



www.engineering.uiowa.edu

THE UNIVERSITY OF LOWA

MEMO

TO:	Engineering Faculty Council
FROM:	P. Barry Butler
DATE:	March 23, 2005
SUBJECT:	Resource Management

Over the past four years, The University of Iowa has experienced a drastic shift in the amount and balance of revenues funding the General Education Fund (GEF). Specifically, between FY-01 and FY-05 state appropriations to the GEF have significantly decreased while tuition revenues have significantly increased. Cuts to our College budget have resulted in the elimination of staff positions, reduction in general expense funds, reduction in equipment monies, and a reduction in the number of unfilled faculty lines. All indications from Central Administration and elected officials lead one to believe that the funding framework for the GEF has changed permanently. These budget cuts and reversions of the past four years have left the College vulnerable—if we don't act now, we could see erosion of the excellence that has been achieved and compromise future growth in stature and strength.

The Regents and the Provost are putting in place a mandatory reallocation plan, effective FY-06, that could seriously diminish our resources unless we act boldly to define a vision and a plan that charts a sustainable future. We have an advantage over other units in the University in that we have been successful in generating alternative resources through contracts and grants. We need to find ways to leverage these resources and invest in ourselves.

I firmly believe that the College of Engineering must be proactive in defining a new resource management model. We simply cannot operate effectively in the new financial climate using our existing financial guidelines/policies. Specifically, we must develop new guidelines/policies that will i) continue to deliver quality academic programs, ii) stimulate future growth of the College, iii) make us less dependent on state resources, and iv) make optimum use of our existing resources.

The Dean's Ad-Hoc Resources Management Committee has made a number of suggestions that need to be explored and acted upon. The faculty has had a chance to comment on these directly, through their departments, and through the Engineering Faculty Council (EFC). In addition, the DEOs have articulated the concerns of their faculties in Engineering Administrative Council (EAC) meetings. The College's 2005-2010 Strategic Planning Committee has solicited input from the faculty and will soon draft a comprehensive strategic plan for the next five years. They need clear indication of the resources coming from the state and those we are able to generate from within.

Engineering Faculty Council March 23, 2005 Page two

The EAC has had many discussions on these issues, in parallel with the deliberations of the various committees, and come to the firm conclusion that the starting point must be a change in the paradigm that we have used to assess workloads and create incentives for faculty to excel in the full spectrum of their activities—teaching, research, and service. The College aspires for a faculty in which each member is equally proficient at all three areas of endeavor. However, to provide flexibility to individual faculty members at various career stages, the University and the College use the annual effort allocation mechanism that allows variations from the norm.

On March 22, 2005, the EAC unanimously endorsed adoption of new course release guidelines (see attached, Page 3/3). It is important to note that this model applies only to <u>tenured faculty</u>, is the first step in the process to financially re-energize the College, and provides resources to the departments to create incentives for faculty, support of non-tenured faculty, and a base for future growth.

As the elected faculty representatives of the College of Engineering, I am calling on you to review the attached EAC Resolution, solicit input from the faculty, and provide me with your advice by May 13, 2005.

Thank you.

PBB/br

Attachment

cc: College of Engineering Faculty