



FACULTY SENATE

Financial & Physical Planning Committee

December 3, 2018 2:00 – 3:30 pm
Waterman 427A

Minutes

Present: Steven Ades (COM), Andrew Barnaby (CAS), Bryan Dague (CESS), Terri Donovan (RSENr), Jackie Gillen (GSS), Joel Goldberg (CAS), Timothy Higgins (LCOM), Charlotte Malling (SGA), Cathy Paris (Faculty Senate President),

Absent: Steven Ades (COM), Teresa Cahill-Griffin (CNHS), Laura Gewissler (LIB), Joanne Pencak (GSB), Don Ross (CALS)

Guests: Thomas Chittenden

The meeting was called to order by chair Barnaby at 2:01 pm in Waterman 427A

1. **Approval of October 15th and November 5, 2018 Minutes.** The minutes of the October 15th 2018 and November 5, 2018 were approved as written.
2. **Chair Spring 2019.** Andrew will be stepping down as the chair of the FPPC. The committee will elect a chair to finish the year. The Faculty Senate Office will send out a call for nominations, then will conduct an electronic election.
3. **First-Year Residential Learning Community Courses Proposals.** The committee discussed the three proposals.

Proposal A

1. All courses taught through as part of Residential Learning Communities will be 1-credit courses. Two exceptions:
 - a) courses taught in the Honors College
 - b) courses taught as part of learning communities that for the most part aim to enroll students from just a single college (e.g. Dean's Signature programs in CAS)
2. student credit hour (or multiplier) for all such courses will be weighted at 1.3

Proposal B

1. All the algorithm 1 revenue generated by the teaching of courses as part of the Residential Learning Communities (RLCs) will be pooled in a single fund (for two exceptions, see Proposal A.1). That fund will be administered by Residential Life (RL).**

* Note: this means that the money will not be allocated through the normal algorithm 1 methodology, which would distribute funds from undergraduate net tuition to the degree-granting colleges (Responsibility Centers or RCs).

** There needs to be a FYE committee set up with oversight authority over this money.

2. RL will distribute 80% the money* in that fund equally to each RLC. This distribution could either be a fixed dollar amount per student enrolled in the RLC or fixed dollar amount per RLC + a fixed dollar amount per student.

* This is just an example; the percentage could be higher or lower.

3. The remainder of the money in the fund (20%*) will be distributed equally to the sponsoring RCs of the various RLCs to help cover costs associated with that sponsorship. This distribution could either be a fixed dollar amount per student enrolled in the RLC or fixed dollar amount per RLC + a fixed dollar amount per student.

* This is just an example; the percentage could be higher or lower.

Proposal C

1. Responsibility Centers (RCs) receive revenue at the value of ONE student credit hour (SCH) for every first-time / first-year (FTFY) student who enrolls in that unit. Under the IBB model, this revenue is generated by all the students signing up for a 1-credit course “offered” in the unit in which they are enrolled in their first semester at UVM.

2. Of that revenue, the RCs are assessed at a rate of 60%* (e.g. \$300 of \$500); that money is directed to Residential Life (RL) as a “student fee”**.

* This is just an example; the percentage could be higher or lower.

** There needs to be a FYE committee set up with oversight authority over this money.

3. RL allocates two-thirds* of its funds** to the RCs offering Residential Learning Communities (RLC) - affiliated courses with the understanding that the RCs will use the funds in support of instruction and associated programming in the RLCs. For the two exceptions***, see Proposal A.1.

* This is an estimate (amount could be higher or lower). But based on the example above, \$200 of the original \$500 would be allocated by this method.

** The money should be allocated so that each RLC roughly gets the same \$/student. This could either be a fixed dollar amount per student enrolled in the RLC or fixed dollar amount per RLC + a fixed dollar amount per student.

*** The Honors College (HC) is not included because it is not an RC (and it is funded as a Support Center). But students enrolled in the HC would still be included in the headcount for the purposes of setting the revenue for FTFY students per RC.

4. Whatever else an RLC does by way of programming, it will offer a 0-credit (or non-credit bearing) course to students who join it. The course will be graded pass/fail.

5. The remaining one-third* of the funds directed to RL will be used to support general programming / staffing covering all the RLCs.

* This is an estimate (amount could be higher or lower). But based on the example above, \$100 of the original \$500 would be allocated by this method.

6. The portion of the original revenue not directed from RCs to RL (in example above, \$200 of \$500) would be used to support FTFY students who do not enroll in an RLC. As more students enroll in RLCs, this number should go down until it gets close to zero (at least, that would be the desired outcome).

The committee will continue conversations via e-mail and will bring a proposal to the Faculty Senate Executive meeting in December with the intention of presenting at the December Faculty Senate meeting.

4. **New business.** There was no new business at this time.

5. Adjourn 3:30pm

FPPC	
Monday	
2:00-3:30	
1/7/19	327
2/4/19	427a
3/4/19	427a
4/8/19	427a
5/6/18	427a