

Effectively Managing for our Mission

Strategic Planning Work Group #5

August 3, 2007

**Kathy Sahlhoff
Bob Sutton**

**Jacob Boer
Chris Cox
Sue Harrison
Bob Hooper
Leslie Huntington
Jan Morse
Suzanne Olson
Heather Pearson
Andy Phillips
Todd Stephens
Mike Wick**

Effectively Managing for our Mission

Introduction

This report addresses the issues related to “effectively managing for our mission.” It provides summary background information on the current structures and policies that guide the management of the university’s resources, followed by recommendations and conclusions. Six areas were identified that directly and profoundly impact the ability of the university to effectively manage for its mission. To address these six areas the work group divided into sub-groups and focused on identifying processes and procedures the university could follow to improve how these six areas function, and consequently improve the university’s overall operations and effectiveness.

Background

The University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire has much to offer and provides students with an excellent education. As an institution however, many of its operating procedures are informal, out-of-date, inefficient, or nonexistent. UW-Eau Claire’s method of operating may have worked well in the slower-paced twentieth century but does not lend itself to the much faster-paced twenty-first century. People may not readily think of the university in these terms, but today’s higher education environment is competitive and ever-changing, forcing institutions to either keep-up or be left behind. UW-Eau Claire is on the brink of being left behind if it does not become focused, nimble, and efficient. The entire institution needs to examine and possibly reinvent itself, first developing a clear focus and then establishing a plan as to how it is going to get there. This process may involve reevaluating everything the university does—from why it does something to how it does it.

Along these lines, the charge for Work Group #5 was to identify where and how the university has to make changes to most effectively steward its resources. Therefore, the group identified six major overarching areas that impact most university activities and thus are critical to the university’s success:

- Budgeting
- Curriculum/Programming
- Enrollment Management
- Facilities
- Management/Governance
- Personnel

Because these six areas affect all aspects of the university, policies and procedures must be established that enable the university to operate efficiently and effectively. Also, an appropriate level of transparency should be generated in these six areas so faculty, staff, and administrators clearly understand how these areas function. This transparency is an important element in helping everyone to recognize that scarce university resources are allocated and aligned with the university’s priorities. (Please refer to Addendum A for details on how the Work Group investigated these areas.)

The internal scan completed in each of these areas revealed that, in some cases, the university lacks formal procedures and processes, e.g. the lack of a true budgeting process. In other

instances, procedures do exist but are cumbersome and/or inadequate so that they do not allow the university the flexibility and nimbleness it needs to be responsive, e.g. management/governance. The results from the internal scans completed in each of the six areas are discussed at length in the sub-group reports provided in Addendum B. The SWOT results for each area are also included. (Each of these reports was written by a different subcommittee of the Work Group, thus the different styles.)

Recommendations

Based on the internal scans and the SWOT results, the following key recommendations are being proposed:

1. Create a process to develop and implement university priorities and to periodically assess the priorities.
2. Develop a university program prioritization process:
 - Examine and revise the Baccalaureate Goals.
 - Investigate best practices available elsewhere and seek to adapt and adopt
 - Develop university priorities
 - Link decision-making and resource allocation to the resulting priorities
 - Treat all available campus financial and physical resources as “in play” for these priorities
 - Establish and make visible and available a formal process for requesting FTE
 - Develop a process to evaluate curricular/co-curricular programs against the potential of new and revised programs.
 - Enhance revenue streams where possible to support the university priorities.
3. Improve operational efficiencies:
 - Investigate and implement best practices for governance policies.
 - Change the culture of shared governance
 - Clearly define the difference between the role of administration versus the role of shared governance.
 - Implement the delegate model versus the representative model for shared governance.
 - Empower senators to represent the university, not just unit/department.
 - Institute a shared governance that is participatory, not democratic.
 - Reconstitute the Handbook in line with best practices from other institutions.
 - Explore “student-centered” course scheduling versus “faculty-centered” course scheduling.
4. Develop a comprehensive facilities improvement/action plan (renovation and new construction) linked to campus priorities:
 - Partner with private and community groups for facilities. Examples:
 - A community theater
 - A fine arts building

- A hotel incorporated into the new student center
 - Initiate capital campaign to locate private funding for building and renovation of campus facilities.
 - Ensure space allocation is aligned with university priorities and reviewed by appropriate administrators.
5. Develop a process to thoughtfully address the enrollment mix of our students:
- Appoint an enrollment management taskforce to develop a process to manage the enrollment mix and retention and graduate rates
 - Explore access issues
 - Give particular attention to the issues of diversity.

Summary Conclusions

The Work Group feels it is imperative that the university address these recommendations sooner versus later starting with the most critical one – establishing priorities. While the internal scans produced a wide variety of results and recommendations, there was one reoccurring theme. All decisions – budgeting, personnel, facilities management, and enrollment management – must be intentional, with the appropriate level of transparency, and aligned with the university’s priorities.

The Work Group recognizes that to achieve the above recommendations, several taskforces will have to be created with the sole charge of developing processes and procedures for each recommendation. The Work Group recommends that each taskforce be appointed by the Chancellor with individuals selected based on their interest and ability, not representation. The group thinks it is imperative that taskforce members have a university-wide perspective.

8-03-07

Addendum A

Work Group #5 Summary Update 7-02-07

Work Group #5 has been meeting weekly to address the issues pertaining to “Effectively Managing for Our Mission.”. The group has used as its guide the desired outcomes identified by the earlier groups involved with developing the strategic management process. To further focus its effort the group identified what it thought were the key areas driving the university and came up with:

- Budget
- Curriculum/Programs
- Facilities
- Management/Governance
- Personnel
- Enrollment Management

At this point the Work Group split into six subcommittees to conduct the environmental scan. To help the group members focus for both the internal and external scans, the following five issues were addressed for each area:

- Process (Are there established university procedures for _____?)
- Policy (Are there university policies in place that would impact _____?)
- Financial Support (Are there monies available to support _____?)
- Review the Decision (Are there established processes in place to review past decisions—or in other words, is there accountability, follow-up, and/or a continuous improvement process?)
- Priorities (How does this decision/action fit with the university’s priorities?)

The Work Group met throughout the environmental scanning process so the subcommittees could share with the rest of the group what information they had gathered and obtain feedback. Upon getting towards the end of both the internal and external scans the subcommittees started drafting recommendations. Although the Work Group is still finalizing the recommendations and gathering additional information as appropriate, some of the key ones are as follows:

Budget

- Strategic plans should be developed at all institutional levels – but are most in need at the “top” levels of the institution. These plans should provide clear direction and the ability to develop priorities among the many needs of the institution.

- Decisions should require a discussion of the relevant strategic priorities and be linked to funding sources. That is, there should be explicit links between priorities, funding, and decisions made.
- Strategic plans should provide measurable goals and milestones, and continuous quality improvement processes should be put into place to monitor the results.
- Existing processes and principles guiding reallocations of base budgets should be reviewed for effectiveness. The institution should investigate best-practices available elsewhere and consider implementing suitable models.

Curriculum/Programs

- Develop program prioritization and master academic planning processes.
- Institute liberal education learning outcomes and quality improvement processes for co-curricular and curricular programs.
- Establish administrative office (something like “Dean of Undergraduate Studies”) for oversight of cross-college concerns (like GE, FYE, Blugold Fellows, Service Learning, Assessment, ...)
- Investigate credit for co-curricular learning
- Investigate “student desire” registration and scheduling
- Discuss branding UW – Eau Claire as “Wisconsin’s Experiential University”

Facilities

- A detailed Facilities Master Plan which would include:
 - Campus Master Plan
 - Campus Development Plan
 - Long-Range Maintenance Plan
 - Campus Parking Plan
 - Space Use Plan

Management and Governance

This section is currently under development by the subcommittee and will be included in the final report.

Since the submission of this preliminary report on July 2nd, this subcommittee subsequently submitted its report and the following represent the key recommendations pulled from it:

- Break down the barriers in the funding request process. The need for the Provost to request funding from the VC for Business and Student Services to augment the academic mission is seen as a detriment to efficient management.
- Review the organizational structure of University Senate and Senate committees.
- Use best practices from other institutions to reconstitute the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook.

