

Humboldt State University Review of Budget Process Implementation Planning Retreat

February 20, 2009

Summary of Results

Maddox Management Consulting, LLC

Table of Contents

Summary	1
Appendix 1: Summary of Recommendation Assignments	5
Appendix 2: Transcription of Flip Charts	10
Appendix 3: Notes of Retreat Discussion	18
Appendix 4: Detailed Implementation Planning Template	27
Appendix 5: Implementation Plans from Small Groups	28

Summary

On February 20, HSU assembled representatives of the major leadership groups involved with the budget process to develop implementation plans for the recommendations from the review of the HSU budget processes. While a full day retreat is a significant amount of time, given the number of recommendations involved the priorities were to

- Get a jump start on developing implementation plans
- Make initial assignments of responsibility
- Identify the highest priority actions, especially in the short run

The implementation proposals were developed by small groups of the retreat participants. The groups were chosen to provide balance of viewpoint and in some cases with an eye to areas where the input of specific individuals would be critical. Each group worked on a different set of recommendations in one of the following categories:

- Reporting and data
- Planning
- Analysis
- Budget process and decision-making
- Communications

The groups were given templates which identified the information to include in the implementation plan for each recommendation. A complete set of the templates the small groups prepared is attached as Appendix 5 (page 28). This should be used as a starting point for additional implementation planning—in most cases the action steps and assignments and timelines for implementation need to be spelled out in more detail. The tables in Appendix 1 (page 5-9) summarize the most critical information: the person or group assigned accountability and the suggested start and end dates. HSU will likely want to make some adjustments to these assignments—there are cases where the group or person assigned responsibility is probably not quite in a position to drive the process.

Each group presented their implementation proposals to the full group. We have two sets of documentation of that conversation—the transcription of the flip charts each group and the facilitator prepared (Appendix 2, pages 10-17), and Patty Lindley’s notes on the conversation (Appendix 3, pages 18-26). In most cases, the flip charts capture the main points of the group’s proposal while Patty’s notes do a better job of capturing the main points of the conversation about that proposal.

Priorities

One of the main purposes of the retreat was to identify the highest priority items for action. The group discussion gave the highest priority to these items:

- Institutional Research (IR)
 - Models
- Clarify nomenclature: necessary first step
- Get three standard financial reports designed and into production
- Develop the expense summary categories
- Prepare a comprehensive diagram of funds flows
- All funds budgeting
 - Definitions
 - Who “owns” what resources, what flexibility
- Get information on base/one-time funds into the process and reports

These priorities were arrived at quickly, but they do seem consistent with the underlying logical connections between recommendations. The President, Vice President, and Executive Committee should confirm these priorities soon.

There was discussion about the proposal related to the development of strategy at the “pragmatic” level, which focuses on what combination of moves the institution can make to secure the best possible resource base to sustain its mission. The small group’s proposal was that this should be addressed after an IR function is established—the idea is that the pragmatic strategy should be data-driven, and therefore needs the support of an IR office which will pull together data and develop models. In the discussion with the whole group, the question was raised whether HSU should try to make some progress on spelling out this strategy in the shorter term because the University cannot afford to wait to get more clarity on these practical strategies. This point was not resolved in the time available in the retreat and may need further discussion.

One of the questions about these priorities and all of the other recommendations was how much they depend on the Budget Office and what capacity that office has to support these projects in addition to their ongoing work. The response was that the unit really has very little additional capacity to respond to new demands. The idea of adding capacity to the Budget Office came up and needs to be explored. However, it can be difficult to bring in temporary staff to take on the work of a budget office—the work is dependent on the knowledge of local (in this case HSU and CSU) systems, policies, and practices rather than business practices that are common in a wide variety of businesses and organizations.

Accountability

The group assigned accountability for the entire body of the recommendations to the University Executive Committee. They will be asked to review the retreat implementation templates, assign responsibility for each recommendation, and monitor progress regularly.

