

Proposed PBC Role in Campus Strategic Planning and Budgeting Cycles May 3, 2010

Introduction

PBC is submitting this proposal to the UW-Superior Faculty Senate regarding the role it might take beginning this coming fall (2010) in providing an agreed-upon, regularized avenue for faculty input into the CIPT and campus strategic planning and budget review processes. First we want to share some history of our thinking and discussions.

Last spring in April (2009) PBC developed an approach to send forward to Senate with timelines for providing such review, beginning in the 2009-2010 academic year (see attached April 6, 2009 minutes). The PBC discussed at that time whether it should be considering and making recommendations to Faculty Senate regarding the continuing CIPT planning and budget process processes (over the long term) and the annual and biennial budget processes. For this discussion, PBC members referred to the timelines flow chart based on the various calendar frameworks provided for the CIPT annualized process and the institutional annual and biennial budget processes. Points raised during this discussion included:

- When will the PBC be able to see budget proposals? Will departments be able to propose budgets?
- Regarding budgets, it was felt departments could put budgets in their strategic plans
- Two types of input were identified and described
 - Proactive – This would be input to CIPT based on departmental strategic plans. This would be part of the *academic planning* process with such plans due and/or available in March of each year.
 - Reactive – This would be responding to the CIPT proposal/plan, which is scheduled to be due and/or available in September/October of each year. The reaction would be in terms of the faculty view of the *institutional plan*.
- Another basic question the Council had was whether the processes noted above would be in place within which the PBC could do its reviews and recommendations

After a May 2009 meeting with the Provost, PBC decided to delay implementation of the PBC planning and budget review process we had envisioned in April; this was to allow our review and input work to evolve in sync with the timelines and activities of CIPT, the Provost's Office and the overall campus. It was decided, with the Provost, that PBC would meet with him face-to-face, beginning in the summer of 2009 and twice a month in the academic year, to become educated about campus planning and budgeting processes, as well as to have regular opportunities to offer the Provost feedback on these processes as they unfolded in the 2009-2010 academic year.

During the fall of 2010, PBC met regularly with the Provost, and the Council was exposed to a wide variety of campus planning and budgeting documents. Here is a monthly play-by-play of our progress; minutes for each monthly meeting are attached:

- **September:** In our session with the Provost, he outlined the recent campus approach and strategies for responding to budget cuts as background. Looking forward to this year and the new role of the PBC, he touched on these points:
 - He wants to be a resource to the group and wants to use the group to process potential ideas in a purposeful manner.
 - Additional cuts are likely, given the economic situation, and tuition increases are likely next year
 - The PBC will need to start by getting a sense of the scope of the budget and how accounts work
 - At the next meeting the focus will be to walk through what was done this year and how we got there

At the 2nd September meeting the group was given a tutorial by Jan Hanson about how to think about all the timelines and documents previously shared with PBC.

- **October:** The focus of the meeting's discussion was on the Academic Affairs budget. The Provost walked PBC the group through what was done to address the \$2 million budget cut, where we are now, and what we need to do.
- **November:** The Council discussed these questions with the Provost in this discussion; Are the currently funded Liberal Arts Initiative DINs providing continuous funding that has been added into the campus base? What of that earmarked money has been already dedicated and what is currently being completed or moved upon? What are the resource implications of continuing implementation of the Liberal Arts Initiative DINs into the future? Where is the campus right now in the planning and development of the next round of DINs? In addition to the Academic Plan, what initiatives are being put forward as part of the academic departmental budget process? The Provost told us he have Jeff Kahler provide the PBC with four documents or views on the DIN process: Copies of the original DIN proposals, copies of the approved DIN proposals, copies of the budgeted DIN proposals, and copies of what is being actually spent on the DIN proposals
- **December:** The PBC used the CIPT "triangle document," the UWS Strategic Priorities document, and the UWS Academic Plan as the basis for a discussion related to tenure track faculty positions. Questions included: Is the number of such positions staying even or advancing? What is the history regarding the filling of vacant positions? What do the statistics for tenure track positions over time look like? Where are we and where are we going? What are the faculty resource implications of expanding the First Year experience seminars? What would be the resource implications of adding a Second Year experience effort?
- **February:** The Meetings in February raised these issues:
 - The Council has yet to receive the requested DIN information, a question was raised regarding any current system wide DIN efforts, where does Inclusive Excellence fit into this discussion, what are the upcoming initiatives that the campus has identified? Considerations related to approval of faculty hires and PBC role (none to date), effects of differential tuition upon S & E budgets, and external grants and funding as a potential outside resource.
 - Faith Hensrud came to another February meeting to provide an overview of the current grants and external funding situation and she responded to a range of questions about outside funding, a grants administrator hire, and other issues related to grantsmanship for the campus.

- In another February meeting we were asked by Joel to comment about the plan for restructuring the CIPT and charged with updating the academic plan for the campus.
- **March:** The Council worked on the academic plan update and looked at the materials we were sent about the DIN efforts. The discussion then shifted to the charge of the PBC and its ability to make recommendations to Faculty Senate. PBC concluded that it is once again operating in a vacuum. There is still a lack of clarity regarding the institution's planning function and process (and related schedule/calendar) and how PBC can participate in this process in a proactive and constructive manner. We decided to meet again with Joel Sipress and Chris to discuss these concerns.
- **April:** The Council worked on updating the academic plan (finished in late April) and met with Chris about the budget for the upcoming fiscal year. Chris passed out a summary sheet of funding changes and a detailed budget sheet showing budget related numbers by activity area.

This is where we now find ourselves, a committee in search of a viable role in planning and budgeting processes.

PBC Proposal for Its Role in 2010-2011:

We view the 2010-2011 academic year as a transitional year while we get these processes rolling. Using departmental input as a starting point for PBC review and recommendations to Faculty Senate, the PBC has identified the following three timeframes (in chronological order) as the steps to be taken in 2010-2011 by the Council:

- 1) March – Typically, this would have occurred this past month.
 - a. Here the PBC would review departmental strategic plans as an input base for *proactive* recommendations to CIPT and its planning process for the 2010-2011 academic year.
 - b. Because of this, PBC would like to ask all departments to provide the group with the following materials no later than October of 2010.
 - i. Using the current academic plan and any strategic planning already accomplished, the departments would provide an outline of their immediate and long term planning initiatives.
 - ii. PBC would review these plans and compare them with the CIPT planning documents (if any), identifying gaps and inconsistencies, offering CIPT feedback for their planning processes based on departmental plans provided.
- 2) September/October – Review of CIPT plan (as a document integrating departmental and other plans) as a basis for *reactive* recommendations regarding the plan integration process and product
- 3) January/February – Review (during first week or beginning of semester) the academic budget proposed by the Provost's Office as a basis for *reactive* recommendations regarding how well the budgeted implementation items reflect the plan (whether there is a match).