Personnel

- Develop a written, formal process for requesting FTE. Through this process, the university would be able to better align new positions with established priorities. It would eliminate the need for “personal pleas,” which is a current informal way in which positions are requested. With a written, formal process, decisions regarding FTE could be well thought out and assessed, without the urgency and emotional components that may accompany personal pleas. Additionally, it is crucial that the process be easily available to the campus community.
- FTE allocation should be directly tied to the university’s established priorities. This is not currently taking place, except in occasional informal ways. The allocation of available FTE has tended to be reactionary rather than forward-thinking. Positions are allocated to departments/units that are in dire need of additional staffing without any thought of how the initiative aligns with the university’s priorities.
- Develop a process to assess the impact a new position has on a department/unit. Since UWEC typically does not choose to eliminate a position currently filled by a person, two activities should occur regarding new positions:
 - capture the additional productivity resulting from a new position along with how well that productivity fits in the university’s priorities.
 - determine whether the new position fulfilled the stated need within the department/unit and whether it is aligned with the critical priorities of UWEC.

Enrollment Management

- Agree on what “enrollment management” means for UW – Eau Claire. Currently, there are many different internal perspectives of what enrollment management can and should encompass for a comprehensive, moderately selective, public university.
- Form a task force to determine the most efficient and effective organizational structure to foster enrollment management as defined at UW – Eau Claire.
- As part of that structure, form an enrollment management committee of 8-10 individuals who have authority and responsibility for debating the philosophical issues of enrollment management and for providing clear directions as how those decisions should be implemented.

Addendum B

Budget Subgroup

Internal environmental scan

This draft report considers three basic forms of budgeting/revenue: (1) new revenue generation, (2) annual / base budgeting, and (3) one-time budget supplements. In each case, four questions are asked: (1) what is the process, (2) what are the policies that support / impede processes or decisions, (3) is there a CQI process in place to review processes or decisions, and (4) to what extent do strategic priorities guide processes and decisions? The comments in this internal scan reflect a “mosaic” of the responses – not all individuals agree on every point, but this scan attempts to provide a balanced view of each of the issues.

Part 1 – New revenue streams and how they can be enhanced

- What are the processes by which one can request or create a new revenue stream supporting a desired function/unit/program?

There isn't any formal “process” per se. If someone requests the creation of a new source of funds for their unit, they will need permission (ultimately) from the VC for Business and Student Services, and if it is related to Academic Affairs, from the Provost as well. This “two bosses” model frustrates the Deans in Academic Affairs since they know that the Provost has limited authority to make such decisions; on the other hand, while this may be frustrating for some, Regent and System Policy have defined roles for the Chief Business Officer and the Chief Academic Officer (Provost).

All that is required is a proposal (i.e. a model of what you want to happen, and including details will strengthen the argument), oral or written, and a compelling reason why a new revenue stream is needed versus using the normal tuition / base budget allocation model. Hence, there is little in the way of “red tape” required to make the request. On the other hand, an important complicating factor is that the local administrative staffing levels required to support the creation and oversight of these models is limited – in short, we may be challenged to be able to effectively implement new revenue models (because of workload) even when they make sense, because administrative systems that are configured to serve typical situations often are difficult to modify to serve atypical situations.

There are a few examples (though not many) of new revenue streams: the MBA consortium, the MEPD cohort program, the Materials Science Center, the undergraduate business alliance, etc. Each has a slightly different model (some are run thru CE and some are managed via program revenue accounts – 136). Unfortunately, experience shows that “deals” involving revenue sharing often require discussions and negotiations to be repeated. There may be many other such opportunities, but the campus culture appears to be (largely) unaware that this can be done.

- What policies support or impede the creation of such new revenue streams?

The university is responsible for meeting an annual tuition revenue target and must do so by generating a portion of the annual budget via the normal tuition / fees revenue stream. Hence, it is important to ensure that funds going into alternative revenue streams are NOT diverting normal tuition sources that would prevent us from meeting our tuition revenue target, but instead are truly NEW revenue sources that would otherwise not come into the institution. This is a significant challenge because proposals for new revenue streams may in fact involve some level of diversion of normal tuition sources.

There are also some cases in which the model proposed might conflict with state statute, or Regent or System policy. In general, there is a campus culture that is risk averse, so if the model has any appearance of conflicting with a policy at UW System, at the Regent level, or with the statutes, it will not be supported.

In addition, there are various other policies that impede the creation of new revenue streams. Some of these are: the tuition plateau (versus per credit tuition) which makes collaborations with other campuses very difficult and limits our ability to collect revenue generated by additional student credits, special course fee rules (typically UW System rules – FAPs or GAPS – or our interpretation of those rules), the fact that excess tuition revenue is returned to the campus planning reserve (instead of to the units that “generated it”), and the philosophical principle that – as an agent of the state – there might be political consequences for “charging extra” for services that some might view as “free” or part of what tuition/fees should already cover. Which policy impedes which proposal depends on the proposal itself, and to know for sure whether a policy is an impediment requires specific details of the proposal.

Possibly the most significant barrier is the “principle” that each unit on campus is part of the university – working in support of a common goal – and hence should not be seeking to create a “self-serving” and self-supporting revenue stream that can’t be “tapped” to cross-subsidize other areas. On the other hand, when units that work hard to generate additional revenue do not share in the positive results (i.e. locally in the unit) from that effort, the incentive to do so is non-existent.

Some examples in which there are existing revenue streams that do cross-subsidize other areas are in the operations of the auxiliary units: food service, parking, housing, bookstore, etc. Typically, the auxiliary unit receives no 102-based funding (other than “rent-free” use of university land and/or building space) and it must generate sufficient revenue to fund its own operation. In addition (and in return), these units provide an “institutional support fee”, or subsidy, to the campus that can be used for other purposes. One modest example is the income from vending machines on campus which are used, in part, to fund the annual commencement exercises. Depending on the type of auxiliary enterprise, the support fee collected can be significant. In most instances, the support fee to the campus is provided to the Chancellor to be used at his/her discretion. How this “process” works (and how much money is involved) is neither well known nor well understood across campus.

- When new revenue streams are created, do the financial “rewards” of the new revenue impact the program/unit/function; that is, is there a “local” financial incentive for creating the revenue stream?

This depends on the “deal” that is made and the manner in which the revenue stream is created (i.e. via CE or via a 136 type account). When CE is involved, a revenue sharing arrangement is agreed upon, and “yes” the financial rewards are shared with the program/unit that generates the funds. In other cases, the “deal” may be made, but the financial rewards do not necessarily return to the unit. This depends on who is involved and how aggressive (and demanding) the interested parties are about sharing the revenue. This is one reason why the culture on campus sees little incentive to create new revenue streams – there is a sense that doing so will not actually “pay off” for the unit doing the work. On the other hand, it is also true that some proposed implementations of “revenue sharing” models do not accurately account for all of the administrative (indirect) costs associated with “administering” the model; that is, the model may appear to generate a steady stream of new revenue that should be available to the unit, but some (maybe even much) of the revenue is actually required to offset the expense of maintaining the new model itself (e.g. support units must allocate personnel / time to “run” the new program and provide support for it). It is common for units to assume this indirect cost is really “free service” and then resent having to share the funding with those providing the service.

- What processes exist to ensure continuous quality improvement (CQI) and review of ongoing revenue streams? Are changes made that reflect the result of CQI?

We do examine the extent to which our revenue generating models are legal and are consistent with policy, but we don’t have a definition for, nor do we think we know how to measure “quality”; therefore, as long as the model is legal, we do not use a CQI process to evaluate the effectiveness on any regular basis. The only exception to this is if it becomes clear that the model is financially unsustainable or is adversely affecting our tuition revenue target. Then we do re-evaluate the arrangement.

- To what extent do strategic priorities impact and influence the creation of new revenue streams?

The current university strategic plan is not “operational” in that it does not provide priorities that are helpful to inform decision making. In the absence of such a plan, decisions are based on the extent to which the proposal is consistent with the mission of the university and is legal. Hence, we do not have an explicit prioritization process or list of priorities that would guide the decision making on this.

Part 2 – The annual budget process and the link to planning and assessment

- What are the processes by which one can request a change (including an increase) to the annual base budget supporting a desired function/unit/program?

There are two processes in place for increasing base budgets. One is the annual base (or general) operating budget process that is initiated in Dec/Jan of each year. This is also called the Redbook process. The other is a less formalized on-campus process for creating and submitting DINs (Decision Item Narrative) to UW System.

In the case of the annual Redbook budget process, the Director of Business Services (Dave Gessner) provides a general operating budget “master spreadsheet” to each of the three top level division administrators (Chancellor and both VCs). Each of these division administrators then separate the master operating budgets into subparts that align with

the major functional units that report to that division. For example, in Academic Affairs, each College Dean and Associate VC receives a spreadsheet with budget details for that college/unit. Each spreadsheet reflects the base budget as it existed at the beginning of the current fiscal year, and the instructions are to modify the budget allocations as each administrator sees fit, but NOT to modify the “bottom line” total for that particular major “division.”

