a reasonable way to recruit because students characteristically change their major several times prior to graduation. Additionally, finding the excess capacity is difficult.

Goals of budget modernization: Several goals were touched on including the goal to incentivize K-State 2025, to preserve the land grant mission and others. Erickson and Carlin discussed efficiencies and how they get driven, both academically and centrally; yet that is not a part of the budget model. Metrics to drive budget dollars? EAB has what others have done, but the goal is to make something here that is very K-State driven. The hope is to make things more transparent. We all need to be thinking about the questions that need answered.

Institutional support fee was discussed related to how it is paid to the university and where it is paid from; this equals roughly \$1.7 million dollars. Extramural funding (SRO) was brought up as well. How is this going to be affected by a new budget model? They are still working through all of that. Research grants were also discussed. It was vocalized that we are living in an unequal environment. It was agreed there is no single budget model that will solve all problems.

Timeline: The model is supposed to be unveiled in April. It's difficult to envision how the model will work, but having these discussions is important. There was mention that helping to dissipate rumors is all of our responsibility.

5. Old Business (updates) – These items were tabled until the next meeting.

- A. K-State 2025
- B. Campus building plans / renovation funds

6. Other – January meeting is canceled unless necessary.

7. The meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm. The next meeting will be on February 1, 2018 at 3:30 pm in 3046 Business Building unless members are informed otherwise.