

Joint Budget, Planning and Assessment and Evaluation Sub-Meet and Confer Notes
Thursday, November 17, 2016

In Attendance:

Lynn Akey, Aaron Budge, Kevin Buisman, Brooke Burk, Julie Carlson, Carrie Chapman, Clarke, Jean, Paul Corcoran, David Cowan, Anne Dahlman, Casey Duevel, Lynnette Engeswick, Nathaniel Gustafson-Sundell, Jude Higdon-Topaz, Avra Johnson, Mark Johnson, Cyrenthia Jordan, Jane Kolars, Pat Nelson, Roland Nord, Michael Olson, Kim Rademaker, Kirsten Rosacker, Sharon Sandland, Zorian Sasyk, Bryan Schneider, Steven Smith, Richard Straka, Kory Theil, Denise Thompson, Susan Ward, Chad Wittkop, Pam Weller and Marilyn Wells.

Welcome and Introductions (P. Nelson)

Remember this is a new process, so please share your ideas and please ask questions.

Strategic Budget Planning: Context (L. Akey)

Three Strategic Budget Planning work groups have been formed, their goal is to generate draft recommendations to bring back to this group for discussion. Each group will give a brief narrative today for your feedback:

Strategic Budget Planning Process Work Group (P. Nelson)

Draft Process:

1. Collection of the data
2. Analysis of the data
3. Assign the initial (category/buckets we need to decide what we are going to call them)
4. Communicate which category/bucket has been assigned to each program
5. Appeal process
6. Publish everyone's category/buckets

After review of the Vision and Principles the following suggestions were made:

Main Vision:

- Need to add shared governance
- Add the word proactively before the word align

Principle 2:

- Collaborative process

Principle 3:

- Some points may be sensitive and we may not want to share with the general public.

Principle 4:

- Need to make a statement about assessment
- Seems muddy – need to make it more clear
- Not data driven, data informed

General Comments:

Missing the assessment piece in the Principles.

Budget Planning Context and Communication:

- Establish a communication platform with current budget information and university strategies (Dashboard)
- Articulate and regularly refresh information about the University's strategic budget planning process, criteria, and indicators.

Group Discussion :

1. What should we call the three Categories?
 - Growth, sustain, realign
 - Invest, sustain, disinvest
 - Should add the wording “Candidate for” or “Possible”
 - Called them “Tiers” and suggested reorganization or discontinuation
2. What should be the regular time frame?
 - Every two years following the budget session with triggers for adjustments
 - Every 4 years
 - Staggering it every 2 years
 - 2 years as 4 may be a little to long for people making changes.
 - 2 years should be with the legislative session and contracts

Strategic Budget Planning Non-Academic Work Group (A. Johnson & R. Straka)

What is the criteria that we should use to measure?

A list of criteria at this point:

1. Central to the mission and mandate
 2. Quality: What is the quality of the work is be done
 3. Fiscal viability/cost effectiveness
 4. Forward looking opportunities
 5. Internal and external demand
1. Are we missing anything on this list of criteria, if so what is it?
 - Safety/security and liability/risk should be first (maybe a mandate) may be a category by itself
 - Value to the student
 - Impact of recruiting and retention
 - Global demand under 6
 - Number 2 should be effectiveness – is the service excellent?
 2. Is there anything that needs to be removed from the list?
 - Internal and external demand
 3. How would you rank the criteria in the order of importance? This will be discussed at a future session.

Strategic Budget Planning Academic Work Group (C. Chapman & L. Akey)

There are two basic models being considered:

- One size fits all; and
- Differentiated

The workgroup is considering at the differentiated model.

1. **Award Program:** The Program’s primary contribution is to provide a credential to students that might be certificates, degrees, and etc...
2. **Support Program:** The Program’s primary contribution to the University’s mission is to provide curriculum or service type curriculum that helps award programs.

- 3. Research Scholarly or Creative activity program:** The Program's primary contribution to the University's is to advance research scholarly and creative pursuits. (This is currently being discussed as an option)

Are we describing the programs well? Do these descriptors make sense? Are they reflective of the academic programs here at the University?

- A program might be offended to be called a support program. Maybe call it Base Program or Foundational Program.
- Suggested keeping just the two and utilize program type three as criteria.
- Suggested keeping program type three as a program descriptor.

Have we identified the appropriate criteria?

- Is service just service or does it include community impact or should community impact be brought up as a criteria area?
- Indicators have not been articulated to date, that is the next step.
- We do not want to create new measures, we should be able to pull information from what we are already doing.

Closing Comments & Upcoming Key Dates: (R. Straka.)

Please remember that all the 2010 budget reduction information is available on the University website for your review.

- Strategic Budget Planning Campus Open Forum; Tuesday, November 29, 2016; 11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.; Johnson Alumni Room
- Joint Budget, Planning and Assessment & Evaluation Sub-Meet; Tuesday, December 6, 2016; 3:00-4:30 p.m.; CSU 245
- Strategic Budget Planning Work Group Drafts Recommendations Due; Friday, December 9, 2016