

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of September 29, 2011

Present: Lynn Westerkamp, Chair, Robert Boltje, David Draper, Daniel Friedman, Patty Gallagher, Susan Gillman, David Helmbold, Joe Konopelski, Sriram Shastry, Deanna Shemek, Andy Szasz, Mary-Beth Harhen (ASO), Erik Green (GSA), Stephanie Casher (ASO).

Absent: Jessica Greenstreet (SUA)

Guest: Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget Peggy Delaney; Associate Vice Chancellor of Budget and Resource Management Karen Eckert

1. Conducting Committee Business

After introductions, Chair Westerkamp gave the committee an orientation on conducting CPB business, member responsibilities, and confidentiality. Chair Westerkamp also laid out the policy on recusals, and the expectation that when the committee is discussing an issue that pertains to one's department, or in which there is a clear conflict of interest, a member should leave the room and not participate in the discussion.

CPB approved the confidentiality agreement and consultation procedures for distribution to Deans, Departments, Principal Officers, and the administration.

2. Overview of Continuing Issues

Chair Westerkamp gave an overview of continuing issues for CPB:

- SEC 'Proposal to Align Admissions and Retention Functions with Academic Administration' and the restructuring of Student Affairs
- Library usage and consolidation of library resources
- Investigating Total Cost to Student
- Improving consultation on the budget process
- Rebenching
- The distribution (and impacts) of the most recent budget cuts

3. Budget Orientation by Associate Vice Chancellor of Budget and Resource Management, Karen Eckert

Associate VC Eckert gave CPB a budget orientation, including:

- The difference between Permanent vs. Ongoing vs. One-time or Temporary funds
- The difference between a base budget and an operating budget
- The difference between General Funds and State funds
- An overview of FTE allocations
- An overview of the campus recharge system (recharge rates, optional vs. single provider, determination of rates, and how recharge income is accounted for in the budget summary)

- An overview of funding streams (State funds, student tuition and fees, overhead receipts, federal contracts and grants, private gifts and grants, other)
- An overview of student fees—tuition, nonresident supplemental tuition, student services fees, campus based fees (established by student referendum), miscellaneous/course fees, fees for Professional Schools
- The distribution of overhead from Federal Indirect Cost Receipts generated
- An overview of how the UC budget is developed
- An overview of the changes brought about by the Funding Streams Initiative; an overview of Rebenching efforts
- An overview of Campus Business Systems

Following the presentation, Associate VC Eckert and VC Delaney answered questions from the committee.

4. Waiver of Recruitment/Partner Hire in Environmental Studies

CPB reviewed a request for a waiver of recruitment to proceed with a partner hire to retain a Professor in the Politics department. The partner hire would occur in the Environmental Studies department. CPB supports the request to waive recruitment and proceed with this hire.

5. Anthropology Department External Review Deferral

The Anthropology Department has requested a 2-year deferral of their external review, currently scheduled for 2012-13. Some members questioned if there was precedent for this, and if time to “re-build the program” is an appropriate justification for deferral.

CPB will request clarification from Dean Kamieniecki on Divisional hiring priorities in relation to Anthropology before making a recommendation.

6. ITS External Review

CPB began discussion of the ITS External Review. Some issues raised include:

- Concerns about governance and who is setting policy. The EVC should monitor the situation and intervene as necessary. Is there some possibility for campus stewardship of this unit?
- More transparency and interaction with the constituents. The ITS communication protocol with departments, divisions, and the greater campus could be improved.
- Staff placement—is the ITS staff deployed appropriately throughout campus? Are the employees happy in their placements?
- There should be a benchmarking of costs, and someone (or unit) should be charged with monitoring costs in relation to IU charges. Overall, cost-effectiveness of services provided should be evaluated in part through comparisons with other research institutions.

One member also wondered if the Vice Chancellor of ITS would be formally responding to the External Review report. In future Administrative reviews, CPB will recommend that this step be part of the process.

One member suggested that for future administrative reviews that will incorporate input from faculty, the appropriate Academic Senate committee should formally request responses to the survey to try and net a higher response rate.