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I. Introduction

Each year the Campus Planning and Budget Committee (CPBC) develops “the budget and planning priorities and issues” of the campus for the next fiscal year under consideration. This report formerly known as the Goals and Objectives Report (GOR) is presented to the Campus Senate and the UIS administration. Although this report presents the campus planning and budget priorities and issues for the fiscal year 2012-13 (FY13), it also gives direction to our current efforts for FY12. The committee is cognizant of the current difficult budget situation facing the campus due to the State’s fiscal crisis and understands the limitation it may impose on budget allocations.

II. Functions of the CPBC

UIS Bylaws governing CPBC: The UIS Senate bylaws under Article VI.2. E (amended Sept 11, 2009) defines the memberships and duties of CPBC as follows:

E. Campus Planning and Budget Committee

1) Membership, Terms, and Selection of Chair.
The Committee shall consist of six faculty members appointed by the Senate, two from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the remaining Colleges and the library; one student in good academic standing appointed by the Student Government Association; one civil service staff member and one academic professional appointed by their representative bodies. Ex-officio is the Provost. Faculty shall serve three-year staggered terms; all other voting members shall serve one-year terms. Each spring semester the committee shall elect a chair from the ranks of faculty whose term will begin in the summer session.

2) Duties
The Campus Planning and Budget Committee responsibilities shall be to (1) provide for campus-wide input into the campus budgeting and planning priorities by developing a short list of budget priorities for consideration by the Campus administration; (2) review budget allocations and progress in relation to meeting CPBC priorities and the goals in the campus strategic plan; (3) recommend changes in planning priorities to the Senate and to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; and (4) to submit an annual draft in the early spring to the Senate regarding budgeting and planning priorities and issues. The committee is not expected to become involved in detailed and comprehensive investigations in developing budget and planning priorities.
III. Budget and Planning Priorities for UIS

1. Preamble

The Committee recognizes the following importation challenges:

- Continuing State budget deficits, legislative delays, and associated uncertainty
- Secular decline of state funding of higher education and UIS’ share
- Unfavorable demographic changes in Illinois college age population

The Committee recognizes some core goals must be upheld:

- Maintain core academic programs, initiatives, and activities
- Sustain competitive salaries for faculty and staff
- Manage financial aid programs to maintain a diverse and academically talented student population
- Ensure that all operations, facilities, and activities support UIS’ core instructional mission

2. Sources of Information

The committee met every other week during the academic year and the meetings are open to public. All meeting dates are posted on the Campus Senate website and all committee records are posted under CPBC Blackboard accessible to all members of the committee. In preparing its recommendations of budget and planning priorities and issues for UIS, the committee consulted the following sources:

- **Campus Top Budget Priorities Survey 2011**: The committee with the help of the Survey Research Office conducted a campus wide survey of faculty, academic professional, and civil servants during February 24 – March 6, 2011(Survey instrument in Appendix A; Summary Report of Survey in Appendix B). The main purpose of the survey was to determine the top budget priorities of the campus community. The response rate was about 34 percent (271 responses out of about 800 possible respondents) with an even distribution of responses from the three groups -- 34 percent civil servants, 32 percent academic professionals and 34 percent faculty (Appendix B, Table 3). Respondents were asked to rank-order three listed priority items, each separately and then comparatively. The priority items are: (a) strengthen student recruitment, retention, and services, (b) enhance educational quality, and (c) enhance salary competitiveness. In addition, respondents were asked to give suggestions, if any, on how to make the university more effective and
financially sustainable in accomplishing its purposes. The separate rankings of the listed priorities show that 70 percent of the respondents ranked enhance salary competitiveness as their “highest priority” followed by 55 percent for student recruitment and 33 percent for educational quality (Appendix B, Tables 1A-C). The weighted composite ranking of the three separate rankings preserves the same rank order with salary enhancement as the top most priority followed by recruitment and quality (Appendix B, Table 1D). In comparative rankings of the three, salary enhancement has been ranked as number 1 priority by 47 percent, number 2 by 32 percent, and number 3 by 21 percent of the respondents. Student recruitment has been ranked number 1 priority by 35 percent, number 2 by 36 percent, and number 3 by 30 percent of the respondents. Educational quality has been ranked number 1 priority by 19 percent, number 2 by 32 percent, and number 3 by 49 percent of the respondents (Appendix B, Tables 2A-C). The weighted composite ranking of the three comparative rankings also preserves the same rank order with salary enhancement as the top most priority followed by recruitment and quality (Appendix B, Table 1D). Of the 138 written comments or suggestions received, 50 were from academic professionals, 45 from civil service staffs, and 43 from faculty. The comments vary significantly in terms of both size and breadth. The committee reviewed the comments and decided to leave them as it is without any attempt to summarize them due to the inherent problem of such exercise.

