

University Budget Development Committee

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
Meeting Agenda and Summary

Meeting Time: 10-11am
Meeting Date: Thursday, 5 November 2015
Meeting Location: Dempsey 236

Agenda

- ❖ Summary
- ❖ Announcements
- ❖ Discussion topics:
 - Budget spreadsheet
 - Budget 101
 - Public no more – chapter 6
 - Nacubo article
- ❖ Standing question up for debate: *Should UW Oshkosh continue to use the current incremental budget model as it currently operates at the university to college/unit level?*
 - What do we need to know in order to answer this question?
- ❖ Walk-ons

Recommended readings:

- Chapter 6 in “Public No More” book
 - http://www.nacubo.org/Business_Officer_Magazine/Magazine_Archives/January_2013/The_Buck_Stops_Elsewhere.html
-

Summary

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

- I. Announcements
 - a. We were thinking of having another round of open forums in November.
 - i. One is already scheduled – November 17th.
 - ii. Would we have enough materials for November open forums?
 1. Response: Wait until December.
 - b. Leslie: Would it help that we have a meeting longer than an hour?
 - i. Response: I think that would be a good idea.
 - ii. Jean: Could we use November 17th since it is already scheduled?
 1. Response: Dean Beyer and Koker will not be available to attend.
 2. Response: This is okay, let’s keep it on the books.

- iii. John: How would people feel about a Saturday morning?
 - 1. Response: That might be a good idea.
 - iv. Angie will send out a doodle for November and December to schedule a late evening or Saturday meeting.
 - c. Continued scheduled meetings past our January deadline should be two-hour periods.
 - i. Angie getting a doodle sent out.
 - d. Plan to have an Early Spring Workshop regarding what this committee discovered.
 - i. Possibly a Saturday?
 - 1. Response: I don't think people will come on Saturday.
 - 2. Jean: Especially if they are hourly employees
 - 3. Ryan: We will come back to this at a later date.
- II. Budget 101 Continued
 - a. Graphic
 - i. Revenue Sources
 - 1. Emphasize the proportions feeding into the budget.
 - 2. Jean: I think we should also put the percentages in there.
 - ii. John: Instead of making the triangles smaller, could we make it one triangle and list them all in the one?
 - 1. I don't like the term excess tuition.
 - 2. Reserves are over stated with the 3 triangles.
 - iii. Bill: Are those triangles connected?
 - 1. John: Yes.
 - iv. Jean: Excess Tuition and Unspent General Purpose Revenue could be combined.
 - 1. Drop the word Excess and change it to Unspent.
 - v. Ryan: Change the triangles to drops?
 - vi. Ryan: I think we have enough with the Graphic to make a revised version and review next time.
 - b. Structure of UW Oshkosh Department Numbers
 - i. Leslie: Will we be sharing this page with everyone?
 - ii. Ryan: I think the departmental staff and department chairs will care about this but I don't know about Faculty and Staff
 - 1. Bill: I think all department members would care.
 - iii. Leslie: Maybe show it but don't spend too much time on it.
 - iv. Ryan: I think the Division, Department, and Sub-Department Language does not mesh with what our current vocabulary indicates about Departments and Sub-Departments.
 - 1. John: Possibly use a different department instead of Theatre
 - 2. John: Change Division to College/Unit
 - v. Jean: Maybe combine Department and Sub-Department and just call it Department?
 - 1. Lori: Or put the division and put XXXX for the remainder of the numbers.
 - vi. Leslie: Since it doesn't have direct relativeness to our decision let's put it in its simplest forms and if they have further questions they can contact Administrative Services
 - 1. Bill: But let's make sure that Ryan is prepared for these questions.
 - 2. Ryan: But let's not lead people down this road of questions, as it is a bit tangential to our main purpose.
 - vii. Jean: Does anyone use the UDDS codes anymore?

