



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The December meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Monday, December 2, 2002, beginning at 5:00 PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Michael Payne will preside. If there are any amendments to the November, 2002 minutes, please send them to Andrea Halpern, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

AGENDA

1. Amendments to November 2002 minutes

2. Announcements and remarks by the President and members of his staff

Questions

a. What is the status of the "climate survey" that was conducted last Spring or Summer? Specifically, would he please provide at December's faculty meeting a detailed summary of the results of that survey to the faculty and also explain how these results will be distributed to the campus community and when that distribution will take place?

b. What change(s) are taking place in the way that "restricted" and "unrestricted" funds are being accounted for relative to the University's budgeting procedures? Why the change(s)?

3. Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty

4. Old Business

Motion from the Committee on Planning and Budget: Ben Marsh

The Committee on Planning and Budget proposes that its membership be expanded to include all five Vice Presidents (rather than the present three), and that the Faculty representative to the Trustee Finance committee be added as a fifth voting faculty member, and that a present non-voting student member be given a vote, and that the four elected faculty members be elected from the standard divisions (rather than at large).

This motion, an amendment to the *Faculty Handbook*, was introduced last month. See October 2002 Agenda for more information.

5.. New Business

a. Report from the Committee on Academic and Faculty Personnel: Allen Schweinsberg

i). Motion to amend the Faculty Handbook (jointly with Committee on Staff Planning)

We move that the following language be added to the final paragraph in the Faculty Handbook Personnel Policies section, part I.4.a.1.

In order to mitigate staffing problems that may result from aggregation of faculty leaves in one year, a department may request that an individual faculty member's sabbatical leave schedule be advanced as many as three years. All other considerations being equal, preference will be given to more senior faculty, and faculty who have not previously benefited from an advanced leave schedule will be given priority if further schedule changes are necessary. The request must be approved by the cognate Dean and the Provost/VPAA. It is expected that this remedy will be applied infrequently.

ii) Recommendation on Promotional Salary Increments: FAPC recommends that the salary increments that accompany promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor, currently \$1000, be increased to \$2000 and \$4000 respectively.

Rationale

(1) Promotional increments recognize and reward professional accomplishments and should be consonant with the scholarly and curricular significance of those accomplishments.

(2) A survey of other institutions, including the Northeast Deans' Schools, indicates that average promotional increments are approximately \$2000 and \$3000 respectively, although the variation from college to college is considerable.

3) Last year, Bucknell provided raises that substantially improved average salaries for associate and full professors. We need to sustain that gain and reduce future salary compression. The recommended increments also soften the salary gap that might exist between those who have just been promoted and those who are about to be promoted.

b. Report from the Committee on Staff Planning: Warren Abrahamson

Summary: In response to the university faculty's April 2002 charge, the Committee on Staff Planning (CSP) has considered options to reduce the current six-course annual load of the Bucknell faculty. The CSP has framed its discussions of course-load reduction with the overarching goal of sustaining, strengthening, and extending the quality of the undergraduate education that Bucknell University offers. To this end, the rationale for decreasing load includes pedagogical goals; making more faculty time available to students; enhancement of faculty recruitment, retention, and morale; and balancing teaching and scholarship. Four options are offered including (1) reduction to a five-course annual load with enough added faculty to protect curricular and class-size advantages; (2) move to smaller section sizes with enough added faculty to protect curricular and class-size advantages but with no reduction in annual course load; (3) more frequent paid sabbatical leaves with enough added faculty to protect curricular and class-size advantages but with no reduction in annual course load; and (4) provide teaching credit for a wider range of activities with no reduction in annual course load and with enough added faculty to protect curricular and class-size advantages. The CSP believes that the shift to a five-course (3-2) annual load provides the most benefits, and that the obstacles to its adoption, while appreciable, are surmountable.

