

November 10, 2003
Room 158 Norman Hall

Members Present: Jamie Algina (alternate for Jennifer Asmus), Dale Campbell, Silvia Echevarria-Doan, Maureen Conroy, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Linda Lamme, Terry Scott, Craig Wood, Elizabeth Yeager

Members Absent: Jennifer Asmus, Nancy Waldron

Others Present: Dean Emihovich, Dotti Delfino

Conroy called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m.

Agenda and Minutes

1. Approval of agenda for November 10, 2003

Echevarria-Doan made a motion to approve the November 10, 2003 meeting agenda as submitted by Conroy. Algina seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the agenda.

2. Approval of the minutes of the October 6, 2003 meeting

Algina made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 6, 2003 meeting. Campbell seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the minutes.

Dean's Report

Dean Emihovich explained components of the budget. She explained there are 2 primary sources of funding for the College of Education (i.e., recurring and nonrecurring). The information she presented in the current budget is recurring. Most of this budget is state funds that are fixed, with approximately 90% of funding in salaries. Nonrecurring funds are funds that are obtained through research overhead accounts and foundation accounts and have restrictions according to how they can be spent (e.g., research overhead funds can only be spent on research activities). She explained that the funds in the tuition waiver category have been overspent due to a number of factors including the significant increase in graduate tuition and lack of sufficient funding. Dean Emihovich explained that in several departments, such as Development and Alumni and the Laster Center, funds for salaries and operating expenses are paid through the foundation and do not come from the College of Education budget.

Conroy asked how the deficit in tuition waiver funds of \$120,000 would impact faculty and students. Dean Emihovich stated that this was a university-wide problem. However, the University does not have any extra tuition waiver funds; therefore, this deficit could mean that the College will need to cut back on instruction or deliver instruction in a more efficient manner (e.g., web-based courses, increasing teaching loads). Algina asked how we could generate more tuition waiver funds so that we will not have to cut graduate assistants. The Dean is discussing this problem with the Chairs, but no decisions have been made.

Wood and Campbell asked how the budget links to the College's long range plan as well as UF's long range plan. Dean Emihovich responded by explaining that there is little discretionary funding in this current budget. However, the research account funding could be used to help develop innovative programs. In addition, she suggested that departments could use salary saving funds to develop innovative programs.

Lamme asked how the current budget deficit impacts summer salaries of faculty. Lamme said that in the past, data was provided by individual faculty members and Lamme agreed with the Dean that this would not be a good idea. This is especially problematic for faculty who are going to retire, because their retirement is based on their average salary over the 5 years prior to retirement. Dean Emihovich explained that state funds are declining and the summer budget is a place where budget cuts can be made. Dean Emihovich explained that she cannot guarantee summer budget for faculty due to deficits and suggested that faculty write grants or develop on line courses that generate "off book" funds to be used for summer salaries. Lamme stated that faculty salaries in the College of Education were lower than other comparable colleges on a national level and asked how administrator's salaries in the College of Education compare to other Colleges of Education on a national level. Lamme asked for data comparing the amount of salary being spent on administrators as opposed to faculty. In addition, Lamme and Wood asked how a cut in summer courses would influence the College's FTE. The Dean explained that if summer courses were cut, the loss in FTE could be made up in the following fall and spring or by teaching "off book" courses.

Wood explained that 45% of the expenditures in the current budget appear to be going to centers or departments that are not generating revenue and asked the Dean to explain how funds are generated in these departments. He added that the current budget as presented is difficult to understand because it does not clearly explain which departments are generating funds. The Dean explained that many of these departments are critical to the College, because they help support instruction

and students within the College. Wood asked the Dean for further information about the overhead costs of the College. He suggested that providing a historical overview of the available funds generated by the College and how those funds were spent across the College would be useful information. The Dean stated that she is in the process of collecting this information. In addition, Wood suggested that more detailed information about nonrecurring budget and the current faculty, roles, and funding sources of related departments, such as Alliance, Lastinger Center and so forth, would be helpful to assist the FPC in further understanding the budget. Dean Emihovich will provide a short narrative of faculty, roles, and activities of each of these departments and their operating budgets.

Lamme suggested that we may want to consider presenting data on how individual faculty generate funding. Dean Emihovich stated that using this type of economic model would not be beneficial.

Dean Emihovich suggested that faculty should consider how we deliver our teacher training program. Presently, our teacher training program runs on an expensive model. She suggested that there may be more efficient service delivery models.

Algina asked the Dean to explain the faculty who made up the 8.25 FTE in administration on the current budget. The Dean did not have that information to present, but will include this information in the narrative.

Dean Emihovich explained that the budget is constantly changing and that she is working to generate additional funds that could be used to support faculty salaries in the summer. Conroy suggested that as changes in the budget occur and budgetary decisions are made, the Dean may want to consult with the Budget and Faculty Affairs Committee. Algina stated that the College's constitution states that the role of the FPC is to provide feedback about how the Dean is spending funds.

Dean Emihovich explained that she is investing funds to help build an infrastructure for the College that will help to generate further funding. For example, the Dean has installed a new server for the College. This server will provide opportunities for generating more funds.

Campbell stated that we need to clarify how grant incentives are used and that a specific policy for grant incentives would be helpful information for faculty.

Wood suggested that the Dean consider cutting the budgets of resource units that do not generate funding prior to cutting the summer salaries of faculty and instructional departments.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Scott for adjournment and seconded by Campbell. The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.