

## University Budget Development Committee

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

Meeting Agenda and Summary

---

**Meeting Time:** 2-4pm  
**Meeting Date:** Monday, 7 March 2016  
**Meeting Location:** Dempsey 236

---

### Agenda

- ❖ Summaries
  - ❖ Announcements
    - Any additional reactions to UBDC Report?
    - Faculty Senate update
    - Phase 2
  - ❖ Budget manual creation strategies
  - ❖ Top-10 list
  - ❖ Declared majors vs. graduated majors – some data
  - ❖ Allocations spreadsheet (maybe)
  - ❖ Phalanx updates?
  - ❖ Walk-ons
- 

### Summary

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

- I. Announcement
  - a. UBDC Proposal Feedback?
    - i. Leslie: Questions regarding the need to have a new model implemented faster than we have estimated.
    - ii. Bill: Faculty Senate is formulating a response to UB-1 with concerns.
    - iii. Bill: Questions regarding forums to gather input on the Operating Manual.
  - b. Phase Two: Ryan is drafting a memo to announce the approval to move forward to phase two.
- II. Top 10 List
  - a. Foundational items needed for a successful UB-1
    - i. Strategic Realignment in place prior to the implementation of UB-1.
      1. John: Some changes we may want to wait on until after the implementation of UB-1.
        - a. Programs which are funded via the College and Central due to need or lack of funding from one source.

---

Prepared By: Angie Metke and M. Ryan Haley  
Date Prepared: 20 April 2016

- b. We do not want to make a change for a year and then have a new budget model make further changes.
  - ii. Leadership's support of the opportunities and not just the hardships UB-1 may bring.
  - iii. Curriculum committees may benefit from restructuring or additional oversight due to UB-1 incentives.
  - iv. Centralized marketing may create problems for a decentralized budget model:
    - 1. John: We could suggest that these people sit within the department they work for but they could report to IMC.
    - 2. Ryan: We could also ask why IMC staff is reporting to University Advancement rather than Enrollment.
  - v. Enrollment needs to be more broadly understood.
  - vi. Data driven campus culture needs to germinate.
  - vii. Start-up funding will be needed.
  - viii. Appropriate leadership and financial conditions are needed. If this cannot be provided then perhaps implementation should be delayed.
- b. Feedback:
  - i. Leslie: Suggest bringing the Chancellor back to discuss this list.
  - ii. John: There should be an emphasis on who will be making the budget decisions on campus, since it won't be the model.

### III. Operating Manual creation strategies

- a. Committee will review the provided Operating Manuals and provide feedback on which one, or pieces of which ones would work best for our campus.
- b. Reginald: Okanagan was pretty clear and understandable.
- c. UNH is the most thorough.

### IV. Allocating 102 dollars

- a. Declared Majors vs. Graduated Majors:
  - i. Ryan: It may be more appealing to use graduated majors.
    - 1. This will help with having an understandable data culture.
  - ii. Feedback:
    - 1. Leslie/John: What is the declared point?
      - a. Ryan: Declaring a college coming in as a freshman.
    - 2. Bill: Can we get a five and ten year comparison to see the variation between the two metrics?
    - 3. Leslie: These metrics concern me because CON will always be limited due to the limitation on faculty from accreditation.
      - a. This would impact declared or graduated.
- b. Other metrics:
  - i. SCH Only
    - 1. SCH could become the only mechanism which we allocate 102.
    - 2. With the decline in GPR people have argued that GPR will continue to decline and SCH is the only area with the possibility to grow.
    - 3. Divisions will keep their home tuition and there will be a 50/50 split with home and instruction sharing.
  - ii. SCH & Major Rule
    - 1. Current proposal made in the recommendation.
    - 2. Revenue sharing based on SCH.

- iii. 100% Instruction and Graduation
  - 1. All SCH revenue goes to the instructing unit.
  - 2. Percent of graduates will be used to augment the instruction; offsetting instruction only areas.
- c. Feedback:
  - i. John: It would be helpful to walk all of these scenarios through to see the impact.
  - ii. 100% instruction and graduation rule seems more complex than the SCH only option.
  - iii. John: Could we do an option where we stick with the sharing of SCH for tuition and use percent of graduates to divide up GPR?
  - iv. Fred: My concern is that we are trying to level the playing field by further complexities.