

**MINUTES OF THE RC MANAGERS MEETING**  
**September 26, 2013**  
**9:00 a.m. – Noon, 107/108 Eagle Commons**

Present: L. Campbell, P. Fackler, J. Foster, J. Geiger, D. Katis, T. Latour, S. Puleio, R. Puller, C. Reber, D. Sobina, H. Tripp, T. Varsek, and K. Whitney. Also attending were J. Gant (Item #1), R. Griffin for B. Bailey, and R. Logue (Item #2).

Minutes The minutes of the RC Managers Meeting of August 19, 2013 were approved as drafted.

Agenda Items

1. Workforce Plan and Potential Impact on Future Faculty/Staff Minority Hires

K. Whitney noted comments submitted on the proposed workforce plan and the statement of the African American Caucus presented to the university trustees regarding the impact of the plan on diversity. J. Gant distributed a handout that reflected a chart from the workforce plan related to positions targeted for retrenchment or furlough or to be left vacant and a second chart outlining tenure positions to be hired.

K. Whitney noted that the APSCUF collective bargaining agreement made no provisions for diversity. She further noted that she had asked J. Gant to meet with B. Bailey and R. Nowaczyk on the diversity concerns. RC Managers shared updates on searches within their areas. T. Latour discussed a search for a Library position slated for a January 2014 hire. He discussed the difficulty of attracting people of color, noting that applicants tended to be women and Asian. J. Foster discussed problems with getting a critical Biochemistry position in his college posted due to statewide APSCUF issues. He noted that he would keep K. Whitney apprised of the progress of the search. R. Puller indicated that the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders was in the very early stages of a search. K. Whitney asked RC Managers to forward to her any ideas for addressing diversity concerns related to the workforce plan.

**ACTION: RC Managers will forward to K. Whitney suggestions for addressing diversity concerns related to the workforce plan.**

2. Performance Funding

K. Whitney announced that the university had received a slight increase in performance funding over the prior year. She indicated that R. Moneta had been working on the distribution of this year's award to the RCs that had contributed to the achievement of various performance targets.

Regarding the funding awarded on the private support measure, K. Whitney indicated her preference for once again taking all those dollars and applying them to capital campaign need. She advised that it may be necessary to come back to the RCs for additional capital campaign funding. She also noted that for the funding awarded on the optional measure related to student learning assessment, which had earned \$141,000, she wanted to use \$12,000-13,000 off the top for costs related to the administration of the ETS Proficiency survey, with the remaining funds going to the RCs.

R. Logue noted that the university had done well on the measure related to closing the first-time freshman achievement gap for Pell eligible and under-represented minority (URM) students, but not in retaining those students. She further indicated that IMIR believed that in calculating 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> year retention, PASSHE had used old data and that the numbers should be revisited. She added that given the university's already high level of faculty productivity, RC managers might want to consider a different indicator, such as NSSE outcomes.

P. Fackler observed that while the university had earned roughly 7% of PASSHE Performance Funding, the actual dollar award was closer to 5% since its distribution is tied to appropriation. K. Whitney noted that the arrival of the new Chancellor could result in some fiscal policy changes.

### 3. Budget and BRIC Updates

P. Fackler reported that the university's Council of Trustees had approved the FY14 university budget at its September 19, 2013 meeting. He shared copies of the FY14 Budget Report presented to the trustees at their budget workshop, also on the 19<sup>th</sup>. He noted that enrollment was critical to helping the university deal with unfunded mandates related to union agreements and that both a sense of urgency and sense of discipline were needed in meeting those challenges.

P. Fackler noted that he and T. Varsek would be attending a Faculty Senate meeting in two weeks to brief that group on the budget. K. Whitney asked the RC Managers to notify P. Fackler or T. Varsek if they knew of other units that would like to meet with F&A leaders. K. Whitney also commended P. Fackler for a well-written budget report.

T. Latour asked why the budget report noted a deficit of \$4.6 million when P. Fackler had indicated earlier that the university deficit would be \$6-7 million. P. Fackler explained that the budget presented to the trustees was required to follow PASSHE guidelines vs. General Accounting Standards Board (GASB) principles. As a result, he noted, the trustees' version of the budget did not reflect post-retirement benefits and compensated absences and was, therefore, not a full-cost budget. He offered to bring a full-cost version of the FY14 budget to a future RC Managers meeting. He also reminded the RC Managers of a special meeting scheduled for Tuesday, October 1, 2013, at which RC revenue budgets would be distributed. T. Latour also asked to see closeout data for FY13. T. Varsek noted that the closeout had not yet been finalized.

Turning to a discussion of the Budget Review and Implementation Committee (BRIC), P. Fackler shared concerns about the structure of the group and the limited budget background of many of its members. P. Fackler also shared the criticisms of one BRIC member regarding his [P. Fackler's] role as the convener of BRIC meetings and changes to the original BRIC document supposedly made by PEC. Some RC Managers reported that representatives of their units on the BRIC had been troubled by the behavior of the one BRIC member and that they wanted P. Fackler to remain with the group. Other RC Managers noted that the BRIC had never been viewed as having decisional authority but rather had been considered an advisory group. P. Fackler noted that he planned to meet one-on-one with the disgruntled BRIC member. K. Whitney asked P. Fackler to hold off on any changes to the BRIC structure.

**ACTION: P. Fackler will meet with the BRIC member who voiced criticisms of the BRIC structure and RC Budgeting Manual.**