

**Western Washington University
Board of Trustees
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 9, 2016**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Karen Lee called the regular meeting of the Board of Trustees of Western Washington University to order at 3:03 p.m., in the Boardroom, Old Main 340, in Bellingham, WA.

Board of Trustees

Karen Lee, Chair
Sue Sharpe, Vice Chair
Earl Overstreet, Secretary
Betti Fujikado
John M. Meyer
Mo West
Seth Brickey

Absent

Chase Franklin

Western Washington University

Bruce Shepard, President
Brent Carbajal, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Eileen Coughlin, Senior VP, Vice President for Enrollment and Student Services
Richard Van Den Hul, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
Stephanie Bowers, Vice President for University Advancement
Steve Swan, Vice President for University Relations and Community Development
Molly Ware, Faculty Senate President
Kerena Higgins, Assistant Attorney General
Paul Cocke, Director of University Communications
Paul Dunn, Special Executive Assistant to the President
Barbara Sandoval, Assistant to the President and Secretary to the BOT
Elissa Hicks, Assistant Secretary to the Board of Trustees

2. WATERFRONT EXPANSION UPDATE

Steve Swan, Vice President for University Relations & Community Development, Rob Fix, Executive Director, Port of Bellingham and Kelli Linville, Mayor, City of Bellingham provided the Trustees with background concerning the waterfront efforts to date and what is planned for the future. Fix said that the plans began developing in the early 2000's and that the group Western Crossing Development was formed in 2009 to further cooperation between all the entities. He said that progress has been slow to date with the clean-up efforts not really visible to the public, but that with clean up almost complete, visible changes and development will be coming fast. Mayor Linville emphasized that the agreements and plans in place are binding and ready to move forward and that there is a lot of community support for the project. President Shepard said that Western became involved with the waterfront as a way to serve the community and take a major step towards the future of both the community and Western. Fix and Linville both stated that Western is a critical partner in the development and thanked the Trustees for their commitment to the process. Trustees thanked both for their update and looked forward to seeing the first steps of the development soon.

3. 2016 - 2017 OPERATING BUDGET AND RELATED MATTERS

a. Approval of 2016 – 2017 Academic Year Tuition Fees and Rates

Richard Van Den Hul, Vice President for Business & Financial Affairs provided background on the proposed 2016-2017 Operating Budget and recommended that Western reduce the state-funded resident undergraduate operating fee by 15.0%, as required by the Legislature in the 2015-2017 Operating Budget bill, and hold the capital building fee for this student class at the 2014-2015 annual rate. He said that after review by the campus, and upon the concurrence of the Vice Presidents and Deans, it is recommended that tuition fees for non-resident undergraduate, resident graduate, nonresident graduate, and Masters of Business Administration (MBA) rates for resident and nonresident students be raised by 2.9% respectively.

Trustees asked if there was any campaign money reflected in this budget. Van Den Hul and Stephanie Bowers said that some campaign money is supplementing certain programs but that it does not show in the budget. He said that the budgeting process does not mix campaign money and state money.

Trustees also asked how Western compared to other schools around the country. Eileen Coughlin said that without any external factors our tuition is average, but that the State Need Grant helps the university be well positioned as far as tuition costs. She said that Western has become very attractive to non-resident students, with applications increasing every year, adding that Western must continue to maintain our commitment to serving the students of the State of Washington. She said that competition within the state has increased due to the growth and access of in-state options available in urban areas, thus allowing students to remain at home while attending local institutions.

MOTION 06-01-2016: Trustee Brickey moved that the Board of Trustees of Western Washington University, upon the recommendation of the President, approve a 15.0% reduction in the 2016-2017 annual tuition operating fee rate for state-funded resident undergraduate students; and

FURTHER MOVED, that the capital building fee for state-funded resident undergraduate students be held at the 2015-2016 assessed rate; and

FURTHER MOVED, that the 2016-2017 annual tuition operating fees and capital building fees for the non-resident undergraduate, resident graduate, non-resident graduate and the Masters in Business Administration (MBA) rates for resident and non-resident students be raised by 2.9% respectively.

