



3-5-2010

Faculty Senate - March 5, 2010 Budget and Planning

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_committeemins



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate - March 5, 2010 Budget and Planning" (2010). *Minutes, Senate Committee Meetings*.
http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_committeemins/18

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes, Senate Committee Meetings by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

MINUTES

**University of Tennessee Faculty Senate
Budget and Planning Committee
March 5, 2010, 8:30 a.m. – SMC 720 (CBER Conference Room)**

Present: Don Bruce (Chair), Chris Cimino, Stephen Blackwell, Jerzy Dydak, Nathalie Hristov, Conrad Plaut, Harold Roth, Karen Sowers
Absent: Michael Essington, Lane Morris, Jay Pfaffman, and Marlys Staudt, and Klaus van den Berg

Minutes from February 5, 2010 were approved.

Campus Budget Update: Cimino reported that the final schedule for budget cuts for the next fiscal year had been received. A 6% base cut, translated into a 7.3% cut for UTK, would be handled primarily centrally, with little or nothing passed out to the various units. A potential tax on the new differential tuition, energy savings, and a potential tuition increase will help make that possible. Current discussion surrounding tuition increases is focusing on 5-6%, with the UTK increase possibly being 6-7%.

Bruce asked about the proposed bonus to state employees in the Governor's budget, and Cimino noted that it is fully funded in the budget. The Chancellor would like to adjust that if possible, but no further details are available at this time. The Chancellor is currently holding budget meetings with Vice Chancellors and other direct reports, and a presentation and discussion is set for April 13 at 1 p.m. in the UC Shiloh Room.

Blackwell asked about the current status of planning for the end of the stimulus funding period. The Provost is working with the Deans on this issue, and each will handle things differently. Instructional capacity may be affected, but it depends on the extent to which Deans have used stimulus funding to cover lecturer positions. Some class sections may indeed be larger, or perhaps lost entirely. Cimino noted that the gross impact of the recent series of budget cuts will amount to an approximate one-third reduction in the state appropriation in a three-year period of time.

Update on System-Wide Institutional Support Spending: Roth provided several handouts indicating that Institutional Support spending had fallen since our Spring 2009 report on the issue, but only by a relatively small amount. Any recent system-level effort to reduce Institutional Support spending is not readily apparent in the latest budget documents. Bruce said an update on the earlier report would be prepared for presentation to the Executive Council and the full Faculty Senate.

Non-Academic Spending Review Sub-Committee: Plaut reported that he will be making requests to a few units or programs: the Community of Science, the Math Tutorial Center, the OIT Help Desk, Ready for the World, The Tennessee Teaching and Learning Center, the Thornton Center, and perhaps the Arts and Sciences Advising Center. He will initiate contact with a letter or e-mail outlining the goals of obtaining details on how those operations are

assessed, what data are gathered, what results have been obtained, and what plans they might have to make improvements. Bruce noted that we need to be clear about our purpose, and that is to gather a set of information that will identify best practices across campus.

Benchmarking Non-Resident Tuition Policies at Top-25 Institutions: Hristov provided a report on her group's research activities on this issue. The handout provided did not indicate a large number of institutions with non-resident tuition waivers and a high non-resident student percentage, so it was not clear how the data could be used to make a recommendation for UTK. It was recommended that the group follow up with a few select institutions where a focus on non-resident tuition policy appears to have been a strategy.