Consultant's Comments

This brief summary has focused on recording the deliberations and decisions of the group. I would like to add a few comments that may diverge from the decisions of the group. In considering the comments that follow, HSU should start from an assumption that the results of the group process take precedence.

Planning and strategy. The small group that developed the approach to the planning recommendations proposed that the “pragmatic” strategy be developed based on data and models generated by the new Institutional Research function. I agree that an institution’s pragmatic strategy needs to be deeply informed by data, and in the best case it is driven by data and developed with constant reference to models that check the combined effects of different moves. However, given the timelines for the creation of an IR office and the critical issues facing the institution, HSU may need to move forward on defining its strategic intentions more clearly. This seems feasible because there appears to be an emergent strategy that could be articulated more clearly. Leadership could take some time to work out the logic of each element and the connections between them, and communicate this to community—even if it is subject to revision as better data and models become available.

Assignment of responsibility for recommendations. The assignment of responsibility for recommendations to individuals or groups needs some refinement. There are two levels of problems

1. Staff versus leadership roles. Responsibility for some recommendations was assigned to groups or individuals at too high a level to be accountable for working out details which are critical to those recommendations. The right role for the individuals and groups identified at the retreat may be review and approval towards the end of the process. This appears to be an issue with several proposals related to Reporting and Data and in a few other cases.
2. Team/committee creation and governance. There are some proposals for teams that do not identify who will form the team. There are also proposals for changes in committee structure or charge that are assigned to the group itself rather than to those who create and charge the group.

Proposals on charge-backs. The development of reporting and policies related to charge-backs and other forms of recharges was covered by two recommendations addressed by two small groups, Reporting and Data and Budget Process and Decision-Making. We briefly discussed the need to align these proposals, and their components are similar, but I don’t think we finished reconciling the two proposals. The steps suggested by the Reporting and Data group may be the best place to start in building a single implementation plan that starts with reporting on charge-backs and leads to the formulation of a policy.

Communications. The Communications small group developed a clear proposal for a budget communications strategy. This proposal effectively responds to the recommendation to institute regular communications by the President and Provost,

and does address engagement issues. However, it does not necessarily speak to the report recommendations that address specific points about the communications process such as general practices in preparation and roll-out of budget communications. HSU should go back and address those points. A general approach may be for Marketing and Communications to work on a consulting basis with the UBO and senior institutional leadership on these issues.

Further implementation planning

The implementation planning templates used during the retreat reflected a stripped-down approach designed to provide a quick jump-start on plans. HSU should develop more full-fledged implementation plans that define accountability, goals, and measures of success, as well as fill in detail on action steps. A possible template to guide this process is attached as appendix 4 (page 27).

In addition to filling in the details and refining the implementation plans started at the retreat, HSU should adopt a disciplined project management process to define and track implementation of these recommendations. It is highly advisable to use project tracking software like Microsoft Project, prepare the kinds of information that those programs ask for (such as specific resources required, project interdependencies, subsidiary timelines) and use the tools to report regularly on progress. Too often institutions don't adopt these standard project management methodologies when engaged in administrative change projects (presumably from a sense that the tools are overly complicated and time-consuming). Once the structure is set up, it doesn't take significantly more effort to work with these tools, and it improves focus throughout the project.

Appendix 1: Summary of Recommendation Assignments

1. Reporting and data

Recommendation	Report page	Assigned to	Start	End
1. Add more detailed info on expenses into reports based on summary categories	13	VPs and Carol Terry	Spring 09	
2. Assemble and make more use of time series data	14	CIC	Spring/ Summer 09	
3. Integrate information on one-time funds that reflects sources and flexibility	14	VPs	Spring 09	
4. Diagram funds flow	14, 28	Form team—who assigns?	Summer 09	
5. New and modified reports	14-15, 29-35	RUG—who responsible to expand		
6. Generate ratios and statistics from standard reports	15-16	CIC	Summer 09	
7. Define budget nomenclature /definitions	16	Team—UBO, divisions—who assigns?	Spring 09	ASAP
8. Senior leadership cooperate to resolve data definition issues	5, 17	UEC	Spring 09	
9. Provide more reporting on recharges, including rates	21	UBO	Summer 09	
10. Three standardized reports for regular delivery	20	VPs review and approve UBO generate	Spring 09	ASAP
<i>11. Establish a consistent format for all reports</i>	4-5	UBO		

Items in italics were not recommendations per se, but were issues identified in the report.