The complete report is appended.

c. Motion from Prof. George Exner (offered as a private citizen, not chair of COI)

Motion: That no varsity team activity be allowed for varsity athletes between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. ("class hours") Monday through Friday, except as permitted by paragraphs A and B below. Excluded are all activities involving a member of the coaching staff or athletic department and more than one athlete, and any activity involving a member of the coaching staff and a single athlete if sports instruction is taking place. Also excluded are activities in which three or more athletes engage in training for the sport not in the presence of a member of the coaching staff, except strength and conditioning training as in paragraph A. Forbidden also is any regularly scheduled or recurring activity for the sport during these hours regardless of the number of athletes participating simultaneously, except as modified by paragraph A. Activities as described above are to be excluded, whether they are "required" or "optional" and both in and out of season. Paragraph C lists examples of such activities, but is not intended to cover all things excluded; paragraph D provides penalties and procedures in the event of non-compliance; paragraph E places upon the Committee on Athletics a reporting obligation.

A. Travel to and from games is permitted as necessary. Warm-up activities (for example, a noon shoot-around for basketball) on the day of a home contest are permitted, if each student athlete participates at a time not requiring missing a class or any portion of one (unless reasonable warm-up immediately prior to the contest itself requires it), and the total time period for any student is less than one and a half hours. Conditioning and strength training are permitted, as long as no coach is present and the students are in groups of no more than three.

B. Coaches or teams wishing single event exemption (for example, a sneaker sale) from this prohibition may petition the Committee on Athletics, at least one week in advance of the proposed date, and as long as the proposed event will not cause any student athlete to miss class. It is expected that CoA will try to approve up to two such requests in season and one out of season, per team, for activities not involving sports instruction or training. Petitions for practices (broadly defined) shall require a high standard of justification. Requests for more than two exemptions in season and one out of season should require increasingly high standards of "necessity," and in no event should CoA approve, for any single team, more than 6 exemptions during any academic year. CoA shall not approve any exemptions allowing for multiple or continuing violations of this policy without so reporting to the faculty as a whole at the first regularly scheduled faculty meeting following the approval. Such approval should be rare, to allow for duration of no more than one academic year, and the report to the faculty should include discussion of how steps will be taken to render such exemptions unnecessary in the future.

C. Examples of excluded activities include: team practice or subgroup practice (whether or not a coach is present), film sessions, and skills training (as defined by NCAA regulations), and any instruction in the sport or skills for the sport whatsoever. Activities by members of one varsity team for another (timing, scoring, or announcing, for example) during class hours are prohibited, whether or not labeled "voluntary." (Further, the times of reporting to and departing from such an activity are the relevant times, not merely the official start and finish of the contest.) This list is not intended to be complete; the binding language is "no varsity team activity."

D. Violations of this policy should be reported to the Committee on Athletics, which shall determine whether a violation has taken place, using procedures it will develop and publish. CoA shall have the right and obligation to protect the anonymity of any individual(s) reporting a violation should that be desired, although it should allow for reasonable (perhaps written) questioning by the coaching staff of those persons reporting violations. Should it be determined that a violation has taken place, penalties shall be imposed upon the relevant team as follows, along with such additional penalties as CoA shall deem proper. Further, any violation shall count, for one calendar year, as two of the exemptions allowed by paragraph B.

First violation (in any academic year): Warning. A letter, signed by all members of the coaching staff of the relevant team and the Athletic Director, shall be sent to CoA within two weeks of the finding, acknowledging that the team has been found guilty of a violation and guaranteeing future compliance with the policy.

Second violation (in any academic year): Loss of the right to practice during allowed hours for one day, in season. No further exemptions as considered in paragraph B to be allowed during the academic year. If violations carry the total number of exemptions (counting violations as two exemptions) in an academic year over 6, the excess shall be carried over and count against the allowable exemptions in the subsequent year(s).

Third and subsequent violations (in any academic year): Loss of the right to practice during allowed hours for double the number of days of the previous violation, in season. If violations carry the total number of exemptions (counting violations as two exemptions) in an academic year over 6, the excess shall be carried over and count against the allowable exemptions in the subsequent year(s). Further, a letter detailing the violations shall be forwarded by CoA to Bucknell's NCAA compliance office. This letter shall remain in the file of the relevant team for a period of five years.

CoA shall have the right to introduce further penalties for a continual pattern of violations for a particular team over the course of several academic years.