Hence, without some higher level of negotiation or discussion (i.e. with one of the three division administrators), it is not possible to increase a base budget, even though within a particular College (or unit) budget, it is certainly possible and permitted to move resources around within that budget (as long as the resulting changes do not modify the bottom line budget total). Hence, a Dean could reallocate funds from one department to another since that change would occur entirely within that Dean’s scope of authority in the budget. But this is rarely done to any great extent.

In principle, it is also possible for two Deans (as an example) to reallocate base budget resources – one Dean providing a base transfer of funds to the other with the concurrence of the division administrator (i.e. Provost in this case) – but in reality this is also rare. And of course, any of the division administrators can enact a base budget reallocation (within her/his scope of authority) by fiat – this too is rare.

The only recent instances in which *major* budget reallocations have occurred involve major campus reorganizations (CPS becoming two Colleges) that require such changes. Prior to that, the last major increase to any *college level budgets* occurred in 1988 (as part of the Quality Reinvestment Program). In 1996 there was a one-time distribution of “sabbatical funds” that amounted to \$2000-\$5000 per college, depending on the size of the college. And in 1997 the Chancellor transferred control of much of the centralized master salary account – amounting to millions of dollars – to the two VCs thereby creating three division-level master salary accounts. That is, in 1997 the two VCs received control of their own division-level master salary accounts corresponding to their areas of responsibility. This represents a significant reallocation of resources (from a centralized model led by the Chancellor to a more decentralized model led by all three division level administrators).

There is a formal process for requesting an increase to an annual base budget. The appropriate administrator must submit a supplemental request along with the normal Redbook proposal (spreadsheet). Typically, these requests provide documentation on the increased need and estimated amounts. These are submitted by Deans (or other appropriate persons) along with the Redbook proposals and are discussed with the relevant top level division administrator at that time. The university does not currently have a reallocation methodology that aligns with strategic planning principles and priorities nor any new funding sources, and for this reason (in part), such requests are rarely granted. Any base allocation changes require the approval of the appropriate top level division administrator (the Chancellor and two VCs).

For all of the reasons above, it is common to hear faculty and staff from across campus talk about the static nature of the department/unit budgets. Resource reallocation is permitted but is simply is not often done.

The second process for requesting a change in a base budget is via the DIN (Decision Item Narrative, or a base budget supplement) process. DIN requests are aligned with

the state biennial budget process, and so occur every other year. DINs also require the support of UW System, so it is not necessarily the case that a DIN request would be “warmly received” at UW System in a given year. UW-Eau Claire has submitted DINs in only three biennia – 2001/03, 2003/5, and 2007/09. The DIN in 2001/03 was funded, and UW System supported no DINs in 2003/05. Prior to 2001/03, UW-Eau Claire had not submitted a DIN. There is no formal process on campus for soliciting DIN proposals. In the three cases listed, the senior leadership of the institution initiated the ideas, solicited faculty help in creating the proposals, and made decisions regarding how/when to move the DINs forward.

- What policies support or impede changes to annual base budgets?

There are some UW System “rules” that impede the shifting of funds across different IBACs (an activity code that describes the intended purpose of the funds), and there are several financial policy papers (FAPs) from UW System that govern the process and rules for budgeting. Hence, some reallocation requests may require approval by UW System, such as shifts from “instruction” (IBAC 2) to other areas (a different IBAC), and personnel shifts from classified to unclassified status. Such shifts are permitted, but are not encouraged because they “draw attention from UWS” (and may even require permission), and hence are rarely done.

Otherwise, there are no additional “rules” that impede reallocation of base budget resources, with the obvious exception that any increase to the salary master in a budget must provide the funds necessary to cover the associated fringe benefits (called the fringe tax). And even though there may not be specific rules, some recommended changes would not be in the best interest of the campus as a whole (although this may appear counterintuitive at “lower levels” of the university). For example, if we increase salaries in total for the campus, we must also increase the fringe benefit budget (and set aside additional funds for this). But if we decrease salaries we cannot retrieve any dollars from the fringe benefit budget except when this is done to meet budget reductions required by the State. Hence, there are “strategies” for manipulating the system that may be confusing to some, but are in fact in the best interest of the institution.

While reallocations are permitted, it is a rare occurrence. If a reallocation were to be done between two departments within a college (for example), the members of one department would view this as the “siphoning off” of funds. And since any such change would be a rare occurrence, the political fallout is probably too great for those who have to make the decisions. In the absence of a plan to guide the decision making process, this is a challenge for any campus leader.

There is also a campus culture that impedes the sharing of budget resources across major division boundaries. That is, comments like “why do I have to support what you are doing” or “this isn’t my area so I shouldn’t have to help pay for it” are common – the silo effect may preclude division level administrators from cooperating effectively for the good of the institution. And to complicate matters, any reallocation of resources across major division boundaries must be presented to (and possibly even approved by) the University Senate Budget Committee.

- What processes exist to ensure continuous quality improvement (CQI) and review of the sufficiency of base budget allocations? Are changes made that reflect the result of CQI?

Annual reports and the periodic department and unit reviews regularly request more funds to support programs. However, there is little correlation between those reviews / requests and the annual base budget process. Hence, these review processes *could* serve as standing CQI processes to review the sufficiency of base budget allocations, but in practice they do not.

On the other hand, annual carry-forward balances are sufficiently large that one can conclude that many base budgets are sufficient to cover the needs of the units. At the department/unit levels, the claim is that the funding is insufficient, but at increasingly higher levels the carry-forward balances are very large. One explanation for this apparent contradiction may be that the excess funds are dispersed in numerous locations and in small amounts. This leads to the perception that “we’re out of money” but the sum total remains significant. Another explanation offered is that some campus leaders deliberately leave some positions (FTE) unfilled in order to create flexible spending money, via carry-forward balances, for the next year (by having the unspent salary dollars carry-over into the next FY). This approach is felt to be *necessary* means for running the colleges / units in the absence of budget reallocations. And of course, the planning reserve itself remains a significant “holding place” for unspent campus funding.

The process by which DT funding is allocated *does* include a CQI component – assessment of the prior year accomplishments is requested for all repeat proposals. However, many recipients pay only scant attention to this component of the proposal.

Everyone is in agreement that the budget process should be more rational and better informed by incorporating strategic goals.

- To what extent do strategic priorities impact and influence the modification of annual base budgets?

Again, the university strategic plan is not “operational” in that it does not provide priorities that are helpful to inform decision making. The campus mission is broadly defined and tends to support a “be all things to all people” approach, hence we operate with a wide range of priorities. There is no explicit or written list of university priorities or short/long range goals to be accomplished at the institutional level, nor any process for comparing requests according to criteria or priorities. Each request is considered separately. Decisions are often based upon previous decisions and actions taken, and by a scan of what other issues may be on the horizon; that is, priorities are often determined based on short-term needs and challenges. The one clear time when in-depth discussion of priorities does occur is when the budgets are being cut (mandated cuts). At the lower administrative levels of the university (college, unit, or department level), the use of strategic priorities that guide decision making is more common – but by no means very common. That is, when the “mission” or goals of the unit/program are narrow enough, there are more opportunities for the decision making to be guided by strategic priorities. But this varies from unit to unit and department to department.

Because base budgets are rarely modified in the formal annual base budget process, strategic priorities have little effect. But, some base budgets *have been increased outside of the normal Redbook process*. This is a result of the “squeaky wheel” effect – someone with a pressing need operating outside of the normal budgeting process says “you must give me more funding or else” This approach has proven more successful than

working within the normal system (which almost never results in a base budget change). The most likely explanation for this success is that (a) you can make a compelling case directly in person (and being articulate and persuasive helps), (b) you do not have to contend with others doing the same thing at the same time, and (c) you can time the “ask” in such a way that options leading to an acceptable solution are very limited (e.g. create a “the sky is falling” situation). This is an empirical observation.

A review of the long-term institutional history reveals that in past times of financial prosperity and growth (which is typically based on enrollment growth) and sufficient state support, there was no compelling reason for the “big three” campus administrators (Chancellor and two VCs) to engage in the “sharing” of base resources since all three tended to have sufficient resources to fund their individual priorities. But with the recent and more challenging financial circumstances, in part based upon several state mandated based budget cuts, that older approach has not been as effective. Yet budget realignments have not occurred to correct any imbalances in the cuts taken or to help support the changing nature of campus priorities. In fact, there is a campus perception that the “big three” campus administrators do not “fairly share” the burden of funding campus priorities. The perception is that each protects his/her portion of the budget, and no one wants to “ask the Chancellor” for help from the planning reserve. In short, no one is aware of any significant base budget reallocations having occurred at this level of the institution since 1997 when the master salary account was decentralized to division master salary accounts.