- **Campus Unit Heads — Top Priorities**: The committee members met with 10 unit heads (Deans and Division Heads) to solicit respective top budget and planning priorities for the current/upcoming year and the near future (List of unit heads and respective top priorities are presented in Appendix C).

- **University Budget Documents** (Operating and Capital Budget Requests for FY 2012 presented in the University of Illinois Budget BookFY12, [http://www.pb.uillinois.edu/dr/budgetbook.cfm](http://www.pb.uillinois.edu/dr/budgetbook.cfm))

- **CPBC Past Goals and Objective Reports** — Top Priorities (Appendix D)

- **UIS Strategic Plan Priorities** (Available on UIS Website)
3. **Recommended Top Budget Priorities for UIS**

The committee recognizes the campus must uphold its core mission at all time. Based on review of the sources listed above and after careful deliberations, the committee recommends the following three in rank order as the top budget priorities for the campus for the current and the upcoming year.

**Number 1 Priority -- Enhance Salary Competitiveness.** There has been a continuous erosion of purchasing power of earnings of campus community over the past several years in the absence of any salary increments. Generally, annual salary increment covers three elements: cost of living adjustment to keep real income constant, merit increment to reward higher productivity, and a “catch-up” amount to address “equity” and compression problems. To improve retention and employee morale and productivity; campus must invest in its most important resource – its dedicated employees. The current practice of not meeting at least the annual cost of living adjustment in salary program is unacceptable. In addition, “real” salary increment reflecting performance and productivity gains must be provided annually. Indeed, UIS now ranks near the bottom (12th in salary and 10th in total compensation) among the 14 IBHE peer institutions of UIS in terms of faculty salary competitiveness (Figure 9, page 16, *UI Budget Book* 2011). Staff salaries are also significantly below the comparable IBHE peer group averages. In addition, the committee recognizes the recent furlough program that demonstrates shared sacrifice of the campus community in the face of campus budget shortfalls and the hardship it imposed on them. The committee recommends the campus devote more of available campus funds to salary enhancement for faculty, academic professionals, and civil service staff from its current funding level to effectively address the above issues.

**Number 2 Priority -- Strengthen Student Recruitment, Retention, and Services:** Increase efficiency of current allocation and vigorously recruit quality students nationally and internationally – both on-campus and on-line; increase student retention rate; and enhance campus life. The committee acknowledges the recent campus efforts in this regard by holding the “enrollment expansion planning retreat” to address some of these issues in a comprehensive way. The committee makes a few specific recommends on this that are presented in Appendix E.

**Number 3 Priority -- Enhance Educational Quality:** Increase number of quality degree, certificate, and course offerings consistent with market demand and competiveness with peer institutions; improve campus life; increase funding for faculty development, research and
professional activities, and technology integration. Again, the committee acknowledges recent campus efforts in this regard by holding the “enrollment expansion planning retreat” to address some of these issues in a comprehensive way.

IV. Recurring Recommendations

The committee further recommends that the campus continue to monitor the following three items recommended by CPBC in 2010 to improve budget allocation and efficiency:

1. **Study of composition and growth of current budget allocations:** For optimum funding allocation to the top three budget priorities identified above, the committee recommends conducting a study to determine both the composition and growth of administrative versus “instructional” (direct education, advising and library expenses) salaries and expenditures. A clear definition of “instructional” salaries and expenditures is needed in this regard. The committee recommends the campus maintain an appropriate funding allocation between the two consistent with UIS peer group. The committee recognizes that UIS’ productivity gains over the years resulted from joint efforts by dedicated faculty, academic professionals, staff, and administrators. The committee further recommends that the overall growth of administrative salaries must not exceed the growth of “instructional” salaries.

