

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

4-17-1997

## Faculty Senate Chronicle April 17, 1997

Heather M. Loughney

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

---

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact [mjon@uakron.edu](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).

OK



22 Pages

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of April 17, 1997	1
Appendix to Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of 4/17/97	12
Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of April 24, 1997	14
Appendix to Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of 4/17/97	18

---

Any comments concerning the contents in The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Secretary, Dr. Gary Oller (+1910).  
FacultySenate@Uakron.Edu

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL FACULTY SENATE  
MEETING OF APRIL 17, 1997

The special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman H. Michael Cheung at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, April 17, 1997, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty-three of the sixty-nine members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Deckler, DePaul, Hardy, Hebert, Hines, Hoover, McGucken, Newman, Oller, Redle, Rich, and Ross-Alaolmolki were absent with notice. Senators Braun, Davis, Scott and Smolen were absent without notice.

The Chairman stated that today's special meeting had been called to discuss the proposed budget from the Planning and Budgeting Committee. Before beginning he wanted the body to know that if continued discussion of this was necessary, the Senate would meet again next Thursday, April 24, at the usual hour but in CBA 120. He also wanted to acknowledge the yeoman service which the Senate had been rendered by Mr. Tom Bennett and his staff for providing on very, very short notice the AV equipment necessary for the meeting and he intended to convey the body's appreciation in person when he had the opportunity. He also noted that he had received a request from a member of the Council of Deans that this body not adopt the budget recommendations before it until next Thursday. The COD would not be meeting until the 22nd, and they had asked for the opportunity to discuss the recommendations as a group prior to the Senate's final adoption. He did not think that this was going to be a difficulty since he doubted that the body would be in a position to adopt the recommendations today anyway.

The last matter which he wished to discuss before beginning was the administrative budget reduction for this year which was \$850,000. Last year that budget reduction had been \$3 million. Obviously, this would be discussed later in the meeting in detail, but the point that he wished to make now was that in no way should anybody construe that this reduction was a criticism of any of the people involved in the administrative side of the University. In no way were the Committee's consideration of realigning spending priorities intended as a criticism of those people or their efforts. Everyone's efforts were not only valued but essential for the functioning of the University.

After giving Senate committee chairs the opportunity to bring any burning issues before the body, the Chairman asked Senator Jesse Marquette, Vice Chair of PBC, to walk the body through the budget recommendations of the Committee.

Senator Marquette began with the revenue assumptions that had been generated with the best available information (**Appendix A**, scenarios 3 and 4 on the sheet). The Committee was hopeful that there would be a guarantee from the state of an additional funding support for the state appropriation, even though it was assuming in these scenarios that there would be an enrollment decrease. In scenarios 3 and 4 there was an assumption of tuition increases of 3%. An appropriation guarantee of 3% was being used, and there was an assumption that

enrollment would decline by 3%. These were relatively conservative assumptions. Freshman enrollment had been increasing, but because our enrollment overall had been declining for several years, the University was still suffering from a credit hour loss as a result of the seniors who were graduating but not being replaced at the same rate. Therefore, our overall SEA would continue to decline for a while and then stabilize as we were able to replace the freshman class in larger numbers. In both scenarios the total amount expected from the state was \$91,923,000; the third scenario had an overall undergraduate enrollment drop of 3%, and scenario 4 had a 0% drop. In actuality, we would be somewhere in between. Last year a 4% drop had been projected, but we had come in at around 3.2. (Senator Marquette noted parenthetically on behalf of the Committee that it had been nice to have a Financial Vice-President who would talk to it.) With those assumptions, scenario 3 gave \$5,365,000 in additional revenue, and scenario 4 gave \$7,135,000. When taking into account the earlier mentioned general administrative budget reduction of \$850,000, this brought two sets of total available resources - in scenario 3, \$6,215,000; in scenario 4, \$7,985,000.

The Committee had proceeded by developing a set of priorities. It had begun with sets of activities that were globally significant for the institution and then had proceeded down through a variety of other activities based on the prioritization given to it by the President, the Provost and the Council of Deans. Priority 1 basically was to finish dealing with the Human Resource situation which the University had begun to address last spring and which had resulted in the reorganization of the office and the appointment of an Executive Director for Personnel. This still needed to be pursued for a variety of reasons including training paths, people knowing what they were doing, forms being filled out properly, etc.

Priority 2 was the Presidential Reserve. This reserve was currently a result of the tax on ERIP (the money derived from ERIP returned to the Provost and taxed 10%). There were problems with this. It had meant that the reserve had gone down into the academic side and did not recover the entire fee of the funding that was legitimately available even though we were only supposed to get two-thirds of it back. Basically this was a reshuffling of some money.

The next two priorities dealt with technological issues relating to the Year 2000 problem. These were the first two pieces of what would be three segments (the third to be put into the next budget cycle). The first piece (priority 3) was to actually deal with the date problem, and the second (priority 4) would work on our pretty badly screwed up business systems. Priority 3 would fund the part-time staff necessary to do the work, and the University would acquire some Year 2000 tools by internal reallocation to begin attacking the date problem. Priority 4 would allow us to continue dealing with the date problem and acquire additional functionality for the business systems. The next two priorities (5 and 6) would be funding for additional expenses of the new Media Center and for additional basic charge increases for OhioLink. These first 6 priorities were university-wide issues that did need to be dealt with, and this was why the Committee had put them before salaries.

Priorities 7 and 8 dealt with salaries. Priority 7 was for a 3% salary increase for the institution. Priority 8 was \$500,000 (a .5% reserve pool) to deal with equity issues and compression. The Committee was still discussing how this would be accomplished. Would it be done through the Provost's Office in consultation with the deans, or would it go back to the deans with the stipulation that it be used to deal with equity issues?

Priorities 9 and 10 concerned graduate assistants and Advising Services. These were derived from requests by the Provost and the Council of Deans in terms of increasing our competitiveness in acquiring graduate assistants and in terms of improving advising services which had been pretty badly stripped over the last number of years. There would be some new money for graduate assistants and some internal reallocation because some of the graduate assistant money was actually used to subsidize administrative activities. The increases in advising services were expected to occur through reallocation from student services. This last priority was a result of an extended discussion at a planning retreat held earlier this year with the COD, the Vice Presidents, Chairman Cheung (representing the Senate) and Senator Marquette (representing the PBC). One of the issues that had arisen there was that about half of the students that left the University left in good standing. They did not flunk out; they left because we had not managed to get them into a college by advising them effectively. As it now stood, the number of students assigned to each advisor was pretty horrific.

