

University Budget Development Committee

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
Meeting Agenda and Summary

Meeting Time: 11-12 & 3-5
Meeting Date: Wednesday 20 January 2016
Meeting Location: Dempsey 236

Agenda

- ❖ Summaries
 - Report
 - FAQ update
- ❖ Discussion topics concerning UB-1
 - Competition for students
 - Undeclared students
 - 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?
 - Curriculum committees
 - Academic quality
 - Grade inflation
 - Competition for students
 - Online programs
 - Grants, faculty development, and indirect cost recovery
 - Cost recovery programs
 - Differential tuition
 - Segregated fees
 - Institutional barriers to UB-1 success
 - Characterization of current model
 - Foundation
 - Peer/benchmark study
 - Org chart
- ❖ Walk-ons

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

Summary (11am-12pm)

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

I. Announcements

a. Chancellor's Report

- i. Ryan drafting an initial report which will be sent out for committee review.
- ii. The phalanx summaries will be incorporated into the report.
- iii. Concern:
 1. Will competition for students, grade inflation, etc. occur with a new model?
 2. Nathan: We should address this in a preamble stating to the effect that a budget model is one tool of many for an institution to achieve its objectives; and it cannot stand alone. It is not a mechanism for ensuring Academic Quality.

II. FAQ Review

a. Purpose:

- i. The FAQ will be released with the Chancellor's Report.
- ii. They were generated utilizing forum notes/questions and other types of interactions with campus.

b. Questions/Comments:

- i. Reginald/Nathan: The interim response was a little abrupt. We should change it to we will remain silent on that question.
- ii. Matt: As we review them I think we should generalize and not respond if the question does not fall within our purview. We should be direct if the answer falls within the Dean's or Vice Chancellor's purview.
- iii. Nathan: At the beginning I would include What does a Budget Model do? And What does a Budget Model not do?
- iv. Leslie/Ryan: We will be including a glossary in the report as well as in the FAQ's.
- v. Leslie: Is the research or service activity question (pg. 6) something we should address in this document?
 1. Bill/Leslie: Such funding falls within the College's purview but not from the Chancellor to Dean's area. However, the question will continuously come up as we move models; we should somehow address it.
 2. Jean: I would clarify the wording and who it would be applicable to if you are going to keep it in.
- vi. Leslie/Nathan: The first question states UB-1i s a hybrid of five model types yet we do not address which types. This should be included with

an emphasis that UB-1 draws on the strengths of these other models while dissuading the weaknesses of the individual models.

- vii. Nathan/Leslie: We should write out what DOG means (Distribution of Grades)

III. UB-1 Discussion Points

a. Undeclared Majors

i. Gathering the Data:

1. UW System application includes 5 questions regarding college programs.
2. Section 3 #23 affects us the most. "Academic School/College you wish to enter at the University?"

ii. Questions/Concerns:

1. What if students don't complete any of these questions?
2. Jean: We should see what Admissions currently does so we don't add something to their process.
 - a. When do they enter this information into their account?
 - b. What leads to the undeclared status?

Summary (3-5pm)

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

I. Announcements

a. Debrief: Capital Budgeting Meeting with JoAnn

- i. Facilities goal is to see that curriculum and capital budgeting work together during the Strategic Planning process.
- ii. What are examples of a Capital Budgeted building?
 1. Sage
 2. Clow/CON Renovation
- iii. Matt: Rules have been changed regarding what is considered a GPR and a PR building.
- iv. John/Ryan: For some projects we have to bring our own money; so it is a dual capital building project funded by multiple areas.
- v. Lori: I believe things are changing on how they decide to approve projects.
 1. In the past if we had the funds the project would be approved.
 2. They are planning to move to looking at the bonding authority of the entire campus before anything is approved.

b. Debrief: Admissions Process

- i. On the electronic form there are drop-down options provided to students; which then list the college choices.
- ii. Undecided students need to choose a college.
- iii. Admissions encourages us to wait until the 10th day to pull the data because often students will change their minds after Odyssey.
 1. Who administers Odyssey?

- iv. Ryan: In the Chancellor's Report I will write in that right now we want to use Option 1: Students declare a major and revenue goes into the College indicated on TitanWeb; since there is already a mechanism which collects this data. Further discussion can happen if the chancellor wants us to move forward into phase two.