A preliminary comparative study of educational costs at UIS versus national and state averages (presented in Appendix F) raises a number of questions on “instruction and related expenses” at UIS which may or may not be fully explained by measurement errors and/or reporting discrepancies. Hence, the committee recommends for a comprehensive study of the matter in particular addressing the issues identified in Appendix F.

2. **Changes in current budget practice:** Under the current “fixed budget” or “base budget” approach the spending of any additional revenues generated by higher than expected enrollment is left to the discretion of the administrators who control the budget. This lacks any incentive mechanism. A “flexible budget” process based on “capitalization tests” for each of the four colleges is an option worth exploring. This will allow the campus to avoid excessive spending if revenue turns out to be less than expected. The committee recommends examining ways to allocate additional revenues by recognizing enrollment growth.

3. **Changes in current budget reporting:** To achieve greater efficiency in budget allocation a few cost related metrics that are not calculable from the official fiscal year budgets
should be reported on a regular basis. In particular, the committee **recommends** collection and dissemination of data in three specific areas: (a) direct costs of instruction per student credit hour; (b) revenue per student credit hour from tuition and from the unrestricted general revenue allocation from the state; (c) total cost of direct “front-line” instructional and core student service costs. A description of these metrics and how they might be used by the campus community were presented in 2010 report of the committee. In this regard, the committee acknowledges the good work already done by the *Instructional Resource Management Task Force* in developing and implementing a small number of easily understandable metrics relating to some of the same points raised here.
V. APPENDIX

APPENDIX A: Campus Budget Priorities Survey March 2011 - Instrument

Campus Planning and Budget Committee 2010-11
UIS Survey: Top Budget Priorities for the campus

NOTE: This survey is intended for ONLY currently employed UIS faculty, Academic Professionals and Civil Service Staff.

1. Please indicate the degree to which you feel like each of the following should continue to be recommended as a top priority for the university resources and budget allocations:

   A. **Strengthen Student Recruitment, Retention, and Services:** Increase efforts to recruit quality students nationally and internationally (on-campus and on-line); increase student retention rate; and enhance campus life.
      
      | Box 1 | Box 2 | Box 3 | Box 4 | Box 5 |
      |-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
      | Low   | Medium| High  |
      | Priority| Priority| Priority |

   B. **Enhance Educational Quality:** Increase funding for faculty development and research and professional activities; enhance course/degree offerings and quality, and technology integration.
      
      | Box 1 | Box 2 | Box 3 | Box 4 | Box 5 |
      |-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
      | Low   | Medium| High  |
      | Priority| Priority| Priority |

   C. **Enhance Salary Competitiveness:** Devote more campus funding to increase salary of faculty, APs, and civil service staff from current levels to improve retention and employee morale and productivity.
      
      | Box 1 | Box 2 | Box 3 | Box 4 | Box 5 |
      |-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
      | Low   | Medium| High  |
      | Priority| Priority| Priority |

   D. Please rank order the above three priorities: Next to the following ranks, indicate which of the above should be ranked first, second and third – by putting the relevant letter (A, B or C) in the box next to the rank.
      
      BOX Should be ranked first (#1)
      BOX Should be ranked second (#2)
      BOX Should be ranked third (#3)

2. Please tell us about other ways you think we can make the university more effective and financially sustainable in accomplishing its purposes (please limit to 150 words):

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

3. Please circle the group you represent: Civil Service Staff Academic Professionals Faculty

To forward your completed survey to CPBC please select: [SEND]
Greetings!
I am writing to you on behalf of the Campus Planning and Budget Committee to solicit your input as we formulate our recommendation of top budget priorities for the campus. We are asking only five minutes of your time to complete a very brief survey by March 6, 2011.

As you all know we are going through a tough budget situation. Nevertheless, as an academic institution, we must continue to perform our core functions with the greatest efficiency wherever possible, without jeopardizing the cohesiveness of the organization. The committee decided to solicit input from the campus community by conducting a short survey. The results from the survey will be a valuable piece of information as the Committee attempts to formulate its budget recommendations to the Campus Senate and Administration. There are only a few items on the questionnaire. Please let us know by March 6, 2011, your top budget priorities for the campus by following the link below. While accessing the survey requires you to log in, the survey is confidential. In fact, Webtools does NOT allow us to access names, IP addresses or email addresses of those who complete the survey. Once the results are summarized, we hope to share them with you.

