

University Budget Development Committee

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

Meeting Agenda and Summary

Meeting Time: 9-11am
Meeting Date: Saturday, 16 January 2016
Meeting Location: Dempsey 236

Agenda

- ❖ Summaries
 - ❖ Announcements
 - Phalanx reports (15 January) - thanks
 - Report drafting update
 - Seeking enough details to help with examples in the report, to improve comprehension
 - Chancellor Breakfast on 2 Feb (7:45-9am, Reeve 227)
 - Leadership Council on 10 February (TBA)
 - Allocation spreadsheet
 - Lori will try system queries to expedite this
 - ❖ Discussion topics
 - Competition for students under the PBM:
 - Rationale for splitting tuition when unit of instruction and unit of enrollment don't match
 - 50/50 – example
 - Undeclared students (examples)
 - Ask all students to declare an interest upon entering UW-Oshkosh
 - Split undeclared pool based on declared major percentages
 - Hold harmless
 - Do we need a shadow year and hold harmless period, or is the later sufficient?
 - Sunset provisions
 - Who decides these?
 - What do they look like?
 - Governance for the PBM
 - Who oversees the PBM; i.e., who is "at the table" when making tax rates, decisions, etc.
 - In the development phase – UBDC I guess?
 - Others?
 - After implementation?
 - Grants, faculty development, and indirect cost recovery
 - ❖ Walk-ons
-

Prepared By: Angie Metke and M. Ryan Haley
Date Prepared: 22 January 2016

Summary

Attendees: Ryan Haley, Matt Suwalski, Reginald Parson, Jean Kwaterski, Nathan Stuart, Dean Koker, Dean Neal-Boylan, William Wacholtz, Lori Worm, Dean Yeo

- I. Announcements
 - a. Reminders
 - i. Phalanx reports were due yesterday.
 - ii. February 2nd Chancellor's Breakfast Forum regarding the CSGs. I encourage all committee members to attend.
 - iii. February 10th Leadership Council in Reeve 306.
 1. UBDC Presentation on findings.
 2. Calendar invites have been sent.
 - b. Allocation Spreadsheet
 - i. Lori and the Budget Office looking to populate it.
 1. Expected after our January deadline.
- II. Recommendation to the Chancellor
 - a. Details:
 - i. UB-1 model and details will be provided.
 - ii. Including an explanation of revenue splits for tuition dollars.
 - b. Questions/Concerns:
 - i. Leslie: I would suggest not calling it PBM. People may confuse it with Performance Based.
 1. Ryan: Agreed. Good point.
 - ii. Nathan/Ryan: There is a concern about using averages rather than forecasting to plan/budget for the year.
 1. John: I thought we would be using the last two years to budget for the coming year. However, during the current year the revenue the College generates will flow to them. Then the actual SCH generated the next year will affect how you continue that year.
 2. Matt: That is an operational view of how the budget would work.
 3. Ryan: Before including this in the report to the Chancellor the Dean's should work with Lori and the Budget Office to determine what an ideal budgeting timeline would look like.
 - iii. Ryan: One thing that we will need to mention in the report is the effect of tuition and differential tuition authority.
 1. Lori: Differential Tuition has been inconsistent across UW System Universities; as well as what it is being used for.
 - a. There currently is a working group at the System level that is looking into, when we are out of a tuition freeze, how we can go about setting tuition and fees.
 2. Ryan: The more price setting flexibility we have the more effective our new model would be.

3. John: I think this should be put in the challenges section of our report.

III. UB-1 Discussion Topic: Competition for Students

a. Revenue Splitting

i. Approach:

1. A portion of the tuition goes to the college that is instructing the student and the other portion goes to the college the student is enrolled in.

2. Examples:

- a. Indiana University has 100% of tuition going to the college who is instructing the students.
- b. 50/50 split is the most common, and reduces competition for students.

3. "Poaching" example provided

- a. Purpose is to show how a revenue split will lessen the incentives to poach or compete for students.

ii. Questions/Concerns:

1. John: We may also want to worry about reverse poaching. For example offering Business Math in 2 large lecture halls rather than the 4 smaller sections.

- a. Ryan: This is where we need to depend on the Academic Programs Committee to keep such things in check. Another layer of review will be the performance measures for average class sizes and SCH levels.

b. Choosing a college

i. Option #1: Every student must declare an intended college.

1. Questions/Concerns:

- a. Reginald: I am worried about this option causing stress or resentment among the undeclared students.
- b. Jean: At the University of Minnesota they have students declare during the application process.
- c. Leslie: With this option we would need a really strong Admissions office to guide students.
- d. Ryan: I would be interested to research other universities who use this approach and how they implemented it.
- e. Ryan: This would be an easier alternative because it would not involve any metrics.

ii. Option #2: Divide the overall undeclared tuition by the existing declared major percentages.

1. Questions/Concerns:

- a. Fred: This would lead to more incentive for colleges to get more involved in recruiting majors and career fairs in the high schools.
- b. John/Jean: I would like to look at comparisons of metrics that would impact our university and metrics other Universities have used.
- c. Ryan: This option may be more unifying than separating.

- iii. Option #3: Allocate all undeclared tuition to the unit of instruction.
 - 1. Questions/Concerns:
 - a. Leslie: To me this wouldn't be changing anything from where we are now. Most of the tuition currently would go to COLS because they teach all the general education courses.
- iv. Final Opinions:
 - 1. John/Jean: Would we focus on the double majors? What about Minors?
 - 2. John: Could we get further data to track the movement of undeclared majors and where they usually end up?
 - 3. Leslie/John: We would want to measure the undeclared once a year ten days after the semester; that's where the most accurate data would be obtained.