Priorities 11, 12, and 13 had been brought forward by the COD and the Provost. They had wanted an additional 9% increase in operating budgets, additional money for library, and additional money for new academic initiatives. Given the total amount to which those requests added up and the financial constraints that we would be facing, the Committee broke those requests into pieces. This was why there were requests labeled-a and further down-b.

Priority 14 was basically an attempt to deal with Title IX issues. The University was not yet in substantial compliance with Title IX, and we had to deal with that issue. The actual request from the Athletics Department had been for \$750,000. The Committee had suggested that this be accomplished with some new money and substantial reallocation within the Athletics Department to support the women's teams. The current initiative was going to be to add some sports which for a variety of reasons would get us moving in the general direction of complying with Title IX requirements. Priority 15 (Legal -a) dealt with questions like the fact that when one called our 911 number, our telephone system did not support recording anything. There were also a series of initiatives in terms of dealing with toxic waste and radiation safety. Priority 16 (Development) related to money which the Development Department needed to continue pursuing certain initiatives for fund raising. Since they had been regularly successful in recent years in increasing the funding available for scholarships and other activities, the Committee thought that this was appropriate.

At this point, there was a sub-total and the end of scenario three, the low-end scenario with the administrative recision and about \$1,150,000 of internal reallocation that was in addition to the \$850,000. The Committee was expecting these units to do by reallocation what they had come to the Committee seeking money for. The Committee did not think that these people were doing a bad job, but there was a sense from a lot of the data reviewed that some people needed to be doing different jobs. We needed to realign some of the resources that were available to better serve the academic programs.

The remaining set of priorities were what we would go after if there was additional money which went down to the second total. This was the end of scenario 4. These included the b parts of earlier initiatives. If any one of these had been fully funded earlier up the list, it would have chewed up our ability to deal with subsequent priorities. Finally there was a sort of wish list beyond the best case scenario in which items had been prioritized, but unless Santa Claus came early, the Committee had no expectation of reaching any of them.

Senator Devinder Malhotra had three questions. First, was he correct in assuming that if scenario 3 held (a 3% enrollment drop), there would only be enough money to deal with the first 16 priorities, but that if scenario 4 held ( a 0% enrollment drop), priorities 17-23 could be achieved? Senator Marquette answered that these assumptions were correct. His second question was whether or not the 3% salary increase included staff and part-time faculty. Senator Marquette replied that it included everybody. His third question related to the money assigned to the new Media Center. Senator Marquette responded that so far the Media Center had been funded out of one-time money and it had no budget, so this was why this addition funding had been added here.

In response to Senator Chand Midha's question regarding the calculation of the tuition increases in the various scenarios, the Chairman asked Vice President Paul McFarland to enlighten the body on the new 12-16 plateau that was contemplated in all of the scenarios. The body gave Vice President McFarland permission to speak.

Vice President McFarland pointed out that most other schools in Ohio were using 12 as the initial level for full-time students, while we had been using 13. When you divided full-time tuition by 13 and then changed the divisor to 12 and divided again, you were going to get an increase in the part-time rate from that calculation change. This was going to be proposed to the Board of Trustees and would be in addition to the 3% tuition part-time rate. Therefore, there would be a two-part increase to part-time tuition. It had been estimated that this change by itself would bring in an additional \$2,000,000 in tuition revenue. Given the bleak horizon in other areas like the tuition cap constraint, this had been a source of revenue which we could not afford to pass up. Therefore, we were trying to accept a very significant increase for part-time tuition but were holding the full time tuition at 3%. Senator Marquette added that this proposal had the support of the PBC.

In response to Senator John Green's question for more information about the reductions from the administrative side, Senator Marquette stated that the Committee, after looking at data which he had produced and which had been confirmed by the new Financial Vice President's analysis, thought that there was an imbalance in the distribution of support for the institutional support areas as opposed to the trends in academic support. The funding for colleges and direct instructional had remained relatively flat over the last several years but had increased in the institutional support areas. This was what the Senate had discussed last year, and it had been the origin of last year's \$3 million recision. The Committee was not saying that these were bad people, but they were not deployed exactly the way we needed them to be. The money was not being deployed as effectively as we thought it should be. The Committee then voted to do this with the proviso that these reductions would be undertaken in consultation with the Provost to insure that they would cause no negative effects on academic programs. The same line of reasoning was taken with suggested reallocations. An example of the reallocation was the Title IX issue. This was a serious issue for us which had recently been highlighted in an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education. We had the dubious distinction of being one of the universities most out of line in terms of substantial proportionality in the sports program between women's sports and men's sports. The Committee was willing to put some new money into this but was also asking the Athletics Department to reallocate some from somewhere else in its program to deal with this.

Senator Elizabeth Erickson said that last year the Committee had said that it would be looking not only at additional new money but also reallocations across the colleges. Clearly this had not been done, and she wondered why.

Senator Marquette first noted that the \$850,000 was reallocation across units that moved money from one area to another. In terms of the priorities of the Provost and the COD, reallocation had been taking place between colleges. They did have a program within their reallocations which was not detailed here. The PBC had not dealt with this this year because of having an interim Provost and a new President. However, all of the deans had made presentations to the Committee about their various priorities, and the Committee had understood the priorities of the Provost and the COD in terms of what they had been trying to do. So far the position of the Committee had been that it was not going to do reallocation itself. It would be evaluating the priorities and programs created in terms of the academic plan which was a bottom-up process. All of the deans would be asked to come and discuss what they had done with the money in the past and where they wanted to go now. In terms of creating a prioritized list like the one here, that was the responsibility of the Provost within the academic programs. The Committee had commented on this list by splitting up the priorities into pieces which it thought were manageable. The way the priorities were presented here was not exactly the way in which they had been presented to the Committee by the Provost and the COD. In the future when it had more data, the Committee did plan on dealing more fully with the issue which Senator Erickson had raised.