To give you an idea of the past budget recommendations, I have attached a list of top budget priorities recommended by the Campus Planning and Budget Committee over the past several years. To take the survey please click (or copy and paste on your browser) the link given below.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Baker Siddiquee, Associate Professor of Economics
Chair, Campus Planning and Budget Committee
Phone: 206-7912; E-mail: bsidd1@uis.edu

NOTE: If you received this survey invitation by mistake, please accept our sincere apology and disregard the invitation.

LINK to take the Survey: http://url.uis.edu/2011budgetsurveyuis
Please complete the Survey by March 6, 2011
Attachment: Past CPBC Recommendations
APPENDIX B: Campus Budget Survey March 2011 – Summary Results

Table 1.A: Strengthen Student Recruitment, Retention, and Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Low Priority</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.B: Enhance Educational Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Low Priority</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.C: Enhance Salary Competiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Low Priority</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing System 2 .7
Total 271 100.0
Table 1.D: Weighted Composite Ranking of Three Separate Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority = &gt;</th>
<th>Low = 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Highest=5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Composite Ranking*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>429.3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>378.5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>453.2 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Weights are: 5=highest, ... 1= lowest; Rank in parenthesis.

Table 2.A : Rank #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Strengthen Student Recruitment, Retention, and Services</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance Educational Quality</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance Salary Competitiveness</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.B : Rank #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Strengthen Student Recruitment, Retention, and Services</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance Educational Quality</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance Salary Competitiveness</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.C : Rank #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Strengthen Student Recruitment, Retention &amp; Services</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance Educational Quality</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance Salary Competitiveness</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.D: Weighted Composite Ranking of Three Comparative Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Top=3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>205.2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>169.6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>225.3 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Weights are: 5=highest, … 1= lowest; Rank in parenthesis.

Table 3: Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Professional</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: Top Budget Priorities of Campus Units

Questions asked to respective unit heads (Deans/Division Heads):
1. What are your top THREE budget/planning priorities for your college/department this year?
2. What are your top THREE budget/planning priorities for your college/department for the upcoming year?

Academic Affairs Division:
· Provost/VCAA & Information Technology Services (VCAA/ITS)
· Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS)
· Dean, College of Business and Management (CBM)
· Dean, College of Education & Human Services (EHS)
· Dean, Library Instructional Services (LIS)
· Dean, College of Public Affairs & Administration (PAA)
· Executive Director, Center for State Policy & Leadership (CSPL)

Chancellors Division:
· Associate Chancellor, Chancellor’s Division (CD)
· Associate Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs (ADMIN)
· Associate Chancellor, Office of Development (OD)

Student Affairs Division:
· VC, Student Affairs and Administrative Services (SAAS)

Academic Affairs and Information Technology Services (VCAA/ITS)—Top Budget Priorities

Reported by Interim Provost/VCAA Lynn Pardie

Maintain core academic services and functions
1. Serve the students well
2. Use resources in cost-effective and efficient ways
3. Use metrics developed by the Instructional Resources Task Force
   • Salary Program (if at all possible)
   • Increase Enrollment
4. International programming; Coordinating task force exists that is working on this
5. Consider the development of academic programs for the arts
6. Student support

College of Business & Management (CBM) -- Top Budget Priorities

Reported by Associate Dean Dyanne Ferk

Top Three Immediate Priorities & Resource Needs, in Rank Order
1. Expansion of off-campus (Peoria and other markets) MBA: Re-deployment of existing resources; Course Development Stipend; 1 Faculty (FT) Position; Travel Support
2. Expansion of Online BBA Program: 1 Faculty (FT) Position & 1 AP (FT) Position
3. Undergraduate Advising at the College Level: 1 AP (FT) Position; 1 Peer Advisor (Continuing GA) Position

