

## University Budget Development Committee

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

Meeting Agenda and Summary

---

**Meeting Time:** 10am-12pm  
**Meeting Date:** Monday, 15 February 2016  
**Meeting Location:** Dempsey 236

---

### Agenda

- ❖ Summaries
  - ❖ Announcements
    - FAQ: January 2016 Edition is online
    - Faculty Senate on T @3
    - Q&A sessions
    - Reactions to UBDC Report?
    - New freshman numbers (attachment)
    - CIO meeting
    - Nomenclature
    - Who to meet with next (USP, FDB, EM...)
  - ❖ 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,**
        - 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,**
        - Cost-of-instruction differentials
        - Tuition plateau – (white paper attached)
        - ICRR
        - SF and DT
      - **Policies, procedures, and governance (Bill, Jean)**
        - UW System rules, State Statutes, UW Oshkosh agreements
        - Curriculum committees
        - Hold harmless agreements with sunset clauses
  - ❖ To enroll or not to enroll? – slide show
- 

Prepared By: Angie Metke and M. Ryan Haley  
Date Prepared: 21 February 2016

## Summary

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

### I. Announcements

- a. FAQ posted to the UBDC website Friday.
- b. Faculty Senate tomorrow at 3:15 in Reeve 306.
  - i. We will be presenting the new model, using the slides from Leadership Council.
  - ii. Bill: After every slide I would suggest asking if there are any questions; encouraging a more interactive environment.
- c. Open Forums coming up next week.
  - i. Treating them more like feedback sessions.
  - ii. A PowerPoint presentation will be available as a back-up if there is little to no discussion.
- d. Meeting Debriefings:
  - i. IT CIO – How IT will be collaborating with UBDC and campus as we implement a new model.
  - ii. Brandon Miller – Collaboration with Admissions.
  - iii. USP
    1. We want to start working with them.
    2. Looking at how they will impact class sizes, SCH, etc.
      - a. John: We also will need to look at who participates and enrollment decisions made for Colleges by USP.
  - iv. Leadership Council
    1. February 29<sup>th</sup> meeting Chancellor will be joining us.

### II. Operating Manual

- a. Purpose:
  - i. A document to help us move forward with implementation of a shadow system and hold harmless period.
  - ii. Hope to have a complete manual in the coming 12 months.
  - iii. Goal is to go live during FY17, if all goes well.
- b. Hold Harmless/Shadow System:
  - i. Hold Harmless – you will receive the same budget you receive now, for a period of time to transition.
    1. A meeting will be needed with the Provost or the leadership to determine a new figure which will be provided for a limited time allowing for adjustments and increases in programs, SCH, enrollment, etc.
    2. Leslie: This sounds more like planning; divisions won't be functioning in a new model but will be at the status quo planning ahead to move forward in a new model.
    3. Bill: They will be determining how their finances will change from the current model. For example: every year I pay chargebacks of X amount. Next year I will be paying a tax of Y amount. If it is less or more the divisions will need to determine how best to address the change.

- ii. Fred: I am concerned about the shadow system because divisions will be running two sets of books. Where in a hold harmless period we will be morphing into the new model, using old allocations with different rational on how to address changes.
- iii. John: During the first couple of years some areas will lose money.
  - 1. Bill: This is the issue Deans will have to address. We will need to support the Deans and aid them in focusing on all possible repercussions of any change.
- iv. Ryan will develop a hold harmless example.
- c. Aspects of the Operating Manual:
  - i. Sections:
    - 1. Allocation Spreadsheet
      - a. Members: Lori, Fred, & Angie.
      - b. Hope to present version 2.0 during the coming meetings.
      - c. This will help us identify RGU's and Cost Centers.
    - 2. Cost Assignment
      - a. Members: Nathan and Julia.
    - 3. Revenue Assignment
      - a. Members: Matt &
    - 4. Policies, Procedures & Governance
      - a. Members: Bill & Jean
  - ii. Members will be assigned by Ryan by our next meeting.
  - iii. Goals:
    - 1. Meet with stakeholders.
      - a. Nathan: We should try to schedule one meeting for larger stakeholders so everyone can ask the questions needed for their assignment.
      - b. Bill: Need to take into account state statues.
      - c. Bill: We should invite guests to every meeting. An hour limit for us to ask our questions.
        - i. Ryan: If they can't come to us we will offer to meet with them during a different time.
    - 2. Outside resources.
      - a. Groups may have to work with outside resources/people to support their assignments.

### III. Enrollment – Good to enroll more students or not?

- a. UBDC Concern:
  - i. If we create incentives to grow enrollment will it benefit the University?
  - ii. If we obtain more students but no more GPR we only get 70% of the cost to instruct them and money is lost. Is this correct?
- b. Assumptions:
  - i. Each student requires additional costs.
    - 1. Argument:
      - a. X amount of students does not have to increase costs.
      - b. If we do reach capacity we still want to continue enrollment because adjuncts can be hired, within accrediting limits

- ii. Will we continue to receive the same amount of GPR even if we have a persistent decline in enrollment?
- iii. Tuition is not the only revenue we get from students.
  - 1. Argument:
    - a. We also receive PR dollars: dining, rooms, parking, etc.
- c. Questions:
  - i. Bill: What is the rationale for our enrollment going down?
    - 1. Jean: People say crime rates.
      - a. Nathan: Possibly more negatively reported crime rates.
      - b. Ryan: I checked the crime rates – they have dropped significantly in the last five years – lower crime now.
  - ii. Nathan: What has changed at the University to lead to this?
    - 1. Ryan: USP is a major thing that changed during the past couple years.
    - 2. John: They are currently looking to reform their program; USP 2.0 to focus on retention.
      - a. There was a decline before USP began in FY13/14, but the decline worsened thereafter.
    - 3. Fred: High School graduates have dropped so our pool of applicants has decreased.
      - a. The other Universities have the ability to pull more students due to Minnesota Reciprocity and from Illinois.
      - b. But why are our sister schools growing, while we are declining?
  - iii. Ryan: Is there a group on campus who can advocate for this problem and find a solution?
    - 1. If we move forward with a new budget model it could be blamed for the declining enrollment.
    - 2. Response: That is why Brandon Miller was hired; to focus on such issues.
  - iv. Leslie: What did UW La Crosse do that they grew in freshman enrollment?
    - 1. Ryan: They receive more funding due to a higher DT.
  - v. Leslie: What about summer?
    - 1. John: We currently have no incentive to increase summer enrollment because the Colleges don't see that revenue.
    - 2. It can also lead to decreased enrollments the following semester depending on certain courses.