SOS Steering Committee (SC) Minutes  
Monday, March 31, 2014, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

Voting Members Present: Simon Rhodes (Dean), Bethany Neal-Beliveau (Psychology/President), Horia Petrache (Physics), Vitaly Tarasov, (Mathematical Sciences), Dennis Devine (Psychology), Christoph Naumann (Chemistry and Chemical Biology), Yao Liang (Computer and Information Science), Jiliang Li (Biology), Lin Li (Earth Sciences)

Non-Voting Members: Doug Lees, Jeff Watt, David Skalnik, Snehasis Mukhopadhyay (Computer and Information Science/Past President), Michelle Salyers (Psychology/Secretary), Steve Randall (Biology, School of Science Representative to the BAC)

1. **Approval of agenda** - President Neal-Beliveau called the meeting to order. She called for a motion to approve the agenda. There was a motion, a second and it was approved.

2. **Approval of minutes from February 24, 2014** - President Neal-Beliveau asked if there were any suggested revisions to the minutes from the last meeting. None were noted. She called for a motion to approve the minutes. There was a motion, a second, and the minutes were approved without changes.

3. **Comments by Dean Rhodes**

   Budget season – our assessments (taxes) went up, but Doug Lees caught a big error from the university calculations and saved us a bunch of money (over $400,000). Trustees approved the possible salary increase and units can do up to 2% cash value. However, units cannot give everyone the same increase. Trustees require variability to account for merit. Some schools will likely take less of an increase, but our School will take the full 2%.

   Hires-Forensics and Computer Science were both successful. Biology has one offer accepted, and a second one awaiting the response of the candidate. Psychology search is still not resolved. Chemistry did not get the hire they offered. Math Sciences chair search ongoing.

   Currently there is university-wide thinking about FAR and how to improve it. Doug Lees is our representative. We can send him constructive suggestions to improve it. We are not sure if the end result will be a whole new reporting system, or just updating and fixing the current system. It will be important for a new FAR to be able to provide consistent ways of documenting productivity and to give the ability to create reports.
As mentioned in a prior meeting, the IUPUI campus may be moving towards a common teaching evaluation across courses/schools. IU Bloomington is using a common assessment for their campus starting Fall semester of 2014.

The update from Barry Muhoberac as the library representative is that they are still having conversations between the Library and committee. One suggestion was a pilot program for some of the journals, but that would cause an extra cost and thus not realize optimal savings. So, the Library is reluctant to try that approach.

There were no questions for the Dean.

Bethany Neal-Beliveau (BNB) posed a question for committee before turning to Doug Lees’ presentation. Next Month Kathy Marrs will speak to the Steering Committee, and she can talk about a lot of different things. What particular things should she focus on? Horia Petrache (HP) asked for her to address how many students are on scholarships and what kind. No other suggestions were given. Beth will pass this on to Kathy.

4. Updates from Associate Deans

a. Doug Lees, Associate Dean for Planning & Finance

Doug started with a history of the budgets and who has input into them. The budget sheet comes from campus each spring and we have to match their total income line at the bottom with our projected expenses.

He walked the Committee through how to read the proforma. Appropriations are at the top. This is an increase. Some of the budgeted money (~$307K) had to go back due to a shortfall in state income, but this does not change the amount (i.e., this year we do not have less to work with). Fees are the next lines. “Enrollment shaping” is a category that refers to efforts to increase number of out of state students. Anything beyond a certain base is split 50/50 between School and Campus, and campus uses its portion to pay recruiters to bring in out of state students. The amount now being collected by campus exceeds the cost of the recruiters, so our School and others will be asking how the money is being spent. The CRF (Chancellor’s Reallocation Fund) is based on 1% of fall + spring tuition income and increases as base in an additive fashion each year. Through the reallocation fund (pulls/allocations), the School is paying out more than we are receiving. Last year assessments went up a very small amount, but next year it will be much more.

