

**Enhancing Senate Input on University Planning and Resources
(Senate Document #17-18-20)****TO Wallace D. Loh | President****FROM Christopher Walsh | Chair, University Senate**

I am pleased to forward the accompanying legislation for your consideration and approval. Andy Horbal, Chair of the Elections, Representation, & Governance Committee, presented Enhancing Senate Input on University Planning and Resources (Senate Document #17-18-20), which the University Senate approved at its meeting on April 24, 2019. Please inform the Senate of your decision and any administrative action related to your conclusion.

Approved:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wallace D. Loh", written over a horizontal red line.

**Wallace D. Loh
President****Date:****05-03-2019**

Copies of this approval and the accompanying legislation will be forwarded to:

Mary Ann Rankin, Senior Vice President and Provost
Reka Montfort, Executive Secretary and Director, University Senate
Michael Poterala, Vice President and General Counsel
Cynthia Hale, Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel
John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
Elizabeth Beise, Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Programs
Sylvia B. Andrews, Academic Affairs
Linda Clement, Vice President for Student Affairs
Carlo Colella, Vice President for Administration & Finance
Paul Dworkis, Associate Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer
Andy Horbal, Chair, Elections, Representation, & Governance Committee



Enhancing Senate Input on University Planning & Resources

PRESENTED BY Andy Horbal, Chair

REVIEW DATES SEC – April 8, 2019 | SENATE – April 24, 2019

VOTING METHOD In a single vote

RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT [UMD Plan of Organization for Shared Governance](#), [University Senate Bylaws](#)

NECESSARY APPROVALS Senate, President

ISSUE

In February 2018, several Past Senate Chairs submitted a proposal on the need for Senate engagement in institutional budgetary matters to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). The proposal noted that the University of Maryland is one of the only Big 10 institutions without a Senate or Senate-equivalent body that addresses some aspect of the institution's budget. The proposal asked the Senate to consider creating a body that could develop the knowledge necessary to help it make informed recommendations on matters with financial ramifications and advise the President on institutional planning. In August 2018, the SEC charged the Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee with reviewing the proposal and consulting with the proposers; conducting research on relevant bodies at Big 10 and other peer institutions; consulting with the Executive Secretary and Director of the Senate and a range of campus administrators; and recommending revisions to the Senate Bylaws to establish any new body, as appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee recommends that Article 7 of the Senate Bylaws should be revised to create a Special Committee on University Finance, as defined in the document immediately following this report.

The University Senate should charge the Elections, Representation, & Governance Committee with conducting a comprehensive review of the Special Committee on University Finance in fall 2021 to determine whether it should be codified as a permanent Senate body. As part of its review the ERG Committee should assess the special committee's charge, membership, and operations and recommend revisions to the Senate Bylaws, as appropriate, by March 30, 2022.

The chair of the Special Committee on University Finance should provide annual updates to the ERG Committee on the special committee's progress and overall operations in spring 2020 and spring 2021, which will allow the ERG Committee to make any necessary adjustments and will provide context for the ERG Committee's comprehensive review in 2021-2022.

COMMITTEE WORK

The ERG Committee began considering the charge in September 2018. It met with one of the proposers and distributed a survey to senate leaders at Big 10 and other peer institutions asking specific questions about committees that consider aspects of their institutional budgets. The committee reviewed responses and conducted follow-up interviews with senate leaders at three peer institutions. The committee also consulted with the Assistant President & Chief of Staff; the Assistant Vice President for Finance and Personnel for Academic Affairs; the Associate Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer; and the Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Programs.

After determining that there was value in creating a body like the one called for in the proposal, the committee considered various models that align with existing Senate structures. The most significant challenge that the committee faced throughout its review was the prospect of creating a new body that could develop a deep understanding of the budget without having that understanding itself. After consulting with the Senate Office and Senate Parliamentarian, the ERG Committee determined that forming a special committee would be an ideal way to pilot a new body before it is codified. A 3-year life-cycle for the special committee would allow the body to be informed by the upcoming transition in University leadership and continue to operate while a comprehensive review to develop a formal body is conducted prior to the special committee's dissolution. This model would also allow the ERG Committee to craft specific provisions for the body that could differ from those of standing committees.

The committee developed charge elements for a new Special Committee on University Finance and identified the body's regular and ex-officio membership. It drafted a new article for the Senate Bylaws to incorporate the special committee and shared the approach with various administrative stakeholders and the proposer. The ERG Committee considered feedback it received, made additional adjustments to the proposed revisions to the Senate Bylaws, and developed several administrative recommendations. After due consideration, the ERG committee voted to approve the Senate Bylaws revisions and administrative recommendations at its meeting on March 29, 2019.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could choose not to establish the Special Committee on University Finance.

RISKS

There are no associated risks.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications.



Enhancing Senate Input on University Planning and Resources

2018-2019 Committee Members

Andrew Horbal (Chair)
Leigh Ann DePope (Faculty)
Jonathan Herrington (Ex-Officio Director of Human Resources Rep)
Wendell Hill (Faculty)
Alexander Houck (Staff)
Christine Johnston (Faculty)
Sharon La Voy (Ex-Officio Associate VP IRPA Rep)
Lisha Lai (Graduate Student)
Elizabeth Lathrop (Faculty)

Olivia Mandell (Undergraduate Student)
Elizabeth McClure (Faculty)
Kathleen Molinaro (Staff)
MacGregor Oberfell (Graduate Student)
Bria Parker (Faculty)
Benjamin Reichard (Undergraduate Student)

Date of Submission

April 2019

BACKGROUND

In February 2018, several Past Senate Chairs submitted a proposal on the need for Senate engagement in institutional budgetary matters to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). The proposal explained that the University of Maryland is one of the only Big 10 institutions without a Senate or Senate-equivalent body that addresses some aspect of the institution's budget. The proposers also noted that the University of Maryland Plan of Organization for Shared Governance (University Plan of Organization) explicitly identifies budgetary matters as within the purview of the Senate. The proposal asked the Senate to consider creating a body that could develop the knowledge necessary to help it make informed recommendations on matters with financial ramifications and advise the President on institutional planning. In August 2018, the SEC charged the Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee with reviewing the proposal and consulting with the proposers; conducting research on relevant bodies at Big 10 and other peer institutions; consulting with the Executive Secretary and Director of the Senate and a range of campus administrators; and recommending revisions to the Senate Bylaws to establish any new body, as appropriate (Appendix 4).

CURRENT PRACTICE

There is currently no Senate body that directly considers budgetary matters. Many Senate standing committees have ex-officio representatives from various administrative units who can provide some level of information on the financial implications of matters being considered by the committees, though such information is rarely specific or precise. Transmittal sheets for legislation presented for the Senate's consideration characterize the financial implications of any recommendations, though in similarly general terms.

COMMITTEE WORK

The ERG Committee began considering the charge in September 2018, when it reviewed the proposal and began planning its work. The committee distributed a survey to senate leaders at Big 10 and other peer institutions (peer institutions) asking specific questions about bodies that consider aspects of their institutional budgets; responses were reviewed along with other research on peer institution practices. The committee met with one of the proposers and learned that they envision a

body that would not participate in the actual budgeting processes of the University, but would rather serve as an advisory body that explains/interprets the budget and reports to the Senate. The body would also develop deep historical context for the University budget in order to understand how it has changed over time, and would operate on a macro level, focusing on the broader principles behind long-term allocations rather than specific details.

The committee's chair and coordinators conducted follow-up interviews with senate leaders at three peer institutions that the committee felt might provide useful models: Ohio State University, Indiana University (Bloomington), and the University of Minnesota (Twin Cities). They also met with the Assistant President & Chief of Staff; the Assistant Vice President for Finance and Personnel for Academic Affairs; the Associate Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer; and the Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Programs. The committee received reports on the institutional interviews and administrator meetings, and determined that a majority of members were in favor of proposing some form of new body.

The committee discussed at length the most appropriate model for any new body and considered several approaches that align with existing Senate structures, including University Councils and standing committees. University Councils are sponsored by and report to the Senate and particular members of the administration or to a dean. While councils establish a clear pathway for advising administrators, their engagement with the Senate is more limited, and they can only be created by a taskforce. Senate standing committees represent another possible approach, though the Bylaws establish general characteristics of every standing committee, not all of which would be appropriate for the body ERG was considering. Term lengths, for example, are too limited. Perhaps most importantly, the mechanism for selecting members would not allow the committee to meet over the summer when important budget-related activities take place, given slates of candidates for committees are not approved by the Senate until the first meeting of the fall semester. The most significant challenge that the committee faced throughout its review was the prospect of creating a new body that could develop a deep understanding of the budget without having that understanding itself. While the committee could consider models at other institutions, it was difficult to envision how any of those models would function and be most effective within the University's structures and budget model.

With the upcoming transition in the University's leadership, the committee recognized the critical importance of establishing a body that could engage with both the outgoing and incoming administrations. The University Plan of Organization allows for the creation of special committees "of limited scope and term of duration." After consulting with the Senate Office and Senate Parliamentarian, the ERG Committee determined that the special committee model would be an ideal way to essentially pilot the new body before it is codified. The committee agreed that a 3-year term of duration would allow the special committee to be informed by the transition in leadership and allow it to continue to operate while a comprehensive review to develop a permanent body is conducted prior to the special committee's dissolution. This model would also allow the ERG Committee to craft specific provisions for the body that could differ from those of standing committees. The committee agreed to develop those provisions for the special committee, including a charge, membership, and set of procedures that would provide the most value to the Senate, the University, and the administration.

The committee drafted potential charge elements and considered feedback from the administrative stakeholders it consulted earlier. It also began discussing the special committee's membership. A subcommittee was formed to develop potential membership models. Following a review and

feedback from the full committee, revisions to the Senate Bylaws to incorporate the new special committee were drafted and shared with various administrative stakeholders and the proposer.

The committee considered feedback from the administrative stakeholders, the Senate Office, and the Senate leadership. It also made additional changes to the proposed revisions to the Senate Bylaws, and developed several administrative recommendations that will allow the ERG Committee to recommend adjustments to the special committee's charge, membership, and operations, as necessary. The ERG Committee will also be charged with a comprehensive review of the special committee to determine whether or not to establish it as a permanent Senate body prior to its dissolution. After due consideration, the ERG committee voted to approve the Senate Bylaws revisions and administrative recommendations at its meeting on March 29, 2019.

COMMITTEE FINDINGS

Peer Institution Research

As noted in the proposal, all but two of the University's Big 10 peers have bodies that are engaged with some aspect of the institutional budget (Appendix 1). In order to gather richer information than what could be gleaned from websites, the committee sent a survey to its peer institutions; eleven of them responded, and eight expressed a willingness to speak further (Appendix 2). Interviews with three of those institutions provided additional information on how these bodies function and what their officers feel make them in/effective. The committee also reviewed the specific charge elements under which each body operates.