E. CoA shall provide a summary report to the faculty yearly on violations of this policy and the penalties incurred, via the usual mechanism for reports of CoA.

d. Report from Committee on Planning and Budget: Ben Marsh

The Committee on Planning and Budget makes the following recommendations for the 2003 – 04 fiscal year: that the comprehensive fee increase be 5.0 %, and that the faculty, administrative staff, and wage staff compensation increases each be 3.0 %.

Please note the year-end budget report from 2001 – 2002, which is an appendix to this agenda.

e. Reports from Faculty Representatives to the Board of Trustees

**ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION:
OPTIONS TO REDUCE THE COURSE LOAD OF BUCKNELL FACULTY**

COMMITTEE ON STAFF PLANNING

November 25, 2002

Introduction

The Bucknell campus has discussed the reasons and means to reduce the course load of faculty for some years. For example, the Planning & Budget (P & B) subcommittee produced a white paper during the spring of 1999 on the strategic importance of moving faculty from a six-course load to a five-course load and provided cost estimates to do so. Because P & B argued that course-load reduction would require the creation of new faculty lines, the Committee on Staff Planning (CSP) began discussions during the spring of 2001 of the rationale and means of reducing course loads, including estimations of the number of new faculty lines necessary. The CSP surveyed departments and programs in May 2001 relative to the potential impacts of a shift to a five-course per year teaching load. The findings of this CSP survey were reported to the faculty in April 2002, and in response, the university faculty directed the CSP, after consultation with other relevant committees, to present a set of options during the fall of 2002 on methods to reduce the current six-course per year teaching load of the faculty. Consequently, the CSP has been working towards that goal since early this semester. The CSP and the Academic Affairs Task Force for strategic planning share similar perspectives on the goals associated with course-load reduction. This report represents a summation of several years of discussions in the P & B subcommittee, the CSP, and elsewhere. Our list of options with a recommendation is based on the findings of the April 2002 CSP report to the faculty entitled "Results of 3-2 Teaching Load Survey" and CSP reviews of curricular plans for departments and programs.

Rationale

The CSP has framed its discussions of course-load reduction with the overarching goal of sustaining, strengthening, and extending the quality of the undergraduate education that Bucknell University offers. This goal includes making more faculty time available for teaching, enhancing faculty involvement outside the classroom, improving pedagogy, aiding the course-development process, attracting and retaining the best faculty, and increasing faculty participation in the Bucknell community. To this end, the rationale for decreasing the load includes (1) pedagogical goals; (2) making more faculty time available to students; (3) enhancement of faculty recruitment, retention, and morale; and (4) balancing teaching and scholarship.

Pedagogical goals

The percentage of faculty time devoted to classroom teaching has increased over the past decades – teaching today requires more time per course than it did a decade or two ago. This increase stems from many sources including the use of technology, preparation of visual teaching tools, use of group projects and collaborative learning, shifts in laboratory instruction from demonstration to investigative projects, adaptation of teaching techniques to address multiple learning styles of a diverse student body, commitment to interdisciplinary programs (e.g., Comparative Humanities, Environmental Studies, Women's and Gender Studies) and courses such as capstones, writing courses, and foundation seminars, need for assessment, and staying up-to-date in one's discipline given an explosion of information. In addition, more teaching today occurs outside the classroom. The Bucknell faculty, while continuing to eagerly accept the supervision of independent student research projects and mentoring of honors thesis research, must now find and support student internships and international study opportunities and direct Presidential Fellows. The faculty wants to continue to do what it does well, but it wants to do it even better.

Making more time available for students

Bucknell needs to encourage further faculty-student engagement outside the classroom through continued improvement of student advising and mentoring (e.g., independent student research projects, honors theses, Presidential Fellows), enhanced faculty interaction with student organizations, and increased faculty availability (e.g., more reliable office hours). The Bucknell faculty encourages itself to develop strong academic relationships with students. Bucknell students expect, and the faculty attempts to provide, the extensive personal contact outside the classroom that makes the difference between an adequate education and an outstanding one. As pointed out in

