

**Budget and Planning Council  
Year End Report  
5/11/2010**

**Standing charges:**

1. Recommend University budget policy and overall direction.
2. Advise and prioritize in matters related to institutional planning and finance.
3. Examine and review the institution's proposed budget.
4. Work with the administration in resolving fiscal concerns.

**Report on Standing Charges:**

Over the past year and a half, the Senate Council on Budget and Planning has increasingly focused on planning for the University's future. The following are the Council's recommendations, with rationales:

- **The University needs a succinct and far-sighted vision plan.**

While the University's mission statement effectively summarizes its rationale for being and its operational philosophies, the vision statement (i.e., a projection of the institution at a future point in time) is not a vision statement. It is an overly long and largely meaningless statement which assumes the maintenance of the *status quo*. *The Budget and Planning Council of the Senate is of the opinion that this assumption is not valid. To fully achieve its potential, the University must articulate a clear and distinct vision which will guide its future development.*

- **The faculty needs representation on the President's Cabinet. This would enable us to be "at the table" when long term plans and budgets are discussed.**

The Council has a member who is a faculty liaison to the Board of Trustees' Finance and Audit committee. In addition, there is administration representation on the Council. Therefore we are well aware of what is happening in the present budget. However, at present we have no role in planning future budgets. Faculty representation on the President's Cabinet might enable us to have an active role in planning and the budget. *The President's cabinet should include two faculty representatives: the president of the Academic Senate, and the chair of the Senate's Budget and Planning Council.*

- **The University needs a Strategic Plan which links the Academic Plan and the budget plan.**

Over the years, considerable effort has been devoted to the development of a number of planning documents:

- Comprehensive Analysis (1995)
- Student Success Plan (2001)
- Facilities Master Plan (2003)
- Academic Plan (2007)
- Assessment Plan (2008)

However, these have been developed essentially independently of any overall institutional strategic plan. The Academic Plan comes closest to serving this purpose. There is clearly little to be gained (in a strategic or financial sense) by developing new programs in an area which is ultimately not consistent with the University's overall vision and strategic plan. In addition, in planning for the expansion of academic programs, there needs to be serious cognizance taken of the fiscal impact of the expansion, rather than just claiming that everything will rely entirely on "existing resources. This should be done with an awareness that overall funds are very limited, so that dollars spent in one area are necessarily taken away from other areas.

- **Most of our budget now comes from tuition. We need to determine if there is a long term enrollment plan consistent with a new vision and the academic goals of the institution. If so, what is it?**

Publicly funded educational institutions (such as William Paterson University) are likely to face growing challenges in the years ahead due to:

- Reduced state funding
- Increased building costs
- Limited potential for increased student fees
- Increased faculty, administrative, and maintenance costs, and
- Limited enrollment growth

Since most of our budget comes from tuition, there will be the temptation to grow enrollment as much as possible. This might be a good plan, but it should be an open plan. We should also investigate if each College and Department within the University should have unrestricted growth. Some Colleges have decreased enrollment in the past ten years, and others have grown. If faculty and resources are not reallocated, should we not look at micro-enrollment across the University?

In addition, while it may well be possible to increase WPU's local enrollment in the years ahead, a potential for real growth lies overseas. WPU could establish itself as a unique international institution recruiting thousands of students from overseas pursuing specialized qualifications. For instance, active recruitment of students from India for the Biotechnology programs could possibly be very successful. Similar recruitment from India and China for certain College of Business programs would also work well. If this strategy works, of course additional resources would have to be given to the departments and programs which would have an influx of international students.

- **Continued development and marketing of the Honors Program**

By fully developing this concept and differentiating it from the standard programs (in terms of flexibility, mode of teaching, etc.) it could be developed into a unique and marketable feature of WPU. The Honors Program needs more institutional support. It needs more support for its administration. It needs a "home" – a visible and attractive location. In addition, it needs to be larger. We have many excellent students who are not part of the Honors Program. *It is possible that the Honors Program could be expanded into every department, to allow excellent students in each department to graduate with honors in the major.*

- **Continue to invest in and market the University's emphasis on student satisfaction**

Problems in customer service (including the Registrar's Office, Admissions, the Bursar's Office, the advising system, parking facilities, and BANNER) directly impact on the satisfaction of students. *With an appropriate investment in both systems and personnel, and the establishment of quantifiable goals and objectives, customer service could be turned into a marketable center of excellence for the University.* Through surveys, we are able to define areas of service that are determined as excellent by our students (such as the Library). We need to hold the other areas up to this standard.

- **Academic Centers of Excellence**

The Budget and Planning Council has frequently discussed, and agreed upon the concept of Academic Centers of Excellence (i.e., those areas of the University that are clearly leaders in their field) to which "additional" available funding would be allocated so that they could be aggressively promoted.. These Centers of Excellence could be identified using either the Middle States Report or a new Comprehensive Analysis.

## **Conclusion:**

The University has already evolved a number of times. In 1855, it began as Paterson City Normal School in response to the growing demand for professional preparation of teachers in Paterson. In 1923, the State Legislature passed an act establishing the New Jersey State Normal School at Paterson and, in 1937, the name was changed to the New Jersey State Teachers College at Paterson and a degree-granting curriculum was established.