Appendix 1: Summary of Recommendation Assignments

2. Analysis

Recommendation	Report page	Assigned to	Start	End
1. Multi-year models to evaluate strategic options	12-13	Provost & VPs		Fall 2009
2. Revisit base budgets and link them to prioritization efforts	13	VPs & UBC		2010
3. Determine what benchmarking is needed and how to make it most useful	13	VPs		2010
<i>4. Develop methods to assess effectiveness of programs across units</i>	7	VPs		2010
5. Analyze how HSU went from deficits to surpluses	16	Finance		Spring 09
6. Evaluate how resources from different fund types can work together or have unintended impacts on other fund types.	14	Who assembles team?		Summer 09

Items in italics were not recommendations per se, but were issues identified in the report.

Appendix 1: Summary of Recommendation Assignments

3. Planning

Recommendation	Report page	Assigned to	Start	End
1. Articulate the "visionary" strategy for HSU	12	CIC	In process	
2. Articulate the "pragmatic" strategy for HSU	12	Who assembles team to research IR	In process	2010
3. Make the case for investment	12	President	In process	
4. Outline the next steps in contingency plans	12	VPs & President	In process	
<i>5. Improve cross divisional planning</i>	7	Who will develop incentives?	Fall 09	
<i>6. Optimize all resources-how to use different sources to support common goals</i>	11			

Items in italics were not recommendations per se, but were issues identified in the report.

Appendix 1: Summary of Recommendation Assignments

4. Budget process and decision-making

Recommendation	Report page	Assigned to	Start	End
1. Budget according to new expense categories	13	Budget & Finance group	Spring 09	Fall 09
2. OAA and UBO work together to establish framework for operation of IR office	5, 17	Provost	Spring 09	May 09
3. Ideas to encourage engagement/communications		CIC & UBC	Spring 09	Long term
4. Systems: Get all units on CMS	20	Administrative Affairs	Spring 09	Fall 2010
5. Systems: Establish structures to manage and support Hyperion	20	ITS	In process	
6. Develop a policy on recharges	21	UBO	Summer 09	Fall 2010
7. Re-emphasize the role of line management	18	CIC	Spring 09	Fall 09
8. Timeline adjustments for UBC	18-19	UBC	Spring 09	Fall 09
9. Meetings with Academic Senate Executive Committee	17-18	President & Provost	Spring 09	Fall 09
10. Provost to lead UBC	17	UBC	Spring 09	Fall 09
<i>11. Group processes-collaborate more effectively</i>	10	Same as #3		

Items in italics were not recommendations per se, but were issues identified in the report.

Appendix 1: Summary of Recommendation Assignments

5. Communications

Recommendation	Report page	Assigned to	Start	End
1. Ideas to encourage engagement/communications				
2. Disciplined roll-out and preparation	19			
3. Meet regularly with budget analysts	19			
4. Keep UBC website up to date	20			
5. Avoid instructions that encourage gamesmanship	20			
6. President/Provost budget communications	20			
7. <i>Communications- extensive, frequent, reinforced</i>	10			

See flip chart notes

In general, accountability to develop the annual plan and calendar proposed by the small group was assigned to the UBO and Marketing and Communications.

Items in italics were not recommendations per se, but were issues identified in the report.