Senator Lindgren Chyi wanted to know whether the Committee had taken into account the changing numbers of faculty and staff, what that change might be over the next two years, and how that might affect the budget.

Senator Marquette answered that change had been taken into account and there should be a slight increase in the total number of faculty because we were revisiting the ERIP windows and rehiring in a number of areas. Those were included in the new initiative questions. The monies would be used for a variety of purposes and that would include adding faculty or staff in particular areas.

Senator Midha asked whether it was still true that a 1% increase in salary across the campus required roughly \$1 million, and Senator Marquette said that it was. Even though over the past few years a number of high-salary faculty had retired, the University had had to hire junior faculty at higher rates than it lost senior faculty. Salary compression costs, tuition and fringe benefit increases all played a role here, but according to Brian Davis' figures it was still around \$ 1 million.

In regard to tuition and fees, Senator Frank Griffin noted that about 6% of that went into the athletic fund. Roughly, \$1 of every \$16 that the students paid into the University went into the athletic fund. He wondered whether the students were aware that they were putting that kind of money into athletics.

Vice President McFarland stated that about 3/4 of the general service fee went towards athletics. The Chairman noted that the general service fee was included in the tuition and fees column under "undergraduate." Senator Marquette added that this was a big hunk of money. He did not know whether the students were aware of it and did not know whether they supported it or not. At this point, it was what we were doing.

Senator Derek Hammonds wanted to comment on students' opinions regarding athletics. While campaigning over the past three weeks, he had had an opportunity to talk to over 1,000 students. The overwhelming opinion was for the reduction of money that went toward the athletic program and increasing the amount of the general service fees over which the students had actual control. They would prefer the money to go into programs where the students had a greater opportunity to participate, i.e., the intramural program at the University which was probably the lowest funded intramural among schools in the state of Ohio.

Senator Paul John asked about the \$300,000 for priority 10 - advising services. Two years ago the old budget committee had been charged with the issue of money for funding C&T advising. Would this money be addressing that problem, and if not, would the problem be addressed in the foreseeable future?

Senator Marquette said that the Committee had not discussed the matter this year, and nobody had reminded it of the issue. The money reallocated for priority 10 was for



increasing the total number of academic advisers for undergraduates. It would be up to the Provost and the Dean of C&T to deal with the question of the C&T advisers.

Senator Carol Gigliotti said that this might have fallen through the cracks. Senator John had sent a letter to the Provost last year, and the Committee had seen the letter. She had asked the Provost about it, but it had apparently fallen through the cracks. It had been dated April 2 of last year, so she could understand how that had happened. But at some point this needed to be brought up to the PBC because the faculty were doing all of their own advising in the C&T College, and they had been told that when they did this, advising dollars from the student services area would be forwarded to the College.

Senator Marquette said that if that had been promised by the Provost, it would have been a reallocation under the Provost's purview. The Committee could obviously discuss this at its next meeting on Monday, but if the Provost promised the money, the Committee had never seen it.

Senator George Prough asked whether Senator Marquette could explain the \$400,000 deferred dollars for advertizing under priority 18.

Senator Marquette answered that right now the University's advertizing budget was funded out of essentially one-time found money. The President's office had requested that over a period of time this be moved into a standard item in the budget. Now whenever they needed to do advertizing they went and hunted among leftover position money, etc. This was not a good way to operate, so what the Committee was trying to do was take a portion of money at a time.

The Chairman added that it was the Committee's intention to revisit this issue and try to move all of what was essentially annual expenditure to a budgeted line item and perhaps use the "found money" for contingency purposes so that one could do a real budget. Paul Herold did not know what he had from year to year.

Senator Marquette pointed out another item at the bottom of the list- priority 27 (Year 2000-c) - where \$300,000 had been deferred.

Senator Hammonds had a concern regarding the hiring of part-time staff to deal with the Year 2000 problem (Priority 3). There were only four programs in the country that actually taught "Problem 2000" technology and had programs dedicated to it. He thought that within the next year and a half it would be virtually impossible to find these people at prices that one could afford. We would be competing with government agencies, brokerage firms, etc. His question was when would we get people into these positions because it was essential to get them in as quickly as possible since the recruiting pool was so small.

Senator Marquette answered that there were two issues here. The first was that we had written a lot of this software ourselves. Some of these part-timers would not be used to fix the Year 2000 problem; they would do other things like getting the ability to do admissions through the World Wide Web. Others doing Cobal could fix the Year 2000 problem. One of the Year 2000 tools was a package that would evaluate and actually read the code and identify the location in which you needed to slide the subroutines that would handle it. They were going to use the windowing approach to handle it, so we were not as bad off as an agency that had purchased the package that was no longer supported.

The Chairman, answering Senator Hammond's question a little more specifically, noted that since this was the budget for the next fiscal year, it would begin roughly mid-summer.

With regard to priority 19 (President-a) and the \$275,000 for minority affairs and affirmative action, Senator Malhotra wanted to know what kind of initiatives were included here.

The Chairman answered by first noting that all of the material the Committee had used in its deliberations was available on reserve in the library, in the President's Office and the Provost's Office. It was about a shelf meter of material that comprised plans from each of the academic units. From the summary of the budget request of the President the items listed as new money included the following: main marketing and promotions, \$5,000; marketing research, \$20,000; some change in University publications, \$13,000; additional personnel in the AA/EEO office \$40,000; changes to Memorial Hall, \$6,000; new initiatives in University Communications, \$50,000; a software package for Human Resources, \$100,000, etc.

When Senator Malhotra added that his specific question had concerned whether part of this had been for additional minority hires, the Chairman replied that he thought that it was for the administrative side of AA/EEO. He also noted that this discussion was to identify more things about which the Senate wanted information. The one sheet which the Senators had been given was what he and Senator Marquette had cooked down for ease in presentation. If there was more which people wished to have, please say so.