In its research, the committee identified a range of characteristics that vary across relevant bodies at peer institutions. Some committees, such as Indiana University's Budgetary Affairs Committee, regularly advise the Provost on funding requests from academic units. Others simply receive updates on the budget and fulfill an implicit oversight function, such as the University of Minnesota's Finance and Planning Committee, which its chair describes as "a watchdog...the dog that doesn't bark." Some are quite small, such as Northwestern University's six member Budget and Planning Committee; Rutgers University's Budget and Finance Committee, in contrast, contains thirty-eight members. Most bodies include representation for faculty, staff, and students, though most are also based in faculty Senates. Most also include ex-officio representation from various administrative units. Perhaps most importantly, the budget models used by peer institutions are not consistent. Some use a responsibility center management (RCM) model, in which funding follows credit hours and colleges are responsible for much of their own overhead. Others adopt something closer to the historical budget model used by the University of Maryland, in which units' budgets are generally based on modest adjustments to the previous year's budget. One common theme that emerged from the interviews the committee conducted, however, was the importance of establishing trust between the body and the administration and administrators with which it works. Maintaining an open and collaborative dialogue between involved parties was consistently cited as a key element of an effective body.

In light of these variations, and informed by conversations with other Senate leaders, the committee determined that there was no ideal model offered by a peer institution. However, it is clear that nearly every peer finds value in having a body dedicated to fiscal issues, despite differences in approach. Any new body established for the University of Maryland must align with the University's financial practices and existing shared governance structures.

UMD Budget

The University has two separate and distinct annual budgets: the operating budget and the capital budget. The operating budget includes both unrestricted (tuition and fees, state appropriation,

auxiliary enterprises, and government/private gifts) and restricted (federal/state/local grants and contracts) funds. However, it is important to note that tuition is also “controlled” by the University System of Maryland (USM), the governor, and the state legislature. The capital budget has 5/10 year planning cycles, including annual asking-year requests. The Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which is state funded, focuses on the construction of new academic facilities to accommodate enrollment growth and enhance instructional programs and the modernization of existing facilities to meet current code, incorporate telecommunications and information technology, and improve safety for the USM. In addition, the System Funded Construction Program (SFCP) supports institutional auxiliary projects (e.g., necessary dormitory renovations) but is contingent on the availability of resources, debt capacity, and recurring funds to cover increased operating costs and annual debt service.

The University’s total budget (FY2020) is approximately \$2.3B with \$1.8B from unrestricted revenue and \$500M from restricted revenue that can only be used for designated purposes, primarily research-related. State appropriations make up less than one-third of unrestricted revenue and include funds to support the teaching, research, and public service missions of the University. An additional one-third of the University’s revenues come from tuition/fees; the auxiliary enterprise, government/private gifts, and other sources compose the remainder of the operating budget. The majority of expenditures are focused on salaries, wages, and fringes, but also include fuel and utilities, equipment and supplies, fixed charges/debt/contracts, land/structures, facilities renewal and maintenance, and travel/communication.

The University’s annual budgeting process is iterative and starts each August for the following fiscal year’s budget. Planning involves coordination with the USM, which is responsible for submitting a budget request for the entire system to the state. In December, the governor releases a budget proposal that must be kept confidential until it is publicly announced in January. The legislature can generally change but not increase the governor’s budget. The legislative session runs ninety days, from January to April. The University President lobbies for the institution’s priorities throughout the session, and campus-level plans are adjusted based on the legislature’s deliberations. The final state budget is released in April, and establishes tuition rates and other funding provided by the state. The University has relatively little discretion over how money in the budget is spent; revenue streams are devoted to specific purposes and even enhancement funding, in years when it is available, is tied to particular projects that address key priorities and issues. The President receives advice on the budget from a range of existing officers and bodies, which are described in [Standard VI](#) of the [University of Maryland 2016 Middle States Study](#). Once the state budget process is complete, the campus begins a more detailed and rigorous working-budget process that runs from April through June. The Division of Administration and Finance administers this process through the University’s budget office, and it includes the setting of detailed operating budgets, including salaries and position budgets, across the University. Institutional priorities for the upcoming fiscal year are typically addressed during this phase of the budget cycle and are reflected in the University’s divisional and central budgets.

The Division of Academic Affairs administers approximately 70% of the funds provided by tuition and the state, which supports the faculty and staff that are responsible for carrying out the institution’s mission. The Provost’s Office does most of its budgeting work in the summer and fall. The Provost is advised by the Academic Planning Advisory Committee (APAC), which is comprised of senior faculty appointed by the Provost. The SEC puts forward a list of nominees for the Provost’s consideration. APAC was originally created by the Senate to advise the Provost on academic issues with significant resource implications, including the creation/elimination of

academic units or programs, strategic planning, major revisions of the undergraduate curriculum, resource reallocation, and the distribution of enhancement and research initiative funds.

Finally, the budget itself is not readily accessible or broadly understood. A PDF file of the University's detailed budget can be accessed through computer stations in the library, but the file format makes it challenging to extrapolate useful information. There appears to be broad confusion about the budget on the part of faculty, staff, and students. Therefore, educating the campus community on the budget itself and on the budgeting process is of critical importance.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY FINANCE

A new Special Committee on University Finance will provide an opportunity for a Senate body to advise the President, the Senior Vice President and Provost, and other University administrators on budgetary matters as they pertain to institutional priorities. It will also provide guidance to the Senate and can serve as a much-needed resource to help members of the campus community better understand the University's budget.

Charge

The special committee is an advisory body with three primary purposes: to serve as a resource to help educate the campus on the University's budget; to serve as a resource to help advise the Senate and its standing committees on any recommendations under consideration; and to advise the University administration on short- and long-term planning and priorities. The special committee will regularly report to the SEC, and will report at least twice a year to the full Senate. While the ERG Committee did not define these latter reports, members envision that the first will occur early in the fall semester and focus on providing Senators an overview of the University's budget and information on priorities for the upcoming year. The second could take place at the Senate's annual Transition Meeting, where the special committee could provide a similar primer on the budget and report on the final budget approved by the state. The special committee's ability to fulfill its charge will depend on establishing a robust understanding of the University's budget and associated processes, which inform the ERG Committee's decisions regarding membership and operations.

Membership

The ERG Committee discussed at length the special committee's membership, and reviewed precedents from other Senate and Senate-related bodies (Appendix 3). It generally agreed that ex-officio members with relevant expertise would be critical to the work of the body, and carefully selected those members based on feedback from the administrative stakeholders. Those members include:

- **Past Chair of the Senate:** The Past Chair will have served on the SEC for two years (as Chair Elect and as Chair), which will allow them to provide insights on both the operations of the SEC and of the full Senate. As a member of the SEC, the Past Chair's presence will also facilitate regular communication with the SEC and Senate leadership.
- **Associate Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer:** The AVPF is the University's foremost authority on the budget and brings an unparalleled knowledge of the University's finances. The AVPF's insights will be critical in the special committee's early years and will inform its reports to the Senate.
- **Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel, Academic Affairs:** The AVFPF is the chief financial officer of the Division of Academic Affairs, which is responsible for more than two-thirds of the institution's budget.

- **The President (or a representative):** Including a representative of the President broadens the special committee's perspective and establishes a channel to the President to better communicate the special committee's process and thinking on issues under consideration.
- **The Vice President for Student Affairs (or a representative):** The Division of Student Affairs includes several self-support units, and a representative would provide the special committee important insights into that budget model and its interaction with the University's overall operating budget.
- **A representative from among the current and former unit-level budget officers or former department chairs, appointed by the Provost:** Budget officers have experience with managing daily budget operations that would provide a valuable perspective to the special committee.

As is the case on many other Senate committees, ex-officio members are given both voice and vote.

The regular members of the special committee were chosen with several principles in mind. First, the body should remain within the ideal membership range identified by the Senate Office (Appendix 3). Second, the major Senate constituencies should all be represented. Finally, tenured/tenure-track faculty should comprise approximately the same percentage of the regular membership as they do in the Senate (50%). The committee considered whether some or all of the members should be Senators, but decided that membership should be open to all, given one of the body's primary purposes is to help educate the broader campus on the budget. The committee settled on term lengths that match those of Senators: three years for faculty and staff, and one year for students. Given the importance of building knowledge of the budget, the student terms can be extended up to two times if the members are interested in continuing.

Selection

The ERG Committee explored a range of possible methods for selecting regular members. Members initially preferred the same approach as is used for the Senate's standing committees, which involves a volunteer process conducted each April. Given the special committee would not be incorporated into the Senate Bylaws until after the start of the volunteer period, that option was not viable. The committee decided to allow Senators to nominate members of the campus. The SEC would then select from among the nominees by constituency (i.e. the undergraduate student SEC members would select the undergraduate special committee members, the exempt staff members the exempt staff member, etc.). This parallels a process used in other instances, as when the SEC recently provided nominations for the upcoming presidential search committee. Vacancies will be filled by a similar process using nominees from the most recent nomination period. If there are no interested nominees, a new nomination period will be held.

Operations

Given the frequency of meetings will likely vary throughout the year based on the University's budgeting cycle, the special committee may establish its own meeting schedule, with a minimum of one meeting per month during the academic year. Based on feedback from administrators, who emphasized the confidential nature of budget information during particular periods, the ERG Committee decided that meetings of the special committee should be closed, though its agendas will be public as with other Senate committees. The special committee may invite guests as necessary to inform its work. The Bylaws also include a provision dissolving the special committee

at the end of its third year of operation, which will occur whether or not the ERG Committee's comprehensive review recommends that the body be made permanent.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee recommends that Article 7 of the Senate Bylaws should be revised to create a Special Committee on University Finance, as defined in the document immediately following this report.

The University Senate should charge the Elections, Representation, & Governance Committee with conducting a comprehensive review of the Special Committee on University Finance in fall 2021 to determine whether it should be codified as a permanent Senate body. As part of its review the ERG Committee should assess the special committee's charge, membership, and operations and recommend revisions to the Senate Bylaws, as appropriate, by March 30, 2022.

The chair of the Special Committee on University Finance should provide annual updates to the ERG Committee on the special committee's progress and overall operations in spring 2020 and spring 2021, which will allow the ERG Committee to make any necessary adjustments and will provide context for the ERG Committee's comprehensive review in 2021-2022.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 — Research on Relevant Committees at Big 10 and Peer Institutions

Appendix 2 — Survey of Senate Leaders at Big 10 and Peer Institutions

Appendix 3 — Existing Senate-Related Membership Models

Appendix 4 — Charge from the Senate Executive Committee

ARTICLE 7
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY FINANCE

7.1 Membership and Selection:

- 7.1.a Composition:** The special committee shall consist of a presiding officer appointed by the Senate Chair from among the tenured faculty; five (5) tenured or tenure-track faculty members; one (1) professional track faculty member; one (1) exempt staff member; one (1) non-exempt staff member; two (2) undergraduate students; one (1) graduate student; the immediate Past Chair of the Senate; the Associate Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer; the Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel, Academic Affairs; and the following persons or a representative of each: the President, and the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Senior Vice President and Provost shall also appoint a representative chosen from among current and former unit-level budget officers or former department chairs. All members of the special committee shall be voting members.
- 7.1.b Selection of Members:** The regular membership of the special committee shall be selected by the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee. Following the May 7, 2019, Transition Meeting, current Senators may nominate any member of the campus community. Nominees shall provide a statement indicating their interest in and qualifications for the special committee. Members of the Senate Executive Committee may not be nominated. Elected members of the Senate Executive Committee will vote by constituencies for members of the special committee. In the event of a tie, the Senate Chair will cast the deciding vote.
- 7.1.c Membership—Vacancies:** After each Transition Meeting of the Senate, current Senators may nominate members of the campus community for any vacant seats. In the event of a vacancy during the academic year, members of the Senate Executive Committee from the respective constituency will select a replacement from the most recent list of nominees. If there are no interested nominees, a new nomination period will be opened and members of the Senate may submit nominations following the procedures in 7.1.b.
- 7.1.d Membership—Terms:** Terms shall be three (3) years for faculty and staff, and one (1) year for students. Student members who wish to continue may be renewed up to two times. Terms shall begin on July 1, 2019.