Appendix 2: Transcription of Flip Charts

Transcription of flip charts

A. Small group presentations

1. Reporting and data
2. Analysis
3. Planning
4. Budget process
5. Communications

Key to Time Frames:

- 1 Spring 2009
- 2 Summer 2009
- 3 Fall 2009
- 4 2010
- 5 2011 and later

B. High level conclusions

C. Other discussion material

Appendix 2: Transcription of Flip Charts

A. Small group presentations

1. Reporting and Data

Item	Description	Time
#1	<p>“Add more detailed info on expenses into reports based on summary categories”</p> <p>Consistency across divisions where applicable. Budget template needed.</p> <p>VPs and Carol should review and agree on what expense categories need to be budgeted</p>	1
#2 & 6	<p>“Assemble and make more use of time series data”</p> <p>“Generate ratios and statistics from standard reports”</p> <p>CIC discuss and “farm out” to campus what measurements are needed to determine effectiveness</p>	2/1
#3	<p>“Integrate information on one-time funds that reflects sources and flexibility”</p> <p>Big, important issue. To be addressed by President and VPs</p> <p>How do one-time funds affect performance</p>	1
#4	<p>“Diagram funds flow”</p> <p>Form team—reps from each auxiliary and UBO. Team interviews major stakeholders. Use page 28 as a model. Include #3 and #9, do after #7</p>	2
#5	<p>“New and modified reports”</p> <p>Expand Reporting Users Group. Identify decision-making authority</p>	
#7	<p>“Define budget nomenclature /definitions”</p> <p>Form team: UBO, IR, division reps. Identify terms, align definitions. Review at all levels. Create dictionary. Roll out Train, revisit</p>	1
#8	<p>“Senior leadership cooperate to resolve data definition issues”</p> <p>UEC actively review what team for #7 produces</p>	1
#9	<p>“Provide more reporting on recharges, including rates”</p> <p>Look at this. It’s important. Maybe something for UBC</p>	
#10	<p>“Three standardized reports for regular delivery”</p> <p>President and VPs review and approve Maddox proposed reports. UBO will generate reports out of data warehouse. Post monthly reports. Send out emails when reports are posted.</p> <p>Training</p> <p>Communicating</p> <p>Listening</p>	1
#11	<p>“Establish a consistent format for all reports”</p> <p>YES</p>	

Appendix 2: Transcription of Flip Charts

2. Analysis

Sequence

A. Big Budget Office involvement

- #5 analysis of deficits/surpluses
- Then
- #1, #6 multiyear models
- How different funds work

A. Across all divisions

- #3, #4 benchmarks, assessments

B. Need all the above to

- #2 revisit base budget

#5 Analyze how we went from deficits to surpluses

- budget and finance staff
- + representatives from additional areas to provide perspective
- cover this year and two years back
 - analyze common threads
 - * a problem w/ prediction models
 - * a problem w/ strategic assumptions
- convey, add a plan for adjusting

#6 Evaluate how different fund types work together

- get folks together who understand different funds;
Budget, Advancement, Foundations, Auxiliaries, Fundraising, recharging
- identify funds, define fund funds and their uses and restrictions
- integrate this information into the budgeting process

#1 multi-year models

- Use Hanover and Associates to identify campuses and models that do a good job of this
- Identify a focus group to use this info to fine tune the HSU model
- Build model using technical folks in each respective area and Budget Office expertise
- < How do enrollment, resources and expenditures work and how they affect each other >

#3 Determine what benchmarking is valuable

- Executive leadership agrees to conduct benchmarking
- Define parameters and characteristics (what should benchmarks tell us, they should be built in a consistent manner, how to review and publish benchmarks)

Appendix 2: Transcription of Flip Charts

- Assign benchmarks down thru University to their respective appropriate level
Technical folks, managers, and those being benchmarked all involved in developing and delivering the benchmarks
- Pass back up for review, analysis, and publication

#4 Develop methods for assessment of effectiveness

Feed into benchmark process

Includes review of making sure we can eventually compare across divisions

#2 Revisit base budgets

Requires all the information from the other steps – a long range goal

- Benchmarking needs to include info that will allow the university to visit base budget allocations as a portion of the overall University budget
- At a University level, tied to budgeting process, divisional allocations set
- VPs use data from 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 to do this within their divisions

