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(i) Membership
Members with terms concurrent with holding the position listed
Secretary of the Faculty Senate: MJ Peterson
Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee or designee: David Gross/Eliot Moss
Chair of the Academic Priorities Council or designee: Richard Bogartz
Chair of the Program and Budget Council or designee: Anthony Paik
Associate Chancellor and Chief Planning Officer: Bryan Harvey
Deputy Chancellor: Steve Goodwin
Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance or designee: Andrew Mangels/Lynn McKenna
Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement or designee: Mike Malone/Martina Nieswandt
Chief of Academic Finance and Administration: Deb Gould

Members with staggered two-year terms
Three Faculty Members at-large:
Jennifer Normanly (Chair)
A-Yemisi Jimoh
Sally Campbell Galman

Two Department Heads/Chairs:
Christopher Hollot, Electrical and Computer Engineering, vacant

Two Deans of Colleges or Schools with degree programs:
Tim Anderson, Engineering
Julie Hayes, Humanities and Fine Arts

Two other Deans (CHC, Graduate School, Library, Undergraduate Education):
Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
Simon Neame, Dean of Libraries

Members with two year terms
One other Vice Chancellor: Enku Gelaye, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life
Two undergraduate students appointed by the Student Government Association:
Anthony Vitale, Derek Dunlea
One graduate student appointed by the Graduate Student Senate: Laura Hancock
This committee had substantial participation and support from
Senior Planning Officer Nancy Cohen and Planning Associate Bryan Beck

Submitted by Jennifer Normanly
Chair, Campus Planning and Resource Committee
Scope of Work
The Campus Planning and Resources Committee (CPARC)
• Advises the Chancellor on issues related to ongoing strategic planning
• Identifies priorities emerging from planning, and the alignment of resources with those priorities
• Conducts ongoing evaluation of the annual planning and budget process
• Engages campus administrative leadership and faculty and student governance groups
• Keeps the campus community informed of its work and recommendations regarding organization of planning and budgeting
• Encourages community discussion and feedback, and provides regular reports and recommendations to the Faculty Senate, including a comprehensive annual report to the Faculty Senate in the spring semester

Summary of Recommendations from the CPARC Final Report to the Chancellor 4/26/17
• Going forward, CPARC should conduct a “Look back”, asking whether budget outcomes from the previous years budget planning process aligned with strategic priorities and campus values
• CPARC should “Look forward”, using feedback from campus to recommend changes to the budget planning process
• CPARC was tasked with advising on the preparation for the NEASC re-accreditation self-study including re-visit ing campus strategic priorities
• CPARC would continue discussion with groups engaged in other strategic planning

AY’ 17-18 Focus
Much of the focus for CPARC in AY 17-18 centered on development of the campus strategic plan refresh and preparation for the university reaccreditation review scheduled for October, 2018. In addition to the NEASC self study process, CPARC developed a process for the “Look back”, a survey that was developed with input from campus Heads and Chairs to elicit their feedback on the budget planning process. The survey was designed to understand how Departmental Performance Profiles were used in the budget planning process and what sort of performance metrics or other data would be useful.

NEASC Self Study/Strategic Plan Refresh
CPARC provided oversight and feedback on the strategic plan refresh. The process began with a situation assessment exercise, in which a broad range of campus leaders — including the Deans and Vice Chancellors, academic department heads, and faculty and students active in shared governance — were surveyed to explore the extent to which consensus exists regarding important forces in the external higher education environment. Each participant was asked to respond to a set of 24 statements reflecting external perspectives or factors, and to rate each in terms of “the current importance of the factor to the campus’s planning,” and also their “sense of its importance over the next 5-10 years (i.e., the extent to which it should influence our choices and action).” Respondents were asked to assess “the importance of these views to us as we shape our next campus plan, not … our agreement/disagreement with them.” In all, more than 120 respondents participated. These statements spanned a wide range of issues, from “skepticism that a traditional college experience is worth the money” to “concern that, given competing priorities, the breadth and scale of federally sponsored research cannot maintain its growth trend.” They were chosen to reflect common concerns expressed by a variety of stakeholders and policy leaders. A summary of responses was presented to CPARC and available to working groups through the campus planning website https://www.umass.edu/planning/refresh-archive