Using the 3% drop in enrollment and the state cap of 3% increase in the tuition, Senator Midha was still having difficulty making the calculation to arrive at the figures in the scenarios for total tuition and fees. Senator Marquette answered that because of the way in which we were funded, the tuition calculation and subsidy monies which we got came in different pieces. Therefore, you could not take just a 3% drop in enrollment and translate it directly to the 3% drop in tuition because we also had graduate tuition which would be up 4%. These figures had been prepared by the Budget Director, Brian Davis.

Senator Erickson wanted to know how the Committee had split up the money in such areas as "new academic initiatives a" and "b" or "library a" and "b."

Senator Marquette answered that the Committee had merely split the money but did not choose what would be done with it. It had split it into two or three pieces so that it could fund some other things. What would actually be done with the individual pieces would be up to the Provost and the COD since they had their priorities and plans. The Chairman added that the priorities and plans had been presented to the Committee individually by each dean. However, the COD and the Provost had declined to show the Committee the prioritization of those relative to each other.

Senator Griffin asked whether the Committee had looked at auxiliary funds.

Senator Marquette said that it had; this was where the \$850,000 was coming from. The reallocations inside in terms of graduate assistants was moving money out of areas that had been subsidized out of the graduate student budget. The Committee had looked at all of it; this was where it had gotten the \$3 million last year and where it was getting the money this year. The auxiliaries fundamentally were pretty close to zero. We were not losing money on any of them. They were actually profit and loss centers, and you could not take money from an auxiliary because they did not get it until they earned it. We were not putting general fund money into the auxiliaries. When one started an auxiliary budget at the beginning of the year, one created a line at the front that said that a certain amount of revenue was expected. Then one worked to generate that revenue. They were not being given a bunch of money. That was the difference with the athletics budget because we were giving athletics the money out of the general service fee because they were set up as if they were an auxiliary on the fond hope that they would generate revenue. Football had brought in about \$750,000 in guarantees this year largely due to the Nebraska game. He thought that one had to give a great deal of credit to the members of the football team to go out there and do that.

Senator Dennis Kimmell wanted to comment on why the answer to Senator Midha's question about the calculations for the 97-98 tuition was not easy to explain. It was because of the change in the full-time equivalent of 13-16 hrs. versus the 12-16. That muddied the water, and you could not easily calculate it by looking at these numbers as they appeared on the page.

Since a number of Senators had to leave for a Provost candidate interview, Senator Dan Sheffer wanted to know what the next step for the Senate would be with respect to deliberation of this budget.

The Chairman replied that the body could continue to discuss it until about 5:00 today. Since there was no urgency, the body could reconvene in a week to continue the discussion, and either at that time or at the next regular meeting on May 1 it could vote on this in some form which had come out of the discussions.

Senator Ken Siloac said that at the beginning of the meeting the Chairman had said that the COD had asked the Senate to put off voting on this for a week. Would they in fact report back to this body in some fashion, or were they just asking us to wait?

The Chairman clarified that he had received no formal request from the COD. Rather, a member of the COD had asked that if possible this not be acted upon today so that the COD would have an opportunity to review it. Only three of the deans, the members of the PBC, had seen the material that had led to what the Senate now had before it and were familiar with the sets of priorities in their present order in the document. He saw no reason why the Senate had to act in haste since the budget could not be adopted before June anyway by the Board of Trustees. Also, this was a simple and appropriate courtesy to extend to the deans.

The Chairman now asked whether any of the guests who were in attendance might wish to address the body.

Vice President McFarland noted that he was brand new on the scene, but he wanted to say that there had been an unprecedented amount of information given to the PBC. For the first time ever every administrative unit in the University followed by the deans had made presentations to the Committee. He had tried to impress upon the Committee that it ought to take the time and effort to look at this information that it had never looked at before. He had certainly gotten a lot of comments from the Committee on things that he had presented. There had been a real atmosphere of openness at these meetings which everyone had tried to achieve as well as putting everything on the table.

The Chairman added that as unsatisfactory as this process had seemed each year, it had gotten better each year. He had participated in all of them which in a sense was scary because it was this body and the faculty representatives, not the administrators which represented the longest, continuing institutional memory for planning and budgeting. The process was by no means perfect, and there was still much to do. He had some suggestions but thought that they would be more effectively shared in private.

Dean Jan Dunham-Taylor asked whether the \$850,000 represented the internal reallocation dollars. When Senator Marquette said that that was a separate thing, she then asked where those internal reallocation dollars were coming from.

Senator Marquette said that they would be coming from the units that were predominately responsible. For example, the Year 2000 -a (priority 3) had \$50,000 under internal reallocation. This was for a tool package which we expected Information Systems to buy for themselves. With the addition of the \$200,000 of new money, you were looking at essentially a down payment towards the \$500,000 to buy the financial package. So it was the first installment of perhaps two or three to get the new financial package in. This was

expected to come out of the total business and finance area. The graduate assistant money was actually spread over a bunch of different units.

The Chairman added that by administrative the Committee did not mean college administration; all of this was non-college.

The Chairman asked members of the body if after reviewing the material they had areas which they wanted addressed more fully to contact Dana Zaratsian in the President's office. Senator Marquette added that she had done a yeoman's job as the staff support for the Committee.

Senator Virginia Gunn asked whether this budget addressed the need for more maintenance for physical facilities on campus.

Senator Marquette answered that there were a couple of questions about deferred maintenance that awaited campus planning activities of the new campus planner. We were not sure how much deferred maintenance we had. It was not being addressed in this budget beyond the normal services that were provided. It was unlikely that we would be able to handle the deferred maintenance question out of the operating budget. It was going to have to come out of capital allocations.

Special Executive Assistant Edwin Wilson said that he was not yet ready to address this issue, but we would like \$50 million for the deferred maintenance.

The Chairman added that \$50 million was the estimate. He was going to steal a phrase coined by Senator John Bee, but if he would forgive him, he would do so. The Committee had felt that by attacking the deferred maintenance problem now that it would be creating the equivalent of a deferred maintenance problem with our salaries. This was because salaries was the only place that a significant portion of the money could come from in one way or another. We did not want to trade one deferred maintenance problem for another type of deferred maintenance problem.

Senator Bee moved to adjourn the meeting until April 24 at 3:00 p.m. This was seconded and the body voted its approval. The Chairman reminded the body that it would be meeting in CBA 120. The meeting ended at 4:20 p.m.