Appendix 2: Transcription of Flip Charts

3. Planning

Visionary strategy Time frame: 3

General approach:

- CIC
- Begin process of consultation
- In process—on-going

Pragmatic strategy Time frame: 4

- Team to develop IR capacity plan—CIC and the Provost
- In process, will take about 18 months (June '10)

Cross-divisional planning Time frame: 3

- Develop incentives for cross-divisional initiatives
- VPs, President, Deans, Managers
- Start Fall '09, ongoing

Making the case for investment Time frame: starts 1, finish 4

- Work through University Executive Committee to disseminate information
- In-process, on-going

Contingency planning

- VPs, President work to implement plan Time frame: 1
- Need IR to run scenario Time frame: 3
- In-process, on-going

Appendix 2: Transcription of Flip Charts

4. Budget Process

Divided the ideas into two groups

Openness/Communication/Share

Item	Description	Time
#3 and #11	Ideas to encourage engagement/communications Group processes: collaborate more effectively CIC/UBC	1/LT
#1	Budget according to new expense categories. Budget/Finance group	3
#5	Systems: Establish structures to manage and support Hyperion. ITS	2
#9	Meetings with Academic Senate Executive Committee. President and Provost	1/3
#10	Provost to lead UBC. UBC	1
#7	Re-emphasize role of line management. CIC	3

Policies?

#2	OAA and UBO work together to establish framework for operation of IR office. Provost identify the group	1
#4	Systems: get all units on CMS. Admin Affairs CMS office	4
#6	Develop a policy on recharges. UBO study it, bring it to the UEC and the boards of the auxiliaries	2/4
#8	Timeline adjustments for UBC. UBC should do this	1


Appendix 2: Transcription of Flip Charts

5. Communications

Holistic view to communications

Annual communication plan and calendar – Marcom/Budget Office

First—focus groups to determine what is needed/wanted

Challenge:
Information 
Various levels to
Different stakeholders

Roles:

<u>President</u> (convocation) Framework Vision & goals Key messages to Campus—planned times After Gov budget announced, May revision, etc.	<u>Provost</u> Presents summary Major campus mtgs	<u>UBC</u> Progress reported at Pres Council Put written reports on website	<u>Fiscal Affairs</u> Monthly updates on website Univ notices announce updates on Web site working w Marcom to make clear to lay persons
--	---	---	--

--Create communications flowcharts—making sure information flows to stakeholders

Question: How do I participate in budget process?
Gov process? Change cabinet

Question: How do we keep HSU's budget issues in context to larger view of higher education?

Appendix 2: Transcription of Flip Charts

B. High level conclusions

Highest priorities

- Institutional Research: a lot hangs on this
 - Models
- Clarify nomenclature: necessary first step
- Get the 3 standard reports designed and in production
- Develop the expense summary categories
- Prepare a comprehensive diagram of funds flows
- All funds budgeting
 - Definitions
 - Who “owns” what resources, what flexibility (#6 under analysis)
- Getting information on base/one-time into the process

In the short term, need to explore adding capacity in the University Budget Office, and IR capacity in Finance.

C. Other discussion material

General process

General process for developing policies and proposals (may not apply in all cases)
Staff → VPs or other executive group → UBC → VPs or other executive group → Staff

Pragmatic strategy

- Is it a matter of being entrepreneurial
- Need information and models

Vision and pragmatism—will need to iterate between them

Accountability for implementing these recommendations

- Get the summaries for each category
- The UEC will make assignments
- Regular reassessment

Appendix 3: Notes of Retreat Discussion

HSU Budget Review Implementation Planning Retreat February 20, 2009

Background

Updates were shared with the group: State budget (Rollin); HSU's budget proposal process (Carol); and the Cabinet for Institutional Change (Bob).