the P & B white paper – the faculty member who supervises several honors projects will spend a number of hours a week with each student; will spend additional time reading and commenting on drafts of the student’s work; and will find himself or herself thinking about the subjects at other times as well. Likewise, the faculty member who supervises a group of students in undergraduate research will spend many hours in the laboratory with the students each week; will read and critique the lab reports that the students prepare; will assist students in thinking through their approach to the problem; and will help lead students to a realistic understanding of a significant scientific problem. These forms of personal contact with faculty constitute the highest form of learning that Bucknell can afford our students. And they demand that the institution find ways to reduce the standard classroom-based teaching load. The Bucknell faculty needs to fulfill the expectations that students bring to our campus for their undergraduate experience, and Bucknell must support faculty commitment to personalized teaching and learning. The faculty is committed to every student that Bucknell admits; and the faculty is dedicated to helping each student be successful.

Enhancement of faculty recruitment, retention, and morale

Bucknell is committed to improving its ability to hire and retain the best possible faculty. The six-course load employed at Bucknell is the heaviest found among selective liberal arts colleges and universities. A comparison list of 37 institutions that includes our new frame-of-reference institutions and *US NEWS* top-tier liberal arts institutions, indicates that eight institutions (22%) have a four-course load (Amherst, Bowdoin, Lehigh, Sarah Lawrence, Smith, Villanova, Wellesley, and Wesleyan); 24 (65%) have a five-course load [Barnard, Bates, Bryn Mawr, Colby, Colgate, Connecticut College, Davidson, Franklin and Marshall, Grinnell, Hamilton, Haverford, Holy Cross, Lafayette, Macalester, Middlebury, Mt. Holyoke, Oberlin, Occidental, Pomona, Richmond, Swarthmore, Trinity, Williams, and Vassar]; one (3%) has a 5.5 course load (Kenyon); and only four (11%) have a six-course load (Bucknell, Carleton, Dickinson, and Union). Bucknell does not compare well with frame-of-reference institutions and *US NEWS* top-tier liberal arts institutions, and the university is competing for faculty with more institutions with lower teaching loads than it did a few years ago. As a consequence, Bucknell is losing highly qualified candidates and faculty to the competition more often in a marketplace that is more challenging than it was just a few years ago.

Balancing teaching and scholarship

The scholarly pursuits of the Bucknell faculty encourage passion for learning and provide the environment for undergraduate research. The 1999 Planning and Budget white paper argued that:

“Bucknell has high standards of scholarly productivity and its faculty is already producing scholarship at a rate and level of excellence that matches many of the selective liberal arts colleges with a five- or even four-course teaching load. Such research and publication activities contribute greatly to the reputation of the faculty and the university in general. However, the faculty struggles to balance the demands of writing grant proposals; conducting research; writing, submitting, and revising scholarly publications; advising and mentoring students; and performing essential service for the university while teaching a six-course load.”

The university’s appreciation and understanding of the benefits of scholarship to effective instruction has increased over the past decades. However, the time available for this activity has decreased as other demands on faculty have increased. Scholarly activities have become a pressured and uncompensated pursuit of summers and semester breaks, which inhibit considered preparation for teaching in the following semester, or time for scholarship must be “stolen” from time needed for teaching. The present load is felt to be debilitating by many members of the Bucknell faculty, given the difficulty of sustaining a program of scholarship during the academic year over and above the six-course teaching load. An institution with high standards of scholarly productivity must support the scholarly activities of its faculty, both to enable junior faculty members to establish a program of research and scholarship early in their career and to encourage tenured faculty to remain committed to their scholarly programs and to continue to contribute to the state of knowledge in their fields. A five-course load will make members of the Bucknell faculty better able to conduct themselves at the level of excellence that is expected of them.

The options for course-load reduction considered and the recommendation made by the CSP are based on the explicit assumption of no expectation of increased scholarship but rather on an improved balance between teaching and scholarship. The objective is to generate a more reasonable balance between teaching and scholarship – given that scholarship is forced to the margins when teaching takes so much time.

Risks associated with course-load reduction

There are risks associated with course-load reduction, including curricular losses (i.e., loss of elective courses, loss of sections from introductory courses), increase in mean class size due to the loss of courses and sections, and decreased faculty availability. Bucknell will need to formulate clear expectations of faculty work, availability, and presence on campus if it moves to a five-course load. It has been the experience of some campuses that the transition to a reduced course load has exacerbated the tendency of some faculty to consolidate their teaching in order to keep some days free for off-campus activities.

