

## Budget Committee of Faculty Senate Meeting

Brad Yates, Presiding

February 27, 2017

Approved: March 31, 2017

Attendance: Liz Baker, Laura Caramanica, Leanne DeFoor, Tom Gainey, Anne Gaquere, Tom Jennings, Meg Pearson, Maurice Crossley, and Brad Yates

Guests: Julia Farmer & Angela Insenga

1. Call to Order: 2:02 p.m.
2. November 10, 2016 Minutes approved unanimously
3. December 7, 2016 Minutes approved unanimously
4. New Business
  - a. Discuss potential Budget Allocation for Faculty Senate administrative support
    - i. Julia Farmer and Angela Insenga offered background on the initiative to provide administrative support for Faculty Senate. J. Farmer and Elizabeth Kramer (Past Chair of Faculty Senate) discussed the initiative a few years ago, but it didn't go far. Angela Insenga provided some insight into the process involved in preparing the agenda for Faculty Senate and other administrative duties that helped the Committee understand the needs of the Executive Secretary.
    - ii. J. Farmer and A. Insenga submitted a proposal in late summer/early fall for funding support to cover printing costs and related items to then-Interim Provost M. Gantner. The proposal was based on research of how peer institutions handle Faculty Senate documentation and web site maintenance. The research revealed that peer institution Faculty Senate web sites (and associated documentation) operated separate from Academic Affairs. M. Gantner approved the proposal to provide funding for printing and move web site duties to the Executive Secretary. A. Insenga assumed update duties of the UWG Faculty Senate web site from Teresa Ock in Academic Affairs.
    - iii. A. Insenga explained that approximately 12 hours worth of work is associated with creating the Faculty Senate agenda, taking/proofing minutes, and uploading required documents to the Faculty Senate web site.
    - iv. A. Insenga learned how to update the Faculty Senate web site from UCM and trained with Teresa Ock to learn what documentation is required.
    - v. After some additional discussion, the Committee agreed that a staff position for Faculty Senate is **not necessary** given the recent funding support for printing, etc. that M. Gantner authorized while serving as Interim Provost.
    - vi. A. Insenga receives a course reassigned time for serving as Executive Secretary. J. Farmer noted that the Executive Secretary may choose a course release or a stipend.
    - vii. The Committee agreed the current course release or stipend option for the Executive Secretary is the most cost effective method at this point.
    - viii. B. Yates and A. Stanfield wondered if Faculty Senate needed to have a physical presence on campus (e.g., an office). Space is at a premium and office space for Senate will likely not be a priority. B. Yates suggested an online presence might be an option, and L. Caramanica noted a virtual office door on the Senate web site might be an alternative to the physical space.

- ix. The Committee agreed that a "virtual office" for Faculty Senate might be the best option as opposed to a physical Faculty Senate office. Faculty Senate will utilize the Faculty Senate Newsletter to keep faculty informed (even sharing it via the Work West Bulletin) and train Senators in practices that will help faculty know that the Senate is working for them and welcomes input. This training can be weaved into the summer orientation for new Senators and Executive Committee members.
- b. Brainstorm funding options for small student organizations that aren't funded via SAFBA
  - i. The discussion about small student organizations and funding yielded questions about the process, but Committee members were able to speak to how things work to answer most questions.
  - ii. It was made clear that SAFBA is a separate entity and the Faculty Senate Budget Committee has no purview over that process.
  - iii. The Committee does support discussion of possible designated revenue streams for some of the programs that straddle academic and student affairs. It was explained that SAEM and SAFBA have recently developed a new strategy for allocating SAFBA funds, and it will behoove all involved to allow time for the new approach to be implemented before moving forward with any further changes.
  - iv. Other options for student organizations who might need funds (small amounts in the range of \$200-\$1000) should consider foundation accounts (when appropriate), agency accounts that allow rollover, and requests to Deans and the Provost for monies when students need supplements for travel to conferences or advisors seek funds for induction ceremonies into honor societies and organizations (to pay for a small reception). The Committee is open to other ideas as well.
  - v. Too, the Committee wondered if all on campus must still use Dine West in the same manner that we had to use Aramark for on campus events.
- c. Open Discussion (burning budget questions; future initiatives)
  - i. Open discussion once again raised the question of salary compression for full professors (e.g., years in rank not accounted for in current equity formula). In some departments, this issue is creating low morale and decreasing a desire to be productive in the area of scholarship.
  - ii. Unfortunately, the answer (continue with current equity formula) was a tough one to swallow. Given UWG's desire to continue to push toward 100% of the CUPA it will be necessary to move forward in the same manner to achieve the goal of 100%.
  - iii. It was noted that the current process is the best UWG can do at this time, and it does serve the faculty and staff well.
  - iv. Further, it was highlighted that the PTR incentive program, as originally conceived, would have spoken to the issue of full professor salary compression, but the BOR policy limited options.

5. Next Meeting: Friday, March 17<sup>th</sup> at 10 a.m.

6. Adjournment 3:11 p.m.