7.2 Charge: The special committee shall exercise the following functions:

- 7.2.a** Develop a deep understanding of the University's budget and budgeting processes and use that knowledge to educate the campus community on these practices.
- 7.2.b** Consult with and advise the President, the Senior Vice President and Provost, and other University administrators on short- and long-term institutional priorities, particularly as they relate to the University's mission and Strategic Plan.
- 7.2.c** Advise Senate-related bodies—including committees, councils, and task forces—on the fiscal implications of any proposed recommendations under consideration.
- 7.2.d** Report to the Senate two times each year on the budgetary and fiscal condition of the University and the administration's response to any special committee recommendations.
- 7.2.e** Regularly report on its activities and the budgetary and fiscal condition of the University to the Senate Executive Committee.

7.3 Operations:

- 7.3.a Agenda Determination:** The special committee shall have principal responsibility for identifying matters of present and potential concern to the campus community within its area of

responsibility. The presiding officer shall place such matters on the agenda of the committee. Agendas shall be made publicly available prior to each meeting.

7.3.b Meetings: The special committee shall meet as frequently as is needed to accomplish its charge, but at least monthly throughout the academic year. Additional meetings may be required over the summer months to accommodate the University's budgeting processes. Given the sensitive nature of the special committee's work, meetings will be closed to all but members and invited guests.

7.3.c Minutes: Action minutes of the special committee's proceedings shall be kept in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order for Small Committees.

7.3.d Procedure: The version of *Robert's Rules of Order* that shall govern the special committee shall be *Robert's Rules of Order for Small Committees, Newly Revised*. The special committee shall determine how technology, such as phone and video conferencing and other electronic methods of participation, can be used for its purposes. The special committee may choose to conduct votes via email, and shall agree on any other mechanisms for conducting business outside of meetings, when necessary.

7.3.e Quorum: Quorum shall be a majority of the members of the special committee.

7.3.f Guests: The special committee may invite guests to participate in its meetings if it is deemed necessary.

7.4 Dissolution:

7.4.a The special committee shall be dissolved following the adjournment of the last regular Senate meeting of the 2021-2022 academic year, at which time the provisions in this article will become inoperative.

Appendix 1: Research on Relevant Committees at Big 10 and Peer Institutions

| Institution | Committee Name | Charge/ Purview | Term Length | Membership | Reporting Structure | Advisory Role |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign http://www.senate.illinois.edu/cmte_biz.asp | Senate Budget Committee | Study general state and nation budget trends, study the campus budget, study the criteria followed in regards to allocations, and study the impact of budgetary decisions on educational policy and quality. | Faculty: 2 years Students: 1 year | 5 faculty, 1 academic professional, 2 student, and the Provost or the Provost's designee (ex officio). | Reports and makes recommendations to the Senate | Advise members of the campus administration on the formulation of policies affecting the budget and on the allocation of funds requested by and appropriated to the University and the Urbana-Champaign campus. |
| Indiana University http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/constitution.html#articleIV | University Faculty Council | Consider the relative allocations of the University's resources with respect to new programs and significant changes in existing programs. Consider the setting of priorities with regard to capital outlays. Consider the setting of general faculty salary policies. | Unclear- information not on website | 16 faculty members- this is a committee of the Faculty Council which does not include any other constituencies | Prepares an annual report to the Bloomington Faculty Council. | Monitors the development of the annual campus budget through consultations with the dean of budgetary affairs; members participate in budget meetings of academic and some non-academic campus units; develops budget policies; |
| University of Iowa https://uiowa.edu/facultysenate/charge | Faculty Senate/Staff Council Budget Committee | Advise on budgetary priority setting and other budgetary matters which affect the University's General Education Fund; including salary policy and other budgetary decisions affecting faculty and staff; Advise on state appropriations requests made to the Board of Regents; as may relate to University salary and other budget priorities; Advise on the internal governance procedures of the University which have major budgetary implications and impact on faculty and staff; Advise on the translation of University planning processes and unit reviews into specific budgetary allocations; Promote programmatic and resource allocation decisions that are guided by strategic plans and that will advance the University; and Consult with the UISG (Undergraduate Student Government) president and vice president on matters within the charge of this committee. | Members shall be appointed for a term not to exceed three years. Reappointment is permitted; however, no person may serve for more than six consecutive years on the committee. (4) The Committee shall have co-chairs, each of whom may be appointed for a two-year term by the President of the University after consultation with the Faculty Senate President and Staff Council President. | 7 members of the Faculty Senate 7 members of the Staff Council Provost and Vice President for Finance and University Services serve as liaisons to the committee | Joint Committee of the Faculty Senate and the Staff Council | Advisory capacity to the President; President appoints the co-chairs (1 faculty and 1 staff) after consultations with the Faculty Senate President and the Staff Council President |
| University of Michigan http://facultysenate.umich.edu/senate-assembly/committees/financial-affairs-advisory-committee-faa/ | Financial Affairs Advisory Committee (FAAC) | As the voice of faculty, the committee shall advise and consult with the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer on policy and procedure issues related to the broad range of University activities. The committee's advice shall be sought and given in a timely manner so that the advice could affect the decision-making outcome. | 3 years | Up to 12 faculty members, representing a cross-section of Schools/Colleges and Regional Campuses members, with attention to race, ethnicity, gender, and rank; 1 Graduate student selected by the Central Student Government. 1 SACUA (Executive Committee) liaison. | Reports through the executive committee (SACUA) to the Senate Assembly and then to the Faculty Senate as appropriate | Consults with the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer on matters of finance. |
| University of Minnesota- Twin Cities http://usenate.umn.edu/committees/finance-and-planning-committee-scfp | Finance and Planning Committee (SCFP) | a. To consult with and advise the president and senior University officers on planning, and in particular on financial and operational planning. b. To consult with and advise the president and senior academic and financial officers on the development of the biennial request, of supplemental budget requests, and the annual budget and to review the implementation of the annual budget. c. To consult with and advise the president and senior University officers on the development of the University's capital budget and capital plans, the biennial capital request, supplemental capital requests, and the implementation of capital projects. d. To participate in the development and review of all physical facilities planning. e. To consult with and advise the president and senior University officers on the financial and operational aspects of all major proposals and policy initiatives. f. To consult with and advise the president and senior University officers on other questions of resource allocation, including space allocation. g. To consult with and advise the president and senior University officers on the periodic review of University operations. h. To recommend to the Faculty Consultative Committee, Senate Consultative Committee, or to other Senate committees such actions or policies as it deems appropriate. i. To take up other matters as shall be referred to the committee by the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Senate Consultative committee, or other Senate Committees. | Faculty and Staff: 3 years Students: 2 years | 10 faculty, 2 academic professionals, 4 students, 2 civil service members, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the University Senate. | Makes recommendations to the Senate Consultative Committee (Executive Committee) as appropriate; dual reporting authority to the University Senate and the Faculty Senate | Consultative body to the president and senior University officers on all major issues of planning, budget, resource allocation policy, and University operations. |

| Institution | Committee Name | Charge/ Purview | Term Length | Membership | Reporting Structure | Advisory Role |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Northwestern University http://www.northwestern.edu/faculty-senate/committees/Budget%20and%20Planning.html | Budget and Planning Committee | Interact with University budget and planning processes to discern whether they are aligned with academic values and Faculty interests. Report to the Senate and to relevant University officers any concerns with respect to advancing the academic mission of the university or the quality and sustainability of the Faculty. Provide suggestions on behalf of the Senate to relevant University officers and planning committees regarding the direction and general welfare of the University and the role of the budget in meeting institutional objectives. Develop and coordinate information and expertise regarding best practices with respect to specific issues and general budgetary and planning processes in order to fulfill the Committee's and the Senate's goals and responsibilities. | Unclear- information not on website | 5 faculty members and 1 chair (based on membership list on website) | Reports to Senate and relevant University officers Annual Report to the Senate | Provides suggestions on behalf of the Senate |
| Ohio State University https://senate.osu.edu/fiscal-committee-rules/ | Fiscal Committee | (1) Review, on a continuing basis, the fiscal policies and resources of the university; (2) Advise the president on the alternatives and strategies for the long-term and short-term allocation of university resources consistent with maintaining the missions of the university; (3) Analyze resources and budgets from an overall university-wide perspective; (4) Analyze resources and budgets in detail for centrally supported vice presidential units; (5) Advise the president, in the event of an imminent financial crisis, whether a determination of financial exigency is warranted; and (6) Report annually to the faculty council and the senate on the budgetary and fiscal condition of the university. | Faculty: unclear- not stated Staff: 3 years Students: 2 years | 9 tenure track faculty members, 4 students, 3 staff members, 6 administrators (2 non-voting) 1 faculty member and 1 staff member are appointed by the President | Reports annually to the faculty council and the Senate | Advisory to the President |
| Pennsylvania State University http://senate.psu.edu/senators/standing-committees/university-planning/ | University Planning Committee | The Committee on University Planning solely and in consultation with other committees, shall report on and/or propose action on matters of University planning that affect development and alumni relations, physical plant resources, and the academic and financial policies of the University. In accordance with the Constitutional advisory and consultative roles of the Senate, specific areas of responsibilities include but are not limited to: the allocation of resources among units and functions as they relate to educational policy; academic planning, development planning, and campus and physical planning. | Faculty: 2 years Administrative and Students: 1 year | At least 12 elected faculty senators, 1 undergraduate student senator, 1 graduate student senator, Executive Vice President/Provost of the University or representative, Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer (non-voting), Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations (non-voting) | Mandated reports: a. Annual Construction Report b. Annual Space Allocation and Utilization Report c. Annual University Budget and Planning Report d. Biennial Development and Alumni Relations Report The Committee on University Planning shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council. | Advisory to the Office of the President, including the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer, Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, and the Executive Vice President/Provost, |
| Purdue University http://www.purdue.edu/senate/committees/universityResources/facultyCommittees.html | Budget Interpretation, Evaluation, and Review Committee | Budget Interpretation, Evaluation and Review Committee The Committee shall be charged with continuing to collect and analyze data about Purdue's revenues and appropriations and to convey information about Purdue's budgetary policies to the Senate. Furthermore, with coordination and consultation with the University Resources Policy Committee, this Committee will work with the fiscal officers of the administration to examine and evaluate budgetary policies. | Unclear- information not on website | 4 faculty members and 4 liaisons from various campus offices (similar to ex-officio representation it seems) | Reports to the University Resources Policy Committee. URPC is a committee of the Senate. The Budget committee is listed as a faculty committee. It's not clear what any of this means. | Consults with fiscal officers of the university |
| University of Wisconsin- Madison https://secfac.wisc.edu/governance/faculty-legislation/6-25-budget-committee/ | Budget Committee | Advises and makes recommendations to the chancellor, the provost, and the vice chancellor for finance and administration on institutional budget issues, long-range financial strategies, state biennial budget proposals, and allocations to schools, colleges, and divisions. Advises the shared governance executive committees on issues of budgetary impact and the public position to be taken on budgetary issues. Meets regularly with vice chancellor for finance and administration. Serves as a resource for schools/colleges, departments, and others on matters related to the budget. Consults with and advises other committees, such as school/college academic planning councils and campus planning committees, relating to institutional-level budgetary matters. The committee may also recommend the creation of ad hoc committees on budget-related matters. Reports to the Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Assembly, University Staff Congress, ASM Student Council, and their respective executive committees upon request. | Faculty and staff: 4 years Students: 2 years | 4 faculty members, 2 academic staff members, 2 university staff members, 2 students; Ex officio non-voting members: campus budget director; chancellor or designee; provost or designee; and vice chancellor for finance and administration or designee. | Reports to various shared governance bodies (see last sentence in charge) | Advises and makes recommendations to the chancellor, the provost, and the vice chancellor for finance and administration |