The operating budget (on another page) is developed each year and Schools are asked about different aspects that get factored into the budget. Some are very complex, like lab fees. Details for the lab fee adjustments for next year were requested when staff were not available to help (e.g., holidays). Doug will be looking at this more closely over the summer. Consumables and nonperishables are at the level of the department, but technical salary and space costs stay at the School. The bottom line is that we (as a School) have some input into the budget. We try to base projections on things that are real, but sometimes have to make estimates (e.g., enrollments). For example, we look at the fall enrollment profile in terms
degree objectives and residency status and estimate enrollments for the following semesters.

Steve Randall (SR) asked if we get any pushback. Doug Lees (DL) said that in all domains we could see we were up from last year’s estimates (e.g., enrollments) and we use our current data as well as admissions data to make our projections.

Doug went on to describe that the sheet with color lines is a summary of this year, where the total budget will be will be $42.6 million. He mentioned that the main drivers of assessments are student FTE, employee FTE, and assignable square footage. The SOS increased in all 3 of these measures over the last year. The assessments depend on how other schools do as well.

In the spreadsheets, Doug put in prior years to show us how the appropriations and assessments changed drastically over time. Chancellor’s reallocation fund was based on 1% of state appropriation (the about $6M) and then changed to 1% of fall plus spring tuition (so the amount went up 6 fold!). In a few years this will go up to $3 million and will not be sustainable over time.

SR asked, what is the basis for the policy? DL replied that it is base money that gets repeated each year. So they have recommended for funded projects that have salary lines that the recipient school over time could take over the cost of a salary line, rather than continuing to go back to Chancellor’s reallocation fund. This would allow for recycling of some of these funds rather than committing them permanently. Dean Rhodes (DR) says he thinks the campus realizes the problem with the current system and that it is not sustainable and we will continue to drive discussion of this so that there is an acceptable outcome.

Doug went on to explain that the “CTE” (commitment to excellence) money is to cover some types of positions (e.g., some lecturers, FIS faculty and staff lines, BME/Biology lines)). The last page he showed the committee is the summary of how we have matched the different categories this year to last year. He walked us through to show costs in different categories.

Christoph Naumann (CN) asked about the category called “shortfall”. DL replied that he puts some money aside to cover if things change with tuition or ICR drops below estimates. He labels it shortfall, to be able to cover any shortfall we might have based on the initial estimates

Snehasis Mukhopadhyay (SM) asked if the total salary and fringe add up, and DL responded that there was a transposition error in one of lines and total salaries are correct as listed on the sheet.

BNB noticed that renovation was not a listed category. DL responded that the School has cash set aside for renovation from past end-of-year cash. The renovation is covered. DR also noted that the renovation includes Math Sciences needs in the library for the MAC.

BNB asked if airflow also covered? DL responded that’s a different line and we are not paying for that (the legislature will be). DR added that the Campus is not sure about the “big fix” needed for our school. In this building (LD building), the airflow is good. One solution, ducts running outside the building, are cheaper, but not thought aesthetic by the Architect’s office.
LD building is ok for airflow on its own. In SL, the building was not built for labs and airflow is not adequate. The ET building is also problematic. Buildings currently handle airflow better when doors between them are closed. Even the doors from SL to parking garage are often propped open and never should be. Also airflow is better on higher floors in the buildings (e.g., basement wind tunnel effect between SL and ET).

CN asked how much wiggle room do we have in the budget for things like start-up, which can easily add up? Chairs are asked to complete a form with information on estimated needs and income generation of the proposed new hire. The School then uses budgeted start-up (now about $1.5M) plus end-of-year cash to meet the total start-up costs for the upcoming year. DR reminded us that they do have start-up totally covered at the outset so that if people actually spend it all, the money would be there. This is different from other Schools who work with an estimate (like 70% of promised funds). DL added that it is safer to be sure you can cover all the start up requests.

SM asked if we know the assessment calculation formula, and was there a change from 2011 (noticing a big increase on the paper)? DL replied that yes, in 2010-2011, assessment changed to a consumption model. Prior to this, student FTE, employee FTE, and footage were the 3 drivers—we would pay the average percent for all of campus assessments, based on these 3 factors. Now we use a consumption model that includes more specific driver elements (e.g., dividing out graduate and undergraduate). SM also pointed out the big jump and we talked about different possibilities that accounted for the increase in assessment. DL reminded us to keep in mind that it also changes based on what other schools pay. DR added that even within our School, we have departments that help offset the costs of others. This is part of offering a complete curriculum.