Two areas where strategic priorities are considered are in the annual allocation of DT funding and of laboratory modification (lab mod) funding for campus projects. That is, because there is a clear cycle and timeline to the awarding of each of these funds, all proposals are considered as a group and strategic priorities can and do make a difference in the awarding process. There is no option for a squeaky wheel approach.

Part 3 – “One-time” budget supplements and the link to prioritization and planning

- What are the processes by which one can request a one-time budget supplement supporting a desired function/unit/program?

The process is informal and is often characterized as a squeaky wheel process. Typically, a person submits a request (there is no “form” required) to the next level administrator describing the need – there are no deadlines or rules to guide this.

- What policies support or impede the allocation of a one-time budget supplement?

The only limiting factors are the legality of the request, the size of the request, and the amount of budget available. The only other typical impediment is when the request involves additional FTE – which is controlled and limited per UW System policies and which are very tightly controlled on this campus.

While it isn’t a campus policy per se, the excess tuition revenue generated in a given year (i.e. the revenue generated that is over the stated tuition revenue target) is returned to campus the following year into the planning reserve – which is generally considered to be appropriate. However, there isn’t a straight-forward process for “applying” for or allocating funding from the planning reserve, and so there is a campus belief that the planning reserve money is “untouchable”. On the other hand, hundreds of

thousands of dollars are provided annually (via one-time transfers at the end of each year) from these central funds to help offset the expenses incurred in supporting “course availability” needs.

- What processes exist to ensure continuous quality improvement (CQI) and review of the impact of the budget supplement? Are changes made that reflect the result of CQI?

CQI processes are not routinely enacted to determine the effect of the one-time funding, and measuring quality is thought to be difficult. There are some exceptions – for example, the proposal itself may include an assessment component, but formal CQI is uncommon otherwise.

- To what extent do strategic priorities impact and influence the awarding of a one-time budget supplement?

The university strategic plan is not “directional” enough to foster the creation of an explicit or written list of priorities. In addition, there isn’t a process for comparing requests according to stated criteria or priorities. Each request is considered separately. Declines are typically a result of a lack of available funding or a determination that the request simply doesn’t seem “worthy” enough. The squeaky wheel rule applies here as it does in the base funding case. Many individuals desire such direction and priorities as well as a means for updating and continuously modifying a “priority list” so that it remains valid into the future. At the lower administrative levels of the university (college, unit, or department level), the use of strategic priorities that guide decision making is more common – but (again) by no means very common. That is, when the “mission” or goals of the unit/program are narrow enough, there are more opportunities for the decision making to be guided by strategic priorities.

Planning for the future....

- There is general agreement that the creation of strategic directions and priorities (operational ones and at *all levels of the institution*) are essential for helping guide decision making.
- There is general agreement that there should be clear links between strategic priorities, the decisions made, and the funding provided.
- There is general agreement that some form of CQI process would be useful for evaluating the effectiveness of decisions from the past. In fact, many believe that an effective “review process” would actually lessen the squeaky wheel effect and instead promote better long-term planning and decision making.
- There is some agreement, although it is not universal, that the institution has sufficient funding at its disposal (although it might not be easily accessible to those who need it). How one sees this situation appears to depend on the extent to which the person understands the entire budget situation (where the funding resides at various levels of the university), and how skillful they are at getting access to those resources.

Recommendations....

- Strategic plans should be developed at all institutional levels – but are most in need at the “top” levels of the institution. These plans should provide clear direction and the ability to develop priorities among the many needs of the institution.
- Decisions should require a discussion of the relevant strategic priorities and be linked to funding sources. That is, there should be explicit links between priorities, funding, and decisions made.
- Strategic plans should provide measurable goals and milestones, and CQI processes should be put into place to monitor the results.
- Existing processes and principles guiding reallocations of base budgets should be reviewed for effectiveness. The institution should investigate best-practices available elsewhere and consider implementing suitable models.

Curriculum/Program Processes Subgroup

Environmental Scan and SWOT Analysis

Academic Curriculum and Programs

Course Scheduling Processes

Within the College of Arts & Sciences, the course schedules for fall and spring are developed by the department chairs, approved by the Dean, and submitted to the Registrar and the Provost. Each chair proposes the days/times/number of sections for each course they chose to include on the schedule. The proposed schedule is reviewed and modified by the Dean relative to faculty workload and course availability issues. The resulting tentative schedule is submitted to the Registrar and the Provost for initial publication. Department chairs and students review the tentative schedule for potential conflicts. Changes to each tentative schedule are proposed by the chairs, approved by the Dean, and submitted to the Registrar and the Provost as the official course schedule. As students register for courses, the Dean monitors registration for course availability issues. If necessary, the Dean negotiates with the chair to have additional seats made available and with the Provost to fund those additional seats. Upon the Provost's approval, the chair modifies the official course schedule to provide additional seats. The course schedules for winter and summer follow the above process. The process and outcome are so dependable that several faculty have apparently come to rely on overload pay to supplement their income on a regular basis. In addition, the Dean monitors registration for low-enrollment courses and cancels courses as appropriate and necessary with the potential to reassign faculty to courses in higher demand.

Within the College of Business, course scheduling follows a 12-month enrollment management plan. The plan, which was developed by the Dean's Council and approved by the College faculty, outlines target annual student enrollment figures for each course in the business core. These targets are set to meet the College's target for overall upper-division enrollment. A standardized and consistent core course schedule that adheres to the enrollment management plan is used by the College. Each year the Dean's Council monitors the actual and targeted enrollment figures and makes minor modifications to the plan and the corresponding core course schedule as appropriate. The course schedule for the upper-division courses in each major is determined by the appropriate department chair and the college assistant dean for student affairs based on student demand.

The College of Nursing and Health Sciences and the College of Education and Human Sciences were unable to respond to our request for scheduling processes in time to be included in this report.

Strengths

- ✓ Colleges have the flexibility to follow a process appropriate to them.

- ✓ In Arts & Sciences, department chairs largely determine schedule allowing for increased flexibility.
- ✓ In Business, the scheduling process enables the college to be intentional in its enrollment and to meet expected course availability needs.
- ✓ Dean approval provides a system of checks and balances.

Weaknesses

- ✓ In Arts & Sciences, the current system of providing additional funding for seat availability results in an incentive program to withhold GE seats.
- ✓ The checks and balances provided by the Dean's review of the schedule requires administrative "fortitude" when it comes to enforcing constraints on the departments.
- ✓ Revisiting course schedules multiple times for predictable seat availability is inefficient.

Opportunities

- ✓ The current evaluation of GE provides opportunity to rethink the class-scheduling process.
- ✓ The enrollment plan used in the College of Business provides a model of efficient scheduling.

Threats

- ✓ Unclear and inconsistent definition of instructional workload makes it difficult for the Dean to identify inappropriate schedules.
- ✓ Campus culture does not support top-down decisions making it difficult for the Dean to force changes in departmental schedules.

Curriculum Modification Processes

The university has extensive policies regarding actions required for any changes involving curriculum and academic programs. The specific requirements for approval are found in Chapter 7 of the FAS handbook with a matrix on Page 7.19 and a flow chart on page 7.20. All changes to academic program requirements except for changes to degree requirements, start within an academic department/programs or equivalents and then proceed through multiple levels of the shared governance process. In practice, many courses are initiated at the request of an individual faculty member who develops the course proposal and guides the course proposal through the approval process.

Curriculum committees exist within some departments, within all colleges and in the case of the GE program at the university level (UGEC). Some changes in curricula and program require passage by college faculty at college meetings that have highly variable attendance rates by faculty. The University Senate APC is charged with much of the oversight of tracking undergraduate academic changes beyond the level of specific courses and several curricular and program changes require actions of the full-university senate especially those involving creation, elimination or renaming of majors and actions involving academic departments. Surprisingly, even applying for extramural funding where there are curricular implications requires action by no less than seven different committees/authorities.

Colleges develop their own parallel regulations regarding requirements for curriculum and academic program changes and administer much of the bureaucracy.

Creation of new academic programs requires action by every level of the faculty and administration including the UWS – BOR. The process starts with a “request to plan” a new program or major. If the “request to plan” is approved by UWS then a full proposal is developed. UWS analyzes the following information which is provided by the institution to determine if a new program is approved: a) institutional mission and program array, b) student demand and market need, c) collaboration, d) technology, and e) resources required.

University-wide curricular concerns such as the First Year Experience program, the Service Learning program, the Honors program, the General Education program, and others are lead by faculty. Each program is run largely independently from the others. Most such university-wide programs report directly to Academic Affairs.

Strengths

- ✓ The curriculum modification processes are well established and visible.
- ✓ The current system provides multiple layers of checks and balances.

