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Making certain that the percentage of funding allocated to the academic enterprise from centrally allocated funds represents the university’s commitment to the mission of academic excellence, innovation and success, which defines and invigorates the academic initiatives of a Carnegie-designated, tier-1 research intensive institution.
Five Core Academic Operations Recommendations for Base-Funding:

- Direct and Indirect Activities that Support the Colleges’ Academic Mission
- Non-Revenue Generating Units
- Merit-Based Scholarships
- Provost Performance Funding
- Provost Initiatives
➢ That non-academic expenditures (i.e. facility rentals, building maintenance and upkeep, security) should not be considered a part of the direct and indirect activities of the academic colleges, thus, not funded through central allocations to the Colleges or IDC.

➢ The more resources allocated to all of the Deans (Colleges, Library and Honors) will provide the Deans more flexibility to achieve student and faculty success measures, including those aligned with “50 in 5” strategic initiatives.
The overall academic operations budget should be allocated via a developed model that must have general guidelines/principals for a fair and transparent distribution and must be the responsibility of the Provost’s Office. Considerations include:

- Develop fixed, base-funded allocations for direct/indirect and non-revenue generating units
- Create a merit-based model (revisit budget at year end) that recognizes effort/reward instead of entitlement
- Investigate the benefits/challenges of an allocation model based on SCH vs Revenue Generating
- Consider a College funding/allocation model based on enrollment
The overall academic operations budget should be allocated via a developed model that must have general guidelines/principals for a fair and transparent distribution and must be the responsibility of the Provost’s Office. Considerations include:

- Create base funds allocation for annual performance funding to Colleges
- Create base funds allocation for Provost academic initiatives
- Create allocations to non-revenue generating units that are commensurate with the institutional mission and vision for the unit (i.e., if the Library is to be one of the best in the nation, then funding must reflect that mission)
Recommendations:

- Merit-based scholarships should be centrally funded with a gradual increase commensurate to the increase in student enrollment.

- Consideration given to whether merit-based scholarships should be a function of and funded by Academic Affairs as opposed to Enrollment Management.

- Minimum base-funded number merit-based scholarships to be allocated to each college - *(additional scholarships from college philanthropic activity)*
Recommendations:

- Funding from undergraduate tuition should include fall, spring and summer instruction, interdisciplinary classes and minors.

- Differentiate ‘Core’ classes from others - Funding is needed to ensure quality instruction in core courses such that delivery by colleges/departments is incentivized or rewarded.

- Funding Student support services such as advising, tutoring, and career counseling are essential to promote engagement, academic performance, and timely progress. As enrollments have increased, additional funding is needed to properly support the students.
Recommendations:

Graduate Tuition Should Be Allocated Differently From Undergraduate Tuition

- The per-student costs of instruction/training are considerably higher due to different instructional, administrative, facilities, personnel, accreditation, and national ranking systems demands.

- Additional needs and demands are unit-specific and may be program-specific, which should be considered when forming the allocation model.

- Differences are somewhat reflected in the weighted credit hours and special professional tuition, so computing the differentials may not be a large challenge.
Recommendations:

Professional School Tuition Should Be Allocated Differently From Graduate Tuition

- The per-student costs of instruction/training are considerably higher due to different instructional, administrative, facilities, personnel, accreditation, and national ranking systems demands.

- Additional needs and demands are unit-specific and may be program-specific, which should be considered when forming the allocation model.

- A higher proportion of allocation than for graduate allocation (perhaps 100%) to the unit to cover the real costs associated with program administration to avoid special tuitions.

- Consider the cost of instructional, administrative, facilities, personnel, accreditation, and national ranking systems demands, faculty and student licensures, tracking graduates for accreditation reports, career development/advising, etc.
Recommendations:

Graduate Tuition Reimbursements (GTF) Should Be Allocated Differently From Institutional and External Sources

- GTF funding should be part of the base budget allocation, for stability and consistency year to year
- Partly funded based on enrollment (more grad students results in more GTF);
- Funding model should include grants and development funding for the disciplines and departments that have opportunity for GTF through grants
- Development funding for graduate student tuition support through endowed tuition scholarships
Recommendation:

- Summer school should be incorporated into a yearly model that treats spring, summer and fall as equal academic semesters or terms.

- Base-funds for summer school should reflect an allocation model where colleges receive an allocation commensurate to the amount that college generates.
Recommendations:

- Funding remains consistent at 80-20 split and should be maintained.
- Funding for Honors and the Libraries represent “common goods” for entire university community; thus, funding model should take into account services provided university-wide.
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Recommendation:

- Fund the Libraries collections inflation based upon the Library Journal Price Increase Data

- Assign an amount per undergraduate, graduate and professional student based on enrollment. Enrollment variations would be reflected using a three-year, rolling average, buffered.

- Provide annual consultations between the Libraries and Provost’s Office regarding success measures, operational changes and new program support. Part of the cost of adding additional colleges and programs should include the library resources (people and/or collections)

Nonrevenue Generating Unit:

Library
Recommendation:

- Annual funding consultations between the Provost and the Dean of the Honors College about changes in the College's operational obligations and environment and in the role of the College in supporting University priorities and mandates.

- Provide funds for the development and promotion of critical NTT faculty who are not eligible for University-wide programs.

- Funding for space adequate to the needs of a College that has increased its enrollment by 130% over the past 10 years.
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