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At the end of the 2015-2016 academic year, both the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight (JTFSO) and the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation (JTFRA) submitted their final reports to the Faculty Senate and disbanded. Their reports include recommendations that were endorsed by the Senate in Motion Number 31-16. Specifically, creation of a new campus-level standing committee dedicated to providing leadership and oversight to the campus strategic planning process and the associated resource allocation system. The committee’s membership and organization were to be developed jointly by the Chancellor and the Faculty Senate Rules Committee, and the committee was charged with undertaking review of the FY18 budgeting process, continuing the work of the Joint Subcommittee on Administrative Costs and Services (JSACS), and informing and encouraging discussion with the campus community.

Over the summer of 2016, the Chancellor and Rules Committee formed the Campus Planning and Resource Committee (CPARC). Consistent with the recommendation endorsed by the Senate, the Committee was charged with

1) undertaking input on and review of the implementation of the annual budget process, including preparation of the FY18 budget, with a view to ensuring that the resource allocation system serves the purpose of aligning resources with campus values, and that the entire process meets the stated goals of transparency and consultation, and with recommending adjustments as needed;

2) integrating the work of the Joint Subcommittee on Administrative Costs and Services; and

3) encouraging ongoing efforts to pursue campus-wide priorities, including, but not limited to, the campus’s diversity plan, plans for internationalization, and an outreach and engagement strategy.

CPARC commenced regular meetings in the spring semester of 2017 to engage in each of the above three action items. Following is a status report for each.

I. Review of the Campus Budget Planning Process for FY’18

CPARC discussions were informed by updates from deans on the college consultative processes that were being implemented during AY 2016-2017, review of various budget planning documents including some of the prioritized budget requests (“Rollups”) from deans (posted on a CPARC website on 4-19-17), as well as preliminary A&S unit Rollups. CPARC identified a number of opportunities for improving the overall effectiveness of the planning process and the satisfaction of the involved parties. Input on these findings was solicited from the Provost, deans, and academic department heads. These issues are described below, together with CPARC’s recommendations for improvement.

1. Insufficient feedback to departments on whether their plans and/or budgets have been approved at subsequent levels. There is a sense that departments send their plans "over the transom," but are not clear about the status of plans or when clarity might be achieved. There seemed to be some variation across colleges in terms of both the level and form of feedback (e.g., formal vs. informal, private vs. on the record).

CPARC recognizes that budgetary uncertainty during the course of the year makes useful feedback challenging, but recommends that colleges adopt clear expectations for the nature and timing of feedback that can be provided. For example, if a proposal seems unlikely to receive favorable action within the range of likely budget assumptions, it may be better to provide feedback to that effect as early in the process as possible rather than leave all questions hanging. The proposed revised process includes scheduled discussions and feedback between planning groups at multiple points of the process, including at the final decisions of funding. Additionally, department head feedback suggested that some clarity about a minimal unit budget earlier in the process would allow departments to more quickly adjust course offerings to meet demand and compete more effectively for temporary and or specialized instructional support, rather than having to wait for the full budget process to conclude in the summer.

2. Insufficient opportunity for departments and colleges to express their perspectives on the impacts of budgetary and trend changes. The process's focus on improvement (either within existing resources or with new investment) is understandable, but departments and colleges are
also often challenged to cope with changes in the demands placed upon them on an everyday basis. The annual planning and budget process should provide an opportunity for units to comment on their overall resource situation and detail changes in their circumstances that may not fit within the concept of "strategic investment."

Department budget plans and college rollups should include a summary of the status of resources with an opportunity to remark on changes in demand and resources and how those changes affect the department/college’s capacity for quality and effectiveness.

3. **Confusion regarding what is due to whom, with whom discussions are to take place, and at what point these discussions will occur.** The planning and budget process has evolved considerably during its first two years, and some confusion about timelines and steps is inevitable. In addition, while flexibility across schools and colleges is desirable, it can also contribute to confusion if local processes are not clearly mapped back to basic campus-wide expectations.

The proposed revised timeline has clearer indications of the requested deliverables and the discussions that will take place at each step. CPARC recommends that College guidelines and processes clearly indicate how they link back to the overall campus process.

4. **Year to year budgets do not fully account for plans and budgetary commitments that are multi-year in nature.** There is a strong desire on the part of units to take a multi-year view of budgets, and this is completely consistent with the campus strategic plan. CPARC recognizes, however, that promoting a multi-year perspective is complicated. In many cases, ongoing fiscal uncertainty means that the campus is not in a position to make multi-year funding commitments. However, we believe some steps can be taken to promote a longer and broader view even in the face of financial uncertainty.

CPARC recommends that a one- to three-year timeframe be incorporated into departmental and college budget plans to make clear when proposed actions are part of a longer-term strategy, and to enable discussion of timing and phasing where appropriate. In addition, CPARC encourages Deans, Vice Chancellors and the Chancellor to identify funding pools – even if only modest ones – that can support multi-year initiatives. This has been done on a large scale with respect to priorities such as data science and Biomedical Engineering, with positive impact on planning.

