

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING
Thursday, May 2, 2019; 3:45 pm
Business Building, room 3046

Present: Valerie Barnett, Brad Behnke, Lynn Carlin (Provost Liaison), Duane Dunn (for Heather Reed), Robert Hachiya, Keith Hohn, Katie Kingery-Page, Laurel Littrell, Jansen Penny, Jeffrey Stevenson, and Bob Weaber

Proxies: Jessica Meekins

Absent: Durant Bridges, Jess Falcone, Brian Lindshield, Heather Reed

Guests and visitors: Lori Goetsch, Jeff Morris, and Joelle Pitts

1. Littrell called the meeting to order at 3:45 pm.
2. The April 4, 2019 minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Budget Modernization

Guests: Jeff Morris, VP of Communications and Marketing

Lori Goetsch, Dean of K-State Libraries

Joelle Pitts, Head of the Content Development department in the Libraries

These questions were provided to the Service Center guests in advance:

1. How does the model appear to be working for your area in the shadow year and what concerns do you have moving forward into implementation?
2. How are you striving for more efficiency, when you have already been maximizing efficiency with the recent budget cuts?
3. How will you be able to grow your budget in the coming years if enrollment improves?
4. How do you plan to adapt to increasing expenses in the new model? How are you documenting these cost increases for your area?
5. One component of this model is benchmarking. How do you benchmark your area with similar services for our peer institutions?
6. How are you documenting the levels of service, staff size, and expenses needed for your area with our peer institutions?
7. How are you determining your "service level agreements" and how are you developing charges for additional services?
8. Has the model changed how you will allocate funds with departments/areas within your unit?

Question 1: How does the model appear to be working for your area in the shadow year and what concerns do you have moving forward into implementation? Morris began. Benchmarking can be difficult. You also have to think about what services are being provided now, who they are offered to, and what, if any, cost is being charged for those services. Both staff and expenditures have been reduced in DCM. Transparency about previous deals, so to speak, are being identified and additionally what areas are being sub vented. They're working to get a set budget for the upcoming year. It was asked how they plan to compare and benchmark? There is a consortium service that can provide this that they're considering joining, but each contributor has to define what they do in order for comparisons to be more accurate. Morris shared with committee members their service agreement template.

Pitts noted, that as many know, right now they're undergoing a large reduction and therefore, most concern, related to the budget, is how to account for inflation each year. She highlighted that \$300,000-400,000 each year needs cut, unless there is a way to collect for the cost of inflation. They're trying to align what they spend with curriculum and other needs. It was clarified that collection cost and cutting has been par for the course. Right now, Goetsch commented it hasn't had an impact on day-to-day business, but they have concern how things will be managed in the new model and what opportunities there may be for increase to their base budget.

Question 2: How are you striving for more efficiency, when you have already been maximizing efficiency with the recent budget cuts?

Goetsch noted there will be benefit to the campus, overall, in efficiency of the library in future years in part, because of the new HVAC and lighting due to the fire last summer. Morris commented that overall they'll be doing less work in that they're looking to manage duplication in job positions to be more centralized if possible, and also to review various reports done around campus and identify whether they're still necessary. Shared services was mentioned, which combines resources and has been understood to be beneficial.

Question 3: How will you be able to grow your budget in the coming years if enrollment improves?

Erickson was present also and responded to this question reporting that the following would be dependent on whether funds become available. A request form is being beta tested that would allow the revenue centers to make requests, either one-time or multi-use in future for funds. Committee members discussed this further.

Question 4: How do you plan to adapt to increasing expenses in the new model? How are you documenting these cost increases for your area?

It appears there will be a need each year to request funds, unless perhaps a multi-year request is in place. Part of the philosophy is that transparency would exist wherein all can make a request and would be on the same playing field, so to speak, and then it could be determined and discussed where we want to invest the limited dollars available. Because no tuition dollars are available to revenue centers they would need to either identify areas where they can increase revenue, ask for increased funds, or perhaps do both of those. It was highlighted that a budget model does not replace management of funds.

Question 5 – benchmarking was covered earlier.

Question 6 – How do you determine your service level agreements? Morris discussed some of the items in their template, which were fairly straightforward. They identify which positions cover what services and then analyze what their base budget covers. Then it branches out to more detail of enhanced services and so on. What they worked towards was getting a total picture. Goetsch commented that the Library's template should be fairly straightforward as well. Proposed templates will be reviewed back up through the chain of budget committees for vetting and approval. There will be a process for changing a template as well, once it's approved. It was noted these agreements will be phased in. The first four (Facilities; HCS; DCM, and ITS) agreements are due by the end of this month. Then the others will be working towards completing theirs in fall or spring. Once the service agreements are in place, they will undergo review prior to budget cycles in the future.

A question that has come up repeatedly in this body has been whether service centers will start simply operating as a business and relations will become strained. It was commented that these agreements will highlight things that previously may have not been transparent, for example, there is a cost for inter-library loans, but many did not realize there was a cost associated with doing this. It was noted that this is a high stress time for all involved, however, we all need to continue work towards the good of the whole.

Question 7: How are you determining your "service level agreements" and how are you developing charges for additional services? This was discussed briefly earlier, but they're working to identify areas where monies and strengths can be combined. Looking toward the future, the Library plans to continue to making the best use of endowment funding, in keeping with rules that are in place for those funds.

It was asked whether any from FSCOUP will be able to attend when the provost from Auburn visits. There will be a first Tuesday meeting and also another meeting where the current and incoming FS president will be invited. If there are specific questions, it may be wise to share those with Spencer Wood or Tanya González so they can present them.

Question 8 was answered in earlier.

Guests were thanked for taking time to come and visit with this committee.

4. Ongoing Business

A. Multi-year City/University Fund proposals

The administration's process of submitting proposals to the city each year won't change and those that have been approved are being followed through on, such as campus crosswalk improvements and other safety issues. For example, the campus creek safety issue was worked on recently and it came in under budget.

However, it was commented that a large portion of City/University funds will be dedicated towards the north campus corridor improvements for many years leaving little to be requested for improvements elsewhere. The desire is that as leadership on the governance bodies rotate, they continue to remember and use the approach of submitting a combined shared governance request as has been done in recent years, which has been very helpful. After discussing this at various meetings, it was thought it may be wise to continue to submit a joint request yearly. Erickson reported he will still continue sending notice in the fall to each of the governance bodies' presidents reminding them to submit ideas.

It was commented there are still safety issues that arise where city/university funds would have been used to address them. Those will still need addressed even if there are times when no city/university funding is available.

B. University Handbook Section B95, CCOPs

This will be looked at further in the fall to verify all units have submitted a copy of their election procedures and also to review the handbook language for any edits needed.

5. Co-Chair for 2019-2020

A nomination was made for Brad Behnke to be Co-Chair of FSCOUP for 2019-2020. No other nominations were made and the nomination was accepted. Motion carried to elect Behnke as Co-Chair for 2019-2020 year.

6. Announcements / Other
None

7. Meeting was adjourned at 4:53

Next meeting: *September 2, 2019*