A REPORT ON THE ALLOCATING OF RESOURCES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND

This report, from the University Faculty Council, on the process of allocating resources at UR is divided into two parts. Part One is a summary of the current process, at least as it relates to educational expenditures. Part Two consists of a list of recommended changes that should be made in the process. Each recommendation is followed by a rationale. The report is based on interviews with the Provost, Vice President for Business and Finance, and the A&S and B-School Deans, on interviews and other communications with present and former members of the Planning and Priorities Committee, and on research into how budgeting is done at some other universities similar to UR (see Appendix).

Part One: Summary of Current Process of Allocating Resources at UR.

There are few provisions in official University documents that pertain to the allocating of resources at UR. The Bylaws say, “The Vice President for Business and Finance/Treasurer shall be . . . in charge of the business and financial affairs of the University and its various divisions,” and the Guide to Faculty Governance says, “The Dean of each school . . . is responsible . . . for budgets . . .” and that the faculty shall play “an appropriate role in those matters of traditional concern to the faculty . . . [including] budgeting for the academic mission of the University.” In addition the charge of the Planning & Priorities Committee (see below) explicitly gives it a role in the allocating of resources.

Given the lack of official instructions on how and by whom resources should be allocated at UR, this part of the report summarizes customary practice, which is simply the process that was established a good many years ago and that has been incrementally modified over time by various Presidents, Vice Presidents of Business and Finance, and Deans.

The allocating of resources at UR takes place within the context of the University’s annual budget, which is comprised of two separate categories: (1) Educational and General Activities and (2) Auxiliary Enterprises Activities. The second category includes budgets for housing, food services, bookstore, health services, and telecommunications. Each unit within this second category is supposed to be self-supporting, i.e., to generate its own income. (Officially intercollegiate athletics falls under this second category, but because it is not self-supporting, its budget is part of the first category.)

This report describes only the allocating of resources relating to Educational and General Activities. This part of the budget includes spending for academic programs, student aid, libraries, computing, and student development, intercollegiate athletics, and other administrative services. (Although the School of Continuing Studies falls within this category, it must be and is self-supporting.) This part of the budget is, in turn, comprised
of two parts: the compensation budget and the operating (non-personnel) budget. Funds for the educational budget come from both restricted (earmarked) and unrestricted sources, the most important of which are tuition, endowment income, investment income, and annual giving. The total educational budget for any given year is the result of a certain percentage increase in the previous year’s budget plus an amount designated for major new expenditures, called program improvements.

A. Preparation of the Macro Budget.

It should be noted first that the University does not have anything like zero-based budgeting, whereby each unit within the University would each year or periodically have to make a case for either its total budget or for a certain increase in its budget. Instead, the budget of each of the major units of the University, such as a school, is automatically increased each year by a certain percentage, which may vary from year to year. Although there is no University policy that requires the budgets of sub-units, e.g., departments, within those major units to be increased by that same percentage, traditionally their budgets have also been increased by that same percentage.

Each year the Controller’s Office asks all heads of units/sub-units “to review their existing operations for costs that can be reduced or eliminated.” However, because units/sub-units may need to and are allowed to use unspent funds in one area to meet needs in other areas for which there are inadequate funds (except that staff salary allocations may not be used for other purposes), total costs tend to increase. Deans, VP’s, and other unit managers, therefore, have the discretion to differentially increase operational, non-staff spending so that pressing needs may be met. For example, in recent years the standard increase in the operational budget of A&S has not been passed on to the departments; the A&S Dean asked them to forego an increase in their operating budget, unless they could demonstrate a need for it, so that the money could be spent on other school-wide priorities.

Preparation of any given fiscal year’s budget begins in the Office of Business and Finance around September. There is no one factor on either the revenue or expenditure side that “drives” the making of the budget. On both sides, there are certain guidelines or “default positions” that are used in constructing a tentative macro budget. On the expenditure side, they are as follows: (1) the operating budget (non-personnel expenses) is increased by a percentage approximating the percentage increase in inflation the previous year (in recent years the increase has been three percent); (2) the compensation pool is increased by inflation plus one percent; (3) $750,000 is set aside for continuing program improvements, and $300,000 to $500,000 for one-time improvements; and (4) the University seeks to produce annually about five million dollars in “net revenues” as protection in the event of unexpected major expenses. On the revenue side, the “default positions” are as follows: (1) tuition is increased by inflation plus two percent (a long standing practice); (2) the unit spending rate of the endowment is increased by 6% each year so long as the new spending rate is at least four percent but not more than six percent of the three-year moving average of the market value of the endowment fund (currently 4.85%); and (3) annual giving is assumed to be an average of the amounts given the two
previous years. The money to fund one-time program improvements comes from excess revenue generated by excess enrollment and, thus, varies from year to year.

