

The following areas were highlighted as potential candidates for changes or updates in the budget model as collected through feedback from various stakeholder groups. The Budget Working Group (BWG) considered these different elements over the last 6 months and the below represents the group's collective responses.

- Multiple stakeholders shared concerns the model encourages creation of new courses or an incentive to chase student credit hours (SCH) (that may not be in the best interest of the University).

**BWG Response: The Faculty Senate and the Provost's Office will work together to monitor the creation of new courses and ensure there are no redundant or unnecessary course creations.**

- Our smaller commonwealth campuses are grouped into an entity known as the University College, there was a concern that this entity was receiving SCH and not the individual campuses.

**BWG Response: OPAIR has corrected how these are counted in the model.**

- Multiple unit leaders have requested forecasting and cost-analysis tools for budget planning.

**BWG Response: Information has been published [here](#), by the Office of Budget and Finance and [here](#), by the Office of Planning and Institutional Research (OPAIR) on how to calculate SCH.**

- There were some concerns with various SCH coding problems within our systems.

**BWG Response: OPAIR has corrected how these are counted in the model.**

- The issue of how to properly account for part-time students in the model was raised.

**BWG Response: These SCH are included in the model. The BWG affirmed the original decision not to include part-time undergraduate student headcounts in the model. We didn't want to dilute full-time headcounts, as most of the work in a college or on a campus is associated with full-time students.**

- The issue of how to account for double majors in the model was raised.

**BWG Response: We decided to count double majors as .5 to each major to reflect that both programs incur costs and resources to support these students.**

- Stakeholder feedback to consider using more recent SCH, headcount, and research expenses to avoid "lag" in the model.

**BWG Response: This topic was thoroughly deliberated. We decided to continue to use three-fiscal year averages to give units a longer ramp to respond to declines in enrollments. Strategic funds may be used to financially support new programs or significant enrollment**

increases in more recent periods where the model “lag” could harm units experiencing growth.

- The question was asked if we should weigh summer courses differently in the model.  
**BWG Response: After robust discussion, we decided not to change the model, as weighting summer heavier may mean less funding for fall/spring. The administration will continue to evaluate other ways to encourage summer instruction.**
- The question was raised on we were using an appropriate funding mechanism for World Campus courses.  
**BWG Response: Graduate headcount is included in the model for both full- and part-time students. Undergraduate headcount is not included in the model for full- or part-time students (but SCH is, as it also is for graduate programs).**
- How does the model measure and incentivize student success.  
**BWG Response: The only way the current model financially supports student success is with strategic or subvention funds. Separate from the Budget Working Group, we encourage finding a way to measure and incentivize retention, persistence, and graduation, or potentially other metrics that are impactful and meaningful to each unit. Accountability to achieve these KPIs may not be appropriate to incorporate into the budget allocation model.**
- Does the model appropriately capture the cost of instruction in different units.  
**BWG Response: Calculating the cost of instruction is exceedingly complicated and difficult. The model currently accounts for cost of instruction with subvention, strategic funds, and weighted tuition rates. The complexity that would be necessary to include accurate cost of instruction would move us towards a full RCM model and would be directly opposed to our guiding principle of simplicity. We fully acknowledge this outcome of the model and recognize that weighted tuition creates inequities for the campuses.**
- A common comment to the BWG was that the model does not value research appropriately.  
**BWG Response: We advocate for improved, consistent messaging on how research is valued in the budget model financially and communicate to all levels of faculty. All research F&A goes to research support as well as additional E&G funds that support research administration.**
- Funding for graduate programs.  
**Response: The model weights more funding for graduate courses and headcount. We acknowledge that graduate funding should be monitored and continually assessed with leadership from SVPR and Graduate School Dean.**