Develop Implementation Plans in Groups

Five planning groups were asked to address specific Maddox recommendations and complete an implementation planning template for each item (how will it get done; what resources are needed; what sequence; timeline).

Full Group Discussion

REPORTING AND DATA

Colleen Mullery, Robin Bailie, Nancy Kelly, Linda Mortenson, Steve Smith, Mary Kay

Report Recommendation: Add more detailed information on expenses into reports based on summary categories.

Discussion:

- Most recommendations are in process
- Additional detail is needed in reports
- Important to have consistency across divisions when applicable – there is a need for a common budget template

Recommended action(s):

- President, Vice Presidents, and Associate Vice President (Business Services) review and agree on which expense categories need to be budgeted – to include broad consultation, including budget finance group subcommittee

Timeline: In process, Fall 2009

Report Recommendation: Assemble and make more use of time series data; Generate ratios and statistics from standard reports.

Discussion:

- WASC has highlighted the importance of data-based decision-making

Recommended action(s):

- Cabinet for Institutional Change will assist in generating discussions regarding performance measurements to determine effectiveness

Appendix 3: Notes of Retreat Discussion

Report Recommendation: Integrate information on one-time funds that reflects sources and flexibility.

Recommended action(s):

- President and Vice Presidents need to discuss one-time funds and develop a mechanism for top management to communicate this information to campus; one-time funds do effect ratios.
- Include one-time funds in diagram and recharge reports.

Report Recommendation: Diagram funds flow

Recommended action(s):

- Use Maddox’s model on page 28 – Sample Funds Flow Diagram
- Form an implementation team which would include representatives from each auxiliary and the University Budget Committee (the Budget Office would know what is required to create a diagram; divisional representatives wouldn’t be needed). Include broad consultation in developing a diagram, with interviews of the major stakeholders.

Timeline: Summer 2009

Report Recommendation: New and modified reports

Recommended action(s):

- Need three standardized reports to be generated and distributed by the University Budget Office each month – President, Vice President and Associate Vice President (Business Services) to review Maddox’s suggested reports and either adopt or make appropriate changes to reflect campus needs
- Provide training for using the reports and provide opportunities for communication
- There is a lack of connection between existing reporting groups; representatives from all divisions are needed; the reporting users group needs to be officially recognized
- Need to decide who has decision-making authority

Timeline: High Priority

Report Recommendation: Define budget nomenclature/definitions

Recommended action(s):

- This is a top priority; it has been started
- Form a team, including representatives from the University Budget Office, Institutional Research, and each major division
- Identify terms/definitions which will be reviewed at all levels, starting at the “bottom” with final approval at the University Executive Committee level
- Develop process for informing campus
- Dynamic dictionary to be revisited/reviewed (by University Budget Office)

Appendix 3: Notes of Retreat Discussion

Timeline: 2008-2009 academic year

Report Recommendation: Senior leadership cooperate to resolve data definition issues

Recommended Actions:

- This is a top priority
- Should be handled by an expanded University Executive Committee

Timeline: 2008-2009 academic year

Report Recommendation: Provide more reporting on recharges, including rates

Recommended Actions:

- The University Budget Office should research campus-wide chargebacks, find out how other campuses are handling them, and determine if there are legal considerations. Submit a draft policy to the University Executive Committee.

Timeline: Summer 2009

Report Recommendation: Establish a consistent format for all reports

Recommended Action(s):

- It was agreed that this is important and should be done by the University Budget Office.