Weaknesses

- ✓ All actions, including removal, start with the department.
- ✓ There are little or no overall campus-wide checks-and-balances.
- ✓ Having university-wide curricular programs report directly to Academic Affairs has resulted in limited coordination and vision for the programs as a collection.
- ✓ The paperwork and sheer weight of curriculum-modification process is anti-nimble.
- ✓ The "bottom-up" design of the curriculum results in a course array that lacks integration and intentionality.

Opportunities

- ✓ Current evaluation of GE provides opportunity to rethink the overall curriculum modification process.

Threats

- ✓ Existing committees may wish to protect their role in the curriculum modification process.
- ✓ In general, the faculty body is not supportive of additional administrative positions as might be necessary for an appropriately coordinated university-wide curriculum program array.

Student Registration Processes

Normally, students register for courses in a priority-order based on their total earned credits (the more earned credits, the earlier a student registers). At or after a student's assigned registration time, each student is allowed to register for up to 18 credits of courses. Students who have earned less than sixty credits, as well as students on probation, are required to obtain a Personal Advising Code (PAC) from their advisor prior to registering. The appropriate department chair may approve any exceptions to stated registration permission policies (including overloads,

prerequisites, and so forth). The Dean may approve registration for more than 18 credits.

Honors students and students with disabilities are allowed to register prior to all others.

Incoming freshman and transfer students are allowed to register during their scheduled summer orientation session.

Graduate students register for courses in much the same way as undergraduate students.

Strengths

- ✓ The more advanced students are given opportunity to register for needed courses earlier in the process.
- ✓ The first-come-first-serve process forces some students to take courses they might not otherwise take.

Weaknesses

- ✓ Freshman must wait to register during orientation.
- ✓ Students can only register for what is still open.
- ✓ Courses may fail to register enough students.

Opportunities

- ✓ Desire-based registration could be explored.

Threats

- ✓ Any major changes to the registration process will add additional work to a staff already overwhelmed by switching to the PeopleSoft software package.

Quality Improvement Processes

Academic programs are reviewed on a seven-year cycle with administration of the review being the responsibility of Academic Affairs working jointly with the University Senate Academic Policies Committee (APC) for undergraduate programs and the graduate council (GC) for graduate programs. The Department self-studies represent the majority of the baseline data used by the internal review team (nominally a team of three university faculty members) and a single external reviewer. Both internal reviewers and external reviewers are appointed in consultation with the department/program and this could represent a problem in getting unbiased reports. Under the current system, program review is coordinated by the APC for undergraduate programs and the GC for graduate program reviews. Once recommendations are received by the Provost appropriate department/program reactions to the review are usually negotiated directly with the Provost with reports filtering back to the faculty committees. The university policies state only that department/programs *take into consideration suggestions for changes in curriculum and advising* and that Deans may make personnel and/or budget changes associated with reviews. There is also a policy statement that deans may ask for additional resources for program improvement.

The university has a campus wide - University Assessment Committee (UAC) appointed by the Provost and charged with assessment of student academic achievement based on baccalaureate goals. Each department is required to have an assessment plan and to assess student learning within the program. The UAC maintains the university portfolio project, conducts exit interviews and generates a University-wide assessment of student learning report that is shared with college curriculum committees. It is not clear what the college curriculum committees are expected to do with this assessment information or how this information filters down to faculty and staff in charge of curriculum development and modification.

Strengths

- ✓ All academic departments are nominally reviewed at least every seven years.
- ✓ The university administers the NSSE survey and other assessment instruments.

Weaknesses

- ✓ The university does not have a meaningful feedback loop to use the assessment data collected.
- ✓ The administration of university-wide assessment instruments is opaque with limited awareness on the part of faculty and staff.
- ✓ While departments are required to have assessment plans, it is likely these are only paper plans without real implementation.
- ✓ There is a disconnect between assessment of majors/minors (when present) and the goals of the Baccalaureate degree.
- ✓ The assessment process lacks appropriate administrative support having only an 8-credit annual release for the Assessment Director. At universities with robust assessment programs there is almost always a separate well staffed assessment office (Example: Truman State University)

Opportunities

- ✓ Assessment exams are already given, we just need to use the data.

Threats

- ✓ Some faculty perceive assessment as "busy work".
- ✓ Some faculty fear that assessment results might be used against them.
- ✓ In general, the faculty body is not supportive of additional administrative positions as might be necessary for an appropriately staffed assessment process.

Program Prioritization Processes

The University does not have an explicit program prioritization process. While prioritization presumably occurs, it is not via a formal process nor based on documented criteria.

Strengths

- ✓ The lack of published priorities allows the administration flexibility in supporting or not supporting initiatives.

- ✓ The lack of published priorities allows aggressive faculty and staff to acquire funding through repeated pleas.

Weaknesses

- ✓ Both of the above are also weaknesses.
- ✓ The university has no documented criteria for how to respond to new resources or the loss of existing resources.
- ✓ The lack of priorities supports a culture of independent contractors in which each department/program focuses only on their local concerns.

Opportunities

- ✓ The Provost and staff have already begun looking at a prioritization process based on the work by Dickeson.

Threats

- ✓ Many faculty will resist prioritization in order to protect their turf.
- ✓ It is not the "Eau Claire way" to make distinctions between programs.
- ✓ The university's culture of shared governance might make it difficult to establish priorities that differentiate between programs.

Co-curricular Programs

Program Scheduling and User Registration Processes

Co-curricular scheduling is dependent on the nature of the co-curricular activity or unit. For example, Continuing Education has a registration process conducted by their office. Recreation has its own registration process run out of their office. Academic Skills Center has an open scheduling process allowing students to stop by for help. The Center for International Education has an orientation process for study abroad run out of their office.

Strengths

- ✓ Scheduling flexibility allows for each unit to meet their own needs.

Weaknesses

- ✓ It is difficult to access the array of co-curricular programs (no single point of oversight).
- ✓ The current system does not allow students to earn credit for the learning that takes place via co-curricular programming.

Opportunities

- ✓ The university could create a central portal for organizing all co-curricular programs.
- ✓ The university might develop a process through which students can receive credit for learning that takes place via co-curricular programming.

Threats

- ✓ Some faculty will resist the idea of granting credit for co-curricular learning.

- ✓ There would be a significant workload to develop the learning outcomes and assessment processes required to support credit for co-curricular programming.

Demand Monitoring Processes

Each unit is responsible for monitoring student demand for its programs.

Strengths

- ✓ This open process allows each unit to monitor its own clients.

Weaknesses

- ✓ Areas of opportunity not currently assigned to a unit may be missed.
- ✓ Self-monitoring further supports a culture of independent contractors where each program is concerned for its own survival.

Opportunities

- ✓ The university may be receptive to integrating the curricular and co-curricular program arrays into one intentional package.

Threats

- ✓ Staff may attempt to protect their turf.

Program Array Modification Processes

There is no formal process for modifying the co-curricular program array. In most cases, new programs are established via external grant funding.

Strengths

- ✓ The grant-driven approach allows the university the flexibility to pursue new areas.
- ✓ Most external granting agencies have significant reporting processes designed to assess and improve program quality.

Weaknesses

- ✓ The grant-funded model further supports a culture of independent contractors where each grant author is concerned for the program's own continuation.

Opportunities

- ✓ The university may be receptive to integrating the curricular and co-curricular program arrays into one intentional package.

Threats

- ✓ Staff may attempt to protect their turf.

Quality Improvement Processes

Co-curricular units are formally reviewed every seven years. Each unit under review writes a formal self-study addressing five major areas: 1) the current state of the unit; 2) planned directions for the future; 3) the relationship of the unit to curriculum and instruction; 4) the professional development activities of the staff; and 5) unit information such as mission, philosophy, and organization. Constituents of the unit are surveyed. Each unit is reviewed by a Review Team consisting of at

least three members. After the review, the Review Team submits a report based on a standardized evaluation instrument. The Review Team holds a brief exit interview with the unit personnel describing their findings. The final report is submitted to the unit's administrator. The administrator and the Unit Director meet to discuss the report and develop an Action Plan. The administrator meets with the Unit Director at least every six months to monitor the implementation of the Action Plan.

Strengths

- ✓ Every unit is reviewed every seven years.
- ✓ The review process is well-designed and consistently followed.
- ✓ The review process explicitly links to the curriculum.

Weaknesses

- ✓ Student learning is not addressed sufficiently.

Opportunities

- ✓ Units would likely be open to updating their organization and review to reflect a stronger focus on student learning outcomes.

Threats

- ✓ Some faculty believe that the faculty body of a university "owns" student learning.
- ✓ Staff may resist the workload of adding sufficient rigor to support student learning outcomes.

Program Prioritization Processes

The University does not have an explicit program prioritization process. While prioritization presumably occurs, it is not via a formal process nor based on documented criteria.

