

MINUTES

**Faculty Senate-University Council Resources, Space and Budget Committee
Friday, November 1, 2019, 10 a.m.
Altgeld Hall 125
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois**

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Creed, Dawe (for Doederlein), Duffin, Johnson, Millhorn, Nicholson (for Royce), Pearson (for Bolden), Schatteman, Shi, Slotsve, Subramony, Thu (for Beyer), Whedbee (for Riley), Woodruff

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Beyer, Bolden, Doederlein, Martin, Montana, Riley, Royce

OTHERS PRESENT: Condon, Ingram, Kassel, Klaper, McGill, Rogers

I. CALL TO ORDER

RSB Committee Chair **T. Arado** called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

A quorum was established.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

It was suggested that Item VI. B. be omitted, because **J. Royce** is not in attendance to give the report. No objections were noted, and the agenda was adopted by voice vote.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2019 MEETING MINUTES

No objections were noted, and the minutes were approved by voice vote.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Budget Principles Discussion
Sarah McGill, Chief Financial Officer
Andrew Rogers, Director, Budget and Financial Planning

Administration is committed to having mechanisms in place to transition to more local budget control by January 1, 2020.

The purpose of today's discussion is to learn from the RSB members what their expectations, concerns, visions are as regards local budget control.

What does local control mean to you?

- Personnel funding/decisions made at the college level. Other operational decisions are made at the department or division.
- College and division control.

What local funding level do you envision?

- Minimum starting level at the current funding.
- Increase from current levels.

Concerns/Questions about local control?

- Revenue requirements and use of revenue by generating units.
- With local control comes local accountability.
- What mechanism and guidelines will be in place for communicating strategic plans upwards to advocate/negotiate for increased funding?
- There is a need for strong decision-making and communication processes, which allow for cross impact discussion (avoid further siloing).
- Suspicion that this is a move to downsize.
- Concern for faculty impact, based on a history of institutional mistrust.
- Concern about equity issues.

Possibilities for central funding:

- Building maintenance.
- Personnel benefits, such as tenure/promotion, raises, vacation buyouts.
- Charge backs. If charge backs continue to be restrained, that represents funding which must be held back in the central fund.
- Information Technology and certain technologies should be counted as infrastructure.
- Regardless of what is decided, transparency is key.

What level of budget detail is required for transparency?

- Budgets divided by personnel and operating expenses.
- Once budget control is at the local level, does the requirement for transparency lie with the local unit?
- Beyond transparency, there are also issues of predictability, ability to project into the future.
- Need for a visualization tool to support local funding priorities and transparency tools accompanying local funding control.

Committee members were encouraged to continue to send feedback to **B. Ingram** and **S. McGill** as questions or concerns come to mind.

- B. Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee update – Jeffrey Royce

This item was omitted from the agenda, because **J. Royce** was not in attendance.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Increasing student representation on FS-UC Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Therese Arado

It was noted that there are current two Supportive Professional Staff Council and two Operating Staff Council representatives, but this proposal calls for three student representatives. **I. Pearson** responded that he has discussed the proposal with SPS Council and OS Council leadership, and they support the proposal for three student representatives.

Attendance and quorum concerns were raised. **I. Pearson** noted that the current RSB Committee meeting day and time (Fridays at 10 a.m.) is ideal for students, and he assured the committee that the Student Association would assign students who can attend the meetings.

P. Kassel suggested that one of the three students be a graduate student. **G. Slotsve** moved to modify the proposal to include two undergraduate students and one graduate student, all appointed by the Student Association. The motion was seconded and passed.

A. Schatteman moved to bring the proposed amendment, including above modification, forward to University Council for approval, seconded by **I. Pearson**. Motion passed.

Discussion also took place regarding the possible future make-up of the committee in a restructured shared governance and local budget control environment.

- B. Questions/topics for President Freeman’s visit to RSB on December 6. The focus of this discussion will be strategic planning.

Members were invited to send questions/topics to **P. Erickson** by November 29.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

G. Slotsve moved to adjourn, seconded by **N. Johnson**. Motion passed.
Meeting adjourned at 11:13 a.m.

Future RSB meeting dates: Dec 6, Jan 10, Feb 7, Mar 6, Apr 3.

President Lisa Freeman is tentatively scheduled to meet with the RSB on Dec 6, Jan 10, Mar 6.