In 1957, the college, by state mandate, was transformed into a multipurpose liberal arts college and in 1971 the institution became The William Paterson College of New Jersey. Finally, in 1997, based on the quality and breath of the faculty and its academic, cultural, and community service programs, the institution became The William Paterson University of New Jersey.

Each of these changes represented critical steps in the evolution of the William Paterson University and, given the forces threatening education today, the Budget and Planning Council believes that the time is ripe for a further major evolutionary step.

Given the nature of the competitive market and the likelihood that State funding will fall increasingly short of the level needed, William Paterson University has to address two critical questions:

- What is unique about William Paterson University? What is its distinctive competence?
- Why would students attend WPU as opposed to Montclair, Ramapo, etc.?

It is often said of William Paterson University that it is one of the best-kept secrets in New Jersey. Despite this, it offers students:

- Outstanding facilities.
- A highly qualified faculty.
- An administration which actively works to improve the support of students, and
- A number of programs whose reputation go well beyond the local area.

The pieces are largely in place. However, the University lacks a vision; a sense of its own future. Unfortunately, its competitors, recognizing this problem, have selected specific goals and objectives (such as the number of students or the development of specialized niches in the marketplace) and have benefited from being able to focus their efforts on achieving them. As a result, many, many

opportunities presented to William Paterson University have been allowed to slip away.

WPU will soon be under the leadership of a new President. This, in itself, represents a major opportunity for the institution to develop a long-term vision and strategic plan. However, the President will need the full support of the Board of Trustees if she is to implement the major changes that will be needed. Without that support, the process is likely to degenerate into conflicts between various interest groups on campus.

### **Report on Additional Charges for 2009-2010:**

1. Report to the Senate by November 10, 2009, on the impact of cutbacks to department budgets on the teaching and research activities of faculty.
  - A questionnaire was given to all department chairs, 17 responded
  - 16/17 said there was an effect of the budget cuts on their department – the other said it was hard to say since their budget was so small to begin with
  - 13 said the number of adjuncts was affected, interestingly, 6 said they had fewer adjuncts, and 4 said more
  - All said they had cancelled courses
  - 13/16 said the main effects of the budget cuts on the department was on research and travel, 5/16 also mentioned unfilled faculty lines.
  
2. Provide faculty input on plans for allocating Economic Stimulus funds coming to the University for the current fiscal year.
  - Some federal stimulus funding (1.9 million dollars) was received as part of an agreement to maintain affordability for our students by capping tuition and educational and general fees at 3% .
  - ARRA Grant: Smart Building Project – an energy management system funded by a 1.1 million dollar grant under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. There will be cost benefits of installing this energy management system to control temperature in four energy inefficient buildings.
  - Noyce grant – This grant of \$899,469 was funded by the National Science Foundation with Recovery Act money. Its main goal is to provide scholarships to Science and Math majors who are planning on entering teaching careers. It will allow the training of new high-performing teachers who will be mentored and will teach in low-performing urban schools. This grant is funded for 5 years.

[Type text]

3. Provide faculty input on the allocation of budget funds for the Fiscal Year 2010-2011.

- We met with Steve Bolyai at every meeting and provided feedback on the budget

4. Conduct a study, in cooperation with the administration, to analyze the growth in costs of administrative personnel over the past ten years, and the reasons for this growth.

We determined, from the Fact book and from Jane Zeff's office, that since 1985,

- the number of students has increased by 22.8%,
- the number of faculty has increased by 11%,
- although the number of administrators had increased by 47% by 2005, now it is down to less than a 2% increase.
- the number of non-faculty staff has increased by over 58%.

Some of this decrease in administrators is due to unfilled positions, some is due to changes in job descriptions. Some of the increase in non-faculty staff is due to increased Service and Maintenance for the new dorms and buildings, but the majority is under the heading 'Professional Staff'. This heading must contain some positions which used to be secretarial, since those have decreased, but that doesn't account for all of the growth. See the chart and graph on the following page. This should be investigated further by the incoming council. The increase in salaries of the administrators was not addressed by this council.

### Changes in numbers of employees by category 1985-2009

	Secretarial	Technical	Service/Maint	Other Pro- fessionals	All these	% Change	Faculty	% Change	Admin	% Change	Students	% change
1985	203	45	101	86	435	0	334	0	51	0	9360	0
1991	217	58	118	142	535	22.988506	302	-9.58084	53	3.921569		0
1995	229	64	124	151	568	30.574713	315	-5.68862	45	-11.7647	9090	-2.88462
2000	249	71	132	180	632	45.287356	358	7.185629	58	13.72549	9945	6.25

[Type text]

2005	183	101	154	237	675	55.172414	372	11.37725	75	47.05882	10970	17.20085
2009	149	128	168	244	689	58.390805	371	11.07784	52	1.960784	11494	22.79915
%												
<b>Change</b>	<b>-26.60</b>	<b>184.44</b>	<b>66.34</b>	<b>183.72</b>	<b>58.39</b>		<b>11.08</b>		<b>1.96</b>		<b>22.80</b>	