Top Three Immediate Future Priorities & Resource Needs, in Rank Order
1. a. BBA Concentration in marketing: 1 Faculty (FT) Position
   b. BBA Concentration in Management: 1 Faculty (FT) Position; currently underway (replacement of Huff); 1 Faculty (FT) Position (Replacement of O’Neal retirement)
   c. CBM Graduate Internship Program: 0.5 AP (FT) Position – CBM Grad Internship Coordinator
2. Continuing Support for Faculty Scholarship Activities: Faculty Development Funds
3. Expansion of International Education: International Recruitment; Travel – faculty and Staff
College of Public Affairs and Administration (CPAA) – Top Budget Priorities:
Reported by Dean Pinky Wassenberg
1. Getting faculty to accommodate student growth (90% seats are filled in CPAA)
   How? Increasing summer school offerings
   Problem: summer school/overloads/ and adjuncts have a single budget line that does not change
   even if the demand for summer school increases.
   How to attain this? Serious consideration should be made to having colleges get a % of the
   revenues they generate (instead of having one big pool of money for all colleges).
   More responsibility should be devolved to colleges, where if a college does not carry its weight
   then, this should be considered when income is distributed.
2. Increase scholarly expectations
   Sponsor research by providing funding (greater amount of funds are desperately needed!).
   Let colleges manage the funding by providing a percentage of the gains.

College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) – Top Budget Priorities:
Reported by Dean Larry Stonecipher
1. Reaccreditation of Academic Programs (in support of CEHS Strategic Goal of Academic
   Excellence)
2. Protect against the possible slide in the Tenure Track Faculty/Adjunct Faculty ratio. UIS should
definitely stay above 50/50, as it can prevent problems with public perceptions of the education
provided by the university, and can negatively impact recruitment and retention. We need to be
sure that full-time faculty are hired where there has been growth (such as online) or faculty
retirements. Special attention should be paid to programs, departments, and colleges where this
ratio low.
3. Hire full-time faculty in areas where high student/course loads warrant it.
4. 50% AP Certification Officer needed

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) – Top Budget Priorities:
Reported by Dean James Ermatinger
1. Salaries remain very important to him. He would like us to get salary increases, but he noted that
   this was something that would happen at the university level.
2. He would like more support for research and research projects that involve students. In
   particular, he thinks it would be a very good idea to have internal grants at the university or
   college level that could be significant (up to $5,000) to fund research projects in which students
   and faculty are working together. This sort of thing would hopefully improve student retention,
   raise the intellectual climate on campus, and give faculty a chance to engage in more scholarship.
   He would also like to be able to award more research grants to faculty, and he thinks internal
   competitive funding opportunities will inspire some good scholarship in the College.
3. The dean continues to value our potential for supporting conferences or demonstrations of student
   work and faculty work.
Brookens Library (LIB) – Top Budget Priorities
Reported by Dean Jane Treadwell

FY2011:
1. Implementing improvements based on data from the ERIAL (Ethnographic Research in Illinois Academic Libraries) project: new furniture, drop-in instruction sessions, CTL partnership, etc.
2. Maintaining key e-resource subscriptions, adding new ones, and managing them well despite budget cuts: added staff member to e-resource workflow, implemented electronic resource management system
3. Enhancing marketing and outreach efforts: working on redesign of library web site; began offering additional CINRC workshops, increased Friends programming; participation in the Big Read; partnership with Student Life on National Gaming Day; partnership with English Club on poetry readings and other speakers in Mary Jane’s Café; added Facebook, Twitter, Foursquare, live chat

FY2012:
1. Enhance library technology:
   a. Reduce number of systems maintained and interfaces library patrons must use (federated search, SFX, WorldCat Local, etc.); may require purchase of new system(s)
   b. Streamline purchase, installation, and management of installed base of public and staff computers
   c. Develop library aps for I-Pads and other mobile devices
   d. Promote institutional repository
2. Increase staffing to better meet needs of the community—Add two faculty librarian positions in response to revamped general education curriculum and retention and recruitment goals
3. Review Brookens Library Master Plan to determine if elements of it could be completed in the short-term within existing footprint (ex: install compact shelving, move Archives, construct classroom/group study, etc.)

Center for State Policy & Leadership (CSPL)
Reported by Dr. David P Racine, Executive Director of CSPL

FY2012
1. An additional academic professional position for the Office of Graduate Intern Programs/Graduate Public Service Internship (GPSI) program ($40,000 - $60,000) to pursue a more comprehensive effort with former interns and to look for other ways to bolster graduate education.

