

DRAFT Minutes FAP Meeting #10 AY2016-17
November 10th, 2016; 10 a.m. – 11 a.m.
Faculty Governance Conference Room-SL225

In Attendance: Tanja Dominko (Secretary), Tahar El-Korchi (Chair), Fabienne Miller, George Pins, Kristopher Sullivan - Assistant Vice President Academic Affairs

Absent: Jeffrey Solomon - Executive Vice President/CFO

Invited Guests: Alison Donta-Venman – Director of Institutional Research; Judi Trainor - Associate VP for Finance

1. Approval of the Agenda

Agenda was approved as distributed

2. Announcements

- More information on the 11 million dollar surplus and potential use

Chair El-Korchi inquired about any plans for use of the budget surplus of \$11.7M at the end of FY2015-16. Ms. Trainor explained that conservative budget predictions and sound fiscal management resulted in a large surplus this past year. She emphasized that WPI relies on these funds to supplement university reserves which are used for, among others, capital needs. Some of the capital needs occur during new Faculty hiring (new lab renovations, equipment...). A concern was raised that surplus may have been in part a consequence of unfunded academic requests from last year and that those requests should be considered for funding together with new capital needs.

- Update on Annual Planning and Budget Committee (APBP)

Chair El-Korchi (Chair of FAP is a member of APBP in addition to the Secretary of the Faculty, Prof. Richman, and an Appointee to the Board's Finance and Budget Committee, Prof. Craig Wills) reported that the schedule for the APBP meetings has been developed and the first meeting will take place on November 14th. By March 2017 general budget assumptions will be complete and the Board of Trustees will vote on the line item FY2017-18 budget at their meeting in May 2017.

The first APBP meeting will review all budgetary line variances from FY2015-16 that exceeded \$50K in projections (both Revenues and Expenses) leading to the surplus and take into consideration budgeting assumptions presented to the Board of Trustees during the November 2016 meeting (enrollment target range between 1,100 and 1,140, tuition increase between 3.1-3.5%, reducing draw on the endowment below 4.8%, proposed 15 new TTT hires plus one search from the prior which was unfilled, proposed salary increase pool between 2.5-3.5%). Further work of APBP will be to develop institutional needs that align with the Strategic Plan. Some of the main considerations in the upcoming year will be dedicated to initiatives including: Faculty support (positions, space, research accounting support...), upgrade Enterprise Resource Planning system – ERP possible (replacement of Banner), strategic plan goals, risk assessment, diversity and talent development, and information technology.

During last year's APBP process, active participation of Faculty representatives on the APBP was encouraged. While main budgetary requests are developed through the established academic structure (initial budget requests originate at department levels, proceed to the level of Deans and ultimately to the Provost's office for final recommendations), some of the academic budgetary considerations are overarching and cannot be addressed through this hierarchical structure. In particular, FAP identified an ongoing need for a proposal that will outline resources needed for growth of the Faculty. Mr. Sullivan stated that a comprehensive plan for growth of Faculty is being developed in collaboration with a COG subcommittee this year and will be presented to the COG by the end of February, and the proposal for a 1-year plan of faculty growth will be presented to APBP including a request for resources for the plan's implementation.

One FAP member underlined the importance of aligning the needs of all support services with those of the academic enterprise and was assured that there are opportunities for these discussions and budgetary request modifications during APBP meetings as representatives from all main divisions are present at the same time.

FAP also mentioned the need to better explain the amounts within the salary pool that are allocated to increases, incentives, bonuses, promotion, and equity adjustments. Due to large disparities in percent increases and other bonus/incentive pay between officers/key personnel (determined by the Board of Trustees) and Faculty/staff, there is a perception that the average 2.5 or 3.5% does not accurately represent what remains available for Faculty and staff salary increase. Ms. Trainor assured FAP that the percentage approved for salary increases accurately represents the amount that remains available for Faculty /staff increases.

3. Approval of Minutes from Meeting #9, October 27th, 2016
Minutes were approved as distributed
4. Development of a list of institutions for benchmarking (continued from previous meeting) – Alison Venman-Donta, Judi Trainor
In preparation for the conference call with Sibson Consulting, FAP and WPI administration has been discussing which schools would best represent the group of peers for comparative purposes for the upcoming faculty salary study, as well as for other benchmarking purposes. The committee agreed that the group should include peers as defined by several basic characteristics (STEM focus, Carnegie research classification, student enrollment, geographical location, etc.) and a separate group of aspirational institutions. Ms. Donta-Venman recommended that a combination of institutions that have been traditionally included in a variety of our benchmarking studies and institutions that we have recently identified as ones we compete against for students and Faculty would represent an appropriate group (Table 1).

Institution	US News and World Report 2016	Comparison of Financial indicators	Carnegie Class. 2015	AITU member	Academic Affairs comparison for the Board of Trustees	Leadership Retreat	Athletics	IPEDS data feedback report	USNWR top engineering	Admissions	HR	Faculty Salaries
WPI	60	❖	R2	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
MIT	7	❖	R1	❖	❖		❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
Carnegie Mellon University	24	❖	R1	❖	❖	❖		❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	39	❖	R2	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
Stevens Institute of Technology	71	❖	R2	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
Rochester Institute of Technology	107	❖	R3	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
Clarkson University	129	❖	R3	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
CalTech	12	❖	R1	❖				❖	❖		❖	❖
Brown University	14		R1					❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
Cornell University	15		R1					❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
Tufts University	27	❖	R1			❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
Case Western Reserve	37		R1	❖		❖		❖	❖		❖	❖
Boston University	39		R1			❖			❖	❖	❖	❖
Northeastern University	39		R1			❖			❖	❖	❖	❖
Umass Amherst	74		R1			❖			❖	❖	❖	❖
Virginia Tech	74		R1			❖			❖	❖	❖	❖
Dartmouth College	11		R2									
Wake Forest University	27		R2									
Lehigh University	44		R2			❖			❖	❖	❖	❖
Drexel University	96	❖	R2	❖		❖		❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
Illinois Institute of Technology	103	❖	R2	❖		❖		❖	❖		❖	❖
University of Dayton	111		R2									

Table 1. Institutions, their rankings and inclusion in benchmarking studies conducted for different purposes (column headings)

5. Adjourned at 11:10am

Tanja Dominko
Secretary