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New Funds in 2011-2012

• Total Base Funding: $12,450,000
• Total increase in base funding: $124,500
## Departmental Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Salary</th>
<th>Base Funding</th>
<th>Productivity Funds (SCH Only)</th>
<th>Total (Base + Productivity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>$2,782,305</td>
<td>$2,505,727</td>
<td>$658,212</td>
<td>$3,163,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>$1,875,707</td>
<td>$1,604,346</td>
<td>$475,889</td>
<td>$2,080,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>$1,148,860</td>
<td>$983,957</td>
<td>$307,071</td>
<td>$1,291,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>$1,575,063</td>
<td>$1,090,920</td>
<td>$205,411</td>
<td>$1,296,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>$1,719,250</td>
<td>$1,045,899</td>
<td>$181,594</td>
<td>$1,227,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>$1,049,382</td>
<td>$831,361</td>
<td>$270,771</td>
<td>$1,102,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>$872,635</td>
<td>$758,077</td>
<td>$358,781</td>
<td>$1,116,858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Vulnerable Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Salary</th>
<th>Base Funding</th>
<th>Productivity Funds (SCH Only)</th>
<th>Productivity % of Base Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>$1,875,707</td>
<td>$1,604,346</td>
<td>$475,889</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>$1,148,860</td>
<td>$983,957</td>
<td>$307,071</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>$1,049,382</td>
<td>$831,361</td>
<td>$270,771</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>$1,719,250</td>
<td>$1,045,899</td>
<td>$181,594</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>$1,575,063</td>
<td>$1,090,920</td>
<td>$205,411</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>$872,635</td>
<td>$758,077</td>
<td>$358,781</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>$2,782,305</td>
<td>$2,505,727</td>
<td>$658,212</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary Challenges in College

- Faculty Salaries
  - Need for increases in base funding

- Maintaining SCH production under current model
  - Inability to make long-term commitments with vulnerable funding

- Space
  - Efforts to recapture/keep existing space
  - New space needs
Total Tenure Track Faculty Lines

- Science: 159
- Engineering: 149
- Humanities: 147
- CSBS: 128
- Business: 64
Net Gain in Faculty

Recession

USTAR Funded

Net loss in last 15 years
Points to Remember

• In 1996, CSBS had 29% more faculty than the COE

• By 2012, the COE had almost 10% more faculty than CSBS

• Only two colleges had “real” growth in the last 15 years
  – Engineering
  – Science
### UG Estimated Tuition/Fee Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Estimated Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Science</td>
<td>$50,520,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>$55,708,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$46,381,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$21,647,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$32,647,469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- UG Estimated Revenue
Revenue per Faculty Member

- Social & Behavioral Science
- Science
- Humanities
- Engineering
- Business

Revenue/Faculty

0 100,000 200,000 300,000 400,000 500,000 600,000
SCH Production/Faculty Member

- Business: 1283
- CSBS: 993
- Science: 881
- Humanities: 793
- Engineering: 370
Undergraduate Majors and Graduate Students

Growth in Majors but Net SCH drop

- Undergraduate Majors:
  - 2004-2005: 3000
  - 2005-2006: 2500
  - 2007-2008: 1500
  - 2008-2009: 1000
  - 2009-2010: 1500
  - 2010-2011: 2000
  - 2011-2012: 2500

- Graduate Students:
  - 2004-2005: 500
  - 2005-2006: 500
  - 2006-2007: 500
  - 2007-2008: 500
  - 2008-2009: 500
  - 2009-2010: 500
  - 2010-2011: 500
  - 2011-2012: 500
Problems with Productivity Model

• Increase in majors, net decline in SCH
  – Transfer credits
  – Competition across colleges
  – Need for curriculum and delivery methods to continue to evolve to attract “new” students
• Growth in two departments, net loss in college
Conclusions

• Meaningful change not possible with current productivity model

• High-performing college with marginal influence on critical issues
  – Base funding
  – Faculty salaries and related resources
  – Space, new and old
Priorities

- Targeted Merit and Equity Pay in Departments and Units
  - Requires increased base funding
- Development of targeted faculty positions (based on department performance)
  - Secondary to improved pay for existing faculty
- Continued Development of research infrastructure and productivity
  - Office of Research Administration
- Reconnecting with undergraduate base
  - Student Ambassador Program
  - From the Classroom to Careers Initiative
- Targeted Private Development
  - Break Ground on a New Building in the next 18 Months
  - National Scholarship Endowment Initiative