Minutes CACBSP: October 13, 2016, Chancellor’s Conference Room

Meeting commenced at 1:00pm.

Attendance: Mehrdad Simkani, Matt Wolverton, Matt Wyneken, Connie Creech, Adam Lutzker, Sarah Lippert (Faculty Secretary), Cathy Miller (Chair), Mike Hague (CFO invited to meeting), Provost Knerr (ex-officio), Tess Barker (Chancellor’s Chief of Staff)

Guests: Lisa Rudgers, Julie Peterson from Peterson Rudgers Group

Review of Minutes:
1. Under discussion of budget comments, the transfer of funds at fiscal year-end 2016 made by unit Deans resulted in confusion about the details and rationale for the transfer. Discussion led to an understanding that there were three distinct reasons for transferring money:
   1. End of year (2015-2016) adjustments based on comparing actual revenue to revenue targets. Money transferred to the unit if the unit exceeded its revenue target; money returned from the unit if the unit failed to meet its revenue target.
   2. End of year (2015-2016) discretionary transfer from the other units to CAS approved by the Council of Deans (total to CAS was $850,000).
   3. Adjustments to 2016-2017 base budgets based on projected enrolment and revenue targets. For 2016-17, the projected enrolments are down from previous years, thus the adjustment to the 2016-17 budget was a decrease.
2. Cathy Miller (Chair) will adjust description in draft minutes to reflect the discretionary transfer discussed in the Sept. 28, 2016 meeting.
3. Minutes to be approved by e-mail after re-circulation

Future Meetings:
1. We are working on strategic planning, understanding the budget model, and reviewing budget-to-actual financial statements this semester
2. Gen Ed reviews to be discussed towards the end of the semester
3. Will meet on October 27th, November 10th, November 22nd, December 8th, December 15th (1-2:30)

Discussion with Strategic Planning Consultants: Peterson Rudgers Group

Introduction from Consultants:
1. Consultants attended 27 separate meetings with governance groups, chairs, members of the community over 3.5 days earlier in September and early October to discuss the process for strategic planning.
2. Consultant notes from those meetings are available to review.
3. Consultants presented a draft time line for the planning process to start discussions.

Discussion/Faculty Comments:
1. To meet the Strategic Planning charge of the CACBSP, at least one committee member should be on the Steering Committee
2. Committee might be large, but that is preferable for transparency
3. Regarding Steering Committee Constitution: who are we thinking about as the Flint community?
   a. Consultants met with the Citizens Advisory Council
   b. Citizens Advisory Council has recommended smaller Salon discussions that wouldn’t necessarily be the same players who come to the larger town hall meetings (essentially promote non-traditional ways to collect input)
4. What will the approval process be to approve the final plan:
   a. Consultants noted that at other universities the staff and students are included in the discussion, revision, and consultation, but the faculty actually approve/endorse the plan
b. Suggestion that student/staff council can endorse if they wish, but it is still the Faculty who have authority to vote through a meeting of the Governing Faculty

c. Since the university’s primary mission is Academic, the prioritization of academic representatives in the approval process is important. Shared governance doesn’t mean that all types of groups participate equally in all matters; however, we may want all voices included in the discussion process

5. Discussion of leadership and membership of the Steering Committee:
   a. Consultants noted discussion in other meetings about whether the 2 co-chairs of the committee would both be faculty, or whether one would be staff; it was also noted that when asked the staff representatives said that they felt both co-chairs should be faculty
   b. It was noted that last time a staff member co-chaired the steering committee
   c. Suggestion that perhaps it could be co-chaired by two full professors
   d. Update to the committee on the selection process for Steering Committee members proposed by the Chair & Chair Elect of Faculty Council on October 12th:
      i. Proposal is to have the chairs of AAAC, FC, and CACBSP solicit nominations from faculty, staff, and students (open call), which would then be discussed with their committees, and then taken back to the Provost and Chancellor