Two points need to be understood about these expenditure and revenue guidelines. The first is that they lack a compelling rationale. Although they were not chosen arbitrarily, the best rationales that can be given for them are (1) the increases in expenditures are high enough to enable the University to make significant annual improvements but not so high as to run the risk of being unsustainable over time; (2) the endowment spending policy is in line with the policy of other major endowments; and (3) UR has used these guidelines for a number of years, and they “seem to work.”

Secondly, these guidelines are just that—guidelines. They are to be followed unless there are exceptional reasons for not doing so. There are two obvious examples of when the guidelines were not followed. First, in 2004 the Board voted to raise tuition by $7,000, in addition to the usual increment of inflation plus two percent. Since then, however, increases in tuition have conformed to the guideline. Second, as a result of the 2004 tuition increase, over three million dollars (not including the amount for financial aid) has been available each year to fund program improvements. Presumably, however, after the effects of the 2004 tuition increase are fully applied, and assuming that tuition will be increased at the rate of inflation plus two percent, the amount set aside for program improvements will likely return to the customary $750,000.

Even during periods of normalcy, however, the guidelines have to be adjusted somewhat in order to reconcile expenditures with revenues. The Vice President for Business and Finance, the Controller, and the Provost are collectively responsible for making these adjustments and coming up with a tentative macro budget, including amounts for program improvements, that is balanced. Just how they make these adjustments, i.e., on the basis of what criteria (other than what they think would be in the best interest of the University), is unclear.

The macro budget prepared by the senior administrators is then presented to the Planning and Priorities Committee, but not prior to its first meeting, for its review and approval. This Committee has twenty-four members, including seven faculty (four from A&S and one each from the Schools of Business, Law, and Leadership) elected by their respective faculties for a three-year term. Non-tenured faculty may serve on the Committee. The other members of the P&P Committee are the President, who chairs the Committee, his/her chief of staff, five vice-presidents, the Controller, five deans, two staff members (added this year), and two students.

The P&P Committee’s official charge is as follows: “Planning & Priorities is advisory to the President. The committee’s focus is on strategic planning. It assists in shaping institutional priorities and in establishing the direction of resource allocation; reviews university priorities and updates progress on the strategic plan on a regular basis and makes recommendations to the President regarding the budget annually.”
In recent years, however, the Committee has not engaged in strategic planning or in establishing the general parameters of the budget. In particular, it has not been involved in deciding how much of the program improvement funds would be allocated by the Program Improvements Sub-Committee. (See below.) Although the proposed macro budget submitted to the P&P Committee is discussed, changes are seldom made or even requested. Many former faculty members of the Committee report having felt unable to understand, and thus unqualified to question, the proposed budget. After being approved by the P&P Committee, the recommended macro budget then serves as the basis for a recommendation to the President regarding the next year’s fees for tuition, room, and board. Upon being approved by the President, that recommendation is presented to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees at its December meeting. The final annual budget is approved by the Board at its March meeting.

To what extent previous Presidents and Boards have modified the recommendations of the P&P Committee or consulted with it before doing so is not known, but that they have sometimes made such modifications without consulting with the P&P Committee is clear. For example, this past year the Board, although it accepted the Committee’s recommended increase in overall fees for tuition, room, and board, decreased the recommended percentage increase for tuition and increased the recommended increase for room and board, and there was no consultation between the Board and the Committee on these changes.

B. Deciding on Program Improvements.

The University of Richmond is very fortunate to be in the position of having enough income that each year it is able to set aside funds for program improvements (improvements so costly that they cannot be funded out of the regular annual budget). How are those funds distributed?

In the fall of each year, while the macro budget is being prepared by senior administrators, various units and sub-units of the University are deciding on what, if any, program improvements to request. These requests can be for one-time expenditures in the current year, e.g., equipment, or continuing expenditures, e.g., new faculty lines that commence in the next fiscal year and continue indefinitely. Within the schools that have departments, the latter submit their program improvement requests to the dean of their school. The deans of the schools and other unit heads, e.g., the Vice President for Information Services, then decide which of the program improvement requests submitted to them merit their support, rank them according to their importance, and submit them, with supporting documentation, to the Business Office, which places them in notebooks that are distributed to the members of the Program Improvements Sub-Committee of the P&P Committee.

