

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING

November 11, 2015
UC 135, 3:15 p.m.

Faculty Senate Budget Committee members in attendance: David Agard, Tom Baxter, Janel Bloch, Nancy Campbell, Steve Crites, Haley Erickson, Nathan De Lee, Yasue Kuwahara, Bob Lilly, Carrie McCoy, Ausbra Mcfarland, Phil Moberg, Celeste Morris, Kevin Muenta, Karen Mutsch, Paul Tenkotte

1. Call to order. The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. on November 11, 2015.
2. Approval of minutes with the additions of Tom Baxter to the members in attendance at the October 2015 meeting, and Celeste Morris to the members in attendance at the September 2015 meeting.
3. After some discussion, the April 2014 minutes were not approved, as the membership of the committee is now different, and many current members were not present at that meeting.
4. Chair's report and announcements
 - A. Janel discussed the Huron presentation from last week. She has sent the PowerPoints to those that were there at the presentation.
 - B. Janel has met with Sue Hodges Moore, Vickie Natale and Beth Sweeney to discuss salaries and determine why salaries are no longer available in Steely Library. Turnover and other factors led to the discontinuation, and salaries will now be put back in the library and online so they are accessible and easy to find.
 - C. Janel is obtaining feedback from the provost and the above which will help this committee in working on further salary analysis.
5. Old business
 - A. Discussion re: budget committee bylaws

The Faculty Senate Constitution is being looked at by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The proposed changes affecting the Budget Committee were discussed, and Janel will relay this input to the Executive Committee.

Discussion took place that the university biennial budget proposal should also remain in the budget committee charge, as listed in 1. A). Furthermore, we need to maybe not strike 3) which is the advisory to COSFL. We need to find out if COSFL still exists and what was the Senate chair's rationale for striking the three above charges. B. was also in question and discussed. The consensus is the committee wants to be represented and have a voice on the budget.

B. Voting item: Two changes to budget committee bylaws

- Article 1, Part A: Replace "It shall review and report to the Faculty Senate on the University's biennial budget proposal" with

"It shall periodically report on the Council on Postsecondary Education's biennial budget development process and recommendations for funding the public universities".

After discussion, the proposal was **revised to** "It shall periodically report to the Faculty Senate on the University's budget priorities submitted to the Council on Postsecondary Education's biennial budget development process and recommendations for funding the public universities." The vote was all in favor except one.

The reason for this change is that the CPE is really who proposes the budget.

- Article 4, Part C: Replace "Whenever possible, each major division (Professional Studies, Arts & Sciences, Chase College of Law, Business and the Library) should have at least one member represented on each subcommittee." with "When possible, subcommittees should have representation from each college and the library." The idea is still there.

After discussion, the proposal was **revised to** “should have at least one representation from each college.” The vote was all in favor except one.

- C. Budget priorities survey content and timing. Discuss the revised survey draft, which incorporates comments from the committee on the first draft. See the following documents.
 - Second draft of survey (posted on Blackboard)
 - [Faculty Senate Budget Committee Priorities Report 2013-2014](#) (posted on Budget Committee website) and
 - “Summary of Faculty Budget Priority Surveys, 2003-2014” (posted on Blackboard)

Discussion on the survey took place. Janel reported on the feedback from the faculty executive and budget committee and Sue Hodges Moore.

- The item requesting years at NKU was deleted. Janel reviewed the importance of the new formatting of the survey.
- A few suggestions were noted and a few words were added. A suggestion was to separate the hard commitment (salaries) versus soft commitment (project grants). Discussion of “fund differential workload” and to change to “fund reduced teaching workloads such as research, programmatic grants, strategic investment initiatives and graduate mentoring/capstones.”
- Adjustments on the divisions of the budget survey items were made.
- Both questions on 7 and 8 will remain.

- D. Salary policies and analysis. Discuss proposed content of salary data to be requested from Institutional Research. Discuss how to proceed with salary analysis.
Proposed columns include:

Name	Dept.	Rank	Yrs. in rank	Highest degree	FY/AY	Salary	2-CIP	2-CIP salary	\$ dif.	% dif.	4-CIP	4-CIP salary	\$ dif.	% dif.	6-CIP	6-CIP salary	\$ dif.	% dif.	Notes	

- Ideas for benchmark/peer institutions to include in the comparison salaries

The peer institutions were briefly discussed. The suggestion was made to include local and regional institutions that typically aren’t considered peers because those are the ones for which NKU competes for both students and faculty. These include UK, XU, UC, Miami University, and UD. This discussion will be continued in the next meeting.

- For the 2013-2014 Budget Committee salary analysis, see “Report on a Comparison on NKU and CUPA Salaries”, (posted on Blackboard)

E. Current budget review/new budget model

F. Commonwealth affairs

Understanding activities related to efforts to change state funding model for universities and other activities related to the state government and other relevant entities

G. Desired presenters and topics

6. New business
7. Adjournment

Future meetings:

- December 9, 2015, UC 135
- February 10, 2016, UC 135
- March 16, 2016, UC 135
- April 13, 2016, UC 135