| Institution | Committee Name | Charge/ Purview | Term Length | Membership | Reporting Structure | Advisory Role |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Rutgers University http://senate.rutgers.edu/Committees.shtml | Budget and Finance Committee | <p>To select and study policy issues associated with the University's budget, including priorities and allocation of funds, and to develop recommendations to the Senate.</p> <p>To evaluate the probable financial impact of proposed new programs being considered by the Senate.</p> <p>To receive, study, and make recommendations to the Senate, and through it to the Board of Governors and Board of Trustees, with respect to requests from members of the University community or others with a legitimate interest regarding Rutgers University investments.</p> <p>To consider, study, and make recommendations to the Senate, and through it to the Board of Governors and Board of Trustees, with respect to any investment policies of the University that may involve ethical and moral principles as established by the Boards of Governors and Trustees.</p> <p>To consider broad issues related to physical plant and infrastructure, space, transportation, and safety on and among the three campuses.</p> <p>To present to the University Senate an annual report on the Rutgers University budget.</p> | Unclear- information not on website | 17 faculty members, 4 staff members, 6 students, 6 administrators, 2 representatives from the alumni association | Presents an annual report to the University Senate | Receive, study, and make recommendations to the Senate; through the Senate, recommendations can be made to the Board of the Governors and Board of Trustees |
| University of California- Los Angeles https://senate.ucla.edu/committee/cpb | Council on Planning and Budget | <p>CPB's charge is to "make recommendations based on established Senate policy to the Chancellor and Senate agencies concerning the allocation of educational resources, academic priorities, and the planning and budgetary process" as well as formulating a Senate view on "the campus budget and each major campus space-use and building project." CPB discusses with the Executive Vice Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Finance the current strategic and budget issues. CPB maintains an active relationship with the Statewide University Council on Planning and Budget (UCPB) through its UCPB representative.</p> | Up to 3 years | 16 faculty, 2 undergraduates, 2 graduates, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Budget (ex-officio) | Reports to the Senate Liaises with the Statewide University Council on Planning and Budget | Recommendation to Chancellor and Senate agencies |

Appendix 2: Survey of Senate Leaders at Big 10 and Peer Institutions

What is the functional role of the committee and how does the committee fulfill that role?

Purdue

The Committee shall be charged with continuing to collect and analyze data about Purdue's revenues and appropriations and to convey information about Purdue's budgetary policies to the Senate. Furthermore with coordination and consultation with the University Resources Policy Committee this Committee will work with the fiscal officers of the administration to examine and evaluate budgetary policies.

Wisconsin

We have a campus planning committee that advises administration on long-range development plans, building priorities, site selection, and aesthetic criteria, regarding facilities for research, instruction, recreation, parking and transportation, and other university functions. We also have a shared governance budget committee that advises administration on institutional budget issues, long-range financial strategies, state biennial budget proposals, and allocations to schools, colleges, and divisions. Both achieve their mission by meeting regularly (several times per semester) with relevant administration officials (up to and including the chancellor), issuing reports and recommendations, and generally serving as a resource both for administration and for shared governance bodies.

Illinois

The UIUC Senate Budget Committee is elected, and was designed to serve as advisor to the provost/chancellor on budget issues.

Indiana

The Budgetary Affairs Committee is the only committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council that is empowered to speak to the administration on behalf of the council without necessarily first seeking the council's advice. This, in order to quickly respond to administrative proposals. I had to add that this power is used sparingly, and not in the past 6 years. The routine business of the BAC, under IU's RCM system, involves sitting in the provost's budget meetings with her deans, vice provosts, and auxiliary fund directors, to review their budget requests, comment on any new initiatives, and focus, especially on incremental new spending. Total increments will vary from \$4-11 million a year. The provost generally accepts 85-95 percent of the committee's recommendations, and provides her rationale for differing on the other 5-15 percent.

Ohio State

The Senate Fiscal Committee at Ohio State is a large and active committee that considers all aspects of the university budget. More can be found about this committee at <https://senate.osu.edu/committees/fiscal>

UCLA

ADVISORY; INTERACTS WITH CFO AND HEAD OF ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET

Nebraska

It provide a review and comment on budget cuts

Penn State

The Committee on University Planning solely and in consultation with other committees, shall report on and/or propose action on matters of University planning that affect development and alumni relations, physical plant resources, and the academic and financial policies of the University. In accordance with the Constitutional advisory and consultative roles of the Senate, specific areas of responsibilities include but are not limited to: the allocation of resources among units and functions as they relate to educational policy; academic planning, strategic planning, development planning, and campus and physical planning including safety and security of persons, buildings, and other facilities.

The committee shall be the primary Senate body advisory to the Office of the President, including the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer, Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, and the Executive Vice President/Provost, for all planning functions; and shall review

those functions of the University that contribute to the planning processes. The committee shall participate in the development and review of the master plans for each of the University's campuses and be consulted regularly in regards to proposed changes to those plans. In addition, this committee shall assist in creating an understanding of the University's planning functions among all units within the University. The committee shall have access to all information necessary to perform their charge.

Minnesota

The Finance and Planning Committee serves as the consultative body to the president and senior University officers on all major issues of planning, budget, resource allocation policy, and University operations.

What is the level of engagement between the administration and the committee? Do you feel the committee's input is valued by the administration?

Purdue

We have 5 administrators on the committee as liaisons. I believe that they value the input of the faculty on the committee and Senate.

Wisconsin

High engagement. The planning committee is chaired by the provost and the budget committee includes our chief budget officer and our vice provost for finance and administration. Both committees have substantial input and it is definitely valued by the administration. This is perhaps somewhat less true of the budget committee because it has only existed for 2 years, but administration and faculty and staff are working together to make it as integral to the budget process as the planning committee is to those issues.

Illinois

At this point: low to nonexistent. In the mid-1990s, our administration began appointing its own committees rather than calling on Senate committees.

Indiana

Absolutely, yes. It is part and parcel of our system of shared governance at IU.

Ohio State

The chief financial officer of the university is a member of the committee and regularly attends meetings. The vice president of operations is also a member and attends every meeting. The four executive deans are members and take an active part in committee. The chief administrative officer in the office of academic affairs is also a member. So, there is a high level of engagement of administrators in the work of the committee. The office of business and finance puts a high level of value in the committee, and really doesn't make any major decisions without some level of input from the committee.

UCLA

MEETINGS ARE BIWEEKLY, OFTEN INVOLVE VISITS FROM SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS HANDLING BUDGET; TRADITIONALLY, THE CFO HAS BEEN RESPONSIVE AND ENGAGED. OUR SENATE OF COURSE HAS NO GOVERNANCE OVER FINANCIAL MATTERS.

Nebraska

When needed. Yes

Penn State

Of the 22 members on the committee, including the chair and vice chair (both appointed University Faculty Senators), 3 major administrators (including the University's Provost) sit on the committee, as does 1 student senator and 4 "resource" members (which are also primarily administrative in nature).

The committee's design is not only to generate feedback in an attempt to influence administration and administrative decisions; the committee is also designed to report back to the Senate on construction projects, space allocation, and budgetary matters. Therefore, the success of the committee is not considered solely as a matter of the administrative responsiveness to our input. That said, the structure at Penn State is designed to put members of the committee at the proverbial table wherein administrative decisions of some import are considered: For example, our University Planning Committee has "LIAISON WITH OTHER SENATE, ADMINISTRATIVE, SPECIAL OR JOINT COMMITTEES" including (1.) UPC Chair is a member of the Strategic Planning Implementation Oversight Committee; (2) Chair is also representative on Classroom Advisory Committee; (3.) UPC Representative on the Parking Appeal Committee (which must be a faculty member at University Park); and (4.) UPC Representative on the University Energy Conservation Policy Committee. Our feedback in those meetings is possible and available; however, assessing fully and unambiguously the influence of the committee, its chair, and its representatives is difficult to summarize in any straightforward fashion.

Suffice to say, the committee's input is not deemed more or less valuable than the input of any of the other standing committees of the University Faculty Senate at Penn State.

Minnesota

High level, with the Sr. VP for Finance & Operations, the VP for U Services, the assistant VP for Finances, the director of Finances, sitting on the committee as ex officio, no vote. The committee's input is very much valued.

What type of information/data does the committee receive from the administration in order to inform its work and how often does it receive updated information?

Purdue

salary averages per department; equity; and I'm not sure what else. The committee must request the information they desire. I don't believe that they have any automatic reports. That said, this committee was very active when originally created about 10 years ago. We kept re-electing the chair, however, and at some point he seemed to burn out and quit holding meetings. We have just found a new chair, a few new members, and hope to reinvigorate this committee.

Wisconsin

Both committees receive continual updates on whatever is relevant to them.

Illinois

We receive updates from the office of the Provost on a regular basis on budget matters.

Indiana

Almost anything it asks for. It is a "blue sky" type of relationship. Very open.

Ohio State

The committee really works hand and hand with the administration, such that the administration provides the committee and its subcommittees whatever data is needed for the committee to be informed and to provide advice.

UCLA

WE STRIVE FOR FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY. BUT DATA ON SOME PROJECTS AND OFFICES IS OFTEN HARD TO EXTRACT. OVER THE PAST FEW YEARS, THE APB HEAD AND THE CFP HAVE BEEN MORE FORTHCOMING ABOUT OUR FINANCIAL PRESENT AND OUR FINANCIAL FUTURE.