See SWOT Analysis for Program Prioritization in Academic programs.

7-24-07

Enrollment Management

Environmental Scan

Enrollment management, including recruitment, retention, and successful graduation, is one of the most crucial components of the university as it lays the groundwork for the educational experience our students receive. Successful enrollment management should generate the type of student body mix needed to meet the university's priorities. Without a well thought out approach to the make-up and mix of the student body, the university will not be as successful as it could be. Yet, in performing an internal environmental scan, it was discovered that – although consistently the university meets its freshmen enrollment target – other areas of enrollment management are not well orchestrated and things are happening more by chance than through intentionality. The following discusses the current practices identified through the internal environmental scan and concludes with recommendations.

Internal Scan

Deciding the Target for the Number of Incoming Freshmen

UW System oversees enrollment targets. The actual setting of UWEC enrollment targets starts with Andy Soll, Vice Chancellor for Business and Student Services, in conjunction with Andy Nelson, Institutional Researcher. The target number is developed by reviewing retention projections and estimates of the size of the graduating class. One of the goals is to maintain a relatively consistent number for the incoming class or problems will develop in course availability, services available over the next four years, and in tuition generation.

Vice Chancellor Soll presents the recommended targets to the Executive Staff for discussion and approval. This target does not seem to include target for long term projections.

Deciding the Mix of Students

The Enrollment Planning Advisory Committee (EPAC) has been disbanded. Currently there is no mechanism to intentionally “shape” the incoming class by deciding the issues related to the mix of students desired, i.e. diversity, gender mix, traditional students, non traditional, high achievers, first generation/low income, non resident, etc. Although questions about the upcoming demographic issues and the relative mix of the student body have been identified, it is not clear how these questions can and should be addressed in the current environment

Enrollment Management Structure

Currently there is no formally structured connection between the primary offices involved in the practical aspects of enrollment management, i.e. Admissions, Registrar's, Financial Aid, Academic Advising, etc. Admissions, Academic Advising, Financial Aid, and Housing meet informally to discuss status of the incoming class. Admissions, Registrar's, and Financial Aid meet monthly on an informal basis to

discuss overlapping policies and procedures. No formal system is in place to address the crucial philosophical and institutional policy questions.

Recruiting Student of Colors

There is a lack of clarity about whose primary responsibility it is to recruit students of color – whether it is the Office of Multicultural Affairs or Admissions.

Retention

With the disbanding of the EPAC and the Retention sub-committee of EPAC, it is not clear that any specific work has been done this year to improve retention.

Policy

The institution sets its own policies for admissions requirement.

UW System mandates policies concerning holistic admissions and transfer policies. System also implements initiatives such as the WI Covenant and the Adult Student initiative.

Accountability

The number of students compared to the target figure and the overall quality figures for the incoming class are closely monitored and Admission is held primarily accountable. There does not seem to be any accountability for retention or graduation rates. Note: The university has made “increasing retention rates” one of its goals to System.

SWOT Results

Strengths

- University hits its enrollment target
- Effective informal collaboration among units to support recruitment
- Relatively good retention

Weaknesses

- Lack of a formal enrollment management plan
- A lack of a formal organizational structure to foster enrollment management
- Executive Director of Enrollment Management in title only
- An enrollment target set with limited discussion
- No one is accountable for retention and graduation rates
- Responsibility for recruiting students of color not clearly delineated
- Low yield rate for students of color

Opportunities

- Wisconsin Covenant may increase applicant pool
- Growing pool of nontraditional/graduate students
- Increased pool of students of color

Threats

- Projected decline in primary applicant pool
- Increased competition from sister schools and for-profit schools

Recommendations

Provide a structure that clarifies responsibility and accountability for enrollment management.

Create a high level enrollment planning committee to grapple with the big questions, a vehicle for broad-based conversation that includes a mix of faculty and staff. The committee should have the ability to do enrollment planning that is more than just numbers, but is also about a targeted mix of students that directly supports strategic planning. The institutional researcher will be an important resource.

Resources for Environmental Scan

Kris Anderson, Executive Director of Enrollment Services and Admissions

Jesse Dixon, Director of Multicultural Affairs

Debbie Gough, Director of Advising, Testing and Orientation

Steve Tallant, Provost

UW-Oshkosh enrollment management plan on the Web

7-24-07

Facilities SWOT Analysis

STRENGTHS

1. Precedent of sharing w/ community
 - Additional buildings/remodels – stronger case for GPR dollars due to integration w/ community
 - Multi-purpose facilities, i.e. Carson Park/Bollinger Fields
2. Leadership in place/vision to move us forward
3. Very lofty “Mission” to live up to (Excellence)
 - fight or flight
4. Process is in depth enough and takes enough time for entire campus to submit feedback
5. Classroom renovation and Instructional Technology projects are planned, approved, and completed in approx. 2 year cycles
6. Students could assist us in making the pitch for more facilities since they have more credibility with legislators (Example: Davies)

WEAKNESSES

1. Campus has taken a very conservative approach
 - Last time academic space was added – 1986 (McPhee)
 - Last time “non-academic” space was added – 1992 (library IT & collection capacity)
 - In need of a major overhaul
2. Lengthy process dictated by system to get a new facility (see Chancellor notes)
3. Not a lot of flexibility if something happens to “fall in our lap” – not a timely process to take advantage of last minute opportunities
4. We have fallen way behind other campuses that we’re competing against
 - Every other campus in the UW system and among our peers has had some form of new construction in the last 5 years
5. No individual devoted to generating money for facilities
 - e.g athletic development, no Foundation campaigns for new facilities
6. Our strategic plan needs to be updated & there has to be follow through
7. Campus is currently Land locked. Need to think creatively to expand the footprint.
8. To do any small improvement to a building, funding must come from individual departments – some depts. can sustain that while others cannot
9. Our facilities could be perceived as out-of-date and in poor condition, so our ability to recruit and retain high quality students as well as faculty and staff is reduced.
10. Difficulty determining priorities – due to entire campus in such dire need of improvement – where do we start? (refer to Strengths #4)
 - We need written procedures regarding space assignment – we have some formal processes in place, but when the rubber meets the road, those formal processes are not necessarily followed.
11. No formal gateway to campus – upper or lower

12. Lack of communication regarding processes/procedures – from new construction to adding electrical outlets. Lack of awareness on campus of how these things work. Positive examples: Iowa State (planning process flow charts) and University of Northern Iowa (Principles and procedures for space assignment)
13. Campus improvements, etc., where charge backs occur – we are at the mercy of System – processes defined
14. Lack of detailed planning on the par with William and Mary (vehicular and pedestrian traffic flows diagrams) and UW-Oshkosh.
15. One person (Provost) charged with determining the allocation of space.
16. Decisions at system level regarding project approval often not based on need, but the political savvy of those proposing the projects.

OPPORTUNITIES

1. It's been so long since we've had a new building on campus - that change is going to grab everyone's attention
 - Incredible potential for change/growth
2. Showing some sort of progress and/or commitment would potentially improve morale across campus, offer sense of pride in place
3. Strategic plan revision/renewal is an opportunity to get the entire campus “on board”
 - Foster buy-in
4. Because everyone else has passed us by, we should be able to use our competitors to learn from their mistakes and gain practical and creative ideas to implement on our own campus
5. Not aware of a capital campaign for facilities, so an untapped area?
6. Naming rights
7. With facility improvements/upgrades, we have a new opportunity to market our campus, use as a recruitment tool
8. Need to do your homework and be prepared when/if the money becomes available
9. Expanding campus footprint by acquiring adjacent property
10. Foundation – private money = quicker process to build

THREATS

1. Other campuses in the system are arguing for FTE driven budgets – planning and moving forward, assuming someone will eventually foot the bill
 - If budgets do become FTE driven, due to limited growth/expansion, we could lose major funding from the state
2. According to Facilities, the calculated value of backlog of programmatic facilities work exceeds the calculated value of backlog of maintenance and repair. It has been so long since we've had major improvements, that it would be more economical to replace vs. renovate
3. There is a backlog in maintenance and repair
4. There is a backlog in ADA compliance
5. The current space is functionally obsolete – even with infrastructure updating, the space is still unsuitable

6. Parking – lease on upper campus up in 2010, according to FP & M website; 2015, according to Chancellor
7. If you can't justify when your turn comes, you risk losing the opportunity
8. Department of State Facilities reviews all facilities projects even after OK'd by the legislators

Final Recommendations/Suggested Goals

A detailed Facilities Master Plan which would include: (the development of the Facilities Master Plan would need to align with established campus priorities)

- Campus Master Plan
 - a sense of place must be enhanced on campus
 - create a committee to explore any and all possibilities for acquisition of land and/or structures and how those would be integrated into the current campus
 - design the Master Plan with a focus on working toward a “Green Campus”
- Campus Development Plan
 - explore the acquisition of land and/or structures in the surrounding area and develop a plan to integrate into the Campus Master Plan
 - develop a plan to acquire available land and/or structures when they become available
- Long-Range Maintenance Plan
 - become ADA compliant across campus
- Campus Parking Plan
 - address parking shortfalls/issues; investigate the possibility of building a parking ramp on campus
- Space Use Plan
 - remodel and renovate when/where necessary and reallocate space in alignment with the Strategic Plan and Campus Priorities
 - develop a pedestrian-friendly campus; explore other institutions and how they have developed their pedestrian space (Beloit College)
 - address quality of classrooms (size, technology, usefulness, etc.)

