

Hi Nanci,

From our table I have questions and comments, which I will record here and then you can forward the questions to the right person.

- Can money be moved from the capital budget to offset expenses in the operating budget?  
*As we have moved to an all-funds budget, there are no longer two separate budgets. We only have one University wide budget.*
- There was a comment that the operating budget should be separated so that faculty could make better decisions on cuts that would affect them
- Last year \$50000 savings was realized through items such as increasing parking fees, etc but instead of saving a program, the money was spent on the KPMG report. *This IT Review was recommended by SBAC to the Board last fiscal year because of the concerns expressed by the University community.*
- Did not think that the value of the report was worth the \$48000. There was also a question about the recommendation to put more money in IT when it was felt that the University spends far more on IT than other institutions. *The report was done by KPMG and it did make a few suggestions as to how the University maybe able to realize future savings. Also, the report was clear as to the difficulty in benchmarking our IT department, as many institutions do not house IT in just one area.*
- On Attachment 3, the items that are marked 1X need to be separated out in the notes. For example the \$300000 also included lab refreshment which was pointed out as an ongoing activity. The temporary cost of a consulting CIO is not really 1X because if a permanent CIO was not found, the consulting cost would have to be paid again and results in an ongoing cost if this temporary position needs to be refilled. *The lab refresh is a one-time staff expense. Yes, it could be ongoing but the cost will change depending on the number of labs needing a refresh. The CIO is a 1x for this fiscal year – it is not ongoing. However, if a permanent CIO is not found, then this could be a 1x expense for next fiscal year.*
- P&A cuts represented costs that were real in terms of staff, lab assistants, etc. but that other programs were just offering up cuts that didn't really represent spending cuts. For example, line #56 BAID – The perception was that a program that may have been suspended last year, then got put back on the books and then cut was not really a cost savings (referring to BAID). There was the notion that programs such as the business programs were already padded. *BAID was not suspended last year, but it did not run. This occurs often across the University that courses/programs are not run due to a variety of factors. In the 2014/15 draft budget, BAID is being recommended for suspension. As well, some areas were able to use cancelled sections in the Spring 2014. These sections are now lost to those areas.*
- #58 felt that lab hours that were not really used and got cut (no impact)
- On the green sheet, the first two items on the Not Recommended Items were very high. It was felt that Admin offered things up that were not realistic nor acceptable. It looks very suspect when the items that Admin offered up on their part ended up not being recommended for cuts. The group wanted more details. *More details are given in another document.*
- Suspension of programs – what is the criteria? The process does seem to be the same for example between A&S and Business. There is no opportunity to make decisions. *This fiscal draft budget, the two Faculties of the suspended programs suggested these programs in the 5% cuts.*
- On the green sheet – under the recommended items the numbers for Arts& Science and Fine&Applied Arts didn't look right. In A&S, how does .05 Staff reduction cost out at 12,486 and in F&AA how does .13 cost out at 32,900. *A&S - The .05 staff is \$2,619*

- savings plus restructuring of Chemistry and lab staffing of \$9,867 (this is hiring at a lower pay grade).
- F&A The .13 includes a \$20,000 savings in delaying a hire in this year (20,000 + .13 staff reduction \$12,900 = 32.900)