## APPENDIX A

**Planning and Budget Committee  
1997-1998 Plan and Budget Summary  
Table I**

**Prior Year Budget and Revenue Projections**

Category	1996-97	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Tuition and Fees	74,470,000	77,393,070	79,162,870
Appropriations	89,180,456	91,923,000	91,923,000
Other Sources	13,077,381	12,777,381	12,777,381
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>176,727,837</b>	<b>182,093,451</b>	<b>183,863,251</b>
Revenue Change		5,365,614	7,135,414
Administrative Budget Reductions		850,000	850,000
<b>Total Available Resources</b>		<b>6,215,614</b>	<b>7,985,414</b>

**Prioritization Schedule for 1997-1998**

Priority	Activity	Funding basis			Rationale and Notes
		New	Internal Reallocation	Defer	
1	Human Resources	150,000			Rationalize training and hiring
2	Presidential reserve	150,000			Eliminate ERIP tax
3	Year 2000a	200,000	50,000		Year 2000 tools and part time staff
4	Year 2000b		250,000		Buy financial package
5	New media center	94,000			Support instructional enhancement
6	Ohiolink	30,000			Basic charge increase
7	Salaries	3,000,000			Presidential and COD priority
8	Equity /compression adjustment	500,000			Method under PBC review
9	Grad Assistants - a	200,000	150,000		Increase competitiveness COD priority
10	Advising Services		300,000		Planning retreat priority COD and VP's
11	Academic operating-a	300,000			Rebuild operating funds
12	New academic initiatives - a	300,000			COD priority
13	Library -a	275,000			COD priority
14	Athletics	350,000	400,000		Women's sports teams
15	Legal - a	375,000			911 recording, toxic waste disposal
16	Development	325,000			New fund raising initiatives
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6,249,000</b>	<b>1,150,000</b>		
17	Alumni	125,000			Restore prior cuts
18	University Advertising	100,000		400,000	Stabilize budget line
19	President - a	275,000			Minority affairs and AA/EEO
20	Academic operating-b	300,000			Rebuild operating funds
21	New academic initiatives - b	300,000			COD priority
22	Library -b	275,000			COD priority
23	President - b	275,000			
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7,899,000</b>			

*Following are priorities for funding beyond best case scenario*

24	Legal - b	375,000			
25	Academic operating-c	300,000			Rebuild operating funds
26	New academic initiatives - c	300,000			
27	Year 2000c			300,000	Buy student package

**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON  
Revenue Projections - 1997-98  
Current Unrestricted Fund**

	1996-97		1997-98 Projection			
	Original Budget	Revised Budget	Scenario #1	Scenario #2	Scenario #3	Scenario #4
<b>Revenues:</b>						
<b>Tuition and Fees</b>						
Undergraduate	\$54,088,400	\$54,843,030	\$57,134,000	\$58,837,900	\$57,134,000	\$58,837,900
Graduate	15,889,300	15,600,000	15,981,100	16,047,000	15,981,100	16,047,000
Non-Resident Surcharge	5,875,000	6,285,000	6,536,000	6,536,000	6,536,000	6,536,000
Course Fees	1,375,000	1,455,000	1,455,000	1,455,000	1,455,000	1,455,000
Miscellaneous Fees	1,095,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Less: G/F Support to Athletics	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)
<b>Total Tuition and Fees</b>	<b>\$73,589,670</b>	<b>\$74,470,000</b>	<b>\$77,383,070</b>	<b>\$78,182,870</b>	<b>\$77,383,070</b>	<b>\$78,182,870</b>
<b>State Appropriations</b>						
Instructional Subsidies	\$88,180,457	\$88,180,456	\$88,274,845	\$88,274,845	\$90,923,000	\$90,923,000
International Business Subsidy	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
<b>Total State Support</b>	<b>\$89,180,457</b>	<b>\$89,180,456</b>	<b>\$89,274,845</b>	<b>\$89,274,845</b>	<b>\$91,923,000</b>	<b>\$91,923,000</b>
<b>Other Sources:</b>						
Earnings on Investments	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000
<b>Departmental Sales/Services:</b>						
UASC	748,420	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Other	5,452,381	5,452,381	5,452,381	5,452,381	5,452,381	5,452,381
Indirect Cost Recovery	2,025,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000
Miscellaneous	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
<b>Total Other Sources</b>	<b>\$12,275,801</b>	<b>\$12,877,381</b>	<b>\$12,577,381</b>	<b>\$12,577,381</b>	<b>\$12,577,381</b>	<b>\$12,577,381</b>
<b>Endowment Income</b>	<b>\$161,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>\$175,206,928</b>	<b>\$176,727,837</b>	<b>\$179,445,098</b>	<b>\$181,214,898</b>	<b>\$182,093,451</b>	<b>\$183,893,251</b>
<b>REVENUE CHANGE FROM 96-97 REVISED</b>	<b>(\$1,520,909)</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,717,259</b>	<b>\$4,487,059</b>	<b>\$5,385,614</b>	<b>\$7,135,414</b>

		ASSUMPTIONS			
		Scenario #1	Scenario #2	Scenario #3	Scenario #4
<b>Tuition/Fee Rates:</b>					
Undergraduate	12-16 plateau	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Graduate		4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Law		4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
<b>SCH:</b>					
Summer		-2.0%	0.0%	-2.0%	0.0%
<b>Academic Year:</b>					
Undergraduate		-3.0%	0.0%	-3.0%	0.0%
Graduate		-1.0%	0.0%	-1.0%	0.0%
Law		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>State Appropriations</b>		<b>Executive Budget</b>	<b>Executive Budget</b>	<b>3% Guarantee</b>	<b>3% Guarantee</b>
<b>Athletics</b>		<b>No Increase</b>	<b>No Increase</b>	<b>No Increase</b>	<b>No Increase</b>

Planning and Budgeting Committee  
1997-1998 Plan and Budget Summary  
Table II

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL FACULTY SENATE  
MEETING OF APRIL 24, 1997

The special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman H. Michael Cheung at 3:03 p.m. on Thursday, April 24, 1997, in CBA 120.

