

**MINUTES**  
**FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING**  
**Thursday, November 1, 2018; 3:30 pm**  
**Business Building, room 3046**

Present: Valerie Barnett, Brad Behnke, Durant Bridges, Jess Falcone, Robert Hachiya, Keith Hohn, Jordan Kiehl, Brian Lindshield, Laurel Littrell, Heather Reed, and Jeffrey Stevenson

Proxies: Jess Falcone for Katie Kingery-Page

Absent: Jessica Meekins and Bob Weaber

Guests: Ethan Erickson, Charles Taber

Liaisons: Lynn Carlin

1. Littrell called the meeting was called to order at 3:30 pm.

2. Budget Modernization

Guest: Provost Taber

Ethan Erickson began the discussion with committee members prior to Provost Taber's arrival. We are going to be transitioning from the design phase to the new model and structure, and it's important to recognize that with a new model comes new policies that will need put in place. Therefore, a governance structure is needed. Erickson provided a handout to review with members related to this structure.

Throughout the Shadow Year and Bridge Year, the Core Team will 1) receive recommendations from the Budget Planning Team 2) finalize changes to the Model for Bridge Year Implementation, and 3) establish FY 20 budget for revenue and service centers. The Core Team will have two Deans and will rotate alphabetically, by college, starting with Amit Chakrabarti, Arts & Sciences and Tim DeNoble, Architecture, Planning and Design. It was illustrated that things are being built while flying the ship, so to speak. Ethan explained the provost will Chair the University Budget Planning Team. The membership of the University Budget Planning Team was outlined. As has been stated previously, members will be considered "university" representatives, with the idea they are representing the university as a whole, not their specific unit.

Revenue/Service Center Working Groups – These groups will have five members each from the Budget Planning Team. The work they will do constitutes a large investment of time and energy in making recommendations to the full planning team.

Budget Model Review Panel. This group will evaluate on a periodic basis, the model itself, such as pros and cons and will recommend to the University Budget Planning Team any adjustments to formulas/metrics as necessary. This panel would be chaired

by the provost and have representatives from the revenue and service center working groups and representation from the governance groups. They would meet each year, but work towards the periodic review.

The nomination process for the Planning Team was inquired about. The president would appoint two VPs, the provost would appoint two deans, and then each VP and dean would be able to nominate two additional members. The nominees from the deans and VPs would need to be direct reports of the dean or VP and someone who has fiduciary responsibility, such as management of a unit, etc. Term limits: In order to stagger rotation, in the beginning some would serve three year terms and others four.

Discussion: Some concern was mentioned over only having administrators appointed by deans or VPs. Benchmarking was brought up and the difficulty with comparisons. It was also noted that some service centers are beginning to charge more. How will that be monitored to be sure the appropriate cost is being attributed to a service? It will be challenging, but there are standard definitions out there for various services. This will be part of the work of the Service Center Working Group.

Questions addressed to Provost Taber:

- Membership of Planning Team – there was concern about members being selected solely for their fiduciary knowledge and experience, but not having a breadth of experience in evaluating proposals and ideas. The provost responded he believes there will be a wealth of experience for both of those pieces. It will be of great importance that when the call goes out for nominations it is clear what will be expected of members. It was commented that there are faculty who have been previous department heads or chairs that would have knowledge on budget, but also have experience in evaluating proposals and ideas. Ultimately, the selection of members will be made by the Core Team from the nominations submitted. Again, the selection of members will be given thoughtful consideration.
- Budget Model Review Panel. Members asked for his vision for this panel. On a periodic basis, we need to evaluate the model. It should not be too frequent, otherwise this can cause frustration that the model could change too frequently and no one will know how the model is supposed to work in any given year. However, it is important to evaluate the model in a timely manner to make adjustments as needed. This panel will serve a very important function in assisting with the evaluation of the model and feedback to the Planning Team. He anticipates that each year we will do a three-year budget plan projection. In practical terms, this would mean that each year's budget may change, due to unforeseen circumstances or surprises, but generally speaking, each college

should have an idea of the budget and how it may change for three years in advance.

