

University Budget Development Committee

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

Meeting Notice and Agenda

Meeting Time: 2-4pm
Meeting Date: Tuesday, 5 April 2016
Meeting Location: Dempsey 236

Agenda

- ❖ Phalanx processes and updates
 - ❖ Walk-ons
-

Summary

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

I. Announcements

- a. Chancellor sent out a video approving UBDC's next steps to move forward with a new budget model.
- b. UW System's new model.
 - i. Ryan is being asked to help UW System work through the System level budget model.
 - ii. This may help with UWO's plans to move forward with a new model.
- c. Provost Earns input.
 - i. Wants an understanding of what his role will be moving forward.
 1. Matt: We need a separate section outlining the roles of the Vice Chancellors, Deans, etc. in the Operating Manual.
 - a. Ryan: Yes, it will need to be in the governance section of our manual.
 - b. The Illinois model had a nice set-up on governance.
 - ii. Recommended that Central would be overseen by a budget committee and that the Dean's would also be overseen by the same committee.
 1. We never mentioned this in our White Paper; it needs to be included in the Operating Manual.
 - iii. Ryan emphasized that Program Prioritization needs to be underway prior to the implementation of a new model.

II. Next Steps

- a. Operating Manual
 - i. Phalanxes will need to identify their portion of the Operating Manual and write up how UW Oshkosh will approach each section.

Prepared By: M. Ryan Haley
Date Prepared: 4 March 2016

- ii. Institutional Research will need to be brought in to begin providing data.
 - 1. Bill: How will we obtain benchmark data?
 - a. Ryan: The Cost Assessment Group will be looking into that.
- b. Phalanx Sub-Group Meetings
 - i. Invite Ryan to all scheduled phalanx meetings.
 - ii. He would like to participate and provide feedback.
- c. Phalanx Reports
 - i. Each large group UBDC meeting will have time for Phalanx debriefing.
 - ii. 1-2 Phalanxes can present where they are, questions they have, roadblocks they have encountered to the large group.
- d. Feedback
 - i. Bill: There will be some topics which will span across several phalanxes; should we then utilize the large group meetings for these?
 - 1. Ryan: Yes, our large group meetings will allow for bringing in representatives from across campus.

III. Phalanx Updates

- a. Revenue Assignment Questions:
 - i. Tuition Plateau: A year roughly 6-7 Million dollars of classes are taught for free.
 - 1. The issue:
 - a. UW Oshkosh couples interim with the semester allowing students to take more free classes.
 - b. If we decoupled interim from the semester students would pay for interim classes if they take all their credits during the regular semester.
 - 2. Responses:
 - a. Matt: If we have a plateau or not the Colleges will get the funds based off of whichever formula is determined.
 - b. John: If we recommend a change and it is implemented prior to the new model it will make it easier to divide up the tuition for those courses.
 - c. Leslie: Would decoupling allow for more offerings of classes which quickly fill during the semester?
 - d. Ryan: The alternative would be to leave interim as it is and advertise more aggressively.
 - i. Nathan: I would be concerned that we would not make enough revenue to support the free interim classes.
 - ii. John: Or we could just allow interim for study abroad, research and other courses which require fees for their programs.
 - ii. How will Segregated Fees and Differential Tuition work with mono-funding?
 - 1. Ryan: Is it within our purview to mandate these areas mono-fund?
 - 2. Matt: We wouldn't be looking to change what they fund, just minimize the accounts in which they fund.

3. Leslie: I am concerned with funding Segregated Fee and Differential Tuition funded areas with the Central Tax since my students don't utilize all of those resources.
- b. Cost Assignment Discussion
 - i. Revenue Generating Entity (RGU) is anything that generates revenue.
 1. Programs which may need to be removed:
 - a. LLCE; they offer credit and non-credit bearing programs.
 - b. Athletics does not generate enough revenue to maintain themselves.
 - c. Business Success Center is being incorporated into the Universities accounts.
 2. Programs which should be included:
 - a. Reeve and University Dining should be separate.
 - b. Student Recreation & Wellness Center.
 3. Questionable Programs:
 - a. Best Western Hotel.
 - b. Biodigesters.
 - c. Foundation.
 - ii. Divisible Entities Feedback.
 1. We should stick to 3-4 metrics max.
 2. Leslie: Each of these areas should be evaluated based on the value RGU's receive.