ANALYSIS

Anna Kircher, Han-Sup Han, Lee Lindsey, John Filce, Bob Snyder

Report Recommendation: Analyze how HSU went from deficits to surpluses

Recommended Actions:

- Finance and other representatives analyze deficits/surpluses for FY 2008-2009, 2007-2008, 2006-2007
- Identify problems (i.e. are assumptions being made too conservative?)
- Communicate the problems and propose a plan for adjusting

Timeline: This should be done by the Budget Office, Spring 2009

Report Recommendation: multi-year models to evaluate strategic options; evaluate how resources from different fund types can work together or have unintended impacts on other fund types

Appendix 3: Notes of Retreat Discussion

Recommended Action(s):

- Evaluate how all funds work together (budget, advancement, foundations, auxiliaries, recharges), including understanding how they can be used and what restrictions are in place.
- Incorporate into budget definitions and budget process
- Include in budget strategy
- Ask Hanover Research to assist with multi-year models; identify campuses with good models in place
- Identify a focus group to “fine tune” HSU’s models
- Analysts to work with the budget office to build the models
- Models needed for three major categories: enrollment, resources, expenses

Timeline: Evaluation of fund types, Summer 2009; Multi-year models, Fall 2009
(University Budget Office)

Report Recommendation: Determine what benchmarking is needed and how to make it most useful/Develop methods to assess effectiveness of programs across units

Recommended Action(s):

- Executive leadership agrees that we will do benchmarking
- The assigned unit will depend on the benchmark being done
- Specifications/definitions for the benchmarking will be created and reviewed
- Define the parameters and begin the process
- Review the results and publish
- Assessment will be part of the benchmarking process

Timeline: 2010

Report Recommendation: Revisit base budgets and link them to prioritization efforts

Recommended Action(s):

- Base budgets should be revisited as part of the benchmarking, assessment, modeling
- Include information that will allow the university to revisit the overall allocation to each division
- Vice president’s need a bottom-line divisional allocation before reviewing their unit’s allocation

Timeline: Long-range goal

Appendix 3: Notes of Retreat Discussion

PLANNING

Ken Ayoob, Lynne Sandstrom, Rollin Richmond, Patty Lindley, Laura Jackson

Report Recommendation: Articulate the “visionary” strategy for HSU

Recommended action(s):

- Refocus HSU’s current vision statement – assign to the Cabinet for Institutional Change – include campus consultation

Timeline: Begin Spring 2009, complete Fall 2009

Report Recommendation: Articulate the “pragmatic” strategy for HSU

Recommended action(s):

- Assign to Cabinet for Institutional Change - Institutional Research team to handle

Timeline: Developing, in process, June 2010

Report Recommendation: Improve cross divisional planning

Recommended action(s):

- Needs to begin
- Implement incentive/reward system for cross divisional initiatives

Timeline: Fall 2009

Report Recommendation: Make the case for investment

Recommended action(s):

- University Executive Committee needs to develop mechanisms; make decision, talking points, disseminate clear message

Timeline: Ongoing, 2010

Report Recommendation: Outline the next steps in contingency plans

Recommended action(s):

- President and Vice Presidents to implement
- Need Institutional Research to run various scenarios

Timeline: In process, ongoing

Appendix 3: Notes of Retreat Discussion

BUDGET PROCESS AND DECISION-MAKING

Martin Flashman, Carol Terry, Nancy Hurlbut, Ann Moore, Burt Nordstrom, Harry Wells

Report Recommendation: Ideas to encourage engagement/communications

Recommended action(s):

- Openness, communication, sharing of information extremely important
- Cabinet for Institutional Change
- University Budget Committee
- Fierce Conversation training
- Budget finance group subcommittee
- President/Provost Communicate with Academic Senate
- Vet with University Budget Committee
- Set timeline and process for communicating budget information

Timeline: In process

Report recommendation: Budget according to new expense categories

[not sure what was discussed regarding this item]

Report recommendation: Provost to lead UBC

Recommended action(s):

- Vet with University Budget Committee

Timeline: Vet Spring 2009; implement Fall 2009

Report recommendation: Re-emphasize the role of line management

Recommended action(s):

- Need to know who is making decisions and who is accountable
- Clarification of roles, shared governance
- Tasked with Cabinet for Institutional Change

Timeline: In process; reviewing governance/culture change issues broadly

Appendix 3: Notes of Retreat Discussion

Report recommendation: OAA and UBO work together to establish framework for operation of IR office

Recommended action(s):