Nebraska

A budget plan, no other information

Penn State

In order to deliver their three annually mandated reports on construction, space allocation, and budgetary matters, the committee works with administration with regularity. In addition to mandated reports, the committee has additional charges they receive each year, which, in most if not all cases, require significant discussion with administration. Having the Provost on the committee, questions can be answered directly in committee or, at minimum, can be discovered in time and then shared with the committee at a later date. Also in attendance at each of the 6 meetings per year is our Senior Vice President Finance and Business as well as our Senior Vice President Development and Alumni Relations. The "loop," as it were, between faculty senators and administration is hardwired into the structure of the committee insuring in ongoing communication line between the two groups and they both seek mutually beneficial decisions for the University as a whole and strive to live up to the common goal of shared governance.

Minnesota

It receives annual budget info, projected/anticipated issues, collegiate budget info, or whatever else the committee deems necessary. The committee meets monthly for 2 hours and the committee leadership meets regularly with the Sr. VP.

Does the committee fulfill a role that is not met by other Senate or university-level bodies?

Purdue

Yes.

Wisconsin

Yes.

Illinois

No.

Indiana

Yes. We have a well-defined division of labor here.

Ohio State

The senate fiscal committee plays a central role in the senate. It works with other committees to provide fiscal information about issues that impact the work of the other committees.

UCLA

THIS IS THE MAIN SENATE COUNCIL THAT FOCUSES ON FINANCE AND BUDGET.

Nebraska

Yes.

Penn State

At Penn State, we share the roles that must be met in order to conduct prudent business. The committee is more a complement than a gap-filler.

Minnesota

It serves as the key body to address all U wide budget issues.

Does the committee serve in an advisory role for other Senate or university-level committees? If so, does it involve formal charges or less formal consultation? Do you feel the committee's input improves the operation of those bodies and in what ways?

Purdue

Yes. They report to our University Resource Policy Committee (a Standing Committee of our Senate).

Wisconsin

Two seats on the planning committee are held by people who also serve on the academic planning council. There are also myriad informal ways that the two committees interact with other shared governance committees. Both committees report regularly to the Senate and other governance bodies.

Illinois

It does not serve for other senate committees.

Indiana

No. The campus committee is paralleled by a university-level committee that deals directly with the VP & CFO, and focuses mainly on university financial policies, such as debt management, building and capital improvements, etc. The main and regional campus BAC chairs sit on the university-level committee. I also chair that committee, in addition to the campus BAC.

Ohio State

Yes, the fiscal committee serves an advisory role for other senate committees. In fact, the chair of the fiscal committee is also a member of the research committee by rule. The consultation with other committees is not formally described in rules. The coordination of the work of different committees is accomplished by the senate steering committee and the faculty cabinet, which is comprised of the chairs of all 19 committees and councils.

UCLA

WE HAVE MANY STANDING SENATE COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES. ALL OF THEM INVOLVE PERIODIC INTERACTIONS WITH SENIOR MANAGEMENT. SEVERAL INVOLVE MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL OFFICE. TWO HAVE THE POWER TO APPROVE ACADEMIC COURSES--THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL AND THE GRADUATE COUNCIL.

Nebraska

No.

Penn State

Indeed, as indicated previously, not only is the roster integrated between senators and administrators, the committee members that are senators also sit on committees beyond the purview of the senate (for example, in committee work that considers all that constitutes university parking). The extent to which those senators are influential is not easy to estimate, but Penn State is committed to shared governance, so, at minimum, their voices would not be censored or silenced under most any circumstance.

Minnesota

The chair of the Finance & Planning Committee sits as ex officio, voting member on the Faculty Consultative and Senate Consultative Committees.

What is the nature and extent of the training given to new members of this committee?**Purdue**

None, to my knowledge. But our Nominating Committee requests volunteers so they are self-selected and often come from business, finance, economics, etc. and are quite knowledgeable already. The Nominating Committee looks for expertise, diversity (of all types - gender, racial as well as disciplinary), and interest when making selections.

Wisconsin

Varies.

Illinois

Need to take training on Open Meetings act, required by the State.

Indiana

None. We coach them as we go. It is purely OJT!

Ohio State

There is a lot of continuity on the committee, but for those new members, there will be a one meeting orientation session at the start of the academic year.

UCLA

WE HAVE A TRANSITION MEETING THAT INFORMS THE INCOMING CHAIR OF THE RELATIONSHIP HE/SHE/THEY HAS WITH THE SENATE OFFICE.

Nebraska

None.

Penn State

New senators go through a general orientation program; however, to the best of my knowledge, no special training is provided to individuals cycling onto the University Planning Committee (which is not an anomaly -- training usually happens in vivo during senate committee business rather than through a formal process before committee business begins).

Minnesota

In the summer prior to the start of fall semester, the out going chair, staff and incoming chair meet to transition leadership; new leadership, staff, meet with ex officio and then at beginning of fall semester, the Senate Office along with the FCC Chair conducts an Committee Chairs' Orientation and then, at the first meeting of the committee, the Senate staff conducts a committee orientation.

Is the membership structure (in terms of specific membership composition and term lengths) effective for fulfilling the committee's function? Why or why not?**Purdue**

Yes, other than our continued re-election (arm twisting) of the original chair. We will stay on a 3-year term limit, with the opportunity for renewal, in the future.

Wisconsin

Yes. There are representatives of all shared governance groups (including students) on both committees - and the appropriate ex officio administration members are also integrally involved.

Illinois

yes, there are 5 faculty, one staff, one graduate and one under-graduate student.

Indiana

Yes. The members are selected by the campus council's nominating committee.

Ohio State

The senate fiscal committee revised its membership recently to add more students. It is a large committee that is well designed to fulfil its duties. There are 9 faculty, 6 students, 3 staff, and 4 deans. There are also 4 fiscal officers in non-voting positions. The terms are 3 years for faculty and staff, 2 years for students, and not termed for administrative members. The committee accomplishes a lot of work (see AY 17-18 annual report) partly because of its structure of having 4 active subcommittees.

UCLA

YES. OUR COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES TRIES TO ENSURE GENDER EQUITY, REPRESENTATIONS OF COLLEAGUES FROM URMS, AND REPRESENTATION FROM MANY

DIFFERENT AREAS OF THE CAMPUS, WHICH HOUSES A LARGE COLLEGE, MULTIPLE PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS, AND A LARGE CENTER FOR HEALTH SCIENCES.

Nebraska

Not sure.

Penn State

The term lengths on the committee are contingent on the senator's general term length, meaning, if a senator has recently won an election for a three-year term, their ability to serve the senate in any capacity is limited to those three years. That said, there is a limit on the number of years a faculty member can serve on the same committee, which is generally seen in a positive light. In terms of the composition of the committee, the combination of administrators, resource members, student senators, and, of course, University Faculty Senators does not appear to be out of balance at this time. The communication lines hardwired into the committee make reporting back to the Senate fairly straightforward, which creates opportunities for dialog between the administration (more generally) and the senate (also more generally) on topics of relevance to planning, space, and budget. This has been an opportunity for dialog surrounding these issues that otherwise are simply less likely to come up spontaneously during, for example, the President's remarks address the Senate on the state of the University. The answer, therefore, to the question is yes, for the moment, but we are always conducting self-assessment to think and rethink about our internal structure and access to administrative decision makers.

Minnesota

Yes, because on a three - five year cycle each committee is reviewed in terms of its charge and membership. If a committee deems it necessary to add membership, it can make a proposal to Committee on Committees and then that goes to the appropriate consultative committee and finally to the appropriate senate for action.

Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

Penn State

Reasonable expectations from a planning committee are essential, especially in the early years of a committee. Because university senates have primary jurisdiction over academics and curriculum, and to protect academic freedom, our "final" (so to say) influence on budgetary decisions can be limited even if our input is vital. It would be a mistake with regard to interpretation to see a planning committee as "not influential" because they do not obviously or forcefully shape administrative budgetary plans related to construction.



Senate-Related Membership Models

The University Senate has several different types of bodies outlined in the University's Plan of [University's Plan of Organization](#) and [Senate Bylaws](#). These include the Senate Executive Committee, the Committee on Committees, the Nominations Committee, Standing and Special Committees, and University Councils (see Article 8 of the Plan).

Senate Executive Committee (SEC)

The regular membership of the SEC is **elected by continuing and incoming Senators** at the annual Transition Meeting of the Senate. The regular membership includes 15 Senators:

- Chair of the Senate
- Chair-Elect of the Senate
- 7 faculty Senators
- 2 staff Senators (one exempt, one non-exempt)
- 2 undergraduate student Senators
- 2 graduate student Senators

In addition, it includes 4 non-voting ex-officio members:

- President or representative
- Senior Vice President and Provost or representative
- Executive Secretary & Director of the Senate
- Parliamentarian

Committee on Committees

The Committee on Committees is responsible for the identification and recruitment of individuals for service on Senate and University committees and councils. The membership of the committee is **elected by continuing and incoming Senators** at the annual Transition Meeting of the Senate. It includes 11 Senators:

- Chair-Elect of the Senate
- 6 faculty Senators
- 2 staff Senators (one exempt, one non-exempt)
- 1 undergraduate student Senator
- 1 graduate student Senator

Nominations Committee

The Nominations Committee identifies candidates for Chair-Elect, members of other elected committees of the Senate, and members of other bodies to which the Senate sends representatives. The membership of the committee is **elected by continuing and incoming Senators** at the annual Transition Meeting of the Senate. In addition to the Chair-Elect, it includes 8 outgoing Senators:

- Chair-Elect of the Senate
- 4 faculty Senators

- 2 staff Senators (one exempt, one non-exempt)
- 1 undergraduate student Senator
- 1 graduate student Senator

Standing & Special Committees

The Senate's 10 standing committees have memberships ranging from 11 (Student Conduct) to 23 (Educational Affairs, Staff Affairs, and Student Affairs). The average size is just under 20 members. During the last review of the University's Plan of Organization, the ERG Committee determined that the ideal committee size was between 18 and 21 members (see Appendix 1). Each spring, members of the campus community can volunteer to be considered for these committees. The Committee on Committees meets in the spring and early summer to develop slates of members, which are **voted on by the Senate** at its first meeting in the fall. Each standing committee has ex-officio representatives relevant to the committee's charge. In nearly all cases, ex-officio committee members are voting (the Staff Affairs, Faculty Affairs, and Student Conduct Committees have at least one non-voting ex-officio member). See Appendix 2 for membership details.

University Councils

Provisions for University Councils are established in Article 7 of the Senate Bylaws. They are jointly sponsored by and report to the Senate and particular members of the administration or to a dean. There are currently three: the University IT Council, the University Library Council, and the University Research Council. The membership of each Council includes between 9 and 13 regular members, who are **jointly appointed by the designated administrator and the Senate**. Each Council also has ex-officio representatives, who should be non-voting. The Athletic Council is established separately in the University Plan and Bylaws, and has different provisions than the other Councils. See Appendix 3 for membership details.