7-26-07

Management & Governance Subgroup

Management

The recently released Policy Research Institute Report, *Renewing the University of Wisconsin System: Creating the Capacity to Manage and Compete*, states “Although the UWS is clearly successful in many areas, it is also clear that it would be in a better position to adapt to its current and likely future fiscal environment were it, and state government, to act to eliminate or minimize obstacles to management that have been identified in this paper. The following actions would move in that direction: 1. Address the UWS’s plea for greater management flexibility and autonomy from the rest of state government.” (p. 1)

This plea for greater management flexibility in terms of budget flexibility was echoed here at UW-Eau Claire in the Internal Environmental Scan.

Internal Environmental Scan

Two questions were asked to a selected set of administrators and supervisors from department chair / unit director level through upper-level administration.

What policies or procedures currently in place hinder your work or create inefficiencies in what you need to accomplish as a ...?

Are you aware of policies or procedures followed at other institutions that allow for these tasks to be accomplished in more efficient ways? If so, please explain.

The internal environmental scan clearly revealed three common areas of concern:

- **FUNDING**
The current “two bosses” model (referenced in Part 1 of the Budget subgroup report) requiring the Provost to seek permission for funding for academic affairs from the VC for Business and Student Services is seen as a major roadblock by many supervisors and administrators.
As one respondent stated “if the CBO (Chief Business Officer) doesn’t report to the Provost, then nothing will change. Because that position currently reports directly to the Chancellor, that position has no obligation to listen to or even respond to the academic requests from the Provost.”
- **DIRECTION and INCENTIVES and ORGANIZATION**
The lack of a clearly-defined set of priorities stemming from a well-developed strategic plan has held some departments back from expanding the necessary energy to launch new initiatives. Without the assurance of “being valued”, without extra incentives for bringing in new revenue streams, and without the flexibility for creative budgeting across the whole department or program, there is little incentive to “think outside the box.”
Some chairs have put discussions for future change “on hold” until campus priorities are revealed as “it is hard to continue to focus on program development when it is not clear how valued our programs are.”

Since departments launching new and innovative ideas often keep very little of any additional revenue generated by such initiatives, this practice serves as a disincentive to “taking a risk” with a new idea.

Summer course offerings are determined by reviewing the enrollment course-by-course. A department lacks the flexibility to use the extra funds provided by a high-enrollment course or by a graduate-level course to support the needs of other essential, but low-enrollment courses. Funds recovered from summer session, however, are used to fund course availability in the fall.

We support the initiative to review models for the organization of student affairs.

- **REQUESTS and REPORTS**

The current processes involved in routing documents through administration for signatures, especially the process for requesting money for travel, are seen as very time consuming, inefficient, and often redundant. In some cases, requests for reports seem unnecessarily redundant.

Other areas of concern:

- 1) The state-mandated cap of \$12,000 in overload salaries
- 2) UW – Eau Claire’s very conservative interpretation of the special course fees policies should be examined.
- 3) Lack of closure on initiatives; example: resolution of suggested changes for baccalaureate goals.

Governance

The recently released Policy Research Institute Report, *Renewing the University of Wisconsin System: Creating the Capacity to Manage and Compete*, states “University Governance provisions are more oriented to providing reassurance to University constituencies than to providing a coherent management structure.” (p. 9)

Internal Environmental Scan

The governance structure at UW-Eau Claire is rather unique in the system as the main entity is a combined faculty and academic staff University Senate. While decisions concerning curricular and faculty personnel issues are made by University Faculty and decisions concerning academic staff issues are made by University Academic Staff, everyone may be involved in the debate on the issue. This allows for each subgroup to learn from the other.

The internal environmental scan revealed two areas of concern:

- **STRUCTURE**

“One needs to believe that the time spent in the governance process is worth it or not.” Some view the size of the current university senate as a negative; others view the combined senate as a positive.

Most suggest that the processes for making decisions could be reviewed. For example, for academic-related policy changes, approval is required at many levels of governance. To move a change through the process requires a lot of time, thus often hindering a fast response to specific needs. A more efficient process could be developed.

- **HANDBOOK LANGUAGE**
Policies and procedures explained in the Faculty and Academic Staff handbook are often confusing, vague, and/or redundant.

Recommendations

- 1) Break down the barriers in the funding request process. The need for the Provost to request funding from the VC for Business and Student Services to augment the academic mission is seen as a detriment to efficient management.
- 2) Reward establishing new initiatives and creating new revenue streams.
- 3) Review models used for calculating summer session salaries.
- 4) Streamline report process to remove redundancy.
- 5) Streamline the reimbursement procedures and review administrative requirements for signatures.
- 6) Review the organizational structure of University Senate and Senate committees.
- 7) Use best practices from other institutions to reconstitute the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook.

- Internal Scan
 - ***Strengths (to maintain)***
 - Thin and flat administrative structure
 - Dedicated and cooperative managers
 - Unified governance structure of faculty and academic staff
 - ***Weaknesses (to overcome)***
 - Process for funding requests
 - Lack of incentives for exploring new initiatives and new revenue streams
 - Lack of cohesion for Student Affairs & Student Services
 - Lack of departmental funding decision-making authority with regards to course availability, especially for summer school
 - Cumbersome and redundant reporting/requesting procedures
 - Lack of inclusion of classified staff and LTE in discussions
 - ***Opportunities (to consider)***
 - FTE availability for restructuring Student Affairs & Student Services
 - Ability to “tap” into expert resources on campus for problem solving
 - Campus climate open to Strategic Planning process
 - ***Threats (to recognize)***
 - Loss of informal collaborative efforts across campus due to upcoming retirements
 - Preexisting informal practices that stifle ideas and change

7-24-07

Personnel Subgroup

I. Internal Environmental Scan

Requesting and Obtaining New FTE and Associated Budget:

FORMAL PROCESSES:

UW-Eau Claire has two formal processes in place through which chair, directors, deans, and others can request positions and associated dollars.

1. **Redbook Submission** – Budgets are distributed to each division; dollars and FTE distribution reflect prior year budget (a.k.a. budget by photo copying). Deans and Associate Vice Chancellors can make changes between departments and/or units as long as the bottom line is not increased (exceed total FTE). In addition, deans and AVCs can make requests for additional positions and the associated dollars to the Provost/Vice Chancellor/Chancellor at this time.

Policies – UW System FTE authorization cannot be exceeded.

Financial support – Dollars for positions are dependent upon current budget; normally new dollars are not available. Departments/Colleges/Offices may encounter three scenarios when requesting additional FTE:

- 1) A department/unit is given new FTE but not the dollars to fund the position. This is usually done only in cases when the department or unit already has the dollars in the budget to support the hire.
- 2) Occasionally a department or unit will have funding available but does not have the FTE to hire. In this case, FTE may be allocated without supporting budget.
- 3) A department/unit is given new FTE and the financial support to do so.

Review of decisions – There are no established processes in place to review past allocations of FTE

Priorities – Generally, unofficial priorities play a part in the decisions but only informally. No formal list of priorities exists.

2. **DINs** – *Decision Item Narratives are proposals for additional funding and positions developed on campus and submitted to UW System for increases in budgets in targeted areas. The request to develop DINs is sent from System and generally DINs are written administratively in certain targeted areas – in priority areas or an area where it is believed we can be successful in securing funds. This is one of the more successful ways in increasing FTE.*

(Note: *Budget Book* - The Office of Academic Affairs has a budget book which addresses many issues related to budgeting, but does not address how a case is made to justify the need for FTE. It also has not been updated in recent years.)

