

University Budget Development Committee

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

Meeting Agenda and Summary

Meeting Time: 4-6pm
Meeting Date: Monday, 30 November 2015
Meeting Location: Dempsey 236

Agenda

- ❖ Summary
- ❖ Announcements
 - Update on Budget 101
 - Budget allocations spreadsheet
- ❖ Discussion topics:
 - PBBM (see readings listed below)
 - RCM (see readings list below)
- ❖ Walk-ons

Recommended readings for PBBM:

Overview:

<http://ipspr.sc.edu/ejournal/performancebudgets.asp>

By State:

<http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/performance-funding.aspx>

South Carolina's experience (at state level):

<http://www.highereducation.org/crosstalk/ct0198/news0198-perform.shtml>

<http://www.highereducation.org/crosstalk/ctbook/update0811-performance.shtml>

http://www.nacubo.org/Products/Online_Publications/MADS/Why_Performance-Based_Funding_Has_Not_Succeeded_in_South_Carolina.html

Nova in Florida:

<http://www.universitybusiness.com/article/benefits-performance-based-budgeting>

Prepared By: Angie Metke and M. Ryan Haley
Date Prepared: 10 December 2015

UK Experience:

<http://www.governing.com/topics/education/gov-performance-based-college-funding-coming-stateside.html>

Portland State:

<http://www.pdx.edu/budget/performance-based-budgeting>

University of Florida System (state level):

http://www.flbog.edu/about/budget/performance_funding.php

Recommended readings for RCM:

Overview:

<http://chronicle.com/article/Colleges-Unleash-the-Deans/151711>

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1360080X.2011.605224>

EAB Case Studies:

http://www.uky.edu/ie/sites/www.uky.edu.ie/files/uploads/EAB_RM_Implementing-a-Responsibility-Center-Management-Budget-Model-Challenges-and-Strategies.pdf

Notre Dame (author):

<http://www.academicimpressions.com/news/tailoring-rcm-model-what-works-you>

Virginia:

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/10/27/u-virginia-gives-colleges-ability-spend-money-they-generate>

Indiana:

<http://gradworks.umi.com/36/09/3609718.html>

Davis:

<http://budget.ucdavis.edu/budget-model/>

Ohio:

<https://www.ohio.edu/provost/rcm/resources.cfm>

Summary

Attendees: Ryan Haley, Matt Suwalski, Reginald Parson, Dean Neal-Boylan, Dean Yeo, Nathan Stuart (Attending for Dean Beyer), Jean Kwaterski, Lori Worm

- I. Work with OIR to get SCH and major/minor data (by college)
 - a. Eventually need a process of relaying this data to campus.
- II. Reports
 - a. EAB Report – Optimizing Budget Models.
 - i. Sound Familiar (pg. 5)?
 1. Most sound familiar to struggles our campus faces.
 2. Question: Department chairs demand resources while restricted funds go unspent.
 - a. Ryan: How many of these problems are self-imposed?
 - b. Restricted funds = State Statute or Federal Mandated funds.
 - c. Moving forward we may need to re-think how we interpret these statutes where latitude exists.
 - ii. Good People in a Bad System (pg. 6).
 1. Ryan: Are the faculty and administrator stereotypes listed struggles we will face moving forward at UW Oshkosh?
 2. Nathan: I believe so, but this is where we will need to have the Dean's work with the Administrators to obtain buy-in from campus.
 - b. EAB Report – Optimizing Institutional Budget Models.
 - i. Incentives for Revenue Growth (pg. 6).
 1. Could this be a roadmap for us moving forward?
- III. General Model Ideas
 - a. #1: Target Model.
 - i. Design:
 1. Create tuition revenue targets for each college.
 2. Leslie: Via SCH?
 3. Nathan: Time to Graduation – 120 credit hours.
 - ii. Responses:
 1. Leslie: This could work in some areas but possibly not in other areas.
 2. Nathan: If we did #1 or any other model we will still have transitional issues of finding resources and targets. For example English receives our students but it's not Business English. We would want to start another course for our College.
 - a. Leslie: I don't think we would want to incentivize de-collaboration. We should focus on sharing the revenue.
 3. Matt: Would we be imposing more limitations on our campus structure with Revenue Targets?

- a. If a college doesn't make their target can they take from other units?
 - 4. Nathan: Decentralizing the tuition target to the college/units would be a good idea.
 - a. Fred: Would the target for each unit be generated internally? Generated from Central? Or generated in collaboration with Central and the Deans?
 - b. Jean: How would we split it between the units?
 - 5. Matt: How do we currently meet our tuition target if we don't meet it with 102?
 - a. Lori: PR Balances.
 - 6. Fred: Colleges look at GPR and PR as one in the same; all dollars are green.
 - 7. Leslie: How would we develop service targets for the non-revenue generating units?
 - a. Nathan: Contracts will need to be established listing the quality and timeliness of services expected.
 - b. Leslie: Would the number of customers in each area affect this calculation?
 - c. We may not want to go that far because some areas don't need a large mass of customers; for example the counseling center.
- b. #2 Performance Model
 - i. Design:
 - 1. 4-6 easy metrics.
 - a. Graduation Rates.
 - b. SCH.
 - c. Major Count.
 - d. Student/Faculty ratio.
- c. #4 GPR-to-Cost Model
 - i. Design:
 - 1. Seek mono-funding.
 - a. Remove the circumstances that occur with LLCE, for example, who receive 102 funding, System funding and earns revenue as a Cost Recovery Program.
 - b. Simplify by anything receiving a specific funding, like segregated fees, only receives that.
 - c. Break-down of mono-funding.
 - i. Fund cost-centers with GPR.
 - ii. Partial cost centers will be funded by taxes on the revenue side.
 - iii. Colleges/Revenue Centers would be funded by their Program Revenue.
 - ii. Responses:
 - 1. Leslie: How would we simplify funding?
 - 2. How would we meet our tuition target?
 - 3. Nathan: We will be investing in activities; how we funded previously will no longer matter.

4. Matt: How would we foster innovation and growth in a non-revenue center if they are held accountable by all the units?
 - a. Fred: IMC works with COEHS and explain what they are looking for and what they are willing to give in order to receive extra funding from my unit. This is tying innovation for a non-revenue center to an agreement for revenue.
5. Ryan: At UPenn, the colleges have lots of autonomy.
6. Leslie: Would this incentivize Colleges to cut programs which could broaden an individual's education and emphasize programs which only bring in funds?
 - a. Fred: When this is established there will be mandated programs which will need to be supported no matter what the Colleges agree to.
 - b. Ryan: This is where Central Administrators will be key in reigning in the colleges when they go against the University mission.