5. **The planning and budget process currently focuses only on financial resources, but often space and facilities are critical to plans for improvement.** It is not clear how units should express facilities needs in their budget plans, and the lack of clarity can create unnecessary confusion and frustration.

CPARC recommends that annual budget plans include explicit reference to both financial and physical resources, and clearly indicate the full set of resources required for a given action. In addition, we recommend that the campus capital planning process be more effectively integrated with budget planning, so that the status of physical resources is clear.

6. **Lack of clarity regarding the relationship between academic planning and unit planning for administrative and support services.** Much of the early attention in the budget planning process has focused on academic departments and schools and colleges, with somewhat less general understanding of the process and results for administrative areas.

CPARC recommends that Administrative and Support (A&S) unit planning and budget process steps be added more explicitly to the timeline, showing how the academic and administrative and support unit planning and budget processes overlap and intersect to form the larger campus process. In addition, CPARC believes that the A&S process can be accelerated (because it involves one less layer compared to
7. **Lack of clarity regarding what is represented in the process**, i.e., do the budget plans refer only to central base funding? Where and how do in-college distributions appear? Is there a common definition of strategic investment? Because the process operates at different levels, it is not always clear which level is at work. CPARC's work focuses on the campus-wide budget and planning process: the steps by which decisions are made about base budgets in the executive areas and colleges, including central base strategic investments. There are many other important budgetary decisions, including internal allocations and reallocations by Deans and Vice Chancellors and various non-base allocations. From the perspective of the unit, however, "the budget" is all of these things, so it is important to provide clarity.

CPARC recommends that a document be developed to accompany next year’s planning that clearly defines each aspect of the process, including a “what this is/what this is not” section, and illustrating how the pieces of the budget process work together.

8. **Promoting useful and timely discussion of the process and its results.** One challenge that has clearly emerged in the first two years of the new process is incorporating constructive review and feedback into a complex process that barely fits into the academic calendar. We want thoughtful deliberation, but we also want an opportunity to review and reflect on what the process produces. There are two sides to this: 1) monitoring and providing feedback on the process, which is a central part of CPARC's job; and 2) assimilating and discussing the substantive priorities and allocations emerging from the process, which is of general interest to the whole campus community. The latter is especially difficult when College and Executive Area plans are not synthesized until near the end of the spring semester.

CPARC wrestled with the challenges of monitoring the budget planning process in real time. We've worked to achieve clarity in the consultative processes within each College, and above suggest improvements for incorporating discussion of planning by A&S units before the annual cycle is completed. But some aspects of process monitoring, and most aspects of substantive review, simply cannot be achieved in a few weeks in the spring. We therefore propose to shift the timeline so that each cycle begins with a "look back" on the previous cycle early each fall, taking stock of its successes and shortcomings, and proposing adjustments to the process for the cycle about to begin. We also plan to organize a substantive review of the previous cycle each fall, assessing the extent to which the process met its goals of aligning resources with campus priorities and examining unit action plans in light of the trends and performance data associated with campus goals.

9. **Insufficient guidance on expectations for unit planning and budget proposals, and insufficient advice on how to focus on the useful and avoid busy work.** To allow for the various schools/colleges and executive areas to reflect their specific character and goals, CPARC has not recommended a standard format for the departmental or administrative and support unit planning and budget proposals. However, with so many steps and moving parts the underlying purpose of the process can become lost, or appear more daunting than it is intended to be.

CPARC will more clearly frame the universal aspects of the process, provide more useful guidance on formats, and is recommending that each school/college or executive area provide its own guidance on the submission format.

10. **Insufficient formal opportunities for student input.** Student leadership is represented in the CPARC membership, but the process itself does not yet mesh well with ongoing feedback processes for undergraduate and graduate students.
CPARC is recommending specific points of campus discussion that will be relevant to student feedback. The fall governance discussion will include the student governance groups (SGA and GSS), and specific opportunities for engaging the Student Advisory Boards (SABs) in each A&S area have been identified. We are engaged in ongoing discussions with the student leadership to create appropriate review mechanisms that mesh with their existing organizations.

II. **Integrating the work of the Joint Subcommittee on Administrative Costs and Services**

The work of JSACS has been fully integrated into CPARC’s activity. The subcommittee continues as originally organized, and in the fall CPARC will discuss JSACS’s organization and membership as needed. JSACS devoted much of its effort this year to organizing a survey of faculty, staff and department heads on business practices that need improvement. A status report on this process from JSACS is attached.

III. **Encouraging ongoing efforts to pursue campus-wide priorities**

Preliminary discussions with the new Director of the International Programs Office and the Chair of the Faculty Senate Council on Public Engagement and Outreach occurred this semester, and a discussion of outreach and engagement will occur at CPARC’s final meeting of this semester. Those conversations, as well as updates on diversity planning, will be resumed in the fall.