Bucknell must assure that all departments and programs have a comparable ability to introduce the five-course load and still cover the central curriculum. Similarly Bucknell must assure that this transition does not reduce the ability or willingness of faculty to contribute to general education and interdisciplinary teaching. The university must preserve appropriate balance between upper-level and lower-level courses, and the balance between specialized disciplinary courses and all-university teaching. Bucknell must make every effort to ensure equitable institution of course-load reduction among faculty. Bucknell must communicate clearly that the university is NOT contemplating an upward shift in the scholarly expectations associated with reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

The following four tables outline the major strengths and weaknesses of the four most viable options among the options discussed by the CSP. Also included for each option are important practical considerations associated with a given option. There are substantial costs associated with each option and the benefits of the options vary. The CSP discussions resulted in a clear recommendation, which follows the four options. Finally the CSP provides a rough estimate of the annual cost of its recommendation.

Options to Accomplish a Reduction

| Option | Strengths | Weaknesses | Practical Considerations |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>(1) Reduction to five-course annual load with enough added faculty to protect curricular and class-size advantages¹.</p> | <p>Increased interactions with students outside the classroom.</p> <p>Benefit accrues during the academic year, to provide time for improving teaching and pedagogy when teaching occurs.</p> <p>Provides opportunity to strengthen parts of the curriculum – through allocation of new faculty lines.</p> <p>Easy to understand to an audience outside Bucknell as well as on campus.</p> <p>Aid to recruitment and retention of faculty.</p> <p>Better enable faculty to conduct itself at the level of teaching and scholarly excellence that is expected of them.</p> <p>Make more faculty time available to participate in college-wide and university-wide service that would enhance the undergraduate experience.</p> <p>Enhances morale.</p> <p>Endorsed by a majority of departments and programs.</p> | <p>Advantages to students are less obvious than other options – must work to make advantages occur.</p> <p>Faculty could become less available to students if faculty cluster teaching on fewer days and spend more time off campus.</p> <p>Course caps will have to increase – potentially a 10% increase in average course enrollments.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts to departments, programs, and faculty members will vary since not every department or program will gain staff.</p> | <p>Requires new faculty positions. Preliminary estimates based on the CSP “3-2 Teaching Load Survey” indicate that this option is workable with roughly 19-20 new faculty positions along with associated office and/or laboratory space needs. Bucknell has the capacity to accommodate 19-20 new offices without a new building.</p> <p>All current teaching releases will need to be reconsidered to reclaim approximately 50% of released courses. Fewer course releases would add to the teaching pool to mitigate curricular losses.</p> <p>Faculty members would be able to teach fewer elective upper-level courses and fewer courses with six or fewer students.</p> <p>Must actively work to develop ways to ascertain whether five-course load is increasing faculty availability to students outside the classroom, enhancing faculty commitment to students, and improving pedagogy.</p> <p>Need to balance course offerings across semesters.</p> <p>Temporary replacement faculty would teach a six-course load given no advising, no participation in the governance process, and lower scholarly expectations.</p> |

¹ Reduction to 5.5-course annual load may be an intermediate implementation step, as it would require about half the number of added faculty as the five-course load.

| Option | Strengths | Weaknesses | Practical Considerations |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>(2) <u>Move to smaller section sizes with enough added faculty to protect curricular and class-size advantages but with no reduction in annual course load.</u></p> | <p>Smaller section sizes, which reduces the load per course.</p> <p>Increases teaching effectiveness in each class.</p> <p>Helps students more than faculty.</p> <p>Can be implemented stepwise.</p> | <p>An expensive option given the return – even with as many new faculty lines as option #1, it would decrease average class size by only 2 students. Thirty new faculty lines would produce only a 10% mean class-size reduction and new lines can't be distributed equally across campus.</p> <p>Less value to faculty than moving to a five-course annual load.</p> <p>Does not relieve the fixed-costs of teaching associated with a class of any size – i.e., lecture time, class and examination preparations.</p> <p>Value to faculty differs by department or program.</p> <p>Less obvious advantage for recruitment given that candidates are less aware of class size as a recruitment issue.</p> | <p>Same issues regarding staffing as option #1</p> <p>Bucknell would adopt reduced class-size caps.</p> <p>Faculty would be expected to revise pedagogy to benefit students if the realized class-size reduction for a given course is meaningful.</p> |