Forty-eight of the sixty-nine members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Deckler, McGucken, Murray, Newman, Pelz, Redle, Richards, Ross-Alaolmolki, and Taggart were absent with notice. Senators Batur, Borowiec, Braun, J.Buchanan, DePaul, Hammonds, Hardy, Hoover, Jalbert, McLinden, Scott, and Smolen were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- \* APPROVED THE BUDGET PROPOSED BY THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
- \* APPROVED A MOTION THAT IF THE PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS CHANGED, THE PBC WOULD REVISIT THE BUDGET PLAN AND REPORT BACK TO THE SENATE
- \* APPROVED A MOTION FOR THE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE THE ATHLETICS PROGRAM WITH A VIEW TO REDUCING ITS BUDGET AND TO REPORT ITS FINDINGS TO THE SENATE AT THE DECEMBER 1997 MEETING

**I. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS** - Before turning to the only business of the day, continuation of a discussion of the proposed budget from PBC, the Chairman asked whether there were any special announcements.

Senator Devinder Malhotra said that he had been directed by the Status of Women Committee to bring the following resolution to the body's attention: "The Status of Women Committee unanimously endorses the recommendation of the Planning and Budget Committee to set aside \$500,000 to address salary equity/compression issues on campus. It is the considered recommendation of the committee that these funds be disbursed by the Provost in consultation with the deans."

**II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - The Chairman then reopened the discussion of the proposed budget (Appendix A).



Senator Frank Griffin still had a great concern over the athletic budget and wanted to point out another issue in the athletic budget. If we roughly estimated having 700 teaching faculty who each were paid a ball park figure of \$50,000, that was \$35 million that we actually spent on teaching faculty. With \$5 million in the athletic budget, this meant that for every \$1 which we put into the athletic budget, we only spent \$7 on the teaching faculty, the group that prepared our students for their place in society. He thought that this was an outrage, and he hoped that the Senate would join him in expressing it as such. However, at this point, he was not prepared to propose an amendment or modification of the budget to convey this sense of outrage.

In regard to Senator Chand Midha's question regarding the \$500,000 set aside for equity and compression adjustment, Senator Jesse Marquette, Vice Chair of PBC, answered that if the body would look at page 2, point 2 of the handout, it would see the procedure which the Committee was recommending for dealing with this issue. There was basically a 3-stage process where the Provost and the Council of Deans would consult and then operate seriatim in terms of inequities from the low salary to inequities resulting from initial appointment to salary compression. It was his expectation that the Provost would report on the disposition of that money during the next budget cycle.

Senator Midha wanted to know how the \$450,000 that had been set aside two years ago for compression and emergency new position lines in the colleges had been spent. Senator Marquette said that out of the 94-94 money, the Committee had no idea. That was two Provosts ago. It had gotten reports on the target of opportunity money. Everything that the Committee had requested to be done in the 95-96 budget had been done. The Committee knew where that money had gone.

Senator Paul John moved that the Senate move into committee of the whole to continue the discussion more informally. This was seconded by Senator Malhotra, and the body voted its approval.

Senator Carol Gigliotti, Vice Chair of the Senate, took the chair and the body continued to discuss the budget in the committee of the whole.

When the body came out of committee of the whole, the Chairman returned to the chair, and Senator Gigliotti rose and reported that the committee of the whole had discussed the budget but had no recommendations to make.

Since there was no further discussion of the proposed budget, the Chairman called for a vote and the body gave its approval of the budget recommended by the PBC.

Senator Elizabeth Erickson then moved that if the general purpose tuition cap was set significantly higher than expected, that is 1% or more, the Senate should reconvene at this time. This was seconded by Senator Green. A discussion then ensued as to whether this

should be determined by a percentage figure or a dollar amount (suggested by Senator Dennis Kimmell). Finally Senator Malhotra thought that the whole matter could be handled more simply, and he moved to amend by substitution of the following motion: "If there are substantial changes in the underlying assumptions, then the PBC will take a fresh look at it and report back to the Senate." This was seconded by Senator John Bee.

The body voted first to substitute this motion for Senator Erickson's which was currently on the floor. It approved the substitution, and then it voted on the substitute motion which was approved.

Senator Norfolk, after ascertaining that the PBC would begin serious consideration of the next budget in January 1998, moved that the Athletics Committee be immediately charged with carefully examining the entire athletics program with a view for reducing the budget and that it should report to this body by the December meeting. This was seconded by Senator Griffin.

Since there was no discussion, the body voted its approval.

**III. GOOD OF THE ORDER** - Parliamentarian Don R. Gerlach asked permission to address the body and it was granted. As an emeritus member of the faculty now for three years and having gone through another salary equity business some years back, he wanted to urge upon the Senate for its future action to do something about the section in the PBC report (page 2, item 2) where it was recommending that the Provost and COD decide on the allocation of equity dollars, etc. As a faculty member for 32 years here, he had always argued for the faculty's power, and he urged the body to take that up and not surrender this important function to the deans and the Provost. The deans and their department chairs had been the problem in creating inequity and salary compression issues. What he urged and begged for the body to do was to set up its own committee or have one set up with one representative faculty member from each college or other unit in the University which had this problem, and let that committee investigate and allocate the adjustments. He would not want to cut out the Provost and the deans entirely, but to let them do it alone was a big mistake. One might as well put the fox in the chicken coop.

The Chairman noted that there was old business before the body which it would take up at its next regularly scheduled meeting that in part at least addressed the Parliamentarian's concerns.

Senator Norfolk had received complaints from two of his colleagues about the campus focus spring fling that had taken place yesterday on Buchtel Commons by the Library. They had started blasting loud music around 10 a.m. There had been students in neighboring buildings trying to take exams and faculty trying to teach. He did not know who had planned this and was responsible, but it was a bloody awful idea to do it especially when there was

only one week until May Day when the students could do whatever they wanted. He was not sure what the appropriate thing to do about this might be, but he at least wanted to bring it up as something with which his colleagues were very unhappy.