To begin the discussion phase of the refresh process, a brief document was prepared based on the Executive Summary of the 2013 Innovation and Impact Strategic Plan, edited to include salient Phase II (2014) updates, and remove issues that were no longer relevant. The Chancellor’s office collected overview feedback from the Campus Leadership Council (CLC)/Deans at their August 2017 Retreat on
the extent to which each section of the 2013 summary fits the current situation and priorities, whether a different direction is needed, or if important ideas are missing. The Chancellor’s office convened Working Groups (WG) for each major section of the 2013 SP (with WG chairpersons): Diversity and Inclusion (Anna Branch), Graduate Education (Barbara Krauthamer), Outreach and Engagement (Nancy Cohen), Research (Michael Malone and Martina Nieswandt), Resources (Andy Mangels), Undergraduate Experience (Carol Barr and Enku Gelaye). WG chairs developed a brief update of key progress since 2013 to inform WG discussions. The WGs had access to the 2013 strategic plan summary, key progress points where available and the CLC/deans overview feedback, along with more complete background materials from the full 2013 Innovation and Impact Strategic Plan, Phase II reports from 2014, and the campus Diversity Strategic Plan along with the situation assessment. [https://www.umass.edu/planning/working-group-instructions-refresh]

WG feedback was organized into Commentaries to include the broad campus-level priorities and issues from each WG, highlighting any differences from 2013. These were reviewed with the primary contributors (WGs, CLC/Deans, CPARC) to ensure that the principal priorities were expressed. Based on the above input, a refreshed 2018-2023 Campus Strategic Plan was drafted to include principal campus-level goals and action steps to advance the campus in light of our current and anticipated situation over the next 5-10 years. The draft was shared with campus governance groups (faculty, graduate students, undergraduates; see list below*), stakeholder groups and leadership groups, posted on a campus website with feedback solicited through a webform and email, and presented at two open forums. Over 120 suggestions were received to date. The 2018-2023 Campus Strategic Plan will be revised in consultation with CPARC, working group leaders, and deans and other campus leaders. The working group reports and final Strategic Plan will inform school/college and unit-level plans as well as the 2018 self-study report for NEASC reaccreditation.

*Feedback sessions:
Faculty Senate Councils: Program and Budget, Research, Graduate, Public Engagement and Outreach, Undergraduate Education, Academic Matters
Student Advisory Councils: Student Affairs and Campus Life, Academic Affairs, Administration and finance, University Relations
Student Senates: GSS, SGA
External: Amherst/Campus Council; Alumni Association Board (to be presented)

FY’ 19 Budget Planning Process
Summary of observations of the FY’19 College Budget Planning Processes

- Deans were asked to do the following prior to submitting college budget plans to the provost (Feb 12, 2018)
i. Share the original departmental plans with department heads/chairs and through the college consultative process,

ii. Provide feedback to the department heads/chairs on their plans and to the extent that makes sense for a school/college, provide the rationale to department heads/chairs for what would and would not be put forward in the college roll up

iii. Share plans for the college roll up along with departmental plans in the college consultative process

- Department Performance Profiles were similar in format to FY’18 profiles (one page) www.umass.edu/planning/fy19-planning
- Based upon CPARC recommendations, space planning was included in Unit Planning Requests
- Three new deans to campus resulted in three new College Consultative Processes
- Administrative and Support (A&S) units were provided with templates and planning guidelines https://www.umass.edu/planning/fy19-admin-and-support

Summary of the Administrative & Support (A&S) Budget Planning Processes

A&S units utilize a comprehensive approach to budget planning. This process includes a sharp focus on administrative efficiency and effectiveness. The A&S unit process involves:

- All units target performance improvements emerging from multi-year strategic plans, utilizing performance metrics to guide those areas where improvement is most needed.
- Cost reductions are used to close budget gaps or to reinvest in campus strategic priorities.
- Unit priorities are discussed within each Vice Chancellor’s area to improve collaboration and efficiency.
- Specific action plans for the fiscal year focus on both improvements to be pursued within existing resources and high-impact strategic investments.
- Pooling resources among units is encouraged.

