

University Budget Development Committee

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
Meeting Agenda and Summary

Meeting Time: 1-3pm
Meeting Date: Tuesday, 23 February 2016
Meeting Location: Dempsey 236

Agenda

- ❖ Summaries
 - ❖ Announcements
 - Q&A sessions
 - Reactions to UBDC Report?
 - Faculty Senate
 - ❖ Discussion topics: Road map to UB-1 Operating Manual
 - Phalanxes – round three
 - **Allocations spreadsheet (Lori, Angie)**
 - Determine funds in places across campus
 - Identify possible RGUs and CCs
 - Foundation
 - **Cost assignment (Nathan, Jean, Fred)**
 - Determine divisible vs. indivisible indirect cost areas
 - Develop 5-8 “proxy metrics” for all divisible costs
 - Financial statements – UBDC and from UW System (attached)
 - Taxation structure
 - Peer/benchmarking study for service areas
 - **Revenue assignment (Matt, Leslie, John)**
 - Cost-of-instruction differentials
 - Tuition plateau
 - ICRR
 - SF and DT
 - **Policies, procedures, and governance (Bill, Julia, Reggie... Jean)**
 - UW System rules, State Statutes, UW Oshkosh agreements
 - Curriculum committees
 - Hold harmless agreements with sunset clauses
 - Declared vs. graduated majors
 - SCH split vs. 100% to unit of instruction
 - To share or not to share?
 - Trailing figures or forecast (budgeted) figures?
 - Walk-ons
-

UBDC Summary

Prepared By: Angie Metke and M. Ryan Haley
Date Prepared: 3 March 2016

Attendees: Bill Wacholtz, Nathan Stuart, Lori Worm, Ryan Haley, Dean Neal-Boylan, Matt Suwalski, Dean Koker, Julia Hodgen, Reginald Parson & Alexander Novak (future replacement)

I. Announcements

a. Open Forum Debriefing

- i. Question regarding gaming: Better to be a divisible or indivisible cost unit?
- ii. Leslie: Since people sometimes ask why we can't keep the old model, we should make a larger effort of explaining what the issues were with the old model.

b. Faculty Senate Debriefing:

i. Issues/Suggestions

1. They are composing a document with concerns moving forward.
2. Majors may not be the best mechanism; use Graduated Majors.
3. Bill: Most of what I heard are issues which we will be addressing during Phase 2.

c. Chancellor will be visiting during our next meeting.

d. Welcome Reginald Parson's (OSA Representative) replacement; Alex Novak.

II. Office of Institutional Research Class Size Data

a. Found on their [website](#)

- i. Data on class size and ratios between faculty and students.

b. Thoughts on use of this data:

- i. John/Bill/Leslie: We will need to verify what factors determine these ratios.
 1. Does it take into account: independent study, CON seniors, music and art stacked classes, etc.
- ii. Julia: How do our ratios compare to other Universities?
- iii. Ryan: Someone needs to look into what makes up this data if we end up using it for UB-1.
 1. This may help us determine how to increase enrollment.

III. UB-1 Operating Manual

a. Next Steps:

- i. Goal for the group should be to have the Manual drafted by the end of summer.
- ii. Our next Open Forum for campus will be during Fall.
 1. Bill/Leslie: While we will still be posting to the website it would be beneficial to email campus occasionally regarding the new things we have put on the website.

b. Phalanx:

- i. Allocation Spreadsheet (Lori, Angie & Fred)
- ii. Cost Assignment (Nathan & Jean)
 1. This will be the most detailed portion of the manual.
 2. We can utilize New Hampshire and Ohio examples and possibly work with Huron Consulting for this portion.
- iii. Revenue Assignment (Matt, Leslie, & John)
- iv. Policies, Procedures & Governance (Bill, Julia, Reggie/Alex & Jean)

IV. Tuition Presentation/Discussion

- a. How do we deal with cross tuition?
 - i. Our options:
 - 1. Base revenue only on enrollment.
 - 2. Base revenue on instruction and enrollment (percentage to each; 50/50) – this was submitted in the recommendation.
 - b. Feedback:
 - i. Leslie: I am concerned about CON only keeping revenue from students for a year and a half. Prior to that all the revenue would go to COLS.
 - ii. Matt/John: We should run the numbers and have some scenarios to work with.
 - iii. Ryan: Instruction would be a simpler but we need to decide if we want to get more complex.
 - c. Resolution: We will table this discussion until Ryan brings in the figures for different scenarios.

V. Hold Harmless Period

- a. Schematics
 - i. A unit will be provided with their same allocation and given a period (possibly 1-2 years) in which they will prepare for their provided future allocation within the new model.
- b. Questions/Feedback
 - i. Ryan: Do we have leadership who can approve new budgets which will lead to disproportional cuts and disproportional gains in areas?
 - ii. Bill: We may want to extend the shadow system across two years of the biennium; in preparation for fluctuations within our GPR allocation.
 - iii. Lori: Would it help to inlay an assessment period?
 - 1. Ryan: I would like all RGU's, College and Auxiliary, to each articulate what their needs will be during a transition period.
 - 2. Nathan: We need to draft the Operating Manual prior to that discussion.

VI. Major Head Count Determining GPR Share

- a. Calculation: Percentage of Majors and percentage of Graduates over three years (or use an average).
- b. John: Will we take into account if there is a drastic difference in declared majors and graduates? Shouldn't the unit receive credit for recruiting the majors?

VII. Cost of Instruction Differentials

- a. Purpose:
 - i. We will need to address differentials among the units.
 - ii. Differentials include: salaries, supplies, expenses, etc.
- b. Solution:
 - i. Option 1: Four-tier additional credit price system.
 - 1. Additional cost per credit depending on which tier you fall under.
 - 2. Courses submit requests to the groups to determine which tier they fall into.
 - 3. Feedback/Questions:
 - a. Leslie: Currently we charge \$50 per credit for online courses; would this continue in the new model?

- ii. Option 2: Credit Weight.
 - 1. Each college has a weight placed upon it.
 - a. Weight reflects the cost of instruction.
 - 2. Feedback/Questions:
 - a. Nathan: If the System stays revenue neutral we can apply these weights internally.
 - b. Ryan: This would be similar to Differential Tuition.