There is no official document that describes the membership or duties of the PI Sub-Committee. At some point in the past, it was probably created by the President, who is the official chair of the P&P Committee. Traditionally, however, the PI Sub-Committee has had nine members—five faculty (two from A&S and one each from the Business,
Law, and Leadership Schools) and four administrators (Provost, Vice President for Business and Finance, Vice President for Student Development, and the University Controller). This year, the Provost added a staff member to the PI Sub-Committee. The five faculty members are appointed by the Provost from among the seven faculty members of the P&P Committee. Their appointment is normally for two years. Although they can be reappointed to the PI Sub-Committee, and some have served for two years, faculty seldom, if ever, serve for more than two years at a time. The chair of the Sub-Committee is a faculty member elected at the end of the preceding academic year by the faculty members of the Sub-Committee at that time.

Traditionally the PI Sub-Committee has had the responsibility of deciding which of the program improvements requests, other than those from the central administration, to fund. It involves thoughtful and extensive discussion of the requests and university goals, and requires several meetings from mid-October to mid-November. Requests are reviewed on the basis of their alignment with the most recent strategic plan and more generally with the mission of the University. Each member of the Sub-Committee is charged with representing the interests of the University as a whole, not her/his department or school. Usually the Sub-Committee honors the priorities of a person, e.g., dean, who submits more than one request. When necessary to understand a request, it interviews or seeks more information from the person submitting the request.

At times in the past, some of the funds that otherwise would have been spent by the PI Sub-Committee on program improvements was labeled by the President, Provost, and/or VP for Business & Finance as “must funds” or “set asides” (now called “pre-commitments”) because they were funds that the central administration had already decided to spend on certain items. Although the PI Sub-Committee simply “rubber stamped” them, these “pre-commitments” were listed along with the program improvement requests that were truly debated and allocated by the Sub-Committee. This year, in order to avoid giving the impression that the Sub-Committee had to approve these “pre-commitments,” the central administration presented its “pre-commitments” to the P&P Committee, but the PI Sub-Committee was not given the opportunity to “rubber stamp” them.

What happened this past year made it clear that the amount of money available for the Sub-Committee to allocate to the various schools and educational programs may vary significantly from year to year, depending on how much of these funds are “pre-committed” by the central administration. Additionally, it raised the question whether the PI Sub-Committee and senior administrators can renegotiate either the total amount previously established for program improvements or the amount remaining to be allocated by the Sub-Committee.

In any case, after deciding on which of the many requests to fund, the PI Sub-Committee presents its recommendations for both continuing and one-time improvements to the President, who, upon accepting them, shares them with the P&P Committee and recommends them to the Executive Committee at its December meeting.
After approving, sometime before the end of the fall semester, the macro budget and program improvements for the next year, the P&P Committee normally does not meet again during the academic year.

C. Allocating of Resources within the Schools (except for the SCS).

In each school at UR, the traditional practice has been for its dean to allocate resources within the school, i.e., prepare its budget, decide which program improvement requests to fund, and decide how surplus funds should be spent. Currently, however, the deans of all schools allow the faculty to participate in the allocating of resources, albeit in ways and degrees that vary in accordance with the size of the school and the administrative style of its dean. For example, because the Leadership School is no larger than many departments in the School of Arts & Sciences, it usually makes decisions in the same way that most departments make their decisions. This means that decisions about such matters as program improvement requests are usually made by the collective faculty. In the A&S and Business Schools, the departments submit their proposed operating budgets and programs improvement requests to the deans, who take suggestions from their academic councils and department chairs on which of those requests to fund and on how to spend surplus funds. The Business School also has a planning committee that influences the allocating of its resources, and this year the A&S Dean held open hearings on the A&S budget.

Each dean is also able and likely to have “discretionary funds” at her/his disposal. The reason for this goes back to the period when the University had no provost. Prior to that time, whenever a program was eliminated or a faculty person died or retired and was not replaced, the funds allocated to the program or to the faculty member’s salary were taken from the department and school and put back into the University’s general fund. Even if that person were replaced, the replacement was very likely to earn a lower salary, and the savings in salary funds were taken from the department/school and put back into the University’s general fund. As part of the general fund these monies were then available to be used to finance program improvements or increases in the general budget.