**Next Steps for CPARC**

CPARC has one final meeting scheduled for this academic year, at which time we will develop our action agenda for AY 2017-2018. Topics up for discussion include:

1. Determining how to review alignment and effectiveness of the FY18 budget planning cycle for A&S and Academic Affairs units
2. Use AY16-17 input from Heads/Chairs, Deans, Provost to further refine/revise the budget planning process, including the systematic/formalized engagement of student priorities in the process
3. Advise on the preparation for the NEASC re-accreditation self-study including re-visiting campus strategic priorities
4. Continue discussion with groups engaged in other strategic planning including, but not limited to, the campus’s diversity plan, plans for internationalization, and an outreach and engagement strategy.

**Overview of the Annual Campus Planning and Budget Cycle**

Based on CPARC discussions and feedback received, the following figure illustrates the recommended process for annual planning and resource allocation.
Joint Subcommittee on Administrative Costs & Services (JSACS)!
Campus Business Practices Survey!
Report to CPARC!
25 April 2017!

Task Force Members!

Co: Chairs: Julie Brigham-Grette (Department Head, Geosciences); Andy Mangels (Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance)!

Ghazah Kawish Abbasi (Sociology)!
Bryan Beck (Planning Associate, Chancellor’s Office)!
Marilyn Billings (Faculty Senate Rules Committee; Dubois Library)!
Julie Buehler (Vice Chancellor for Information Services and Strategy, CIO)!
Elizabeth Chilton (Associate Vice Chancellor for Research)!
Nancy Cohen (Senior Planning Officer, Nutrition)!
Deborah Gould (Chief, Academic Finance and Administration, Provost’s Office)!
Bryan Harvey (Associate Chancellor, Chief Planning Officer)!
Eddie Hull (Executive Fin/Admin/Plan Officer, Student Affairs and Campus Life)!
A-Yemisi Jimoh (Professor, Afro-American Studies)!
John Kingston (Professor, Linguistics)!
Lynn McKenna (Associate Budget Director, Budget office, A&F)!
Thomas Moliterno (Isenberg School of Management)!
Jennifer Normanly (Department Head, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology)!
Amilcar Shabazz (Professor, Afro-American Studies)!
Thomas Szumita (Director, Finance & Business Services, Student Development)!
Jeremy Tibbetts (Public Health Sciences)!
Jacqueline Watrous (Executive Director Administrative Systems, A&F)!

Charge

The charge of JSACS, originally as a subcommittee of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight (JTFSO) and Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation (JTFRA), was to outline a strategic budget process for A&S units within the context of the development of a larger campus-level budget process, undertake a first iteration of review of administrative costs and services, and make a recommendation on the process moving forward.
Activities

During the Fall semester, 2016 we developed an on-line questionnaire to solicit feedback from the campus community about campus business practices. We developed a website to request input concerning barriers to progress in the daily operations of the university. We aimed to improve administrative business practices on campus and asked people to help by thinking about administrative processes and procedures that could be improved with urgency or over the long term.

To this end, the committee developed a survey that was sent to all campus faculty and staff. The survey was designed to identify the areas where:

- They spend the most time developing workarounds,
- There is a drain on time and patience
- There is an obstacle to progress.

Results

The JSACS survey solicited input from the widest swath of faculty and staff on priorities for improving administrative business practices. The survey was open from January 15 to February 24, 2017.

Our survey received 257 responses that could be categorized under broad areas of campus endeavors. This included EOD, Admin and Finance, academic finance operations, facilities, procurement, and two miscellaneous categories. The number of comments fell under the category of Human Resources (257) related to the hiring and job leveling. Detailed text descriptions were captured in spreadsheet form according to the 10 categories so that the specifics of the suggestions could be easily assessed.

All of the survey responses are now being classified into 6 “action categories”:

1. Feed Data to a planned Administrative Quality Assessment and Development (AdQAD) Process
2. Launch a new AdQAD in a problem area
3. Get more information about a problem area
4. Talk to Relevant Administrators about issues presented
5. Areas where we need to develop performance metrics
6. Parking Lot – Things less urgent that need attention

For example, Human Resources is currently conducting an AdQAD and the survey responses will be incorporated into this process. Other responses point to the need for a department to reach out to the campus community to conduct more research and analysis to obtain more
information about the challenges of a particular business process or system, such as travel or grant proposal processing.

The most important next step is to summarize the results for the campus community to promote transparency, improve services, and community. This will be done by creating a new landing page on the JSACS website that will bin the results into the 6 action categories and paraphrase the scope of the responses. It is the intent of the committee to preserve the trust of the campus community that all responses will remain anonymous. At the same time, we also wish to faithfully report the results and actions being taken. Once the results are compiled, we will report to CPARC and drive traffic to the website with email messaging to the campus community.

JSACS agreed that the process of soliciting campus suggestions to improve our business practices should be an ongoing endeavor, perhaps handled by a smaller committee to review incoming responses on a regular basis.