The motion passed unanimously.

b. Approval of 2016 – 2017 Annual State Operating Budget

Richard Van Den Hul said that last year the Board of Trustees approved the first year of a two-year budget in July 2015. This spring, the budget process re-examined year two of that budget to see if there were adjustments, or “emergent issues,” that should be included in the FY2016-2017 annual operating budget. He said the President, Vice Presidents and Deans evaluated all the requests and have included the recommended budget in their materials. It includes: funding for competitive compensation for faculty and staff, the diversity initiative advancing critical cultural consciousness, expanded funding for the Education and Social Justice minor, replacement of grant funding to continue the strides made toward suicide prevention, funding to strengthen laboratory safety practices, and funding for the enhancement of first year math instruction. Van Den Hul said the university recommends the Board of Trustees approves a state operating budget in the amount of \$160,272,642 for the 2016-2017 fiscal year. (See Attachment A)

Trustees had no questions, adding that the background information provided in the materials helped them understand the entire budget process and feel confident in their decision.

MOTION 06-02-2016: Trustee Meyer moved that the Board of Trustees of Western Washington University, upon the recommendation of the President, approve a 2016-2017 Annual State Operating Budget of \$160,272,642 consisting of a State Appropriations in the amount of \$75,832,000; Western Washington University tuition operating fee funds of \$80,232,467; and administrative services assessment revenue of \$4,208,175.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Lee announced a 10 minute break at 4:00 p.m.

The board returned and reconvened the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

**4. RESOLUTION NO. 2016-05 RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF BRUCE SHEPARD
RESOLUTION NO. 2016-06 RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF CYNDIE SHEPARD**

Trustee Karen Lee started the recognition of Bruce and Cyndie Shepard by saying that both will be greatly missed, that the pair have brought many gifts to campus and to the state of Washington and that she feels the campus is losing something of tremendous value. She noted that President Shepard had assembled an outstanding leadership team and that he served as a teacher to all around him. Trustees and others in the room thanked Bruce for his leadership and recognized him for his humility, honesty, ability to listen, thoughtfulness and his ability to serve others.

Trustees also thanked Cyndie Shepard for her service as first lady and for her leadership with Compass to Campus. They recognized her for being a beautiful woman inside and out, her warm and genuine heart, community engagement and her inspirational leadership to change the lives of thousands of first generation students.

Bruce and Cyndie both thanked the Trustees for the opportunity and privilege to serve Western the past eight years.

MOTION 06-03-2016: Trustee Fujikado moved that the Board of Trustees approve Resolution 2016-05 Recognizing the Service of Bruce Shepard.

MOTION 06-04-2016: Trustee Sharpe moved that the Board of Trustees approve Resolution 2016-06 Recognizing the Service of Cyndie Shepard.

Both motions passed.

5. EXECUTIVE SESSION MAY BE HELD TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL, REAL ESTATE AND LEGAL ISSUES AS AUTHORIZED IN RCW 42.30.110.

At 5:10 p.m. Chair Lee announced that the Board would convene in Executive Session for approximately 10 minutes to discuss legal matters.

The Board returned to open meeting at 5:34 p.m. with no action to report.

**WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
SUPPORTING INFORMATION
SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

TO: Members of the Board of Trustees

FROM: President Bruce Shepard by:
Richard Van Den Hul, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
Linda Teater, Budget Director

DATE: June 9, 2016

SUBJECT: **Supporting Information for Approval of the 2016-2017 Annual State Operating Budget**

Schedule of Approvals for 2016-2017 Annual State Operating Budgets

At the June 9, 2016, Board meeting the Board of Trustees will be requested to approve tuition rates for all student categories for the 2017 academic year. At this same meeting, the Board will be asked to approve the 2016-2017 Annual State Operating Budget, which relies on the projected tuition operating fee revenues generated from these tuition rate proposals.

Introduction

In order to fund the basic instructional and academic support missions of the institution, the President is proposing, for Board approval, a 2016-2017 budget for state funded operations which reflects revenue and expenditure estimates available for University operations from state appropriations, net tuition operating fees, and the administrative services assessment.