INFORMAL PROCESSES:

There are a number of mechanisms through which FTE and the associated budget dollars can be requested. These include:

1. ***Annual Report/Meeting*** – The annual report itself includes a lot of information about a department or unit. Many of the issues needing to be addressed in the annual report allow sufficient latitude to request and justify the need for more FTE. One specific item requested on the 07-08 annual report that aligns with this follows:
 - The University Planning Committee has discussed our use of the term “marks of excellence” as a way to communicate what makes this university special – the experiential learning opportunities that set this university apart such as international studies, faculty-student research collaboration, internships, community service, and other things that your department/unit might be doing that add value to a student’s degree. Please indicate the top two or three “marks” from your department/unit that might be used to demonstrate excellence. If additional funds were to become available, in what ways would you use that funding to create additional “marks of excellence” or to enhance and expand existing ones?

The annual meeting held to discuss the annual report allows chairs to request FTE and dollars through the discussion that ensues.

Policies – None

Financial support – Usually any change in FTE is done through reallocation or using float.

Review of decisions - None.

Priorities – Generally, priorities play a part in the decision but only informally.

2. ***Departmental or Unit Review Processes*** - The departments and units are required to be reviewed every 7 years. Part of the process requires departments/units to write self studies and provide information in a wide variety of areas. This allows departments/units to document needs. Specifically this can be addressed through the following:

- *Departmental Self Study requests:* I.I.c. Student demand for the program(s). Comment on trends in the number of majors and minors, number of graduates, and course availability
- *Unit Self Study requests:* Explain Planned Direction for the Unit. Describe the overall direction in which you want the programs/activities in the unit to develop over the next seven years. Include a discussion of resources.

The departmental review concludes with a meeting of the chair, dean, provost, and provost staff to discuss recommendations. A case can be made during these meetings to document FTE and budget needs. These discussions create more of an awareness of need rather than a formal list of priorities. The Unit Review concludes with an Action Plan and could document the need for a new position(s).

Policies – Departmental Review Procedures, Support Service Unit Review Procedures, and UW System Academic Planning and Program Review Procedures (ACIS 1) <http://www.uwsa.edu/acss/acis/acis-1.pdf>

Financial Support – The support for the departmental review process is through paying for external consultants.

Review the decisions – No. There is one exception to this - if a new program is created, it undergoes a “Joint Program review” in its fifth year. This is done as a requirement of the UW System.

Priorities – Generally, priorities play a part in the decision but only informally.

3. **Personal Plea** – a chair or director, working through the dean or AVC can make a request to the PVC/VC/Chancellor for additional FTE and dollars.
No formal process, no policies, generally no review of the decision. Priorities play a part in the decisions.
4. **Reallocation of Current FTE** - a dean, AVC, VC, PVC, or Chancellor can reallocate vacant FTE from one department to another when a need has been documented.
No formal process, no policies, generally no review of the decision. Priorities play a part in the decisions.

Note: A change in the UW System budget can also play a significant role at UW-Eau Claire. In times when the UW System needs to make substantial budget reductions, UW-Eau Claire may be expected to cut FTE. This means two things:

1. Requests for new FTE are denied.
2. When vacancies occur (as a result of resignations, retirements, etc.), the positions usually are not filled.

In times of budget cuts, UW-Eau Claire has generally cut vacant positions. In other words, people currently employed at the university normally are not laid off or non-renewed.

In addition, as vacancies occur, the dean/AVC/VC does examine the need to fill the position and review whether it could be reassigned. Normally, this does not happen.

II. External Environmental Scan

1. *What is the process at your institution for requesting a new position?*

Stout: Supervisor requests new FTE in writing which ends with the division administrator.

La Crosse - Provost and division heads make decisions. No formal process.

Oshkosh - Decentralized model; colleges, units and divisions keep their vacant FTE.

River Falls - no formal process (“Go to the VC for Budget and beg” was the response.)

Stevens Point - The department/ unit making the request submits paperwork justifying the new position. The justification includes things like the source of funding, source of FTE, etc. The Chancellor and Line Officers then must approve the request.

Truman State - Whether requesting a new position or a vacant position, the process begins with the department requesting the position. A form is prepared and sent to the Budget Director, AA/EEO/Gender Equity officer, Human Resources, and signed off by the President. This form is used for both staff and faculty positions. Human Resources

then provide a packet so the department can prepare the advertisement of the position (job description included) - the advertising is charged to the department requesting the position. This will change in the near future as Truman is undergoing a Classification and Compensation Study by Fox, Lawson and Associates (FLA). The change will be that the job description will have to be developed, to include exempt/non-exempt status under the FLSA for the new position and placed on a salary band, prior to advertising.

Drake University - At Drake University, adding a New Position would first require submitting a request through our annual Strategic Improvement Plan (SIP) process, providing the rationale. If adding the position is approved through the SIP process, the department would then be required to submit a Job Evaluation Request and a Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ) through the annual salary budgeting process to have the funding request reviewed and approved.

2. What is the process for requesting an increase in budget?

Stout: New requests go to Chancellor and his cabinet

La Crosse – annual meetings of budget planning and division heads

Oshkosh – Division head makes decisions via requests.

River Falls – Review y-t-d actual vs. budgeted in January and move money at that time per needs or requests.

Stevens Point - Depending upon the level at which the request is made, the request is made to the appropriate line officer. This also requires paperwork detailing the justification for the increase. Approval depends upon the size of the request and where the funds will come from.

Truman State - I am assuming that the budget increase is for the salary and benefits for the newly created position. This is accomplished by the department Dean/Chair and the Budget Director and approved by the VP of Academic Affairs (Faculty) and President (Faculty/staff).

Drake University - The SIP process looks at the request from a strategic viewpoint. The budgeting process looks at the funding and the prioritization of limited resources as well as market competitiveness and internal equity issues.

3. How do you ensure that new positions, reallocation of vacant positions, or budget increases are given to priorities?

Stout – No formal process. Decided at each level.

La Crosse – No formal process

Oshkosh – Chancellor's staff group meets 4 times a year to discuss.

River Falls – Through conversations with the Chancellor and Provost.

Stevens Point - There are a set of criteria established by the Chancellor's vision statement. The requests are measured against those criteria. The request must significantly meet the vision criteria in order to be considered for allocation.

Truman State - The President's staff work to ensure new positions that are critical to the mission of the University are given the highest priority.

Drake University - New positions are only approved once a year with a June 1st effective date (first day of the new fiscal year). This requires departments to preplan their

requests. One exception would be a mid-year restructure based on a resignation or retirement and that cannot wait until the budgeting processes.

III. Recommendations

1. The internal environmental scan showed a need for a written, formal process for requesting FTE. Through this process, the university would be able to better align new positions with established priorities. It would also eliminate the need for “personal pleas,” which is a current informal way in which positions are requested. With a written, formal process, decisions regarding FTE could be well thought out and assessed, without the urgency and emotional components that may accompany personal pleas.

Additionally, it is crucial that the process be easily available to the campus community. A way to accomplish this could be to have information and forms visible and accessible on the UWEC web site.

2. As was mentioned above, new positions should have a direct tie to the university’s established priorities. The internal environmental scan showed that this is not currently taking place, except in occasional informal ways. We have tended to be reactionary in awarding FTE positions, rather than forward-thinking. Positions have been given to departments/offices that are in dire need of additional staffing. This means that FTE may not be going to departments/offices that have initiatives that align with our priorities. (This also brings up the issue that the university has not formally established its priorities. Thus, it is difficult/impossible to align new positions with areas in which we’d like to grow.)

3. We recommend that departments/offices develop a “staff plan” which details their functionality with more or less staff. For example, a department may say “With two additional staff, we could pursue XX initiatives. With two less staff, we would limit our ability to offer XX programs.” This would allow departments/office an opportunity to show how they currently contribute and could increasingly contribute towards the university’s priorities. When new positions become available, the staffing plan may give the university guidance in determining where to best place them.

4. The internal environmental scan showed that decisions to award new positions are not reviewed at a later date. In other words, we do not formally look at the results/outcomes of adding new staff within departments/offices. At this point, the person in a position would have an annual evaluation by his or her supervisor. However, the university would not look at whether the position is fulfilling the expectations. UWEC does not typically eliminate a position currently filled by a person. Decisions to retain, eliminate or reallocate positions are made when a person leaves the position and the department/office indicates a desire to fill the position. With this in mind, we recommend two things:

1. That departments/offices address the results/outcomes of new FTE in their unit/department reviews. Most unit/department reviews conclude that new positions are needed. When a new position is granted, the unit review should

capture the additional productivity that resulted from it, as well as how that productivity fits with the university's priorities.

2. That the university have a formal process in place to assess positions at the point that they become vacant, to determine if they fulfilled the stated need within the department/office and align with the critical priorities of UWEC. The process should also help the university assess whether the need for that position still exists within the department/office. Specifically, the university should look at how the position contributed toward established priorities.

5. We recommend that the university find possible ways to streamline the recruiting/hiring process.

7/18/07 10:07 a.m.