Faculty Budget Committee Report

College of Charleston Faculty Senate Meeting
April 7, 2015
Committee Members: Thomas Carroll (Exercise Science), Julia Eichelberger (English), Rohn England (Mathematics), Steve Johnson (Studio Art), Rhonda Mack (Marketing), Courtney Murren (Biology), Tom Ross (Psychology), Brian McGee (Academic Affairs, ex officio)
Please refer to your copy of the report

- It’s posted online with the Senate agenda
- A few paper copies are available
- For more detail, see the two memos we sent the Provost in January and February
- After a summary of tonight’s report, we’ll invite you to ask questions and make comments
Process for developing 2015-16 Budget for Academic Affairs

Departments submit requests for budget increases to deans/division heads

Deans/division heads present requests to Provost and Budget Committee at a public forum
All requests presented at Jan. 12 public forum are then considered together.
Departments submit requests → Deans/division heads present requests → Committee responds with memo to Provost → Provost presents draft budget at public forum January 26

Committee discusses memo with Provost on March 6 → Committee writes memo in response to draft budget on February 4

Committee provides input before Provost’s decisions are made

Provost will propose his finalized budget to President before BOT meets in May
Results

Overall, generally sound decisions have been made on how to spend funds that we expect will be limited:

- 1.5% inflationary increase in operating budgets
- 1-2% increase for new spending

Expected limits mean many worthy requests will not be moved forward.

One way to change the budget landscape in future years could be imposing fees for a program or course in a particular school.

Such fees aren’t subject to the same restrictions as universal fees for tuition, athletics, etc. (Legislature often limits universal fee increases to rate of inflation)
School-based fees: an example from Clemson

Major & Course Fee

Keeping pace with change is critical for success in the 21st century. CBBS graduates must be prepared with more than just access to the latest technology and course content. They need courses that fully develop their leadership, decision-making, and critical-thinking skills. They also need an academic foundation to make effective and ethical decisions in their chosen profession.

We want our students to have a top-20 college experience and graduate to pursue outstanding careers. To accomplish this, we have designed the entire CBBS experience to increase our students’ success in highly competitive job markets. This goal is partially supported by a CBBS Major and Course fee that funds infrastructure and program enhancements that benefit all CBBS majors, as well as non-majors in upper-level CBBS courses.

These enhancements include additional faculty to ensure more sections of upper-level CBBS courses and smaller class sizes. The ability to offer more sections allows us to guarantee that CBBS majors get all the required CBBS courses they need for a timely graduation while maintaining the high quality of these courses. More sections also mean non-CBBS majors are able to take part in the highly demanded CBBS classes.

We also offer and encourage our majors to participate in several unique leadership and professional development opportunities such as Creative Inquiry, LEAD! leadership certification program and Horizons professional development programs, all of which help students transition from learners to leaders. As one of the largest and most competitive colleges at the University, we proudly support our students as they invest in themselves and their future.

Fee Assessment

- A CBBS major fee of $1,000 per semester is assessed for all full-time CBBS majors who are juniors or seniors.
- A CBBS course fee of $100 per credit hour is assessed for all other students for each credit hour of CBBS 3000- and 4000-level courses in which they are enrolled. This policy for CBBS majors also applies to first-year students, non-CBBS majors, and part-time students.
We’re in agreement with the Provost on school-based fees.

- These fees could be beneficial if several restrictions are in place:
  - Schools do not keep all the fee; at least 25% is returned to the general fund, to offset the higher cost-per-credit-hour that the institution is absorbing for instruction in these schools
  - Money can only be spent in ways that directly benefit students; spending must be publicized
  - Faculty from the school should assist in setting up a system to oversee the spending of fees
  - School-based fees are unlikely this year. Maybe as early as 2016-17.
What are Special Appropriations?

• The President and other members of our executive team ask SC legislators for special appropriations for particular purposes
• “The art of the possible”: legislators only fund things they find interesting & valuable; they don’t always have the same agenda as C of C does

• Faculty do not participate in the process
• These windfalls do not affect the rest of our budget

• C of C hopes to receive several lines and funding for construction and student scholarships via these special appropriations. More money is now available than we’ve received in several years.
Recommendations, comments

- Thumbs up on the transparency of Academic Affairs’ budget process. *Make this the standard process in the future.*

- Consider multi-year appointments for this committee---steep learning curve if we are to provide meaningful input.

- We can expect zero growth in our downtown undergrad population, hence zero growth in budgets, except for adjustments for inflation + a *very small* number of strategic increases
Recommendations, comments

- Adding new programs may mean reducing existing programs

- Departments need to try (harder?) . . .
  - To predict student demand for their programs
  - To adjust to demand and to students’ interests

- The College needs a better way to assess the needs of departments/divisions, so that scarce funds will be fairly distributed and good programs properly supported
  - “Historic” budgeting model = status quo funding
  - Reallocation of funds can be appropriate at times; for these tough decisions, we need a more transparent process
Now it’s your turn.

Questions? Comments?
We have one additional report to circulate.

- It’s on the closing of the Stern Center Pool/swimming program & the possible budgetary impact of these closures.

- It’s posted on the Senate website for your review.