

University Budget Development Committee

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
Meeting Agenda and Summary

Meeting Time: 10-11am
Meeting Date: Thursday, 28 January 2016
Meeting Location: Dempsey 236

Agenda

- ❖ Summaries
 - ❖ Discussion topics concerning UB-1
 - 102 allocation
 - SCH vs. SCH+Majors
 - Report draft
 - FAQ draft
 - Institutional barriers to UB-1 success
 - Foundation
 - ❖ Walk-ons
-

Summary

Attendees: Ryan Haley, Matt Suwalski, Jean Kwaterski, Dean Neal-Boylan, William Wacholtz, Lori Worm, Dean Koker, Julia Hodgen, Dean Yeo

- I. SCH & Major Head Count
 - a. Option #1: Both play a role.
 - i. Pros:
 1. Balance of SCH and majors.
 2. Competition for majors and incentives to improve curriculum.
 3. Majors is a less clinical output than SCH.
 - ii. Cons:
 1. More complicated.
 2. Induce problematic competition for majors.
 - a. e.g., "bad mouthing" other colleges/majors
 3. Some redundant measures.
 4. Pressure on students to declare a major.
 - iii. Responses:
 1. John: Would it tilt decision making to areas only being important if they have a major? What about the majors in my College who are actually being certified in Education?
 2. Ryan: SCH measure picks them up.

Prepared By: Angie Metke and M. Ryan Haley
Date Prepared: 28 January 2016

- b. Option #2: SCH Only (Not currently in the Chancellor's Report).
 - i. Pros:
 - 1. Simpler.
 - 2. Less competition for majors.
 - 3. No pressure to declare.
 - ii. Cons:
 - 1. More competition for SCH (e.g., poaching).
 - 2. No accommodation for majors.
 - 3. Edge to high SCH colleges.
 - 4. Very clinical "output."
 - 5. No financial incentive to improve majors.
 - 6. May increase pressure to bloat majors.
- II. Financial Reports – Examples Ryan and Nathan have put together for models moving forward.
- a. Revenue Generating Center:
 - i. Source of Funds.
 - 1. Tuition
 - 2. Other Funds (including GPR, DT, etc.)
 - ii. Uses of Funds.
 - 1. Direct Costs (Personnel, Travel, Supplies, etc.)
 - 2. Divisible Indirect Costs (Facilities, HR, IT, etc.)
 - iii. Indivisible Direct Cost.
 - 1. Central Tax – to pay for cost centers.
 - iv. Carryovers.
 - 1. Savings (example has 10%).
 - 2. Unit Strategic Fund (example has 2%).
 - v. Net Sources/Profit/Gain.
 - 1. Option #1: The unit keeps all remaining profit.
 - 2. Option #2: Profit is divided (e.g., ½ going to Central Initiatives and ½ going to the College.)
 - vi. Responses:
 - 1. Leslie: If we do Option #2 where would the Central funds go to?
 - a. Ryan: Either Strategic funds, faculty development, etc.
 - b. John: Would that mean the Central funds would be accessible to the Colleges?
 - 2. John: Even though these are examples, we want to make sure that they are not too arbitrary so that people are misled. Because during the beginning phases we most likely won't have Net Profit because we will still be operating on the same amount of revenue.
 - a. Matt: However, this will be a useful tool for building programs and revenue generation.
 - b. Ryan: I will make them more generic
 - b. Cost Centers:
 - i. Use of Funds.
 - 1. Direct Costs (Personnel, Travel, Supplies, etc.)
 - 2. Divisible Indirect Costs (Facilities, HR IT, IMC, etc.)

3. There will be no indivisible indirect costs for these centers because then you would be taxing the tax.
- ii. Source of Funds.
 1. Direct Fees (Grants, etc.)
- iii. Net Subsidy = all their costs less any funds they receive.
 1. If it is a divisible cost center it will go to the Revenue Generating Unit billing.
 2. If it is an indivisible cost center it will go under the Central Funds.
- iv. Responses:
 1. John: I think it's important to include the divisible indirect costs because it won't put more of the burden on the Cost Centers.
 2. Ryan: This is an attempt to display the financial status of a Cost Center; for transparency.
 3. Jean: How would a Cost Center determine their S&E, Travel, etc?
 - a. Ryan: The performance benchmark study and metrics would help determine those rates.
- c. Central Funds:
 - i. Use of Funds.
 1. Indivisible Indirect Costs (Women's Center, Chancellor, Athletics, GPR Debt Service, etc.)
 2. Carryovers (Savings and the Strategic Funds.)
 - ii. Sources of Funds.
 1. Direct Fees.
 2. Gainsharing (if we decide to split them.)
 - iii. Gross Central Tax = Use of Funds less Sources of Funds.
 1. This will determine what the tax rate should be.
 - iv. Question:
 1. John: What happens if Central has a Net Profit at the end of the year? Will it be split and returned to the divisions?

III. Chancellor's Report

- a. Ryan will be adding information on mono-funding.
 - i. Explanation: Taking the DT funded areas and only funding three fully. The remaining six will be funded elsewhere.
 1. Benefits to the DT committee = less requests to review.
 2. Benefits to the students = DT is still funding student centered initiatives.
- b. Questions/Feedback:
 - i. All comments or changes for the report can be sent to Ryan via email with line items you want changed or paper copies.
 - ii. John: Are we giving a final or a draft version?
 1. Leslie: Let's remove the Draft watermark and let the chancellor interpret.
 - iii. Bill: When are we submitting the document?
 1. Ryan: Sunday, January 31st, but I will contact the chancellor and ask him about next steps.
 2. John: Since we still need time to review the document, I would ask for an extension to the following Tuesday or Wednesday.

- iv. Leslie: Wouldn't it be helpful to include the scorecard for each model?
 - 1. Bill: We can use it as an appendix.
 - 2. Ryan: We are only missing the PBBM group.
- v. John: On the COLS example can you rephrase it to make it more general; instead of "his" college and budget, etc.