Then, when the office of provost was eliminated, it was decided that these unexpended funds would no longer be returned to the general fund but would remain within their respective schools. These funds, in effect, became discretionary monies to be used by a dean for attaining school objectives, possibly with little or no input from her/his faculty, although major shifts in expenditures and the creation of new faculty lines were usually approved by the President and Office of Business and Finance. A dean could, for example, use these excess funds to create new permanent faculty lines or on one-time expenses or purchases, e.g., equipment or the first year’s salary of a new faculty hire. Even after the office of provost was re-instated, this arrangement has continued, except that now the Provost approves new expenditures, such as new faculty lines, but not necessarily the location of those lines.

Using excess funds, a dean is also able to “forward fund” new tenure-stream or other continuing positions. “Forward funding” refers to a dean’s creating a new faculty line,
either within or outside a department, without the approval of the PI Sub-Committee and funding the position for a year or perhaps two out of the dean’s excess salary pool funds. Then after the new line is established and someone has been hired to fill it, the dean requests the PI Sub-Committee to permanently fund it starting the following year, and if that request is at the top of the dean’s list of requests, the Sub-Committee will more than likely approve it. Once it is approved, then the money that was used to create and temporarily fund the position returns to the dean’s discretionary fund. If the PI Sub-Committee does not grant the request, the dean has the option of permanently funding the position from the school’s salary pool.

Over time, with turnover each year and annual increases in a school’s budget, some deans have been able to obtain sizable resources that provide opportunities for furthering the school’s objectives. However, the salary budget is not a true discretionary account. If salary resources are sufficient to cover all current positions, the dean may use remaining salary budget monies to fund additional positions and/or to enhance the salaries of existing positions. The dean may also use these monies to cover an operating budget deficit. If at the end of a fiscal year, there are unspent monies remaining in the salary budget (or the operating budget), the dean may request that some or all of the unspent monies be placed in a restricted account for a designated future use. The uses are usually restricted to capital projects but there may be and has been some flexibility upon agreement with the Provost and the Vice President for Business & Finance.

In summary, the extent to which the faculty of any given school is involved in that school’s allocating of resources is entirely dependent on the discretion of its dean and, thus, changes from dean to dean and time to time. The dean of each school prepares its budget and thus determines where the school’s funds will be spent. There is no official faculty body charged with preparing, approving, or even reviewing a school’s budget. Also, the program improvement requests that are sent to the PI Sub-Committee from a school are chosen by the dean of the school, who may but does not have to consult with the faculty on what those requests should be. Finally, deans have discretionary funds that they may allocate without consulting with any faculty group. In short, within the schools, there is no official faculty body that functions in the way the P&P Committee and PI Sub-Committee function at the university level.

Part Two: Recommendations.

The recommendations that follow are based on the following assumptions: (1) the University is committed to the principle and practice of shared governance, whereby the faculty has the primary responsibility for determining the curriculum, instruction, research, selection of faculty, academic support programs, and, thus, plays a central role in the allocation of funds for all of these areas, (2) that major decisions about revenues and expenditures for all of these areas, and the persons making those decisions, should be made known to the faculty or its representatives, and (3) persons making decisions about revenues and expenditures for these academic areas are accountable to the faculty for their decisions.
A. Planning and Priorities Committee.

1. The Planning and Priorities Committee should begin functioning as it was originally intended to function, i.e., as a strategic planning committee that reviews and shapes the University’s priorities. This would entail, among other functions, fostering a shared vision and shared values for the University, anticipating future needs and ways of meeting them, initiating periodic reports on changes in University spending, proposing corrections to imbalances identified by such reports, overseeing the implementation of previously established goals/plans, making sure that the Development Office is aware of the University’s priorities and is working on funding them, advising on the parameters that guide the annual budgeting process, and annually approving the University’s macro budget. The Committee’s assuming this responsibility would require it to meet throughout the academic year and not just during the fall semester, as is currently the case.