6. What is the best way to get Faculty involvement?
   a. Town halls?
   b. Schools/College meetings?
   c. Consultants might be able to help facilitate discussions in Schools/College, along with having members of the Steering Committee there to promote communication & transparency
   d. Redundancy might be important to make sure everyone can participate
   e. Some meetings of governing faculty/university-wide

7. What does the timeline look like?
   a. It seems good that it doesn’t end in the spring/summer, so that the faculty are here when the implementation occurs
   b. Might be important to have flexibility on the back end of the process so that acceptance/finalization doesn’t feel rushed or forced.
   c. Consultant: Process can be conceived in parts: i) Gathering ii) Synthesis iii) Focus Groups iv) Revisions
   d. Process needs to take into account the frequency of events related to collecting data, and pressures on people’s schedules, as well as the growing pressures on faculty to participate in administrative/service duties when not on contract from June-August
   e. Consultant suggestion that perhaps we should assume that the 3 months in the summer is not a part of the schedule

8. Since strategic planning requires funding, how does the process incorporate budgetary planning and approval?
   a. Answer from consultants: Starting with constraints limits ideas and leads to ineffective plans that are not ambitious enough and don’t produce the best results, but the process also needs to have accountability and budgetary management at a certain point.
   b. Can we add budgetary considerations through the process? Project teams should be discussing budgetary ideas as part of their process.
   c. Perhaps we need an advisory member for the Steering Committee from the Development office
   d. The CACBSP would need to get to work as soon as the plan is approved on implementation through budgeting
   e. The Steering Committee might become a permanent Strategic Planning Committee in order to ensure implementation, but we don’t need to decide on this yet

9. For accountability and annual review of the plan’s implementation, the existing governance committees need to be integrated into the process

10. On measurables for implementation, we should devise ways to accumulate both quantitative and qualitative data—suggestion that satisfaction surveys might be a way to attach data to quality
11. Umflint.edu/strategicplan2017 will be the website for the strategic planning, will be supported by the Consultants.
12. Consultants will update us with either another visit, or in writing, on the next steps of the process.

**Mike Hague Visit:**

**Introduction:**
1. Is functioning as the Interim CFO
2. Is also Director of Student & Business Services at the Ann Arbor campus
3. Mr. Hague will be with us through the transition with a permanent CFO
4. Is invited to attend our Tuesday meeting in November

**Chair Introduction:**
1. Our budget structure is creating unintended consequences for the university, and we’d like to know more about how the money flows to and from each unit and administration
2. How do we go about tweaking the budget so that it works better?

**Discussion:**
1. UM-Flint has a different budget model than Dearborn, or Ann Arbor, funding ‘buckets’ rather than line-items
2. To understand the basic fundamentals of the budget process, the committee will invite Jerry Glasco to present the process to CACBSP at a future meeting. The committee will ask Jerry to discuss the following items and others as necessary for the committee’s understanding of the budget process.
   a. Can faculty leaders be provided details about their unit’s budget formation?
   b. Can faculty who handle budgets in academic units like departments and programs receive more frequent information about their budget to actual progress (instead of having to build one’s own shadow budget system)?
   c. Can we have more information on which funds are designated, restricted and unrestricted? How does the university provide accountability that funds are spent as expected?
   d. Can we discuss the details related to credit-hour rewards, such as Gen Ed curriculum design, new program rewards, etc.?
   e. Can we discuss the university’s chart of accounts and how they relate to program and research initiatives?
   f. How are enrolment targets determined, since they directly affect the budget design?
   g. How can we assist in determining the ‘cost of instruction’ to forward the strategic planning and budgeting processes?
   h. The committee respectfully asks to receive monthly budget-to-actual comparison reports for each unit, and if feasible, by department.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm

Next meeting Thursday October 27th at 1-2:30 in the Chancellor’s conference room

Minutes drafted by CACBSP Secretary Sarah Lippert

Minutes approved January 12, 2017