- Provost should identify a group to work on this issue
- Clarify role/responsibilities for Director for Institutional Research

Timeline: In progress, Spring 2009

Report recommendation: Develop a policy on recharges

Recommended action(s):

- Administrative Affairs, University Budget Office, to develop a recharge policy
- Determine what current practice is, legal issues, analyze what others are doing
- Present draft policy to University Executive Committee

Timeline: Start Summer 09, complete Fall 2010

Report recommendation: Timeline adjustments for University Budget Committee

Recommended action(s):

- Handled by University Budget Committee

Timeline: Fall 2009

Report recommendation: Systems – Establish structures to manage and support Hyperion

Recommended action(s):

- In process, being handled by Information Technology Services

Timeline: Assignment of Supervisor, Summer 2009

Report recommendation: Systems – Get all units on CMS

Recommended action(s):

- In process, cross-divisional
- Project Manager – CMS

Timeline: In process Spring 2009, Completion Fall 2010

Appendix 3: Notes of Retreat Discussion

COMMUNICATIONS

Frank Whitlatch, Steve Butler, Denice Helwig, Amber Blakeslee

Report recommendation: Ideas to encourage engagement/communications; President/Provost budget communications/Communications-extensive, frequent, reinforced

Recommended action(s):

- University Budget Office meeting regularly with analysts and keeping them informed
- University Budget Office/University Budget Committee websites – keep up to date
- Budget communications should not be overwhelming or vast
- Need annual calendar of timely budget communications – to be developed by Marcom, University Budget Office and University Budget Committee Chair
- Flow chart for sharing of information
- Varying levels of interest in budget; provide information based on interest level
- Survey of focus groups occurring Spring 2009 regarding budget process; will do comparison survey later to see if process has improved

Timeline: Communication calendar, developed in Summer 2009; begin in Fall 2009

Following group presentations, the following areas were identified as priorities:

- OAA and UBO work together to establish framework for operation of IR office (top priority) It was noted that an IR structure is in place; although not in all units (i.e. finance) – this needs to be coordinated centrally, a short-term approach while a long-term approach is being considered.
- Provost to lead UBC (top priority)
- Make the case for investment
- Outline the next steps in contingency plans
- Define budget nomenclature/definitions (priority, can be established quickly)
- Three standardized reports for regular delivery (can be established quickly, in process)
- Diagram funds flow
- Communication schedule with Academic Senate
- Add more detailed information on expenses into reports based on summary categories (in process, can be established quickly)
- Analyze how HSU went from deficits to surpluses
- Provide more reporting on recharges, including rates
- Pragmatic strategies is important and needs to be discussed by the President and Vice Presidents

Appendix 3: Notes of Retreat Discussion

Adding additional workload on the University Budget Office, as a result of recommended actions, was discussed. AVP Terry will review time considerations.

It was noted that even though categories, definitions, and diagrams can be identified now, implementation would need to wait until after the finance system conversion process.

Appendix 4: Detailed Implementation Planning Template

Name of Recommendation		Name of person or group assigned primary responsibility		
Background/Issue: <i>What is the problem that this recommendation is intended to resolve?</i>		Goal: <i>What is the final state desired from the implementation of this recommendation?</i>		
Approach: <i>What is the general approach to this recommendation (e.g. create a team from across the University to ..., conduct pilot then rollout)?</i>				
Stakeholders: <i>Who is affected by this change? Who needs to be involved in implementation?</i>		Resource Requirements: <i>Who has the technical or organizational knowledge required?</i>		
Action Plan: <i>What actions need to be taken to achieve the performance goal?</i>				
Major Milestone	Action Steps	Action Owner	Start Date	Finish Date

Add blocks as needed to milestones and to action steps within each milestone.

Appendix 5: Implementation Plans from Small Groups

Implementation plans prepared for each recommendation follow. These are transcriptions of the template forms filled in by the small groups at the retreat. They do not reflect subsequent discussion by the larger group.