Rationale: Given its current charge, what is being recommended is what the Committee is already supposed to be doing. Other schools like UR have functioning strategic planning committees (see Appendix). The need for such a committee at UR was recently made clear by the report (initiated by Faculty Council), “Ten-Year Changes in Faculty Positions, Faculty Salaries, Academic Administrator Positions, and Selected Other Budget Data,” which revealed a number of needs/problems that should have been identified and addressed before now. Although the administration has already taken steps to meet some of those needs/problems, in the future it may not be easy to quickly meet such unexpected needs/problems. It is far better, where possible, to identify them in advance and work to deal with them on a gradual, planned basis than to do so in a hasty, ad hoc manner. Also, whenever major new educational programs are approved, or even being considered, the P&P Committee should be involved in planning how they can be funded and implemented. Such planning, of course, has taken place at UR but has often been done almost entirely by administrators with little or no involvement of the faculty.

As explained in Part One, traditionally the annual budget has been determined by “automatic” or “default” increases on both the expenditure and revenue sides, including a “set” increase for program improvements. Although the budgeting process should continue to begin with “default” increases in expenditures, it should not end with them. Thus, there have been times recently when they have been significantly adjusted so that the University could meet newly identified needs or fund major new programs, e.g., financial aid. Depending on the availability of revenue, such annual adjustments should continue to made whenever necessary to meet major needs identified by the P&P Committee.

2. To enable it to carry out its assigned duties, the Planning and Priorities Committee should be reorganized. First, it should not be involved in allocating program improvements funds; that task should be performed by a separate Program Improvements Committee. Second, the size of the P&P Committee should be significantly decreased, its composition changed, and
the voting privileges of its members made clear. This reorganization should be done by the President and other relevant administrators, working together with a committee of University Faculty Council and University Staff Advisory Council, and with consideration given to representation to all five schools at the University.

Rationale: First, if the P&P Committee were to begin functioning as it was intended and its faculty members were also to continue allocating program improvement funds, that would create an excessive work-load for the faculty members of the Committee. Second, as presently constituted, the P&P Committee is too large to function effectively as a strategic planning committee; it is unclear why some persons are on the Committee; and it is unclear who has voting privileges. The planning and priorities committees at most other colleges and universities are much smaller than UR’s Committee (see Appendix).

3. Each year, well before the first meeting of the Planning & Priorities Committee, the office of the Vice President for Business and Finance should provide all new members of the Committee an orientation (both written and oral) that explains the work of the Committee and the overall process of allocating resources at UR.

Rationale: Without such an orientation it will be difficult for new members of the P&P Committee to make sense of much that is presented to them during the first meetings of the Committee.

B. Program Improvements Committee.

4. The existing Program Improvements Sub-Committee should become a full-fledged University committee responsible for advising the President on the pre-commitment of new funds before they have been earmarked. It should also retain its traditional role of recommending to the President how all remaining program improvement funds should be allocated. The composition of the Program Improvements Committee should be established by the President in consultation with the University Faculty Council and University Staff Advisory Council. To ensure that the PI Committee’s decisions are in line with the goals/plans established by the P&P Committee, the former should be very familiar with the annual reports of the latter. The two committees should also meet jointly whenever the President or either of the committees thinks it necessary.

Rationale: Because some new spending may be needed in areas for which the faculty is not primarily responsible or in order to meet pressing needs, the PI Committee should not expect to allocate all program improvement funds. On the other hand, any pre-commitment of program improvement funds by the central administration should occur with the advice of the Committee. As explained above, the current PI Sub-Committee should be separated from the P&P Committee because each Committee has more than
enough work to do. The issue of who should be represented on the Committee is very important, but because it is potentially divisive, it should be resolved at a later time.

5. Each year all requests for new funding, along with their detailed rationales, should be received by members of the Program Improvements Committee at least a week in advance of the first meeting of the Committee. Ideally these requests should be in an electronic format and, at the time they are sent to the Committee, should be posted on a University website easily accessible by all faculty, which should be notified of their posting. If for some reason, the request for new funding cannot be in an electronic format and/or cannot be posted publicly, then a hard copy of the requests should be placed on reserve in the library at the time they are sent to the Committee, and a summary of the requests posted on an appropriate University website.

**Rationale:** Much of what is recommended here is already being done, but the program improvement requests are not easily accessible to the faculty because to read them persons must go to the library. It would be much better if all the requests or at least a summary thereof were available on a University website.

6. Each year’s chair of the Program Improvements Committee should be elected at the end of the previous academic year by the members of the Committee at that time, and before the first meeting of the Committee, the chair should meet with the new faculty and staff members of the Committee to “bring them up to speed” on the work expected of them.