Senator Barbara Bucey had an announcement to make. She was the Chair of the Regional Conference for the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) which would be meeting here next spring. This was the Great Lakes Region which encompassed Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana and the Ontario Province. The University would be the host site, and she and Carla Mugler, the Dean of University College, had sent a letter out to deans and department chairs requesting assistance from people who were doing advising in the upper division colleges as well as down in C&T. For anyone who was interested in advising or who wanted to learn more about it, there would be a general meeting on Monday, April 28 from 4-5:00 in the Oak Room of the Student Center. If you could not make it and were interested in helping, please let her know and she certainly would put you to work.

**IV. ADJOURNMENT** - The Chairman called for a motion to adjourn. This was moved and seconded, and the body voted its approval. The meeting ended at 4:00 p.m.

*Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin*

## APPENDIX A

**University of Akron  
Planning and Budgeting Committee  
Final Report, 1996-97 Academic Year and  
Recommended Plan and Budget 1997-1998**

***Introduction***

The planning process implemented for the 1997-98 academic year was designed to rationalize and coordinate the planning, budgeting and annual reporting activities heretofore treated as discrete processes. All units were asked to produce five-year and one-year plans for their areas, to develop a budget request for the 1997-98 year, and to demonstrate proper stewardship of university resources via their report of activities funded through the 1996 calendar year.

***Assumptions***

After extended discussion the Committee felt that its deliberations should be conditioned by the following assumptions:

- 1) Our primary goal is to maintain, and improve wherever possible, the quality of the educational activities of the University, including maintenance of the current level of full-time tenure track faculty positions.
- 2) For the foreseeable future higher education in Ohio will face significant resource constraints both in terms of limited state subsidy and restrictions on tuition increases.
- 3) Given the demographic profile of our primary service region, it is neither realistic nor advisable to attempt to "grow" our way to larger budgets.
- 4) Since the primary revenues of the institution are tuition and subsidy income generated by instructional delivery, and there has already been a substantial contraction of the personnel and operating budgets of the colleges, primary emphasis must be placed on improving the efficiency and planning to downsize the various support services of the institution.

***Processes***

All units produced a combined plan, budget request, and annual report for their unit. As appropriate these unit plans were then coordinated and prioritized by the Provost and Council of Deans and the support unit Vice-Presidents.

Having received and perused the plans of the various units and examined performance and budgetary data provided by Institutional Research, the Committee heard presentations from the President, Provost, each of the vice-presidents, the Deans of colleges, the Associate Provost for Information Services, Associated Student Government representatives and the Athletic Director.

In a series of meetings, the Committee then developed a plan and budget recommendation for the coming year reflecting the assumptions and unit priorities before the committee. The revenue assumptions and detailed priorities are presented in Table I. The committee attempted, where possible, to achieve University-wide goals by general reallocation of funds (\$850,000) appearing as Administrative Budget Reductions in the Revenue Assumptions of Table I or specific reallocations for designated activities. These funding shifts are noted as Internal Reallocations in the Prioritization Schedule of Table I. The revenue assumptions are based on the projections appearing in Table II and are projected to fall between scenarios 3 and 4 of that Table. The highlights of those scenarios appear in the Revenue Projections section of Table I.

Because of the size of requests presented and the need to be able to inter-mingle priorities from a variety of sources, the committee subdivided the requests from the various units and labeled these subsets a, b, c, as appropriate, for example as Library - a, Library - b. In the future we expect to receive more specific prioritization of activities by unit so that the designated activities may be more clearly described.

**Priorities**

The plan for the 1997-98 academic year attempts to achieve the following goals:

- 1) Respond to several basic campus wide needs, including rationalizing and improving our non-faculty personnel processes, dealing with the problems created by the so-called "Year 2000" problem and providing basic operating support for the New Media Center. These activities derive from priorities presented by the President and Provost (Priorities 1 to 6 in Table I).
- 2) Maintain salary competitiveness and make a campus wide commitment to dealing with salary inequities - These activities derive from priorities presented by the President, Provost, Council of Deans and the Vice-Presidents (Priorities 7 and 8 in Table I). The committee recommends that the Provost and Council of Deans decide on the allocation of equity dollars and that their decisions address, in priority order:
  - a. Inequity resulting from low salary at time of hire (University level).
  - b. Inequity resulting since initial appointment (College level).
  - c. Salary compression, to be addressed when raise pool level exceeds rate of inflation (College level).
- 3) Increase funding for Graduate Assistants in order to maintain competitiveness with other programs and provide additional instructional support. This activity derives from priorities presented by the Provost and Council of Deans (Priority 9 in Table I).
- 4) Improve undergraduate advising and retention for students not enrolled in a degree granting college by restoring personnel to advising services. This activity derives from priorities presented by the President, Provost, Council of Deans and Vice-Presidents (Priority 10 in Table I).
- 5) Support a variety of instructional activity enhancements in the colleges and University Library. These activities derive from priorities presented by the Provost and Council of Deans (Priorities 11 to 13 in Table I).
- 6) Respond to Title IX responsibilities in athletics by providing additional funding for women's sports. This activity derives from review by NCAA evaluation team during 1996-97 (Priority 14 in Table I).
- 7) Respond to health and safety issues raised by the inadequacy of our 911 recording system and the need for new efforts in regard to toxic waste disposal. These activities derive from priorities presented by the Vice-President for Legal Affairs (Priority 15 in Table I).
- 8) Support new fund raising and alumni service initiatives. These activities derive from priorities presented by the Vice-President for Development (Priorities 16 and 17 in Table I).
- 9) Begin to fund University advertising as a standard line item rather than one-time money in order to allow more effective planning (Priority 18 in Table I).
- 10) Fund additional initiatives in the President's office, including additional support for minority affairs and EEO efforts (Priority 19 in Table I).

The remaining activities in Table I represent additional funding for earlier priorities if the funding situation permits.

***Additional Considerations***

Operating for the first full year under the new planning and budgeting process the Committee has attempted to produce a realistic and prioritized plan for the coming academic year. While the Committee generally feels that the planning process has been successful in its first full iteration, there is still room for improvement in several areas:

- 1) The mission statement and University strategic directions must be made more specific and more accurately reflect the precise mission of the University.
- 2) All unit plans must be clearly developed in priority order.
- 3) The prioritized list of actions which comprise a unit plan must be specific enough to allow evaluation of performance in future cycles of the reporting and budgeting process.
- 4) The plan and budget requests must all adhere to the standard form provided by the Committee.
- 5) The forms themselves should be revised to insure all necessary information is acquired.
- 6) All units must ensure adequate participation by unit personnel in the planning process.