Proposed FY2016-2017 Annual State Operating Budget

A summary by revenue source is included in the table below. Please note that tuition operating fee revenue is presented net of tuition waivers and Western's student/loan grant fund contribution at 4.0%.

2016-2017 Fiscal Year		
WWU State Operating Budget		
by Funding Source		
Funding Source	Proposed for Board Approval FY17	% of Budget
State Appropriations	\$ 75,832,000	47%
Net Tuition Operating Fees	80,232,467	50%
Administrative Services Assessment	4,208,175	3%
State Operating Budget	\$ 160,272,642	100%

Western's Budget Process

Last year, through Western's open, transparent, and bottom up process, the campus developed an operating budget for the current biennium. The Board of Trustees approved the first year of that two-year budget at a special meeting in July 2015. This spring, the budget process re-examined year two of that budget to see if there are adjustments, or "emergent issues," that should be included in the FY2016-2017 annual operating budget for the Board to act upon.

Campus planning unit leaders submitted proposals for emergent issue requests for the FY2016-2017 operating budget in April 2016 after the legislative session ended. Proposals were presented to the University Planning and Resources Council, and audiocast to the campus with venues for feedback.

Budget Recommendation Detail

The President, Vice Presidents and Deans evaluated all the requests and recommended a budget which includes among other things: funding for competitive compensation for faculty and staff, the diversity initiative advancing critical cultural consciousness, expanded funding for the Education and Social Justice minor, replacement of grant funding to continue the strides made toward suicide prevention, funding to strengthen laboratory safety practices, and funding for the enhancement of first year math instruction.

See Attachment A for a copy of this recommendation, or the web version with active hyperlinks may be reviewed at this location:

<http://www.wvu.edu/upb/Emergent/201617emerg/201617emergnar.pdf>.

The President now recommends the Board of Trustees approve the state operating budget in the amount of \$160,272,642 for the 2016-2017 fiscal year.

Attachment:

Attachment A – Proposed 2016-17 Operating Budget

May 4, 2016

TO: Western Washington University Faculty, Staff, and Students

FROM: Bruce Shepard, President
Joined by the Vice Presidents and Deans

SUBJECT: Proposed 2016-17 Operating Budget

The university's budgeting processes are complicated: multiple processes simultaneously occurring. So, before launching into a summary of our proposed 2016-17 operating budget, I will place it in context.

There are both capital and operating budget processes. Capital budget recommendations are nearing completion. On the operating budget side, there is both a biennial budget *request* process (where we decide what to ask the State for) and an operating budget *allocation* process (how we will actually allocate funds once the State has determined appropriations for Western).

Earlier, I wrote to you seeking feedback on proposed [2017-19 budget request priorities](#). Today's subject is different: settling upon an operating budget for the fiscal year immediately ahead.

When it comes to our operating budget, there are actually two processes: a biennial operating budget process prior to the beginning of a biennium and then, embedded within it and for the second year of the biennium, a budget process where we look at possible adjustments to the second year operating budget: matters that have emerged since that original two-year operating budget was adopted.

We are now budgeting for 2016-17, the second year of the 2015-17 biennium. So, most of the heavy lifting was done last year as we, bottom up and together, developed [the 2015-17 operating budget](#). Now, it's time to "tidy up any loose ends" so that I may recommend a 2016-17 fiscal year operating budget to our Board of Trustees for their consideration at the June meeting.

Our processes for developing the 2016-17 budget, bottom up and transparently, are described [here](#). The various proposals have long been available for your critical scrutiny on the [web pages of the University's Budget Office](#) under the heading "FY17 Emergent Budget Requests by Division."

The budget requests that emerged for the 2016-17 fiscal year were considered by the widely representative [University Planning and Resources Council](#). A summary of the individual rankings of those serving on the UPRC is available [here](#). Those ranking alone understate the

benefits we have all had of sitting around the table together in UPRC meetings as the proposals were discussed. We would welcome UPRC insights and their reactions to the thinking we now share with campus as the period for further comment remains open.

The deans, vice presidents, and I met together to consider the 2016-17 operating budget. As a starting point, we used the plans for 2016-17 that were incorporated in the [2015-17 operating budget you saw last year](#).