2. Start-up funding for development and piloting of a public affairs news, information, and analysis website ($50,000).

Chancellors Division (CD) – Top Budget Priorities:
Reported by Edward Wojcicki, Associate Chancellor for Constituent Relations, Office of the Chancellor

  Communications/Marketing – Top Three Priorities:
  1. Continuation of $200,000 in funding to raise the profile of UIS and its strong academic programs.
  2. Additional $250,000 to raise the profile of UIS in the Chicago suburbs
3. Additional $375,000 for a mobile device (apps) strategy, internal communications, research, and staffing to handle the emerging communications technologies

- **Athletics -- Top Priorities:**
  1. Continuation of $200,000 to assist student-athletes in Division II
  2. Fundraising of approximately $500,000 annually for operations and scholarships

- **Human Resources:**
  There are ongoing staffing issues, but we should wait to see what UA does with the new Executive Director of Human Resources and the central level before identifying campus needs.

- **Campus Police/Public Safety:**
  1. Additional $80,000 a year to add one administrator (a lieutenant) and a third full-time dispatcher
  2. Additional $100,000 a year in permanent money for equipment, gasoline, and training because of need of replace equipment regularly and handle an increasing number of campus safety issues

**Administrative Affairs / Facilities and Services (ADMIN) – Top Budget Priorities:**
Reported by David T. Barrows, Associate Chancellor of Administrative Affairs & Executive Director for Facilities and Services
1. To continue to lobby for the extension of the AMFMA assessment fees from the students every year, beyond the time it is scheduled to sunset.....which I believe is in a couple of years.

**Office of Development (OD) – Top Budget Priorities:**
Reported by Associate Chancellor, Office of Development

**FY2011**
1. Capitalize on UIS’40th Anniversary to ignite donor support for the final year of the Brilliant Futures Campaign through stories revealing the lasting impact of gifts on the campus, individual units and program growth.
2. Hire, train and support two new gift officers to replace the four positions vacated in the last year. They will begin establishing their relationships with current and prospective donors and coming knowledgeable about campus history, programs and direction.
3. Work closely with university leadership, the University of Illinois Alumni Association and the University of Illinois/Foundation to further community/regional pride and ownership in UIS; grow internal campus engagement and partnership and external volunteer engagement to raise private support.

**FY2012**
1. Kick off a well-designed special scholarship initiative. This is a university effort that is focused on each campus’ specific scholarship needs.
2. Final year drive of Brilliant Futures Campaign to meet goal of 28 million dollars. EXCEED 28 million dollar goal!
3. Introducing and engaging the new chancellor with principal major donors and other donors groups, as well as, bringing his or her vision for the future of UIS.
4. Support U of I Reorganization and Restructuring objectives, with particular focus on UIS advancement coordination.

**Student Affairs and Administrative Services (SAAS) – Top Budget Priorities**

Reported by Tim Burnett, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Administrative Services
APPENDIX D: Past CPBC Recommendations – Summary 2005-10
Campus Planning and Budget Committee
Planning and Budget Top Priorities for UIS


Recommended Top Three Budget Priorities for UIS (Un-ranked):

V. Strengthen Student Recruitment, Retention, and Services
VI. Enhance Educational Quality
VII. Enhance Salary Competitiveness

Overall Recommendations for Improvement of Future Budget Allocations:
1. Conduct study of composition and growth of budget allocations
2. Make changes in current budget practices
3. Make changes in current budget reporting


Priority 1: Academic Excellence in Teaching and Scholarship (UIS Strategic Goal 1, ST 1, 2)
Priority 2: Student Recruitment, Advisement, and Retention Including Marketing and Branding (Goal 5; Goal 4, ST 1, ST 4)
Priority 3: New Undergraduate Degree Programs (Goal 5, ST 2, AP 23; Goal 2, ST 2)
Priority 4: Faculty, AP, and Staff Salary Equity (Goal 1, ST 1; Goal 6, ST 2)
Priority 5: Infrastructure, especially library improvement (Goal 6, ST 1; Goal 4, ST 4)

Further, based on the Gap Analysis (Gap between UIS and the “peer” institutions),

A. UIS’ strengths are in small class size, favorable student/faculty ratio, presence of sizable graduate programs, and comparable annual institutional expenses per student.

B. Five areas for UIS with small gaps needing monitoring and continuous attention:
   • Increase the undergraduate enrollment
   • Increase the percentage of full time faculty at UIS
   • Increase the freshmen retention rate
   • Increase the graduation rate
   • Increase the Alumni giving rate

C. Two areas for UIS with larger gaps needing immediate attention:
   • Improve the academic background of freshmen enrolled students.
   • Increase the number of undergraduate degree offerings.