Appendix 1: Committee Size Memo



UNIVERSITY OF
MARYLAND
UNIVERSITY SENATE

1100 Marie Mount Hall
College Park, Maryland 20742-4111
Tel: (301) 405-5805 Fax: (301) 405-5749
<http://www.senate.umd.edu>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Plan of Organization Review Committee

FROM: The Senate Office

SUBJECT: Consideration of Senate Committee Size

The Senate Office has concerns about the overall size of some of the Senate committees. The Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee may be charged with considering Senate committee membership changes on an ad hoc basis as representation issues arise. While the ERG Committee does an excellent job of addressing specific issues, we believe that the Plan of Organization Review Committee should conduct a holistic review of all Senate committee memberships. Specifically, the total membership of large committees should be reconsidered because our experience shows that they historically have scheduling and participation issues. If you look at the overall committee sizes, there are a few committees that have between 23 and 31 members, which has proven to be difficult to manage for the following reasons:

1. Large committees are hard to schedule. It is easier to get a consistent and larger majority with a somewhat smaller committee size.
2. Committee members on large committees are more apt to not show up to meetings because they may feel like there are enough members to make up for their absence.
3. Committee members on large committees do not have as many opportunities to speak in committee meetings and as a result may feel less engaged in the committee's work.
4. Large committees have a difficult time coming to consensus on issues because there are so many voices in the discussion.

A spreadsheet of the attendance/participation in all of our committees over the last two years is included for your reference. We believe that the ideal committee size is somewhere in the range of 18-21 members. There are four committees that are larger than that with 23, 27, 29, and 31 members. We think that lowering the overall size of these committees could be beneficial. There are opportunities for the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Committee, the Staff Affairs Committee, the Student Affairs Committee, and the Educational Affairs Committee to be downsized. We believe that slightly downsizing these committees will not drastically affect representation but will allow the committees to be more effective. We propose the following changes that we hope can be discussed when reviewing the committee memberships in the Bylaws:

EDI: Currently this committee has 23 members. We propose removing 2 undergrads and potentially 1 staff and 1 faculty member bringing the total to 19. The undergrads are

historically at the lower attendance rates and this change would align this committee with student representation on other committees like Campus Affairs and ERG, which have 2 graduate students and 2 undergraduates.

Staff Affairs: Currently this committee has 31 members. We already removed 2 staff seats because of the new Senate categories, switched the alternate members of CUSS to be non-voting ex-officios, and removed the University Relations Ex-Officio, so that makes the new total 25. We propose also removing 2 faculty from the committee to align with representation on Faculty Affairs, which only has 1 staff member; we also propose removing 1 student from the committee, leaving 1 student seat (students and faculty typically tend to have less interest in this committee in terms of volunteer rates). That brings the total down to 22, which is closer to our ideal window. This would allow the main constituent groups on the Faculty Affairs and Staff Affairs Committees to be better aligned.

Student Affairs: Currently this committee has 29 members. We already agreed to remove the University Relations Ex-Officio so our new total is 28. We propose that we reduce the undergrads from 10 to 8 for a total of 12 student members, which is still two more than Faculty Affairs and Staff Affairs have in their main constituency representation. We also propose reducing the faculty from 3 to 2, removing the ex-officio rep for the Provost (because they already have a Grad School rep that could help with graduate life issues, and since academic issues are not typically handled in this committee and would go to APAS, PCC, or Ed Affairs, which all have a Provost's rep already), and removing the Administration and Finance ex-officio rep because they are already represented on the Campus Affairs Committee. That brings our total to 23, which is closer to our ideal window without drastically cutting the committee size or reducing representation.

In addition, we propose that PORC consider revisions involving the General Education Committee and the Educational Affairs Committee. The General Education Committee was developed in place of the CORE Committee when the new General Education Program was developed. While the committee serves an important role by providing oversight, the committee has not had much else to do since the implementation of the program, and it cancels the large majority of its meetings. The Educational Affairs and Academic Procedures and Standards Committees are charged to consider other academic issues so there is not much for the Gen Ed Committee to do. One option is to fold the Gen Ed oversight responsibility into the Educational Affairs Committee's charge. If PORC decides to merge Ed Affairs and Gen Ed, our proposal for membership would bring that committee to 28 total members, which is much larger than we would like. Our only suggestion is to remove the Dean for Undergraduate Studies from the membership because the committee would have a different relationship with the Dean once it incorporates the Gen Ed responsibilities and he/she is already represented by three other reps (Honors/Scholars/Gen Ed). Because this merger is a relatively new concept, it is more reasonable to start with a larger committee and reevaluate the membership during the next PORC review.

| 2013-2014 | Staff Affairs | Student Affairs | Ed Affairs | EDI | APAS | Campus Affairs | Gen Ed | FAC | PCC | ERG | Student Conduct |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Committee Size (Voting Members) | 31 | 29 | 25 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 18 | 18 | 16 | 10 |
| Quorum | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 6 |
| Total Members: | 3 Faculty 12 Staff 0 Graduate 2 Undergrad 13 Ex-Officios | 3 Faculty 2 Staff 5 Graduate 10 Undergrad 7 Ex-Officios 1 SGA Ex-Officio 1 GSG Ex-Officio | 12 Faculty 2 Staff 1 Graduate 2 Undergrad 7 Ex-Officios (2 non-voting) 1 SGA Ex-Officio 1 GSG Ex-Officio | 6 Faculty 6 Staff 2 Graduate 4 Undergrad 4 Ex-Officios | 10 Faculty 0 Staff 2 Graduate 3 Undergrad 4 Ex-Officios | 6 Faculty 2 Staff 2 Graduate 2 Undergrad 6 Ex-Officios 1 SGA Ex-Officio 1 GSG Ex-Officio | 12 Faculty 0 Staff 1 Graduate 3 Undergrad 4 Ex-Officios | 10 Faculty 1 Staff 2 Graduate 1 Undergrad 3 Ex-Officios | 10 Faculty 0 Staff 1 Graduate 2 Undergrad 4 Ex-Officios | 7 Faculty 2 Staff 2 Graduate 2 Undergrad 2 Ex-Officios | 4 Faculty 0 Staff 1 Graduate 4 Undergrad 1 Ex-Officio (non-voting) |
| 2013-2014 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of meetings: | 7 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 8 |
| Faculty | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Attendance | 16 | 7 | 49 | 14 | n/a | 24 | 12 | 63 | 49 | 29 | 26 |
| Total Opportunities | 18 | 15 | 96 | 54 | n/a | 54 | 24 | 100 | 70 | 63 | 36 |
| Percentage in Attendance | 89% | 47% | 51% | 26% | | 44% | 50% | 63% | 70% | 46% | 72% |
| Staff | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Attendance | 44 | 5 | 11 | 39 | n/a | 11 | n/a | 7 | n/a | 14 | n/a |
| Total Opportunities | 72 | 15 | 16 | 54 | n/a | 18 | n/a | 10 | n/a | 18 | n/a |
| Percentage in Attendance | 61% | 33% | 69% | 72% | | 61% | | 70% | | 78% | |
| Graduate Students | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Attendance | n/a | 5 | 4 | 5 | n/a | 5 | 1 | 17 | 4 | 8 | 4 |
| Total Opportunities | n/a | 20 | 8 | 28 | n/a | 18 | 2 | 20 | 8 | 18 | 8 |
| Percentage in Attendance | | 25% | 50% | 18% | | 28% | 50% | 85% | 50% | 44% | 50% |
| Undergraduate Students | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Attendance | 2 | 16 | 6 | 8 | n/a | 5 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 11 | 13 |
| Total Opportunities | 14 | 50 | 16 | 36 | n/a | 18 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 18 | 32 |
| Percentage in Attendance | 14% | 32% | 38% | 22% | | 28% | 33% | 40% | 56% | 61% | 41% |
| Ex-Officios | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Attendance | 39 | 14 | 41 | 29 | n/a | 28 | 8 | 19 | 23 | 11 | 8 |
| Total Opportunities | 78 | 35 | 56 | 36 | n/a | 54 | 8 | 30 | 28 | 18 | 9 |
| Percentage in Attendance | 50% | 40% | 73% | 81% | | 52% | 100% | 63% | 82% | 61% | 89% |
| SGA Ex-Officios | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Attendance | n/a | 5 | 2 | n/a | n/a | 7 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Total Opportunities | n/a | 5 | 8 | n/a | n/a | 9 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Percentage in Attendance | | 100% | 25% | | | 78% | | | | | |
| GSG Ex-Officios | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Attendance | n/a | 3 | 6 | n/a | n/a | 9 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Total Opportunities | n/a | 5 | 8 | n/a | n/a | 9 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Percentage in Attendance | | 60% | 75% | | | 100% | | | | | |

| 2012-2013 | Staff Affairs | Student Affairs | Ed Affairs | EDI | APAS | Campus Affairs | Gen Ed | FAC | PCC | ERG | Student Conduct |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Committee Size (Voting Members) | 31 | 29 | 27 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 18 | 18 | 16 | 11 |
| Quorum | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 6 |
| Total Members: | 3 Faculty 12 Staff 0 Graduate 2 Undergrad 13 Ex-Officios | 3 Faculty 2 Staff 5 Graduate 10 Undergrad 7 Ex-Officios 1 SGA Ex-Officio 1 GSG Ex-Officio | 12 Faculty 2 Staff 1 Graduate 2 Undergrad 7 Ex-Officios (2 non-voting) 1 SGA Ex-Officio 1 GSG Ex-Officio | 6 Faculty 6 Staff 2 Graduate 4 Undergrad 4 Ex-Officios | 10 Faculty 0 Staff 2 Graduate 3 Undergrad 4 Ex-Officios | 6 Faculty 2 Staff 2 Graduate 2 Undergrad 6 Ex-Officios 1 SGA Ex-Officio 1 GSG Ex-Officio | 12 Faculty 0 Staff 1 Graduate 3 Undergrad 4 Ex-Officios | 10 Faculty 1 Staff 2 Graduate 1 Undergrad 3 Ex-Officios | 10 Faculty 0 Staff 1 Graduate 2 Undergrad 4 Ex-Officios | 7 Faculty 2 Staff 2 Graduate 2 Undergrad 2 Ex-Officios | 4 Faculty 0 Staff 1 Graduate 4 Undergrad 1 Ex-Officio (non-voting) |
| 2012-2013 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of meetings: | 8 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 11 | 9 |

| Faculty | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Total Attendance | 5 | 10 | 53 | 16 | 35 | 27 | 29 | 55 | 56 | 55 | 23 |
| Total Opportunities | 14 | 18 | 96 | 48 | 60 | 60 | 48 | 100 | 70 | 77 | 36 |
| Percentage in Attendance | 36% | 56% | 55% | 33% | 58% | 45% | 60% | 55% | 80% | 71% | 64% |

| Staff | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|-------------|-----|------------|-------------|
| Total Attendance | 51 | 5 | 14 | 32 | n/a | 15 | n/a | 10 | n/a | 15 | 9 |
| Total Opportunities | 96 | 12 | 16 | 48 | n/a | 20 | n/a | 10 | n/a | 22 | 9 |
| Percentage in Attendance | 53% | 42% | 88% | 67% | | 75% | | 100% | | 68% | 100% |

| Graduate Students | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Total Attendance | n/a | 15 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 9 |
| Total Opportunities | n/a | 24 | 8 | 16 | 12 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 7 | 22 | 9 |
| Percentage in Attendance | | 63% | 0% | 50% | 58% | 45% | 25% | 20% | 57% | 68% | 100% |

| Undergraduate Students | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Total Attendance | 4 | 31 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 22 |
| Total Opportunities | 16 | 60 | 16 | 32 | 18 | 20 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 22 | 36 |
| Percentage in Attendance | 25% | 52% | 31% | 19% | 56% | 55% | 50% | 20% | 36% | 18% | 61% |

| Ex-Officios | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Total Attendance | 54 | 27 | 32 | 24 | 19 | 31 | 12 | 23 | 20 | 13 | 9 |
| Total Opportunities | 104 | 42 | 52 | 32 | 24 | 60 | 16 | 30 | 28 | 22 | 9 |
| Percentage in Attendance | 52% | 64% | 62% | 75% | 79% | 52% | 75% | 77% | 71% | 59% | 100% |

| SGA Ex-Officios | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|------------|------------|-----|-----|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Total Attendance | n/a | 4 | 5 | n/a | n/a | 4 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Total Opportunities | n/a | 6 | 8 | n/a | n/a | 10 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Percentage in Attendance | | 67% | 63% | | | 40% | | | | | |

| GSG Ex-Officios | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|------------|------------|-----|-----|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Total Attendance | n/a | 4 | 4 | n/a | n/a | 5 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Total Opportunities | n/a | 6 | 8 | n/a | n/a | 10 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Percentage in Attendance | | 67% | 50% | | | 50% | | | | | |