**Rationale:** Both of these are needed so that the Committee will be able to begin its work in an expeditious manner.

C. Allocating Resources within the Schools.

7. Each school should seriously consider having a three to five-year plan that is drafted by a faculty planning committee and approved by the school’s faculty. The plan should serve as the primary basis of annual funding decisions in the school. The planning committee should also oversee and report annually to the faculty on the implementation of the plan, and recommend changes in the plan that it thinks are needed.

**Rationale:** Planning serves to involve the faculty in assuming its responsibility for the academic program and to provide guidance to deans and committees who have the responsibility for making funding decisions. The Business School is already doing something similar to what is being recommended.

8. Each school should have a formal and official process or mechanism whereby its faculty advises its dean on the allocation of resources within the school, including the reallocation of faculty lines, the requests for program improvements, the macro budget, and the spending of discretionary or
uncommitted funds, at least when the spending is for new faculty lines and administrative positions, and for equipment costing more than a certain amount (to be determined by each school). Once a school has established such a process or mechanism, it should be posted on its website.

**Rationale:** Just as the University faculty, through the Planning & Priorities and Program Improvements Committees, is able to influence the allocation of resources within the University as a whole, this recommendation, if approved, would enable the faculties of the schools to influence the allocation of resources within those schools. Although the deans of the schools will continue to decide on the allocation of those resources, they should not do so on their own, i.e., without obtaining meaningful advice from their faculty, which, after all, is the body primarily responsible for determining the academic program of each school. This proposal is needed especially in those schools where significant sums of money are available each year for new or discretionary spending. It is also worth noting that many outstanding colleges/universities, some quite similar to UR’s A&S School, have mechanisms whereby their faculties give advice on the allocation of resources for educational programs (see Appendix).

An alternative way of giving meaningful faculty input into a school’s spending decisions would be to require that surplus funds not be kept within each school and accumulated over time, but returned each year to a University program improvements fund and then distributed by the University PI Committee. Although this approach has the advantage of being fair (all schools would have a chance of obtaining some of the surplus funds), it would eliminate much of the flexibility that exists in the present set-up and that enables the needs of each school to be met fairly quickly and effectively.

**9. In implementing recommendation # 8, each school, but especially the A&S and Business Schools, should give serious consideration to creating a Priorities Committee or to allowing its Planning Committee to serve as both a planning and a priorities committee, in which case it would be called the Planning & Priorities Committee.**

**Rationale:** In the smaller schools at UR, the faculty itself might be able to meet and advise the deans on the allocation of resources, e.g., program improvements requests, but in the larger schools this would not be practical. Instead, it would make sense for those schools to have a faculty committee that could meet with a dean fairly often and quickly, but that would report to the faculty. Although a school’s academic council could function as a priorities committee, that would not be advisable, at least in schools with departments—for the following reasons. One, resource allocation decisions, if made properly, require considerable time and effort, and academic councils already have more than enough work to do. Two, because members of academic councils are department chairs and program coordinators, whose primary responsibility is to represent their departments/programs, which compete for resources, those members may not be able to make decisions affecting their schools and the university as a whole as impartially and objectively as could a separate priorities committee charged with making decisions in the best interest of a school as a whole. Three, because departments often rely upon a dean’s support to obtain their objectives, department chairs are less likely to disagree with a
dean than members of a separate priorities committee would be, especially if the latter were tenured members of the faculty.

D. General.

10. After the University faculty has acted on the recommendations in this Report, a committee of the University Faculty Council should draft a document, to be included as part of the Governance Document, that summarizes the official process whereby resources are allocated at UR. This document would have to be approved by UFC, the University faculty, the President, and the Board of Trustees.

Rationale: Resources at UR should be allocated in accordance with established, written, easily accessible policies and procedures, which, however, can be changed in the same way that other official policy statements at UR can be changed.

APPENDIX

Faculty Committees at Other Schools That Are Responsible for Allocating Resources.

College of Arts & Sciences, University of Virginia

Committee on Budget and Personnel Policy (six faculty members): “This committee provides general oversight of the budget policy and allocation of resources by the Dean of the Faculty . . . .”

Williams College

Committee on Appointments and Promotions (three tenured faculty members and three ex officio members—President, Provost, and Dean of Faculty): “The Committee on Appointments and Promotions advises the President and Trustees on appointment and advancement of faculty, allocation of faculty positions to departments and programs, granting of sabbatical and assistant professor leaves, and on College policies governing such matters. The CAP also serves as the nominating committee for various national fellowships.”