- How do you envision subvention as the shadow and bridge year move forward. This is not established yet, but is an important piece that will be worked on.
- How will the Tuition and Fees Strategies Committee (TSFC) work in tandem with this structure? The thought is that committee will still continue its work, but then the Planning Team will also review the tuition proposals. However, the Planning Team will likely not review the fee proposals, but rather the TFSC will. This is not set in stone, of course.
- Benchmarking the service center budgets was inquired about and how that will be done. This will be part of the Service Center Working Group's charge. It is possible there will be different peers for different services centers. There are some national comparisons available for some service centers, but not for others. There will need to be a somewhat flexible approach.
- Revenue Center working group. The provost was asked to speak a little bit about how proposals will come forward. It was discussed that as proposals come forward, they will be given review by the deans, but should not be held back by the dean. Rather, if there are concerns, a cover letter could be submitted with the proposal, as one option, giving a dean opportunity to provide input, but not holding a proposal back.
- Term length of committees – the Core Team will be working on this.
- How will the announcements be made and could this be done in ways that mitigate some of the fears faculty, staff, and students may have? It was commented by members that big changes can be overwhelming, especially for ones somewhat distant from the process. The provost responded that there is a plan in place. He announced that the call for nominations will go to the deans tomorrow (11/2). On Monday (11/5), a K-State Today announcement will go out related to the creation of the Planning Team. It was suggested that perhaps an open forum each semester would be a good idea. It was seen by the various comments from committee members that there is both fear and optimism alike relating to these changes. This is not unusual when big changes occur, yet we need to do what we can to alleviate anxieties where possible.
- Subvention was further discussed. All of the strategic money in the first couple of years will be used to aide units/programs that are not self-supporting. There will be continued opportunity to provide support for these programs. How will mission-critical programs be identified? How will that be decided? It was conveyed some have anxiety and panic related to this. Provost Taber reassured members that panic is really the last thing to do with this kind of change. He provided an example from the institution he previously worked with where there was a certain department that had been having declining

enrollment. However, they looked for the opportunity to change and with thought and creativity they took a new approach. Then, instead of declining further, they grew. He highlighted there will be opportunity for growth here. In the world we live in there are market consequences that didn't used to be there. We want to turn fear into productivity and consider opportunities that we can explore. It was also pointed out that industry may come to us with specific needs and we want to be listening to those to see how we can assist.

- The concern about competition with each other over head count was raised and how this governance structure will operate to assist with this in making sure unhealthy tendencies don't begin. There will be a need to keep informed about this at all levels. FS Academic Affairs will need to be alert to this as well to be sure that duplication is not happening. Departmental fees were briefly touched on. These are part of a larger discussion that needs to occur concerning fees.
- Transparency as to how the colleges are implementing their versions of the budget was asked about. The initial idea is that the deans will meet to share their approaches with each other. This can help identify what is working well or not. Various approaches might be taken, but whatever the method it should be transparent to the individuals within the college.

To reiterate, an announcement about this structure will go out to campus early next week. It was suggested that perhaps coordinating through the deans and additionally having open forums to help alleviate anxieties would be appreciated. Members were also reminded that a facts page on the budget website is available and an email address to send comments. Hearing from our university community is valuable in aiding them to move forward in a positive way.

We need to highlight the opportunities for growth and to empower ones that they can make a difference. A recommendation was made to create a video presentation relating to the plan. This would be a consistent message and one that could continue to be available and perhaps additional ones added to provide updates.

At some point it may be good to touch base again with the universities previously visited and get the college level input to see where they succeeded and struggled. This could possibly be professional development for our deans in future as they each work with their budgets.

Committee members sincerely thanked Provost Taber for visiting with them regarding this important process and its future.

3. The October 4 minutes were approved with one minor edit.

4. Invitation to ~~November 6<sup>th</sup> FSCOT meeting; 3:30 pm; room TBA~~  
Update: This meeting will be held on December 6<sup>th</sup> at the regular FSCOUP time.
5. Ongoing Business
  - A. University Handbook Section B95 concerning CCOPs  
No update on this as of right now.
  - B. Campus building plans / renovation funds  
This pertains to item #4 of this agenda. Not enough members of the classroom planning committee could meet at the November date and therefore this discussion will take place with FSCOT during the December FSCOUP meeting as the classroom planning committee members will be invited, along with the FSCOT members who are available. The reason for meeting is to discuss some standards for general use classrooms on campus. The perspective from teaching faculty is desired and it, therefore, seemed appropriate to have FSCOT and FSCOUP involved in the conversation.
  - C. Multi-year City/University Fund proposal  
No discussion.
6. Announcements / Other  
College name changes: Falcone is in the process of collecting information from other universities related to the question that came up earlier this semester about college name changes and what procedures other universities use to process those requests. She sent out about 20 emails and received about four responses so far. She will share what she's found and the committee prior to the next meeting.
7. The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Next meeting: Thursday, December 6, 2018; 3:30 pm; **1092** Business Building