Our first priority was to assure a fiscally sound budget: one that could be sustained in the years ahead and that would maintain the capacity to cover known expenses in the out years that we are already firmly committed to (e.g., contractual commitments regarding compensation, funding for a major portion of a substantially expanded ESC/Multicultural Services facility).

With such forward-looking fiscal integrity a given, we then gave top priority to truly “emergent” items: essential expenditures for 2016-17 that were not anticipated this time last year. As available funds permitted, we also were prepared to seriously consider moving to base funding those initiatives that had proved successful but that, as experiments, were previously funded using one-time sources.

Further, we had, as a goal, adopting a budget that would not, because of the number of emergent needs funded, require that we make cuts to divisions. That limited the number of “emergent” proposals we were able to fund and also caused us to critically examine the details of the emergent issues that, at least in part, we felt it necessary to fully fund. In so doing and trying to stretch limited dollars as far as possible, we were looking for the most essential parts of particular proposals and also looking for alternative ways to fund particular proposals.

Overview

We took a university-level view; that is, we did not get down into divisional and departmental line items. Just the proposals that have come up from departments through divisions, and to the university level. That does mean, of course, that the budget summary you are now reading does not capture all the budget adjustments made at departmental and divisional levels as needs emerge and as challenges and opportunities require response. These regular, essential, and extensive budgetary adjustments take place following the processes and procedures practiced within each division.

For that university-level view and as in years past, we adopt a sources/uses approach. This means that we focus at the margin: what additional sources are available; what new uses or needs should be considered? And, as this is a budget for the second year of the biennium, we focus on the margin in a second sense: the items being proposed are the marginal second-year budget additions that would come on top of or in addition to any allocation that was included in the already approved year-one budget.

Sources

“Sources” are where additional funds would come from to cover new “uses.” They can come from legislative appropriations, tuition revenues, investments to improve efficiency, and expanded entrepreneurial efforts. “Sources” may, and have, included program reductions or eliminations as well as budget cuts.

Sources for 2016-17 remain largely the same as was anticipated in last year’s 2015-17 budget. This is true for tuition rates, utility savings, auxiliary chargeback revenues, increases in the auxiliary chargeback rates, and state appropriations for year 2 compensation increases. As regards these matters, the numbers you saw last year for 2016-17 are what you will again see in today’s proposals.

We are also able to recommend, as we thought last year would be possible, an operating budget for 2016-17 that does not require program eliminations or cuts to the recurring budgets for divisions. That did mean, though, that only a portion of the emergent requests could be included in the proposal we are bringing to you.

The “sources” side of the budget does include an additional state appropriation of \$732,000 because, thankfully, the legislature heard and responded to our arguments that their funding of the 15% tuition buy down had been miscalculated. (Unfortunately, on the “uses” side, the legislature added three mandatory expense items not anticipated last year and totaling \$670,000 so, what one hand added, the other hand, more or less, took away.) With shifts in our enrollment profiles, we also project tuition revenues \$785,000 above the figures we were using last year.

Uses

“Uses” include budget obligations mandated by the legislature as well as needs and opportunities. In this, a “second year of the biennium” operating budget, we first considered unanticipated needs that emerged after the campus built the 2015-17 operating budget.

The “uses” proposed for the 2016-17 operating budget total \$7,916,323 (not counting the mandated tuition buy down). Included within that total are \$3,749,137 in allocations for 2016-17 that were accepted as a part of the biennial budget proposed last year. That number grew as we allocated additional funds to cover compensation increases either not anticipated or that seemed not possible last year. Of the remaining 2016-17 “emergent” proposed uses – these are the truly new items – our recommendations would cover about half the total dollars requested.