Committee on Priorities and Resources (four faculty members and six ex officio, non-voting members—Provost, Associate Provost, Budget Director, VP for Operations, VP for Alumni, and Associate VP for Facilities): “The Committee on Priorities and Resources advises the President on the allocation of the College’s fiscal and tangible resources and on long-range financial planning and also considers trends in the annual College budget and other matters relating to priorities in fund raising and resources for capital expenditures.”

Amherst College
Committee on Priorities and Resources (four faculty members, three students, and five ex officio members—President, Dean of Faculty, Treasurer, Director of Budget, Director of Human Resources): “The Purpose of the CPR is to bring a range of faculty and student opinion to bear upon (1) the process of annually budgeting the resources of the college, and (2) the long-term allocation of resources. To ensure the CPR’s involvement in the annual budget process, the administration will bring the budget currently being formulated before the CPR while there is still ample time to affect it. The administration will also present its sense of the priorities among competing claims on the college’s resources. The CPR will present to the Board of Trustees the committee’s views on the annual budget as it is being prepared and on long-term financial concerns. In the spring term, the CPR will also receive and respond to new large capital requests and review the ongoing list of capital priorities and deferred maintenance projects. To discharge its responsibility to assess the continuing ability of the college’s financial resources to support its educational mission, the CPR will periodically review the long-term financial impact of such things as the relationship between resources and programs, the level of compensation and benefits, the level and rate of change of the comprehensive fee, and other pertinent matters. To that end, the committee will query other offices and committees about proposals that have financial implications.”

Committee on Educational Policy (five faculty members, three students, and one ex officio, non-voting member—Dean of the Faculty): “The Committee on Educational Policy . . . advises the President and the Dean of the Faculty about the allocation of faculty positions to departments. In making recommendations for such allocations, the committee considers, inter alia, the curricular needs of individual departments and the commitment of departments to offer courses that meet identified college-wide priorities and curricular needs.”

Carleton College

Budget Committee (dean, VP/treasurer, two faculty members, two students, and “such other members of the community as will be determined by the three Presidents): “The Budget Committee will advise the vice president and treasurer in the construction of the annual budget and in the development of a longer-term financial plan. To that end it will conduct hearings and make recommendations to [College] Council throughout the process of construction of the budget. The Council will make the final budgetary recommendations to the Board of Trustees.”

Colgate University

Committee on Budget and Financial Planning (president, provost, VP for Business & Finance, four faculty members, and three students): “This Committee is concerned with long-range financial planning and projections, and the preparation of yearly budgets. It has the responsibility of advising the President on yearly budgets and matters related to financial planning and projections. The Committee normally functions
as an advisory committee on budget issues during the fall term and on financial planning issues during the spring term.”

Bowdoin College

Curriculum and Educational Policy (dean, six faculty members, two students): “. . . Advises the Dean for Academic Affairs and the President on the allocation of faculty positions.”

Financial Priorities: (treasurer, three faculty members, two staff members, one student): “Prepares and recommends the College budget to the President. During the fall budget process, the committee reports its work in progress to, and receives comments from, the college community. During the spring, the committee considers long-term financial planning issues.”

Wellesley College

Committee on Budgetary Affairs (president, VP for Finance, five faculty members, two members of Administrative Council, four students): “(1) Acts as Advisory Committee to the President in the planning for and preparation of the College budget. (2) The Committee shall make an annual total review of the budget, having access to all relevant information, and shall have the power to review any portion of the budget which it wishes to bring into question. . . . It shall advise on any budgetary matter brought to its attention by any segment of the College community. The Committee shall be free to make formal recommendations on particular budgetary matters, shall report such formal recommendations to Academic Council, and shall report to Council on the progress of those recommendations. (3) Advise the President concerning faculty and student views on budgetary matters, including both income and expenditures, and shall recommend general budget policies. (4) The Committee shall . . . identify areas for particular study in upcoming budgets. (5) The faculty and student members of the Committee shall consult with faculty and student groups in meetings at regular intervals to gather opinions on budgetary matters. At those times, the Committee shall report fully on its deliberations . . . [etc.]”

Endorsed by University Faculty on January 24, 2008
with minor clarifying revisions