The Committee will continue to evaluate all aspects of the planning process and will seek any additional improvements it deems necessary.

**Planning and Budget Committee  
1997-1998 Plan and Budget Summary  
Table I**

**Prior Year Budget and Revenue Projections**

Category	1996-97	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Tuition and Fees	74,470,000	77,393,070	79,162,870
Appropriations	89,180,456	91,923,000	91,923,000
Other Sources	13,077,381	12,777,381	12,777,381
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>176,727,837</b>	<b>182,093,451</b>	<b>183,863,251</b>
Revenue Change		5,365,614	7,135,414
Administrative Budget Reductions		850,000	850,000
<b>Total Available Resources</b>		<b>6,215,614</b>	<b>7,985,414</b>

**Prioritization Schedule for 1997-1998**

Priority	Activity	Funding basis			Rationale and Notes
		New	Internal Reallocation	Defer	
1	Human Resources	150,000			Rationalize training and hiring
2	Presidential reserve	150,000			Eliminate ERIP tax
3	Year 2000a	200,000	50,000		Year 2000 tools and part time staff
4	Year 2000b		250,000		Buy financial package
5	New media center	94,000			Support instructional enhancement
6	Ohiolink	30,000			Basic charge increase
7	Salaries	3,000,000			Presidential and COD priority
8	Equity /compression adjustment	500,000			Method under PBC review
9	Grad Assistants - a	200,000	150,000		Increase competitiveness COD priority
10	Advising Services		300,000		Planning retreat priority COD and VP's
11	Academic operating-a	300,000			Rebuild operating funds
12	New academic initiatives - a	300,000			COD priority
13	Library -a	275,000			COD priority
14	Athletics	350,000	400,000		Women's sports teams
15	Legal - a	375,000			911 recording, toxic waste disposal
16	Development	325,000			New fund raising initiatives
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6,249,000</b>	<b>1,150,000</b>		
17	Alumni	125,000			Restore prior cuts
18	University Advertising	100,000		400,000	Stabilize budget line
19	President - a	275,000			Minority affairs and AA/EEO
20	Academic operating-b	300,000			Rebuild operating funds
21	New academic initiatives - b	300,000			COD priority
22	Library -b	275,000			COD priority
23	President - b	275,000			
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7,899,000</b>			
<i>Following are priorities for funding beyond best case scenario</i>					
24	Legal - b	375,000			
25	Academic operating-c	300,000			Rebuild operating funds
26	New academic initiatives - c	300,000			
27	Year 2000c			300,000	Buy student package

**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON**  
**Revenue Projections - 1997-98**  
**Current Unrestricted Fund**

APRIL 24, 1997

Planning and Budgeting Committee  
 1997-1998 Plan and Budget Summary  
 Table II

	1996-97		1997-98 Projection			
	Original Budget	Revised Budget	Scenario #1	Scenario #2	Scenario #3	Scenario #4
<b>Revenues:</b>						
<b>Tuition and Fees</b>						
Undergraduate	\$54,088,400	\$54,843,030	\$57,134,000	\$58,837,900	\$57,134,000	\$58,837,900
Graduate	15,869,300	15,800,000	15,981,100	16,047,000	15,981,100	16,047,000
Non-Resident Surcharge	5,875,000	6,285,000	6,536,000	6,536,000	6,536,000	6,536,000
Course Fees	1,375,000	1,455,000	1,455,000	1,455,000	1,455,000	1,455,000
Miscellaneous Fees	1,095,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Less: G/F Support to Athletics	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)
<b>Total Tuition and Fees</b>	<b>\$73,589,670</b>	<b>\$74,470,000</b>	<b>\$77,393,070</b>	<b>\$78,162,870</b>	<b>\$77,393,070</b>	<b>\$79,162,870</b>
<b>State Appropriations</b>						
Instructional Subsidies	\$88,180,457	\$88,180,458	\$88,274,645	\$88,274,645	\$80,823,000	\$80,823,000
International Business Subsidy	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
<b>Total State Support</b>	<b>\$89,180,457</b>	<b>\$89,180,458</b>	<b>\$89,274,645</b>	<b>\$89,274,645</b>	<b>\$81,823,000</b>	<b>\$81,823,000</b>
<b>Other Sources:</b>						
Earnings on Investments	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000
Departmental Sales/Services:						
UASC	748,420	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Other	5,452,381	5,452,381	5,452,381	5,452,381	5,452,381	5,452,381
Indirect Cost Recovery	2,025,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000
Miscellaneous	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
<b>Total Other Sources</b>	<b>\$12,275,801</b>	<b>\$12,877,381</b>	<b>\$12,577,381</b>	<b>\$12,577,381</b>	<b>\$12,577,381</b>	<b>\$12,577,381</b>
<b>Endowment Income</b>	<b>\$161,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>\$175,208,928</b>	<b>\$176,727,837</b>	<b>\$179,445,096</b>	<b>\$181,214,896</b>	<b>\$182,093,451</b>	<b>\$183,863,251</b>
<b>REVENUE CHANGE FROM 86-87 REVISED</b>	<b>(\$1,520,909)</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,717,268</b>	<b>\$4,487,059</b>	<b>\$5,385,614</b>	<b>\$7,135,414</b>
			<b>ASSUMPTIONS</b>			
			Scenario #1	Scenario #2	Scenario #3	Scenario #4
<b>Tuition/Fee Rates:</b>						
Undergraduate	12-16 plateau		3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Graduate			4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Law			4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
<b>SCH:</b>						
Summer			-2.0%	0.0%	-2.0%	0.0%
<b>Academic Year:</b>						
Undergraduate			-3.0%	0.0%	-3.0%	0.0%
Graduate			-1.0%	0.0%	-1.0%	0.0%
Law			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>State Appropriations</b>			Executive Budget	Executive Budget	3% Guarantee	3% Guarantee
<b>Athletics</b>			No Increase	No Increase	No Increase	No Increase



