

Resource Allocation Workgroup

June 20, 2013

The meeting began with considerable discussion concerning looking at other budget models, as someone suggested on June 13. A decision was made to delve into the topic of other models at the next committee meeting on July 11, 2013.

Observations were made concerning units that were not represented on the committee, such as the Graduate School, the President's Office, the Vice President for Integrated Communications, Student Affairs, Information Technology, etc. The committee reached a consensus that they would invite representation from each of the afore-mentioned units to attend the 7/11/13 meeting. The representatives should be prepared to offer metrics as a starting point for calculating their allocations, since those units do not generate student credit hours. Perhaps they might receive metrics used at peer institutions? Someone observed that institutions do not readily share that information, and it is difficult to find on their websites. Perhaps committee members might request it from professional organizations of which they are members.

Dawn Ressel suggested concentrating on administrative sectors in today's meeting.

Tony Tomsu noted that his office has been tweaking the budget model spreadsheet to break out student credit hours by upper division, lower division, graduate level, tenure-track instructors, adjuncts, and teaching assistants. A question was asked concerning how research was included in the proposed budget model, since UM is encouraging research and faculty who are involved in research generally do not generate as many student credit hours, which seems to be the basis for the new model. Dawn concurred that the current model doesn't recognize research. Tony suggested that a new factor could be added to the formula when research is involved.

One committee member suggested that adding such factors might cause discord, as some units might not have full understanding of why factors are added in some cases, but not in all. The folks from OPBA assured the committee that everything in the worksheet would be uniform and standard across campus and not at all subjective. Jim Hershfield suggested that workloads are fairly standard across campus and that the committee should not get too mixed up trying to find a constant.

Another observation was made that the model doesn't work for units who lose funding. Someone observed that there are huge variations. A suggestion was made to use a cost factor to bring the model into parity with current allocations, then go forward from there. OPBA support offered to plug in actual data to approximate current funding.

Discussion then arose about the model being seemingly weighted toward a non-research, undergraduate model offering general education courses. A concern was expressed about programs with higher tuition and program tuition. When the new metrics are applied, there might be huge disparities.

OPBA then gave the committee a bit of history about how the current state allocation is determined. In 2010-11, the BOR mandated that there would be no increase in tuition for satellite institutions.

Resource Allocation Workgroup

June 20, 2013

Currently, the allocation is determined using an 80/20 split between residents and non-residents. Since BOR funding is offered 80%, based upon the assumption that 20% of students are non-residents, and since satellite schools generally do not have non-resident enrollment, their slice of the pie got even smaller. Further discussion centered on state allocations and policies behind it. It was noted that the Administrative Assessment that is charged on SPABA's and designated funds goes back to the general fund.

Committee members in attendance on 6/20/13:

Jim Hirstein, co-chair

Barry Brown

Tory Clark

Byron Drake

Elaine Gagliardi

Kent Haslam

Charles Janson

Jenny McNulty

Hannah Singleton

Beckie Christiaens

Scott Whittenburg

Dawn Ressel

Tony Tomsu

Ed Wingard

Kathy White