| Option | Strengths | Weaknesses | Practical Considerations |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>(3) <u>More frequent paid sabbatical leaves with enough added faculty to protect curricular and class-size advantages but with no reduction in annual course load. For example, a 4- or 5-year cycle (i.e., one semester leave after six semesters of teaching).</u></p> | <p>Appreciably increases the time available for focused research and course development.</p> <p>Clear benefit in recruitment</p> <p>Some curricular enhancements and addition of faculty lines may be possible if new faculty positions were made available via permanent sabbatical-replacement positions.</p> <p>Simple to institute, lower salary costs of replacement faculty saves money.</p> | <p>Increased time is available when faculty member is <u>NOT</u> teaching – negating most benefits of load reduction to students.</p> <p>Does not make more time available for student mentoring and advising</p> <p>Relies on less-well prepared instructors when temporary replacement faculty is hired.</p> <p>Dangers to common curricular efforts (e.g., Foundation Seminars, Capstones) – temporary staff does not often teach such courses – this option would shift more work to fewer tenured faculty given sabbatical leave absences.</p> <p>More frequent disruption to curriculum and advising.</p> <p>Damages department planning, administrative planning, and university governance given that temporary faculty members do not participate in the governance process.</p> <p>Potentially fragments the faculty because of increased coming and going of faculty from leaves.</p> <p>Financial costs of recruiting and increased faculty time and energy spent recruiting temporary staff.</p> | <p>Some portion of the sabbatical leave would be devoted to activities that would benefit students or pedagogy; possibly alternating sabbatical leaves focused on research with ones directed at benefiting students</p> |

| Option | Strengths | Weaknesses | Practical Considerations |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p>(4) <u>Provide teaching credit for a wider range of activities</u> (student research, mentoring honors students, large class size, new courses) with no reduction in annual course load and with enough added faculty to protect curricular and class-size advantages.</p> | <p>Responds specifically to where instructional pressure is strongest. Can be implemented stepwise.</p> | <p>The quality of student projects may decline given the pressures to enroll independent research students in order to gain teaching credit. May not benefit the majority of faculty since a few departments use this approach already. Creates equity issues as it pits faculty members against one another to compete for students. Not available in many departments/programs unless additional faculty members are provided, as no course can be dropped. Option may effectively reduce course load without any staff additions – the consequence would be erosion of the curriculum.</p> | <p>Requires new faculty positions to protect curriculum. Implementation would include considerable attention to reducing inequities.</p> |

Recommendation

The CSP believes that the shift to a five-course (3-2) load provides the most benefits, and that the obstacles to its adoption, while appreciable, are surmountable. New faculty lines would be needed to offset partially the loss of elective courses, loss of sections within larger courses, and to minimize the increase in average class size. New faculty positions would be allocated to departments or programs through normal CSP procedures. Because of the need for an estimated 19-20 new faculty lines, a transition period of 5 years or more may be necessary to move all faculty members from the current six-course load to a five-course load. This transition period may include a 5.5 course-load as an intermediate step to full implementation of the five-course load. The estimate that 19-20 new faculty lines are needed is based on the assumption that all current teaching releases will be reconsidered and that approximately 50% of released courses will be reclaimed. Fewer course releases would add to the teaching pool to mitigate curricular losses. Implementation will require that the Committees on Instruction and Planning and Budget help to refine the goals and expectations associated with a shift to a five-course load and to see the magnitude of new resources needed for full implementation.

Financial Implications

The financial implications of a shift to a five-course load are substantial. Costs of salaries and benefits associated with the addition of 19-20 new faculty lines are estimated to be approximately \$100,000 per year per position for a total cost of approximately \$2,000,000 per year (or approximately \$600 per student per year). Additional costs would be associated with renovation of office and laboratory spaces for new faculty as well as teaching and scholarly support for new faculty.