In overview, the proposed 2016-17 operating budget “uses” we would fund are:

- **Tuition Reduction:** Resident undergraduate tuition will be reduced by 15%. This is on top of last year's reduction of 5%. These are the amounts anticipated last year but, given the fiscal challenges the legislature was dealing with this year, keeping the 15% tuition "buy down" in place is a significant achievement. An expenditure of \$11,414,000, this is, by far, the single largest component of Western's 2016-17 sources/uses proposal.
- **Competitive Compensation:** This top priority was a major component of the biennial budget developed last year.
 - Salary increases over the biennium for classified colleagues averaged more than double what their counterparts in other state agencies (and universities) saw thanks to shared vision and commitments during negotiation of classified contracts at Western.
 - The faculty/university contract had not been settled when the 2015-17 operating budget was developed. The final contract takes average faculty compensation to above the 75th percentile of peers. With final contract numbers now known, this does require increasing the amount for 2016-17 faculty compensation above what had been set aside last year.
 - For professional staff, we had proposed an average salary increase of 4% for 2015-16 and 3.5% for 2016-17 during last year's biennial budget development. We have known, though, with success in funding classified and faculty salaries, our greatest shortfall when it comes to competitive compensation involves our professional staff colleagues. The vice presidents, deans, and I are pleased that, in the proposals before you, we will be able to make more progress than we thought possible this time last year: 2016-17 salary budget for professional staff is increased to 4.5% rather than 3.5%. This will provide additional funding to implement the Professional Staff Compensation Plan being finalized by PSO in partnership with Human Resources.
- **Previously Decided Initiatives:** Some of the initiatives that were included in the 2015-17 biennial budget decided last year identified additional year-two budget allocations. These are all included in the budget now being proposed. The items are: the diversity initiative advancing critical cultural consciousness, base funding for the WWU employee language program, expanded funding for the Education and Social Justice minor, additional funding for the student success/strategic enrollment management initiative, implementation of aspects of the plan for long-term repair and maintenance of parking lots, and funding of Advancement's analytical data toolset.
- **New Budget Requirements Resulting from 2016 Legislative Session:** We have no choice here: must cover unfunded benefit rate increases and that portion of the increase in employee health care insurance the state assigned to be covered by the (frozen) tuition portion of our budget.

- **Essential Infrastructure Investments:** These are, by and large, items that simply must be covered, Now. Or, risk significant failure. Included are funds to support the enterprise compute and storage infrastructure, the enterprise voice communications system, and a system for digital media management. Given the clear efficiencies that would result, we also included funding for software to improve the efficiency of our curriculum management and degree audit responsibilities.
- **Emerging and Urgent Program Needs:** Over the last year, we concluded, with some urgency, that we must change our approach to investigation of alleged sexual assaults, that we must augment the ways in which we support safe laboratory practices (remember the Chemistry Building fire?), and in improving diversity within our Honors Program. We would also place “enhanced first year math instruction” as an urgently needed academic program improvement.
- **Base Funding for Successful Initiatives:** Several initiatives, tried out using one-time funding, have proved sufficiently successful as to justify base budget funding. These are: the employee wellness match program for use of Wade King, the originally grant-funded program targeting suicide prevention, and the Front Door to Discovery program.

There were, of course, a number of proposed uses that we **do not** include. These fall into several categories:

- There are proposals that did not meet our sense of “emergent” and, instead, should become part of the 2017-19 biennial budget process. These include migration to Banner 9, the request from the Office of Sustainability, the proposal to enhance funding for Scientific and Technical Services, and the Palliative Care Institute proposal. We would encourage the consideration of these items, along with and in comparison to other opportunities, when, a year from now, Western next builds a comprehensive biennial budget.
- There were also several items we believe need to be more fully analyzed, perhaps bringing in outside advisers, to be sure we are proceeding in the most efficient and effective ways possible before we commit to further base budget funding. Included are the proposals to establish a victim advocate as part of our law enforcement resources and base funding our support for disAbility Services.
- Proposals where we propose alternative approaches. As the detailed sources/uses table will show, not all proposals were funded at the full request level. This is because – and as is explained in the detail attached to those tables – we sought alternative approaches to meeting the need or decided to concentrate on what we saw to be the most essential

and urgent of the elements covered in a proposal. This list also includes funding to cover a portion of the costs of remodeling Carver that the legislature had left to the campus. Last year, we budgeted for long-term borrowing and repayment, what are called “certificates of participation.” We now believe these obligations can be covered in a more cost-effective manner using portions of minor capital projects funds and one-time savings. Further, while we recognize that expansion of capabilities in Advancement will benefit the university in dollar and cents terms and is essential in preparing for the next campaign, we believe that Advancement will, going forward, be able to identify sources of revenue to supplement current allocations of state funding.