In FY17, the Joint Subcommittee on Administrative Costs and Services (JSACS) conducted a survey of administrative functions designed to highlight areas needing focus and attention. Many of the responses focused on hiring and compensation policies and procedures. These responses were consistent with issues identified by campus leadership, and an AdQAD was performed. The results of the AdQAD have led to changes in compensation policies, reorganization of various HR functions and strategic funding of critical resources in HR staff. There will be continued attention to these issues throughout FY18 & FY19 as the campus continues to implement best practices and new technology solutions for HR functions.

**Look Back**

During the Fall of ’17, CPARC developed a survey of Heads and Chairs that asked them to discuss how departmental performance profiles had been used during the budget planning process. The survey was administered just after the college consultative processes had occurred and college roll ups (budget priorities) had been submitted to the provost. Responses were received from 39 Heads/Chairs out of a total of 59 academic departments. Key takeaways from the survey were:

- 8 of 37 respondents were unaware of department-level performance data
- Over 80% of 30 respondents reported considering the performance data (47% of 30 respondents specifically referenced these data in budget plans)
- 18 of 30 respondents found the data very-somewhat easy to access
- 15 of 30 respondents found drilling down from the summary graphs very-somewhat easy
- 19 of 29 respondents found it very-somewhat easy to understand Dept performance data
- 10 specific suggestions for improvement focused on types of data that are not currently readily available
• 22-26 of 29 respondents would find the following very-somewhat helpful
  A workshop about how to interpret department's performance data
  The opportunity to get individualized help interpreting performance data
  The opportunity to analyze department performance data in additional ways
  More direction/explanation of expectations for the budget planning document
These results informed the following recommendations.

Look Forward: CPARC Recommendations
1) Integration of planning processes: Departments were required to submit draft Educational Effectiveness Plans (EEPs) in April of 2018. The intention is for EEPs to inform budget and strategic planning, so feedback on draft EEPs should harmonize with the Fall 2018 unit strategic plan refresh (which is based on the campus strategic plan refresh) and FY20 budget planning.

2) Space planning: A multi-year space/capital/renovation plan that is known to colleges/departments is integral to the development of realistic multi-year budget/strategic/educational effectiveness plans.

3) Getting to a culture of evidence: An overarching principle of the strategic plan is a focus on specific actions that emerge from examination of the available evidence. This is relevant to both academic and A&S units and requires an assessment of the extent to which evidence is appropriately reflected in plans, identification of gaps in the data, and the further refinement of the use, communication, and understanding of evidence within and across units.

CPARCs priorities for AY’18-19
CPARC expects to regularize its activities as the 10-year reaccreditation process wraps up in Fall 2018. In particular, we intend to continue the work of JSACs from within CPARC, likely as a sub-committee with invited expertise as necessary. This will provide an opportunity for more and direct input from staff to CPARC.

CPARC will also have a role to play in developing the culture of evidence by assessing the extent to which evidence is appropriately reflected in plans, identifying gaps in the data, and the making recommendations for the further refinement of the use, communication, and understanding of evidence within and across units.

CPARC made ten recommendations in its 2017 report, many of which were incorporated into the annual budget planning process for FY19. Ten criteria derived from the points identified in the 2017 CPARC report (below) will remain on the list of budget planning process elements to evaluate in AY 18-19.

1. Sufficiency of feedback to departments on whether their plans and/or budgets have been approved at subsequent levels.
2. Sufficient formal opportunities for student input.
3. Sufficient opportunity for departments and colleges to express their perspectives on the impacts of budgetary and trend changes.
4. Clarity regarding what is due to whom, with whom discussions are to take place, and at what point these discussions will occur.
5. Annual budgets account for plans and budgetary commitments that are multi-year in nature.
6. The planning and budget process incorporates space and facilities in plans for improvement.
7. Clarity regarding the relationship between academic planning and unit planning for administrative and support services.
Overall, CPARC recommends that the general schema utilized in FY18 for FY19 annual budget planning be followed for FY 20 plans.