GOR FY2009 Top Priorities:

Priority 1: Achieve greater academic excellence in teaching and learning by allocating 33 % of available resources, in particular to bring into reality the long overdue Faculty Institute for teaching excellence (UIS Strategic Plan Goal 1, Strategic Thrust 1)
Priority 2: Achieve greater excellence in scholarship by allocating 16 % of additional resources (Goal 1, Strategic Thrust 2)
Priority 3: Address the long standing needs of the campus, in particular, to continue to provide the faculty, academic professionals and civil service staff an appropriate adjustment for salary compression, equity and competitiveness by allocating 15 % of available resources (Goal 6, Strategic Thrust 2)
Priority 4: Enroll a larger and more diverse student body by allocating 10 % of available resources (Goal 5, Strategic Trust 2)
Priority 5: Retain and graduate a larger and more diverse student body by allocating 7 % of available resources (Goal 5, Strategic Thrust 3)

The next five priorities identified by the committee are:
Priority 6: Provide classroom and technology enhanced education
Priority 8: Enrich individual lives on campus by promoting an intellectually rich campus environment (tied 7)
Priority 8: Strengthen campus culture by creating a distinguished identity for UIS (tied 7)
Priority 8: Strengthen campus culture by enhancing the physical environment of the campus (tied 7)
Priority 10: Promote enrollment and retention by improving access and opportunity at UIS for all students.

In addition, the committee also reviewed the following list of top ten campus planning and budget discussion items identified in GOR09:

1. Bring to fruition the long needed Faculty Institute for teaching excellence for new and current faculty. Faculty Institute will be dedicated to faculty development in the area of teaching. It should promote excellence in teaching and provide faculty with resources, consultation, and assistance to achieve so.

2. Comprehensive salary compression, equity and competitiveness adjustments for faculty, academic professionals, and staff. Recent allocation for equity adjustments for some faculty was a good start but it also raised many questions. There is a need for more comprehensive look at salary compression, equity, and market adjustment at UIS.

3. Improvement and enhancement of Campus Life based on recommendations from recent Faculty, Staff, and Student Survey Reports.

4. Conduct campus energy sustainability, conservation, and efficiency study and initiate steps to seek alternative renewable energy source(s), in particular, funding the feasibility study for wind power generation at UIS.

5. Promote and actively seek ways to create a Liberal Education/Arts campus at UIS.

6. Maintain and enhance the online education and take full advantage of the proposed Global Campus initiative.

7. Engage vigorously in enrollment, retention, and enrichment of freshman class and to increase the quality of students.

8. Build a CampusTown at UIS.

9. Update the June 2000 campus master plan and develop a long term capital plan and funding strategies for the campus.

10. Initiate revenue justification for all budget requests from campus units beginning with next budget request cycle.

**GOR FY2008 Top Priorities**

Priority 1: Address Fully Long Standing Needs of the Campus, Particularly Recruitment and Retention of Faculty and Staff - Address salary compression, equity, and market adjustment (Goal 6, Strategic Thrust 2, Action Plan 1). Allocation: 28% of funds

Priority 2: Achieving Excellence in Teaching and Learning (Goal 1, Strategic Thrust 1, Action Plans 1 - 5). Allocation: 23% of funds

Priority 3: Achieving Excellence in Scholarship (Goal 1, Strategic Thrust 2, Action Plans 12, 13, 9, and 7). Allocation: 20% of funds

Priority 4: Enroll a Larger and More Diverse Student Body (Goal 5, Strategic Thrusts 2, Action Plans 12, 13, 9, and 16). Allocation: 15% of funds

Priority 5: Retain and Graduate a Larger and More Diverse Student Body (Goal 5, Strategic Thrust 3, Action Plans 25 – 29, 32). Allocation: 14% of funds

**GOR FY2006 Top Priorities**

Priority 1: Strengthen Faculty/Staff

Priority 2: Salary Equity

Priority 3: Quality of Student Life

Priority 4: Improvements in Campus Physical Facilities

Priority 5: Maintain Technological Edge

Priority 6: Budget Process Improvements

**GOR FY2005 Top Priorities**

Priority 1: Increase Civil Service Salaries
Priority 2  Make Strategic Investments in Faculty Hires
Priority 3  Increase Support for Student and Faculty Scholarship
Priority 4  Launch the UIS Lower Division