SR asked about shared teaching space outside of our own and if that was factored into assessments. DL said this is covered in our space charges. The two major cost centers for space are CFS services and utilities. If you take the CFS budget and a total utilities estimate and then charge RCs for them by assignable square footage, you then pay for all space costs. DR added that we are the major users of Lecture Hall. Some faculty are asking for more security there or other changes that are expensive. Campus has declined to do it, and have asked us if we want to pay for changes, as we are the major user. This illustrates the complexities of common spaces. SR also noted that sometimes we need to teach in other space because our available space is not the right size.

5. New Business

a. School of Science representative to the IUPUI Budgetary Affairs Committee (BAC; Steve Randall)

SR was appointed by the Dean (Ng) a few years ago and retained by SJR. One of the main roles of this committee is to participate in cluster conversations with Deans, IUPUI strategic planning council, and they report back to Faculty Council. The BAC meets monthly, and the meeting agendas are issue driven with whatever is happening around campus (e.g., last year parking issues and decision not to sell off parking). Another issue of influence was the
legislature decision to give money based on student success. The BAC had conversations about this and suggested money to come back to the School’s of interest. SR thinks that the BAC had influence to change that.

He is coming to the Steering Committee to discuss whether his position should be a faculty vote rather than appointed. Some schools have an elected position and their own budgetary affairs committee. Some Schools did not have a whole committee, but usually had one elected person. SR said it could be helpful to have a budgetary committee and then faculty could provide input. It would be nice to allow faculty to have direct input into that process. He wanted to raise these ideas to this group to see what we think about it.

DR added that historically, this committee did have an election amongst ourselves (Steering Committee) and send one person to the BAC. BNB said that according to the website, Steve is a representative through the end of next year. SR said he could be substituted out.

Michelle Salyers (MS) asked, Are if he wanted to step down or just bringing it to our attention. SR said he is happy to still serve, but wanted to share that our School’s representation is not how it is usually being done elsewhere. He also thinks its helpful to have the Steering Committee represented directly so that information could feed back to this group.

DR said that he had served in this role before, and he thought it was a good learning experience. The committee service is not much effort. SR added that the cluster meetings are held on a Saturday. The representative would have a couple of Saturday meetings.

DR said that this year he participated in both the cluster meetings and a public meeting. He liked that because of advantages of both. For example, in a closed environment, people are able to voice more concerns.

SR added that this is an opportunity for faculty to be able to shape the budget and decisions about how money is spent at the campus level. DR said the representative could bring ideas back to the steering committee and poll people.

BNB said we can consider an election of a Steering Committee member for next fall. This would be something we would do once we knew the new composition of the group. SR said that the BAC usually meets in August, so it would be good to have early.

b. Agenda for Spring Faculty Assembly

BNB reminded us that the date is Friday April 18th at 9am. We will discuss the proposed change to bylaws about voting privileges. Jane Williams will give an update on the new student satisfaction survey. One issue she wants to bring up is the electronic issue, and the work of the subcommittee that has been meeting to discuss this and how to increase participation rates. Jane will bring some of these ideas back to this meeting.

BNB asked any for other agenda items for the Assembly (can send them to her after the meeting, too). SM reminded us to have a standing committee report. Michelle needs to reach out to them to get their reports.
BNB also gave a reminder that we need to get volunteers to run for secretary/president elect. We need to have someone set up for this soon.

6. Old Business
   a. School of Science representatives for IUPUI Faculty Council

   BNB noted that this agenda item reflects a lack of participation at the School -- no one has come forward with nominees for IUPUI faculty council.

   DL reminded us that it is only one meeting a month. BNB said her term ends this year. She is willing to go again this year for one of the positions, but we still need another representative. Currently it is the first Tuesday of the month from 3-5 in the Campus Center.

   The meeting adjourned, and the Subcommittee for Administrative Reviews (SAR) met until 5:00 to discuss evaluation items.
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