Appendix 2: Standing Committee Memberships

| | Size | Members (plus chair) | Ex-Officios |
|---------------------------------|------|---|---|
| Academic Procedures & Standards | 21 | 10 faculty 1 staff 1 grad 3 undergrads | Provost, Director of Undergraduate Admissions, Registrar, Dean for Undergraduate Studies, Dean of the Grad School (or representatives of each) |
| Campus Affairs | 21 | 6 faculty 2 staff 2 grad 2 undergrad | SGA President, GSG President, Provost, VP Admin & Finance, VP Student Affairs, VP University Relations, Chief Diversity Officer, Chair of Coaches Council (or reps) |
| Educational Affairs | 23 | 10 faculty (at least 2 each of T/TT, PTK) 2 staff 1 grad 2 undergrad | SGA President, GSG President, Provost, Dean for Undergraduate Studies, Dean of the Grad School, VP for IT (or reps); Associate Dean for General Education |
| ERG | 15 | 6 faculty 2 staff (exempt, non-exempt) 2 grad 2 undergrad | Director of UHR, Assoc. VP for IRPA (or reps) |
| Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion | 20 | 5 faculty 3 exempt 3 non-exempt 2 grad 2 undergrads | Provost, VP for Admin & Finance, VP for Student Affairs, Director of OCRSM (or reps); Chief Diversity Officer |
| Faculty Affairs | 20 | 10 faculty (stipulations on rank/type) 1 staff 2 grad 1 undergrad | President, Provost, Director of UHR (or reps); elected Faculty Representative from CUSF, Faculty Ombuds Officer (NV) |
| Programs, Courses, & Curricula | 19 | 10 faculty 1 staff 1 grad 2 undergrad | Provost, Dean for Undergrad Studies, Dean of Grad School, Dean of Libraries (or reps) |
| Staff Affairs | 23 | 1 faculty 8 staff (stipulations by college/division) 2 CII 1 student | Provost, Director of UHR, VP for Admin & Finance, VP for Student Affairs (or reps); 3 CUSS Reps (voting); 3 CUSS alternates (NV) |
| Student Affairs | 23 | 2 faculty 2 staff 4 grads (1 Senator) 8 undergrads (4 Senators) | SGA President, GSG President (or reps); 2 from Office of VP for Student Affairs, 1 from Grad School, 1 from Res Life |
| Student Conduct | 11 | 4 faculty 1 staff 5 students (mix) | Director of Office of Student Conduct (or rep, NV) |

Appendix 3: University Council Memberships

| | Size | Members (plus chair) | Ex-Officios |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--|---|
| University IT Council | 17 | 10 faculty 1 grad 1 undergrad | Provost, IT Advisory Committee rep, VP for IT (all non-voting) |
| University Library Council | Up to 17 | 2 faculty (T/TT, PTK) 1 staff 1 grad 1 undergrad Chairs of Working Groups (varies) | Representatives from the Provost, Dean of Libraries, Division of IT; Senate Chair-Elect (all non-voting) |
| University Research Council | 23 | 8 faculty 1 staff 3 students (min 1 of each) | Representatives of VP for Research, Dean of Grad School, Dean for Undergraduate Studies, Director of ORA, Chairs of 4 Subcommittees (voting); representatives of President, Provost (NV) |
| Athletic Council | 26 | Vice-Chair (faculty) 7 faculty (elected by Senate) 1 faculty member from Campus Affairs Committee 1 academic dean 2 staff 1 rep from M Club 1 rep from Terrapin Club 1 SGA rep 2 undergrad athletes (by sex) 1 grad student | VP for Student Affairs (voting); Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, rep of President, rep of Office of General Counsel, Director of Student Health Services, Director of Alumni Programs, a head coach (NV) |



**Enhancing Senate Input on University Planning and Resources
(Senate Document #17-18-20)
ERG Committee | Chair: Andrew Horbal**

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Walsh request that the Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee review the attached proposal entitled *Enhancing Senate Input on University Planning and Resources*.

Specifically, the committee is asked to:

1. Consult with the proposer(s).
2. Review data included in the proposal on the role and composition of similar bodies at Big 10 and other peer institutions.
3. Work with the Senate Office to compile feedback from members of the Senate leadership of other Big 10 institutions on the effectiveness of similar bodies at their institutions.
4. Consult with the Associate Vice President for Finance & Chief Financial Officer.
5. Consult with the Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel.
6. Consult with a representative of the Office of the Provost.
7. Consult with a representative of the Office of the President.
8. Consult with the Senate Director on how the proposal might impact the Senate's ability to make informed recommendations.
9. Consider how such a body could provide budgetary perspective to support the work of existing Senate standing committees during their consideration of policies and issues with resource implications.
10. Consider whether such a body should have specific provisions on composition, membership selection, chair appointment, administrative representation, and term limits that differ from those for other Senate standing committees in order to align with the needs of the University Senate, Senate committees, and the University administration.
11. If appropriate, recommend revisions to the Senate Bylaws. If the committee recommends revisions to create such a body, the committee should develop appropriate specifications on composition, ex-officio membership, term limits, chair appointment procedures, and charge elements and identify an appropriate name for the body.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **February 8, 2019**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



Enhancing Senate Input on University Planning and Resources

| | | | |
|--------------|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| NAME | Jordan Goodman, Ralph Bennett, Marvin Breslow, Willie Brown, Kent Cartwright, Christopher Davis, Mark Leone, Gerald Miller, Arthur Popper, Martha Nell Smith, Don Webster, Drew Baden | DATE | February 12, 2018 |
| EMAIL | goodman@umdgrb.umd.edu | PHONE | 301-405-6033 |
| UNIT | CMNS, ARCH, ARHU, BSOS, ENGR, VPAF | CONSTITUENCY | Faculty, Staff, & Past Senate Chairs |

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE

The Senate is the primary shared governance body at the University and includes elected representatives of the faculty, staff, and students. The Senate’s primary role is to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the University’s administrators. This is defined in the University of Maryland Plan of Organization for Shared Governance, which states: *Subject to the authority of the Board of Regents, the Chancellor, and the President, the Senate shall consider any matter of concern including, but not limited to, educational, **budgetary**, and personnel matters; campus-community matters; long-range plans; facilities; and faculty, staff, and student affairs.*

The Senate shall advise the President, the Chancellor, or the Board of Regents, as it deems appropriate. In addition, Article 1 of the Plan defines the Senate and its Functions. In 1.3.p., one of those functions includes: **Consult and advise on long-range plans as they relate to institutional budget, physical plant development, and other aspects of campus life including ways in which these aspects may be improved, and provide means to keep such plans under continual review.**

The Senate’s effectiveness as an advisory body hinges on its ability to make informed recommendations. In order to facilitate this, an open and transparent budgeting process is necessary. While the majority of the Senate’s work focuses on policy, the campus budget is where policy is put into action. The Senate and its committees should have a clear understanding of the fiscal issues facing the campus in order to fully identify the implications of potential recommendations under consideration.

A top priority in the University’s budgeting process should be enhancing academic excellence on campus. A well-informed Senate can provide valuable input from the various perspectives of the campus community toward this end, and can provide the advice needed to help the administration make the best possible budgetary and policy decisions.

A clear understanding of the budget can also help members of the Senate to understand the fiscal issues facing the campus, provide the campus community the means to ask relevant and informed questions, and aid in developing future campus leaders. This level of clarity would allow the Senate to serve as a valuable conduit for disseminating information and educating the campus community on the complexities of resource realities and could also help reduce false assumptions about how campus resources are being utilized.

DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE

We propose the formation of a new Senate Budgetary Affairs Committee whose broad charge would be to review and advise on the University's budget. The proposed committee would provide transparency in the budgeting process, and ensure the administration has perspectives from the campus community as it considers priorities and implements policies.

Proposed Membership: The members of the committee should include students, faculty, staff, and ex-officio representatives of the administration. Members of the committee should be selected by the Committee on Committees primarily from a slate of nominees provided by the Senate Executive Committee, and should include but not be limited to members of the campus community with budgetary experience. Ex-officio representatives on the committee should include members of the administration that are sufficiently knowledgeable on the campus budget such as the Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel, the Chief Financial Officer, and/or any other representative of the Provost.

Proposed Committee Charge:

- (1) Review, on a continuing basis, the fiscal policies and resources of the university;
- (2) Act as a vehicle to provide analysis and advice to the administration on strategies for the long-term and short-term allocation of university resources consistent with maintaining the missions of the university;
- (3) Report annually to the Senate on the budgetary and fiscal condition of the university and upon the request of the Senate Executive Committee; and
- (4) Act as a resource to other Senate committees on the fiscal implications of proposed legislation.

