

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Subject:

Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Committee

Meeting Organizer:

Cynthia Jowers

Location:

Sue Jameson Room

Start Date:

2/27/2007

Start Time:

1:00 PM

End Date:

2/27/2006

End Time:

3:00 PM

Agenda Items

1 Announcements

Owner:

E. Sundberg

Progress:

Completed

Notes

- a. The proposal for the AAC&U Institute on GE was due last week and Nathan Rank and Sundberg submitted it. The cost for a team to attend will be between \$8,000-9,000.

2 PBAC Update (handouts)

Owner:

Eduardo Ochoa

Progress:

Completed

Notes

Committee reviewed PBAC handouts and Ochoa highlighted the 2007-08 general fund budget priorities: enrollment growth (including good retention rates); academic quality; information technology; and fundraising. Ochoa noted the new 200K for instructional technology and 200K for faculty development. University Planning Steering Committee work has had an affect on this budget.

Committee member comments: Is the 400K for Development a permanent cost? When will we see some accountability for the money spent on Development? There are a lot of people on campus outside of the Development Office who are working on fundraising. The 200K for faculty development is great news. Tenure-track hiring should be a top budget priority. The Deans agreed that there has been some growth in tenure track.

Due to time, the Committee asked to jump to Agenda item #4.

3 First Year Experience (FYE) Budget Models (handouts)

Owner:

Ochoa & Pierce

Progress:

Completed

Notes

Committee reviewed the Budget for FYE Pilot Year Two 2007-08 and Pierce highlighted alternative delivery models. (Handouts will also be posted on the Academic Resources web page.) The scale up could work if we go from 9 units to 10. Ochoa agreed that there are curricular and pedagogical issues that go beyond the budget. FYE is also being looked at by the Academic Planning Committee (APC).

Committee member comments: I support FYE, but courses teaching writing are subsidizing this. Writing classes are under funded. The School of Science and Technology voted against the 10 units.

Added by request of Elaine McDonald-Newman: There was considerable discussion about reasons why the seeming "richness" of OE for FYE can still be paid for by growth money (i.e. it is nearly self-sufficient). These reasons include the following:

1. We have historically under-funded this freshman content and subsidized the rest of our curriculum to the tune of \$70,000 annually.
2. The increase from 9 to 10 SCU while faculty still only get 8 WTU.

Two comments were raised about the last point: the School of Science and Technology has opposed this change from the start due to the heavy unit load experienced by their lower division major courses; if faculty teaching in FYE continue with their proposal to eliminate the peer mentors and SSPs from the pedagogy, we are funding this program by exploiting their willingness to do work they are not getting paid for.

After discussion, Wandling asked the committee to endorse the second year of the pilot. McDonald-Newman agreed that the committee could take an advisory vote. Motion-Wandling. Second-Leader. Voice vote-unanimous to endorse the second year of the FYE Pilot.
