



Below are responses to the questions posed following the 2/29 faculty senate presentation with Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration, Leslie Brunelli. Additional comments from Provost Chilton and Interim VPR Wolcott are included below.

- 1. We continue to talk about the importance of increasing our enrollment in terms of new students coming into WSU. WSU and other institutions are trying to attract and recruit new students from shrinking HS graduating classes. We need to give equal attention and fiscal support to retaining our current students. It costs more to recruit new students than it does to retain current students. Do we have any plans to increase resources to retain students? Not just recruit new ones.**

I agree that retention is as important as bringing in the first-time, first-year class each fall. While enrollment management under Saichi Oba was the only unit that did not take the 6% reduction for FY24, there are retention efforts underway. I asked Provost Chilton to weigh in on this question and she offers the following: Student success is both a system and campus priority, and between the priorities of Student Affairs and DAESA (Division of Academic Excellence and Student Achievement) we are most definitely highlighting impacts and opportunities for student success (especially retention and graduation). Student success initiatives are plentiful in DAESA and Bill Davis could enumerate them more fully. But Core to Career is one program, as well as the Transformational Change Initiative, MESI, and any number of Veterans Support and other TRIO programs. I suggest that Faculty Senate invite both Elizabeth and Bill to a future meeting to discuss these programs.

- 2. When will we know by how much the reduction will be?**

Budget hearings will take place from 3/18-3/29. Decisions will be made during the first three weeks of April and released to the campus by the end of the month. The budget tool attached to Workday, Adaptive Planning, will be updated for unit budget work. During the month of May, I am hopeful to prepare a budget document that describes budget allocations. This is intended to be a transparent presentation of budget decisions and serve as a companion piece to the annual audited financial statements document. Many institutions prepare a budget document – some examples are Oregon State University (Prior Year – FY2023) and my previous institution, the University of South Carolina – both linked here: https://fa.oregonstate.edu/sites/fa.oregonstate.edu/files/budget/annual-budget/fy24_budget_book_final.pdf https://sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/budget/documents/fy24_budget_doc_final.pdf



3. Can you tell us what percentage Athletics is being asked to reduce this budget cycle?

For FY24, the approved athletics budget was \$83.3M. For FY25, we are preparing a budget of \$74M based on expectations of funds flowing through the PAC12 and generated revenue. This expected reduction of \$9.3M is an 11.16% year-over-year cut. As we continue to navigate the changes at the conference level, budgets for FY26 and beyond will continue to change. We're hopeful to present the FY25 budget to the Board of Regents in April, contingent on resolution of pending PAC12 items.

4. Will these funds requested from the state cover the gap in the grants that will occur for the funding of graduate students with their stipend increase?

State funds are not available to cover the contractual change for grants and other non-core funding. The conference budget provided \$500,000 for the ASE contract need for FY24 and \$2,000,000 for the contract need for FY25. For this current year (FY24), our core fund need will be covered. For FY25, the total amount needed is \$7,465,000 with \$4,330,000 for core funds and \$3,135,000 for non-core. The non-core funds must be covered by grants and other funds. We asked the state to cover the full core funds needed, but they have included just \$2,000,000. We will include the balance of the core funds needed as part of the budget development process and consider how to fill in the gap. These funds were allocated on a non-recurring basis, which requires that we add this to our operating requests for the next biennium.

5. Can you address whether research efforts at WSU generate net revenue or lose it, and by how much?

The University provides support for the research mission. At the Regents meeting on March 7, Mike Wolcott presented info from the FY2022 National Science Foundation's Higher Education Research and Development (NSF HERD) rankings, the comparison to our peers, and change over time. From his Research Radar email newsletter, Mike notes: This presentation highlights that federal grants and contracts have doubled since 2008. This growth represents a 50% increase after adjusting for inflation. Unfortunately, in this same timeframe, the inflation-adjusted state and institutional portions have decreased by 20% and 50%, respectively. You can view a more thorough analysis of our HERD figures on [YouTube](#) (starting at the 17 minute mark).



Excerpted from the HERD study for FY22:

Institution	Rank	All R&D expenditures	Source of funds												
			Federal government		State and local government		Institution funds		Business		Nonprofit organizations		All other sources		
Washington State U.	77	368,396	187,580	54,610	103,067	9,099	13,119	921							

This \$103,067,000 in institutional funds represents funds, sabbaticals, cost share and other things that are counted.

The Office of Research is working with Institutional Research to be sure we are accurately accounting for these items. F&A recovered in FY22 was \$36.8M, so less than the institutional funds recorded here. The point that Mike makes though, is this has not kept up with inflation over time.

Mike and I have been talking at length about support for research and would welcome the opportunity to have a deeper discussion with the Faculty Senate.

Thanks again for the opportunity to present and do let me know if there are additional questions.

Best,

Leslie Brunelli