Reference Item: UIS Strategic Plan Goals:

Goal #1: Academic Excellence
  ST #1: Excellence in teaching and Learning
  ST #2: Excellence in Scholarship

Goal #2: Enriching Individual Lives
  ST #1: An Intellectually Rich Campus Environment
  ST #2: A Culturally Rich Campus Environment
  ST #3: A Culturally Diverse Campus Environment
  ST #4: Providing Social/Personal Enrichment
  ST #5: Enhance Intercollegiate Athletics

Goal #3: Making a Difference in the World
  ST #1: Reflection
  ST #2: Dialogue
  ST #3: Action

Goal #4: Strengthen Campus Culture
  ST #1: Create an Identity
  ST #2: Responsiveness
  ST #3: Build Community
  ST #4: Enhance Physical Environment
  ST #5: Promote Environmental Sustainability

Goal #5: Enrollment & Retention
  ST #1: Improve Access and Opportunity
  ST #2: Enroll a Larger/More Diverse Student Body
  ST #3: Retain/Graduate a Larger & More Diverse Student Body
  ST #4: Provide Classroom & Technology Enhanced Education
  ST #5: Sustain a Thriving Learning Community & University

Goal #6: Infrastructure
  ST #1: Physical Resources
  ST #2: Longstanding Needs
APPENDIX E: Specific Recommendations on Student Recruitment, Retention, and Services

1. Utilize students to fill jobs that can reasonably be filled by students (example, event setup, office moving, cleaning, basic grounds keeping, office duties, etc.). By increasing student employment opportunities on campus the university can maximize use of funds (pay student rate, utilize work-study funds, etc) and can enhance student recruitment and retention (by lowering cost of education and increasing bonding and attachment with the campus).

2. Explore whether additional recruiters will “pay off” in student enrollment. Also, explore if shifts in current recruiter allocation would yield greater return (community college [transfer student] recruitment versus high school recruitment, etc.).

3. Drastically improve efforts to recruit current UIS undergraduate students into UIS graduate programs. Adopt best practices.

4. Improve efforts in recruiting for online programs (not subject to the same fees other out-of-state students would be).

5. Conduct more public campaigns (email, flyers, etc.) to engage UIS faculty and staff in recruitment and retention efforts, rather than simply relying on those whose job it is to focus on recruitment and retention.

6. Although in theory student affairs resources and initiatives contribute to student recruitment, retention, and general benefit, it is recommended that all resources and initiatives be tracked and evaluated, to see if they are actually having the impacts they are assumed to have. It would be beneficial to know how many students actually benefit from and/or appreciate each resource or initiative, and the degree to which students feel that the resource or initiative is meaningful to them, especially when compared to the associated costs of providing it.
APPENDIX F: Spending Allocations at UIS Compared to National Averages.

Professor Eric Hadley-Ives, a member of the CPBC, conducted a study for the committee comparing educational costs at UIS with national and state averages (the report is available on the web as eDoc at https://edocs.uis.edu/Departments/LIS/UIS/UIS_finances.pdf). The study raises a number of questions on “instruction and related expenses” at UIS which may or may not be fully explained by measurement errors and/or reporting discrepancies. Hence, a comprehensive study of the matter is called for in particular among others to address the followings issues:

- Weighted Average Instructional Costs at UIS were $31.12 million in 2008-2009 (Table 1 in FY 2009 Revised Cost Study Summary Tables included in memo from MuzoTabag to Cost Study Coordinators for the Illinois Board of Higher Education). Yet, our official UIS budget for FY2009 says our expenditure was $21.44 million on direct instruction. It is not clear why there is nearly $10 million difference.

- National averages for spending on direct instruction out of the education and related (E&R) budget are between 49% and 52% for a university of our type, yet we spend only between 45% and 46% of our E&R budget on direct instruction. Why are we so much lower in direct instruction costs as a percentage of total E&R spending than national averages?

- National averages for academic support are about 12% of E&R spending, yet we spend between 17% and 19% of our E&R on academic support. Why do we spend so much more in this category?

- UIS spends well over the four percent national average going into the category of public service. In fact, we have three times as much (12%) of total expenditure in public service. However, the committee recognizes that part of the reason may be the presence of the Center for State Policy and Leadership (CSPL), which is a special case for UIS and plays an important role.