Report on Fiscal Year 2001-02 Committee on Planning and Budget

The Committee on Planning and Budget is providing this report on the University Operating Budget results for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2002 (FY2001-02).

FY2001-02 Budget Results

As shown below, Bucknell ended FY2001-02 with an unrestricted surplus of \$246,000. **Tuition & Fees** varied due to a slightly larger than anticipated Class of 2005 and a greater than anticipated number of students returning for the Spring 2002 semester. The variances in the **Sponsored Research & Programs** area, where both revenues and related expenses varied significantly, are due to the timing of research activities. The large negative variance in **Auxiliary Enterprise Revenues** (Dining Services, Residence Halls, Bookstore, Summer Conferences) is an indication of continued competition from external sources. The variance in **Other Expenses** (which includes the day-to-day operating budgets for most departments and programs) is attributable to smaller unrestricted and restricted variances that occur across the University.

| | 2001-02 BUDGET (\$000) | 2001-02 ACTUAL (\$000) | 2001-02 VARIANCE (\$000) |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| <u>REVENUES:</u> | | | |
| TUITION & FEES | \$ 87,363 | \$ 87,982 | \$ 619 |
| SPONSORED RESEARCH & PROGRAMS | 1,364 | 2,703 | 1,339 |
| GIFTS AND GRANTS | 10,034 | 9,962 | (72) |
| SPENDABLE ENDOWMENT INCOME | 17,580 | 17,709 | 129 |
| OTHER REVENUES | 6,024 | 6,396 | 372 |
| POST CAMPAIGN & OTHER FINANCING | 1,740 | 1,580 | (160) |
| AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES | <u>22,161</u> | <u>21,229</u> | <u>(932)</u> |
| TOTAL REVENUES | \$ 146,266 | \$ 147,561 | \$ 1,295 |
| <u>EXPENDITURES AND ALLOCATIONS</u> | | | |
| COMPENSATION | \$ 66,453 | \$ 65,930 | (523) |
| TOTAL FINANCIAL AID | 28,083 | 27,346 | (737) |
| SPONSORED RESEARCH & PROGRAMS | 1,204 | 2,211 | 1,007 |
| INFORM. TECH. & INFORM. RESRS. | 4,668 | 4,632 | (36) |
| UTILITIES AND FUELS | 3,796 | 2,956 | (840) |
| OTHER OPERATING EXPENSES | 25,855 | 27,341 | 1,486 |
| RETIREE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE | 3,201 | 2,983 | (218) |
| BUDGETED ALLOCATIONS | 12,082 | 12,206 | 124 |
| BUDGETED CONTINGENCY | <u>924</u> | <u>-</u> | <u>(924)</u> |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND ALLOCATIONS | \$ 146,266 | \$ 145,605 | \$ (661) |
| EXCESS REVENUES (DEFICIT) | \$ - | \$ 1,956 | \$ 1,956 |
| EXCESS RESTRICTED REVENUES | | \$ 1,710 | |
| EXCESS UNRESTRICTED REVENUES | | \$ 246 | |

Comparison of FY2001-02 to FY2000-01

As indicated in the FY2000-01 Budget Results Report, FY2000-01 was the last year we will realize a significant unrestricted surplus. In FY2001-02 the unrestricted surplus dropped to \$246,000, and FY2002-03 will be even tighter.

| | 2001-02 (\$000) | 2000-01 (\$000) |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Total Revenues | \$147,561 | \$136,604 |
| Total Expenses | \$145,605 | \$134,663 |
| Total Excess Revenue | \$1,956 | \$1,941 |
| Excess Restricted Revenue | \$1,710 | \$900 |
| Excess Unrestricted Revenue | \$246 | \$1,041 |

Disposition of Excess Revenues

Excess **Restricted** revenues must remain in the program for which the funds were received, and must be expended within the guidelines set forth by the donor/grantor during future fiscal years. Historically, any excess **Unrestricted** revenue is moved to the University's quasi- endowment. However, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, unrestricted revenues can be allocated for specific purposes.