

University Budget Development Committee

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
Meeting Agenda and Summary

Meeting Time: 10-12pm
Meeting Date: Monday, 29 February 2016
Meeting Location: Dempsey 236

Agenda

- ❖ Summaries
 - ❖ Announcements
 - Q&A sessions
 - Additional reactions to UBDC Report?
 - ❖ Guest: Chancellor Leavitt
 - ❖ **Allocations spreadsheet**
 - ❖ **Revenue Assignment:**
 - Declared majors vs. graduated majors – some data
 - ❖ **Cost Assignment**
 - Populating the Central Fund
 - Proxy metrics for divisible vs. indivisible.
 - Ohio University
 - Northeastern University
 - University of New Hampshire
 - Wright State University
 - Peer/benchmarking
 - Ohio University
 - Wright State University
 - Huron Consulting
 - ❖ **Curriculum Committees**
 - EAB product for assessing majors
 - Check status
 - Carleen has info on major size, credit to degree
-

Summary

Attendees: Bill Wacholtz, Nathan Stuart, Lori Worm, Ryan Haley, Dean Neal-Boylan, Matt Suwalski, Dean Koker, Julia Hodgen, Dean Yeo, Chancellor Leavitt, Jean Kwaterski, Jenny Borgmann, and Reginald Parson

- I. Guest: Chancellor Leavitt
 - a. Committee's Pros and Cons of UB-1.
 - i. Pros:

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

1. Nathan: UB-1 provides incentives for areas on campus that are more entrepreneurial as well as providing non-entrepreneurial areas incentives to bring forth quality service.
 2. John: The new model makes sense; compared to the old model which was so complex and had so many rules we didn't understand.
 3. Fred: I look forward to no longer having chargebacks and having the clarity to budget revenue, based on enrollment. This will also provide further incentives for campus outreach and enrollment generation.
 4. Jean: UB-1 will provide a larger amount of transparency as well as incentives to generate new programs and revenue.
- ii. Cons:
1. Jean/Leslie: There may be a need to spend more money to get UB-1 off the ground; such as hiring budget personnel in revenue generating areas.
 2. John: We do not have the ability to set tuition, due to our membership within the System. This may prove difficult for this model which depends on revenue generation.
 - a. Chancellor: This model should be able to work within a constricted revenue stream. We may encounter further cuts and a continued tuition freeze.
- b. Chancellor's Feedback/Questions:
- i. The GPR and tuition allocation to the Colleges.
 1. Can we allocate tuition via SCH and keep the GPR centrally?
 - a. If we allocate all of our state resources out to the Colleges the Chancellor will be out of the decision making role.
 - b. The Chancellor is responsible for the entire campus and we need a command structure which will permit him/her ability to budget and project into the future.
 2. John: On the UB-1 schematic, every arrow symbolizes a decision. However, the green arrow (tax) will not be the Dean's decision alone. We need to change the schematic so it doesn't look like the RGU's make all the decisions.
 - ii. Implementation
 1. Various scenarios should be planned:
 - a. How would we absorb new money?
 - b. How would we distribute a small cut?
 - c. How would we distribute a large cut?
 2. John: I think this is why in the UB-1 schematic we need arrows going from the RGU savings and strategic initiatives back to Central for those reasons.
 - a. Ryan: We need to further look into how we store and/or redistribute money.
 3. Chancellor: July 1, 2017 would be when campus would completely move over to the new model?
 - a. Ryan: Fall FY17 would be the first live model; shadow system. Fall FY18 we plan to reorganize and determine

what changes are needed while moving the entire campus into the new model.

- iii. Chancellor: If we do not have the infrastructure to provide support for a new model UB-1 will collapse. This committee will then need to move rapidly to identify other infrastructure which we will need work/changes/updates, to ensure the success of UB-1.
- iv. There will need to be strong coordination between the RGU's.
 - 1. Ryan: As well as strong leadership to make difficult decisions.
- v. Possibly reword tax and Central; it brings forth a negative connotation.
 - 1. Leslie: My concern is that people understand tax and Central. We don't want to confuse campus with changes in phrases.
 - 2. Chancellor: Possibly implement the change at the end of Phase 2 during the implementation of the new model.
- vi. Specify the relationship between the RGU's and Central, including the impact shared governance will have.
 - 1. In the submission it was mentioned that the Central Fund would be managed by the VC's, Chancellor and Shared Governance; we currently don't do that.
 - 2. Bill: Historically, this is in fact done to a degree – far more than now.
 - 3. Ryan: We view UBDC morphing into the Shared Governance Oversight Committee which will be involved in the budget decisions.
- vii. Business Advisors
 - 1. I am concerned about hiring accountants in the divisions, possibly leading to separate books compared to Central's books. Ideally, I would like all the accountants in Lori's division to be responsible for each College or RGU.
 - 2. Leslie: I am concerned about losing our budget people who have a lot of the College's history.
 - 3. Chancellor: I am thinking more of the RGU's having a business manager who does the everyday purchasing, accounts payable and personnel functions but work with the Budget Analysts in Administrative Services for budgetary functions.
- c. What are the opinions of Shared Governance regarding UB-1?
 - i. Matt: Academic Staff has discussed it and has a lot of positive feedback. They will be eager to see the specifics.
 - ii. Reginald: The only concern OSA has is with the taxation of Segregated Fees and Differential Tuition.
 - iii. Julia: University Staff views the new model as transparent and understandable. They appreciate being involved in the process.
 - iv. Chancellor: None of the Vice Chancellors have opposed it. They seem fairly ambivalent.

II. Chancellor's Visit Debrief

- a. Bill: I am a little concerned about the roll-out timing. If we are going to start rolling out the new model will there be any money for early initiatives?
 - i. Ryan: This is a great point which we will need to work with the Strategic Planning committee during the hold harmless period.

- b. Ryan: I have concerns about some decisions which will need to be made in order for the new model to succeed.
 - i. Leslie: Could we provide the leadership with a list of specifics which will need to be addressed prior to implementation?

III. Operating Manual

- a. Leslie: Who is the audience?
 - i. Ryan/Bill: Department chairs, budget managers and governance leaders.
 - ii. The plan is that the manuals will go hand in hand with the trainings we offer.