**Budgetary Affairs Committee**

**End of Year Report**

May 9, 2013

**Meetings and Minutes**

The Budgetary Affairs Committee (BAC) met on the following dates during the 2012-2013 academic year.   Meeting minutes were submitted to FPC for each meeting:  October 4th, November 7th, January 17th, February 14th, March 14th April 11th, April 25th (COE FPC/Dean’s Budget Forum)

**Major Goals and Accomplishments**

The BAC began the year by reviewing the COE Guiding Principles and our relationship to the BAC Strategic Planning Goals from 2011-2012, identifying ***Transparency in the College*** as our major goal for the year.   In seeking this goal, the committee accomplished the following at its monthly meetings:

Received monthly budget updates from Associate Dean

Met with School Directors to learn about the policies and practices of schools related to salary savings, IDC, and other miscellaneous funding sources

* Received reports from Directors Crockett (SESPECS) and Bondy (STL) re: revenue, expenditures, salary savings, entrepreneurial and external funding
* Dr. Daniels (HDOSE) agreed to work with his school committee to determine policies and practices for his school

Evaluated budgetary effects of lagging time-to-degree within programs

* Sent position statement to FPC\*

Hosted the COE FPC/ Dean’s Budget Forum with the following presenters:

* Sheri Austin, Assistant Vice President, University Budgets
* Glenn Good, Dean, College of Education
* Sandra Bass, Business Manager
* Thomasenia Adams, Associate Dean, Research, Faculty Development  & Graduate Education
* Tom Dana, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs

Solicited input from administrators, faculty and staff for direction for BAC for 2013-2014 year\*\*

**Recommendations for Next Year’s Committee**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Key goals** | **Key tasks connected to the goal** | **Suggested date for completion   of tasks** |
| Gather information regarding the development & institution of entrepreneurial programs | Invite key   personnel involved in these activities; review current and future projects; advise   FPC | On-going |
| Continue   review of policies and procedures for budget decisions across college (as   designated in forum discussion) 100% | On-going monthly discussions with   appropriate guests invited to shed light on various areas of   interest/concern; continue COE/Dean’s Budget Forum | On-going |
| BAC review   and advise FPC on current/future IDC and salary savings policy | Continue   and monitor current activity to address these issues per school | On-going |
| Monitor   impact of 100% tuition return and advise FPC as appropriate | Solicit   information regarding student credit hours vis-à-vis COE enrollments | On-going |

**Documents**

All minutes and accompanying documents have been submitted to FPC

**\* Recommendation to FPC on Budgetary Effects of Lagging Time-to-Degree within Programs**

In its mission to provide transparency in budgetary issues as it relates to the College of Education, the FPC BAC has reviewed the financial implications of time-to-degree for doctoral students.  In fact, there are currently about 170 ABDs of whom only about 20 are expected to graduate each semester.  While we are sensitive to the issues of work-related necessities of students who do not hold fellowships or assistanceships, there appears to be a body of students who continue indefinitely as ABD, thus precluding the limited number of faculty from opening placements for interested new students.  Currently in the college there are 170 students who have completed their qualifying exams and advanced to candidacy. Many of those students are  and related options for increasing graduate student credit hours.  While the academic implications for completion are certainly greater than the financial matters, we suggest that FPC encourage academic units to work or reconnect with their ABD students to make timely progress on their programs.

**\*\* Summary of Faculty and Staff input from Dean’s Budget Forum Questionnaire**

General comments

Participants found the forum “very informative” with much information discussed “from university to college at the appropriate level of specificity. “ They found that the session “contributed to financial transparency.”  “Everything I was interested in was answered.”   “Keep up the good work.”  “More time for discussion.”

Suggestions, further questions, goals/initiatives for BAC next year

Spending

* How do we balance budget issues with quality issues?
* More concrete details on (actual expenditures)
* Internal review of offices/expenditures:  understand (strengths and weaknesses) of the units of Dean’s area; understand distribution of resources to schools/administrative offices.  “There remains a cloud of mistrust around faculty regarding this issue.”

**GOAL:  CONTINUE REVIEW OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR BUDGET DECISIONS ACROSS COLLEGE**

IDC and Salary Savings

* Set policies for return on salary savings to faculty.   Possible 12 month appointments for Director/Co-Director of Centers.
* IDC and how it’s used, and whether faculty should have a say in the process.  “Faculty generate that money and need to have a voice in conversations about how it’s used.”

**GOAL:  BAC REVIEW AND ADVISE FPC ON CURRENT/FUTURE IDC AND SALARY SAVINGS POLICY**

Tuition

* What impact will 100% tuition return have on courses that draw students from across the university?
* How can we become top 10$$ and how can COE “snag a share of it.”  Will those courses no longer be attractive to others outside education? Will advisors advise against them?

**GOAL:  MONITOR IMPACT OF 100% TUITION RETURN AND ADV ISE AS APPROPRIATE**

Entrepreneurial programs: Present and Future

* How do they sit with COE and UF mission?  How do they generate revenue?  How do they manage expenses?  What can we learn? How can faculty be involved in such enterprises?
* Need picture of IDC funding expenditures/decision making/information on certificates and effectiveness/ impact, actual revenue/cost of running online program, how RCM supports faculty collaboration?
* How can COE maximize its potential distance learning fee revenue and minimize its loss?  This would most likely require some sort of directive from the Dean’s area.
* How will the new online institute pan out?
* Strategic plan suggests hiring a “rainmaker” to support/facilitate entrepreneurial activity.   COE may afford an “ombudsman” to advocate for faculty with ideas but needs help making connections (inside and outside the college, including business), assessing risk/benefit, convincing funders of worthy investments.  “Perhaps a COE faculty member recognized by COE administration (i.e., an advocate for faculty) who has less status than a Dean but enough not to be ignored.”

**\*\*GOAL:  ACTIVELY GATHER INFORMATION REGARDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENTREPRENEURIAL PROGRAMS**