1. Ryan: I believe its secondary information that we will have prepared but won't include in the presentation.
- c. Glossary
- i. Leslie: Do you want to connect the terms we used in the diagram and the numbers with the Glossary? In other words when we have base budget use GPR and what we call it in the diagram? Just in parenthesis?
 - ii. John: Change to "The four regional Deans of the 13 colleges" under the BOR definition.
 1. Leslie: Put some examples of what the BOR provide as services
 - iii. Jean: University Staff Employee change to Formerly instead of Formally.
 1. John: "The University Staff is a governance group with a voice comparable to those of the UW Oshkosh...."
 - iv. Jean: Alphabetize them
 - v. Ryan: We talk about FTE as students and employees?
 1. Response: Yes, the definition would be applicable to both.
 - vi. Angie: Remove Budget Planning Submission Process Memo Attachment A & B
 1. We don't have that documentation anymore
 - vii. Leslie: Should we define S&E? That definition is misleading
 1. Response: Yes
 - viii. Ryan: Have an example of PRF
 1. "Federal revenues (Program Revenue – Federal) are monies..."
 - ix. Angie: Should we remove PS-SFS? Is it applicable to the campus community?
 1. Response: No, take it out.
 - x. Bill: "Segregated fund revenues that, by law, are deposited into funds other than the general funds..."
 1. Ask Jean for further definition
- d. Program Codes
- i. Bill: Since this is the last number within a funding string. Do we need that information at all?
 1. Ryan: I'm thinking front-line what are we trying to communicate to the campus community? Most people are going to want to know more details than our purview. I agree with Bill, this should be removed from the presentation.
 - ii. Leslie: If we are asking people to make a decision about making a change from our current model, they will want to understand how their funds are affected.
 1. Being able to say how things are going to change, how much autonomy there will be, how will a new model change how we do business?
 2. Yes, they will care about the dollars but their primary concern will be how we manage our money.
 - iii. Bill: But we have to be careful that we still stay within our purview of University to College/Unit budget.
 - iv. Leslie: But really knowing our control over the funds is important
 - v. Ryan: This is the importance of having the Deans involved in this process. When these questions arise we will direct them to the Deans. The Deans will have to decide if or how they will be changing the model within their colleges.

- vi. Leslie: I don't know if we can specifically answer that because the Chancellor will make the ultimate decision about the university-to-college level. To stand up in front of people and make a decision regarding college budget models, I don't want to stand up in front of people and make that promise. It's too early to make that decision.
- vii. John: I have already had that question several times. My response is that we don't really know yet, and we will have to determine it once the chancellor makes his decision. We will then have look at our college individually and have those discussions at the college level.
 - 1. We need to know whether or not a new model will give us more resources, less resources, the same, etc.
- viii. Scott: I think we should at least provide some scenarios that may occur with a change in budget model and how we would operate within our college.
- ix. Ryan: I think that's a good idea to make some assumptions and provide scenarios because then the faculty will have some idea of the next steps forward. If we don't answer them, the faculty will not want to move forward in this process of implementing a new model.
- x. Bill: There was a comment at one of the listening sessions that the pie will not be changing shape. Ryan's response was the goal is to grow the pie.
 - 1. That's a good answer because I don't think people understand that's what we are trying to look at; how to increase the pie. We aren't just shuffling the ingredients and who gets what funding. We are trying to find ways to increase funding, so we don't have to play the game of winners and losers.
 - 2. Ryan: The change of pie size is in our hands.
 - 3. Ryan: I think the Deans won't agree to a new model unless it's clear to them how they might run their college within the new model.
- xi. John: I hope we go to a model where we can understand better and be able to predict our revenue. Allowing us to plan and make decisions and manage resources two or three years in advance.
 - 1. Right now I can plan on what funds I receive but it doesn't correspond to growth or course enrollment.
- xii. Ryan: We need to be prepared for areas that cycle in and out of growth as well.
 - 1. John: My response to that is to compare it to a family. Even if one person brings in smaller salaries than the others; we pool all those resources together and we decide how we disperse our resources. Even if there are children who don't contribute revenue to the family. We will still support them as well.
- xiii. Reginald: If we went with an RCM model, would students see a more entrepreneurial approach? Like for more programs or different programs?
 - 1. John: It could be. Similar with Engineering Technology we found new funds to get this new program off the ground until new enrollment would begin funding this program.
 - 2. John: That was the goal of the 60/40 split to fund new resources across campus. For funds to go back to the colleges for new programs.
 - 3. Jean: Are there any GPR dollars in the Engineering Technology program?

- a. John: No, not right now. The faculty that teaches are all on the 133 Grant account.
 - b. There was a lot of discussion about pulling 102 dollars for this program but the Grant made it easier to decide against it.
4. Jean: At what point do you say if you want to have a new major? Do they all have to be Cost Recovery?
 - a. John: No.
5. Scott: Is it more difficult to start new majors?
 - a. John: Well Engineering Technology was different than starting a new program.
6. Ryan: Does ET take away from Math majors? Are we taking tuition dollars from our target that should be going to a Math major?
 - a. John: That's something that we have to look at.
7. Ryan: That's my concern that we go to a new model and we can't create new programs because they will be taking away from our Tuition Target.
 - a. Lori: In RCM models they have that the Colleges pay a tax to the tuition target so we continue making new programs which generate further funds. All programs become the same; all students will count for the same target instead of having Cost Recovery students and General Enrollment students separate.
8. John: Cost Recovery was an innovative way to generate more funds without depleting 102 dollars.
 - a. It had a rule that we couldn't poach students from general programs.
 - b. These are rules made by UWO not System.