SUGGESTION FOR HOW YOUR PROPOSAL WOULD BE PUT INTO PRACTICE

The creation of a new standing committee of the Senate would require a change to the Senate Bylaws.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Many other major research universities, including the vast majority of our Big Ten peers have developed effective models for providing budgetary advice to their administrations through comparable committees. (see attachment)

Peer Institutions- Senate Budget Committees

| Institution | Committee Name | Charge/ Purview | Term Length | Membership | Reporting Structure | Advisory Role |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign http://www.senate.illinois.edu/cmte_biz.asp | Senate Budget Committee | Study general state and nation budget trends, study the campus budget, study the criteria followed in regards to allocations, and study the impact of budgetary decisions on educational policy and quality | Faculty: 2 years Students: 1 year | 5 faculty, 1 academic professional, 2 student, and the Provost or the Provost's designee (ex officio). | Reports and makes recommendations to the Senate | Advise members of the campus administration on the formulation of policies affecting the budget and on the allocation of funds requested by and appropriated to the University and the Urbana-Champaign campus. |
| Indiana University http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/constitution.html#articleIV | University Faculty Council | Consider the relative allocations of the University's resources with respect to new programs and significant changes in existing programs. Consider the setting of priorities with regard to capital outlays. Consider the setting of general faculty salary policies. | Unclear- information not on website | 16 faculty members- this is a committee of the Faculty Council which does not include any other constituencies | Prepares an annual report to the Bloomington Faculty Council. | Monitors the development of the annual campus budget through consultations with the dean of budgetary affairs; members participate in budget meetings of academic and some non-academic campus units; develops budget policies; |
| University of Iowa https://uiowa.edu/facultysenate/charge | Faculty Senate/Staff Council Budget Committee | Advise on budgetary priority setting and other budgetary matters which affect the University's General Education Fund; including salary policy and other budgetary decisions affecting faculty and staff; Advise on state appropriations requests made to the Board of Regents; as may relate to University salary and other budget priorities; Advise on the internal governance procedures of the University which have major budgetary implications and impact on faculty and staff; Advise on the translation of University planning processes and unit reviews into specific budgetary allocations; Promote programmatic and resource allocation decisions that are guided by strategic plans and that will advance the University; and Consult with the UISG (Undergraduate Student Government) president and vice president on matters within the charge of this committee. | Members shall be appointed for a term not to exceed three years. Reappointment is permitted; however, no person may serve for more than six consecutive years on the committee. (4) The Committee shall have co-chairs, each of whom may be appointed for a two-year term by the President of the University after consultation with the Faculty Senate President and Staff Council President. | 7 members of the Faculty Senate 7 members of the Staff Council Provost and Vice President for Finance and University Services serve as liaisons to the committee | Joint Committee of the Faculty Senate and the Staff Council | Advisory capacity to the President; President appoints the co-chairs (1 faculty and 1 staff) after consultations with the Faculty Senate President and the Staff Council President |
| University of Michigan http://facultysenate.umich.edu/senate-assembly/committees/financial-affairs-advisory-committee-faa/ | Financial Affairs Advisory Committee (FAAC) | As the voice of faculty, the committee shall advise and consult with the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer on policy and procedure issues related to the broad range of University activities. The committee's advice shall be sought and given in a timely manner so that the advice could affect the decision-making outcome. | 3 years | Up to 12 faculty members, representing a cross-section of Schools/Colleges and Regional Campuses members, with attention to race, ethnicity, gender, and rank; 1 Graduate student selected by the Central Student Government. 1 SACUA (Executive Committee) liaison. | Reports through the executive committee (SACUA) to the Senate Assembly and then to the Faculty Senate as appropriate | Consults with the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer on matters of finance. |
| University of Minnesota- Twin Cities http://usenate.umn.edu/committees/finance-and-planning-committee-scfp | Finance and Planning Committee (SCFP) | a. To consult with and advise the president and senior University officers on planning, and in particular on financial and operational planning. b. To consult with and advise the president and senior academic and financial officers on the development of the biennial request, of supplemental budget requests, and the annual budget and to review the implementation of the annual budget. c. To consult with and advise the president and senior University officers on the development of the University's capital budget and capital plans, the biennial capital request, supplemental capital requests, and the implementation of capital projects. d. To participate in the development and review of all physical facilities planning. e. To consult with and advise the president and senior University officers on the financial and operational aspects of all major proposals and policy initiatives. f. To consult with and advise the president and senior University officers on other questions of resource allocation, including space allocation. g. To consult with and advise the president and senior University officers on the periodic review of University operations. h. To recommend to the Faculty Consultative Committee, Senate Consultative Committee, or to other Senate committees such actions or policies as it deems appropriate. i. To take up other matters as shall be referred to the committee by the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Senate Consultative committee, or other Senate Committees. | Faculty and Staff: 3 years Students: 2 years | 10 faculty, 2 academic professionals, 4 students, 2 civil service members, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the University Senate. | Makes recommendations to the Senate Consultative Committee (Executive Committee) as appropriate; dual reporting authority to the University Senate and the Faculty Senate | Consultative body to the president and senior University officers on all major issues of planning, budget, resource allocation policy, and University operations. |

Peer Institutions- Senate Budget Committees

| Institution | Committee Name | Charge/ Purview | Term Length | Membership | Reporting Structure | Advisory Role |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| Northwestern University http://www.northwestern.edu/faculty-senate/committees/Budget%20and%20Planning.html | Budget and Planning Committee | Interact with University budget and planning processes to discern whether they are aligned with academic values and Faculty interests. Report to the Senate and to relevant University officers any concerns with respect to advancing the academic mission of the university or the quality and sustainability of the Faculty. Provide suggestions on behalf of the Senate to relevant University officers and planning committees regarding the direction and general welfare of the University and the role of the budget in meeting institutional objectives. Develop and coordinate information and expertise regarding best practices with respect to specific issues and general budgetary and planning processes in order to fulfill the Committee's and the Senate's goals and responsibilities. | Unclear- information not on website | 5 faculty members and 1 chair (based on membership list on website) | Reports to Senate and relevant University officers Annual Report to the Senate | Provides suggestions on behalf of the Senate |
| Ohio State University https://senate.osu.edu/fiscal-committee-rules/ | Fiscal Committee | (1) Review, on a continuing basis, the fiscal policies and resources of the university; (2) Advise the president on the alternatives and strategies for the long-term and short-term allocation of university resources consistent with maintaining the missions of the university; (3) Analyze resources and budgets from an overall university-wide perspective; (4) Analyze resources and budgets in detail for centrally supported vice presidential units; (5) Advise the president, in the event of an imminent financial crisis, whether a determination of financial exigency is warranted; and (6) Report annually to the faculty council and the senate on the budgetary and fiscal condition of the university. | Faculty: unclear- not stated Staff: 3 years Students: 2 years | 9 tenure track faculty members, 4 students, 3 staff members, 6 administrators (2 non-voting) 1 faculty member and 1 staff member are appointed by the President | Reports annually to the faculty council and the Senate | Advisory to the President |
| Pennsylvania State University http://senate.psu.edu/senators/standing-committees/university-planning/ | University Planning Committee | The Committee on University Planning solely and in consultation with other committees, shall report on and/or propose action on matters of University planning that affect development and alumni relations, physical plant resources, and the academic and financial policies of the University. In accordance with the Constitutional advisory and consultative roles of the Senate, specific areas of responsibilities include but are not limited to: the allocation of resources among units and functions as they relate to educational policy, academic planning, development planning, and campus and physical planning | Faculty: 2 years Administrative and Students: 1 year | At least 12 elected faculty senators, 1 undergraduate student senator, 1 graduate student senator, Executive Vice President/Provost of the University or representative, Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer (non-voting), Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations (non-voting) | Mandated reports: a. Annual Construction Report b. Annual Space Allocation and Utilization Report c. Annual University Budget and Planning Report d. Biennial Development and Alumni Relations Report The Committee on University Planning shall have the authority to approve its mandated informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council. | Advisory to the Office of the President, including the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer, Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, and the Executive Vice President/Provost, |
| Purdue University http://www.purdue.edu/senate/committees/universityResources/facultyCommittees.html | Budget Interpretation, Evaluation, and Review Committee | Budget Interpretation, Evaluation and Review Committee The Committee shall be charged with continuing to collect and analyze data about Purdue's revenues and appropriations and to convey information about Purdue's budgetary policies to the Senate. Furthermore, with coordination and consultation with the University Resources Policy Committee, this Committee will work with the fiscal officers of the administration to examine and evaluate budgetary policies. | Unclear- information not on website | 4 faculty members and 4 liaisons from various campus offices (similar to ex-officio representation it seems) | Reports to the University Resources Policy Committee. URPC is a committee of the Senate. The Budget committee is listed as a faculty committee. It's not clear what any of this means. | Consults with fiscal officers of the university |

Peer Institutions- Senate Budget Committees

| Institution | Committee Name | Charge/ Purview | Term Length | Membership | Reporting Structure | Advisory Role |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| University of Wisconsin- Madison https://secfac.wisc.edu/governance/faculty-legislation/6-25-budget-committee/ | Budget Committee | <p>Advises and makes recommendations to the chancellor, the provost, and the vice chancellor for finance and administration on institutional budget issues, long-range financial strategies, state biennial budget proposals, and allocations to schools, colleges, and divisions.</p> <p>Advises the shared governance executive committees on issues of budgetary impact and the public position to be taken on budgetary issues. Meets regularly with vice chancellor for finance and administration.</p> <p>Serves as a resource for schools/colleges, departments, and others on matters related to the budget.</p> <p>Consults with and advises other committees, such as school/college academic planning councils and campus planning committees, relating to institutional-level budgetary matters. The committee may also recommend the creation of ad hoc committees on budget-related matters.</p> <p>Reports to the Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Assembly, University Staff Congress, ASM Student Council, and their respective executive committees upon request.</p> | <p>Faculty and staff: 4 years</p> <p>Students: 2 years</p> | <p>4 faculty members, 2 academic staff members, 2 university staff members, 2 students; Ex officio non-voting members: campus budget director; chancellor or designee; provost or designee; and vice chancellor for finance and administration or designee.</p> | <p>Reports to various shared governance bodies (see last sentence in charge)</p> | <p>Advises and makes recommendations to the chancellor, the provost, and the vice chancellor for finance and administration</p> |
| Rutgers University http://senate.rutgers.edu/Committees.shtml | Budget and Finance Committee | <p>To select and study policy issues associated with the University's budget, including priorities and allocation of funds, and to develop recommendations to the Senate.</p> <p>To evaluate the probable financial impact of proposed new programs being considered by the Senate.</p> <p>To receive, study, and make recommendations to the Senate, and through it to the Board of Governors and Board of Trustees, with respect to requests from members of the University community or others with a legitimate interest regarding Rutgers University investments.</p> <p>To consider, study, and make recommendations to the Senate, and through it to the Board of Governors and Board of Trustees, with respect to any investment policies of the University that may involve ethical and moral principles as established by the Boards of Governors and Trustees.</p> <p>To consider broad issues related to physical plant and infrastructure, space, transportation, and safety on and among the three campuses.</p> <p>To present to the University Senate an annual report on the Rutgers University budget.</p> | <p>Unclear- information not on website</p> | <p>17 faculty members, 4 staff members, 6 students, 6 administrators, 2 representatives from the alumni association</p> | <p>Presents an annual report to the University Senate</p> | <p>Receive, study, and make recommendations to the Senate; through the Senate, recommendations can be made to the Board of the Governors and Board of Trustees</p> |
| University of California- Los Angeles https://senate.ucla.edu/committee/cpb | Council on Planning and Budget | <p>CPB's charge is to "make recommendations based on established Senate policy to the Chancellor and Senate agencies concerning the allocation of educational resources, academic priorities, and the planning and budgetary process" as well as formulating a Senate view on "the campus budget and each major campus space-use and building project." CPB discusses with the Executive Vice Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Finance the current strategic and budget issues. CPB maintains an active relationship with the Statewide University Council on Planning and Budget (UCPB) through its UCPB representative.</p> | <p>Up to 3 years</p> | <p>16 faculty, 2 undergraduates, 2 graduates, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Budget (ex-officio)</p> | <p>Reports to the Senate Liaises with the Statewide University Council on Planning and Budget</p> | <p>Recommendation to Chancellor and Senate agencies</p> |