II. UB-1 Discussion Points:

- a. Hold Harmless – What will this period look like?
 - i. Time-Frame
 - 1. We will need a definite date to end the hold harmless period to ensure we transition to our new model.
 - 2. Areas who lose money will want an extended hold harmless period compared to those who will be gaining more.
(Leadership calls)
 - 3. Jean: We will also need to gauge this period based on contracts in areas which will be losing money and may need to react by letting personnel go.
 - 4. Nathan: I suggest it be at least one year to occur alongside the shadow system.
 - b. Future of UBDC
 - i. UBDC will eventually morph into a budget oversight committee
 - ii. Training
 - 1. Other Universities have trained their committee members on how to analyze the programs and hold them accountable.
 - 2. Leslie: I believe an emphasis should be put on how the programs will impact other Colleges during this training.
 - iii. Curricular process:
 - 1. Currently there is relatively little questioning of these proposals.
 - a. Credibility lent to originating unit.
 - 2. John: Currently within the college there are three reviews before it can go to the committee.
 - a. Ryan: With a new model the College reviews may become more lenient due to the financial benefits.
 - 3. John/Leslie/Ryan: We could have the Dean's review the new curriculum proposals before sending them on to the committee.
 - a. They currently have veto power on these proposals.
 - b. Deans will need to be very mindful of these possible curricular changes
 - iv. Representation:
 - 1. John: We may want budget directors to sit on these committees as an advisor, not a voting member - to point out the financial benefits others may not see.
 - 2. Ryan: Universities often revisit the membership of their curriculum committees to ensure that there is not an overrepresentation of one area.
 - a. John: Currently there are four members from each area of COLS and then one representative from each of the other professional schools.

- b. Ryan: We may want to move away from this because in the new model the COLS members will have a strong incentive to vote as a block.
 - c. Budget Directors
 - i. Who are they?
 - 1. Ryan: You see many universities having budget directors who work with the deans.
 - a. Advocating for their programs.
 - b. Pointing out financial benefits.
 - c. Working with the central administration and the other directors.
 - 2. Leslie: Further discussion needs to be had regarding these positions
- d. Faculty Development
 - i. Current System
 - 1. Faculty Development is funded from the Provost Office and is controlled by the Grants Office.
 - ii. Questions
 - 1. If we are decentralizing everything else, should this be something that should be moved to the dean authority?
 - a. John: I am worried that if we give the dean that authority it will be the first thing to go with budget cuts.
 - i. Could be just as easily cut at the provost level
 - 2. What if we offered an opt-out option for the deans?
 - a. Leslie/Bill: I would worry about what it would fund; would preference be given to certain colleges?
 - b. Colleges would report their fund usage to central, in compliance with System expectations.
 - iii. Future:
 - 1. Nathan: No matter what we decide the level of funding will either have to come from central or from each college.
 - 2. John: If the colleges fund it they may have an expectation of services or money.
 - a. The colleges are effectively funding it either way.
 - 3. John: It probably should be funded from central if the campus chooses to continue with faculty development.
 - 4. Ryan: We'll need to think through the incentives of each funding avenue
- e. Cost Recovery Programs
 - i. Ryan: The distinction between standard programs and CRPs largely disappears under UB0-1, but there still may be reasons to retain the CRP concept.
 - ii. Nathan: The 60/40 will then go away and will be replaced with cost assignment and the tax.
 - iii. Bill/Ryan: There may be push-back to this. But if we relay the positive outcomes (e.g., how CRPs will now be able to cover indirect costs) it may go over better.
- f. Segregated Fees

- i. Ryan: This is an on-going question on whether we can tax these. We need to look at the policy (UW System F50).
 - ii. Nathan/Ryan: We will need to break these down and determine which are revenue generating areas and which are cost centers, funded primarily by Segregated Fees.
- g. Differential Tuition
 - i. Jean: Units funded by Differential Tuition don't have money left at the end of the year because it is swept up into a holding account for the following year.
 - 1. CAR is the only area funded primarily from Differential Tuition.
 - ii. Ryan: Since these are revenue centers do we tax them or no?
 - 1. John: Since Differential Tuition was a campus decision made by students we will have to go to them about changing where their funding goes.