We did critically review the preceding preliminary assessments with the rankings provided by UPRC in mind. Looking at the top ten items in the UPRC rankings, we are agreed on seven. The three we would not fund that are in UPRC’s top ten are Banner 9 conversion, disAbility Services base funding, and future funding for Scientific Technical Services. These are three items we believe should be reconsidered as a part of a biennial budgeting process. For reasons we share in the detail attached to these items in the sources/uses table below, we continue to believe Banner 9 and disAbility Services need more careful analysis before funding needs are clear and included in the University’s base budget. Based upon the priorities assigned by UPRC, though, we did add back in funding for the STS proposal. We will return, in our conclusion, to the needs for clarity regarding just what are “emergent” items.

The Details

For each proposed use, there are detailed budget spreadsheets and a narrative. Those can be reached through the divisional links under the “FY17 Emergent Budget Requests By Division” heading on the [home page for the University Budget Office](#).

The real heart of the work we have done is found in a [2016-17 Sources and Uses Table](#). That table gives you an overview. And, from links in the table, you can drill down for more detail.

Please use the budget forums to ask questions, seek clarifications, and provide feedback. They are available from the University Budget Office [home page](#).

The period for comment remains open until May 18th. I will then finalize the recommendations I am obliged to make for consideration by our Board of Trustees at their June meeting.

A Conclusion

We have come a long way in our budgeting processes. Some of us recall back eight years ago when there simply were no transparent budgeting processes: open, bottom up, participative, strategic, or otherwise. Just none.

Every year, though, we continue to find needs to improve the process. This time around, we struggled somewhat with a matter that clearly requires reconsideration and then clarification. We have always thought of the “year 2” part of the biennial budgeting process as tying up loose ends and dealing with, as the budget instructions specify, “emergent” issues. What are “emergent issues”?

For us, “emergent” and “emergency” share more than a similarity in linguistic origin. Emergent items are items that just cannot wait until the next biennial budget cycle. It seemed, though, that the year 2 process was beginning to resemble the comprehensive biennial year 1 budget process: a chance to bring forward great ideas and important needs, emergency or otherwise.

Mixing the two types of proposals together (emergent and new ideas) may largely explain the ways in which the recommendations herein do not entirely track with the summary of rankings furnished by UPRC. We first addressed emergent items that had to be funded and then urgent infrastructure and other program needs, followed by, as funds permitted, base funding of successful experimental programs, and we set aside items that clearly could wait for the next biennial budget cycle. UPRC considered the set of items as a whole on what appeared to be an equal basis, ranking all pooled together. Quite legitimately. But, it does illustrate a need for clarification.

There is no right or wrong approach here. What is important, though, is that we are clear about the approach to be followed. Important in order to be fair to all playing by the same rules and important in order to make effective use of everybody’s time in developing proposals germane to the requirements of a particular budget process.

One approach is biennial: every two years there is a broad campus engagement in the review of the many alternatives talented and creative colleagues develop for consideration by us all. In off years, there would remain the need to do minor adjustments and attend to emergent issues that could not wait until the next biennial cycle.

The alternative is to go through the broad comprehensive review annually.

With the benefit of new presidential leadership, this will be but one of what are certain to be many opportunities for improvements to our strategic budgeting processes. But, for the record, we do conclude with this evident need to be clear on whether ours is to remain a biennial process. Or, become annual.

WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY - 2016-17 SOURCES AND USES

	FY16-17	
	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Decided</u>
NET (Decided Sources Minus Decided Uses)		730
SOURCES		
ITEMS RECOMMENDED AND DECIDED JULY 2015		
1 Rollover to Yr 2 of Yr 1 of under-committed (over-committed) base budget	1,031,050	1,031,050
2 Utility savings from prior conservation investment	23,955	23,955
NEW SOURCES:		
Additional Tuition Revenue		
3 Resident Undergraduate		0
4 Non-Resident Undergraduate	624,260	624,260
5 Resident Graduate	70,023	70,023
6 Non-Resident Graduate	45,808	45,808
7 College Affordability Program (Backfill 15% tuition reduction for res undergrads)	11,163,000	11,163,000
8 Tuition waiver savings due to resident undergrad tuition reduction	1,307,119	1,307,119
9 Adjustment to Tuition Revenue Estimate for 2016-17	---	785,000
Recurring Cuts to State Operating Budgets		
10 Academic Affairs		0
11 Business and Financial Affairs		0
12 Enrollment and Student Services		0
13 University Advancement		0
14 University Relations		0
Administrative Services Assessments		
15 Revenue from overhead assessment as auxiliary income has changed Increase in Auxiliaries Assessment (5%) by Division	242,295	242,295
16 Academic Affairs	65,355	65,355
17 Business and Financial Affairs	24,275	24,275
18 Enrollment and Student Services	113,796	113,796
Compensation Appropriations		
19 Classified Collective Bargaining Agreements	149,000	149,000
20 General Wage Increases - State Employees	495,000	495,000
21 Compensation State Support (backfill tuition portion of salary increases)	1,690,000	1,690,000
Total State Appropriation for Compensation	2,334,000	2,334,000
TOTAL NEW SOURCES		17,829,937

USES

<u>ITEMS RECOMMENDED AND DECIDED AS PART OF YEAR 1 BUDGET PROCESS</u>			
1	College Affordability Program (reduce res undergrad tuition by 15%)	11,413,929	11,413,929
2	Impact of graduate tuition increase on graduate assistant tuition waivers	74,122	74,122
3	Faculty Compensation	2,250,879	2,675,198
4	Classified Compensation	367,566	367,566
5	Professional Staff and Exec Compensation	878,048	1,128,919
6	Advancing Critical Cultural Consciousness at Western	54,539	54,539
7	WWU Employee Language Program	57,424	57,424
8	Education and Social Justice Minor Support	83,803	83,803
9	Student Success, Strategic Enrollment Management	400,000	400,000
10	Implement Parking Lot Long-Term Repair/Maintenance Stabilization Plan	7,533	7,533
11	Carver (Certificate of Participation Debt Payment)	450,000	0
12	Analytical Data Toolset for Advancement Database	32,400	32,400
<u>Institutional</u>			
13	Central Service Charge for OFM Services	91,000	
14	Legislatively unfunded benefit rate increases	579,000	579,000
15	Employee Wellness Match Program	25,000	25,000
16	disAbility Services	625,000	
<u>Academic Affairs</u>			
17	Enhancement of First Year Math Instruction	125,000	125,000
18	Title IX Investigator and Related Administrative Support	164,726	164,726
19	Migrate to Banner 9 on the XE Platform	285,697	
20	Enterprise Compute and Storage Infrastructure	56,160	56,160
21	Enterprise Voice Communications System	81,000	81,000
22	Office of Sustainability Request	181,890	
23	Creating a Sustainable Future for Scientific Technical Services (STS)	63,358	63,358
24	Honors Student Life Coordinator and Base Budget Section Funding	113,268	56,634
25	Palliative Care Institute	131,976	
<u>Enrollment and Student Services</u>			
26	Curriculog Curriculum Management	16,529	16,529
27	Degree Works: Replacement for Current Degree Auditing Platform	23,505	23,505
28	Suicide Prevention	92,366	92,366
<u>Business and Financial Affairs</u>			
29	Establishing a Victim Advocate to Enhance a Victim-centered Approach	85,037	
30	Strengthen Laboratory Safety Practices at Western	199,361	105,000
31	Talent Management Software Suite	10,911	
<u>University Advancement</u>			
32	Permanent Funding for Key Advancement Staff	199,300	
<u>University Relations & Community Development</u>			
33	Digital Asset Media Management Content System	27,000	27,000
34	Director of Front Door to Discovery Program	118,496	118,496
TOTAL RECURRING NEW NEEDS		19,365,823	17,829,207
UNFUNDED RECURRING NEEDS			1,536,616

