The Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (BLRP) had three meetings during the Winter 2014 quarter. The meetings took place on Friday 24 January, Friday 14 February, and Friday 07 March. The 14 February meeting was a presentation given by Joel Neel about Cal Poly’s Master Plan (Stan Nosek and Provost Enz Finken were also in attendance). The below summarizes BLRP’s work during the Winter 2014 quarter.

- **BLRP** discussed the results of the initial DIALOGR survey, and the results of the survey are included in this report. It is clear to BLRP that faculty are interested in the budget allocation process and decision-making criteria. As a result, a second DIALOGR survey question has been established.

> The Academic Senate Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee (BLRP) seeks your thoughts and suggestions on University budget issues. Our previous topic suggests faculty are interested in the budget allocation and decision-making processes. BLRP needs to know what specific aspects of process are of interest, such as specific decision-making rules/criteria currently in use; and how you want budget decision processes to be shared with faculty.

Thus far, there has only been one response to the new survey question. During the Spring 2014 quarter, BLRP will discuss the best way to summarize the results of the DIALOGR surveys, and provide this information to administration (in response to the Campus Conversation about what faculty want to know about the budget).

- **During the 07 March BLRP meeting, BLRP** discussed the Master Planning presentation given three weeks prior. The following actions items were developed.
  - Request that the Master Planning presentation be given to the Senate
  - Inquire with Joel Neel about what questions the Master Planning team has for faculty

After the presentation to the Senate, BLRP will discuss the feedback from the Senate, summarize faculty input, and provide the faculty input to the Master Planning team.

- **During the Spring 2014 quarter, the long-range planning group will be meeting to discuss the Strategic Plan on Friday 18 April.** The other meetings are scheduled for Friday 09 May and Friday 30 May. Zimbra meeting invitations have already been distributed.
MEANING OF TRANSPARENCY:

The Academic Senate Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee (BLRP) seeks your thoughts and suggestions on University budget issues. To start, BLRP would like to know how you define 'transparency' of the budget and the budget allocation process. Relative to budgeting issues, what does 'transparency' mean to you?

Add your thoughts and vote on (rate) the suggestions of others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Idea (hide comments)</th>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>PostDate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transparency means a clear justification for how funds are allocated. Faculty and staff need to see the relationship between number of students (or scu's), professors, rooms, hours in class, modes of teaching, and the dollars. If we don't have this, we can't make informed curricular changes, especially those that are fiscally initiated.</td>
<td>Carmen T</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>17% (1)</td>
<td>17% (1)</td>
<td>67% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Rating: 4.5 Standard Dev.: 0.76 Consensus: 78.62

Comments (1)

I agree 100% with the first sentence. However, the second sentence makes an assumption that all of those items/concepts listed are used as a part of the justification. I'm not sure that all of them currently do, nor am I of a mind that all of them should (at least, not in every case.) Regardless, the first and third sentences together (and alone) would succinctly state my thoughts on transparency relative to the budget allocation process.

<> Posted by Andy McMahan November, 25, 2013 12:16 AM

Budget transparency means understanding both the distribution of funds and the mechanism that determined the distribution of funds. It means that the campus effectively identifies all revenue sources and where those revenue sources are spent. For me, budget transparency needs to occur for Cal Poly and all of its affiliated organizations (CPC, Cal Poly Housing, Foundation, etc.). For instance, right now out of state students are a growing revenue source for Cal Poly. But no-one communicates how those new revenue sources are being spent. At one time, the departments

2 | Andrew Kean | 11/19/13 |

"Agree"
that attract the most out of state students were promised additional funds from this revenue source, but this promise has not been fulfilled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raters</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>14% (1)</td>
<td>14% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>71% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Rating: 4.29 Standard Dev.: 1.16 Consensus: 64.79

"Transparency," in part, means that we should see a clear accounting of which campus entities make money, and which cost money. There should, perhaps, be incentives for departments that are money-makers. Transparency also should include clear numbers that allow us to compare dollars spent on administration with dollars spent on actual instruction. This might be a way to stop the ever-increasing shifting of dollars away from teaching and toward administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raters</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>25% (1)</td>
<td>25% (1)</td>
<td>50% (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Rating: 4.25 Standard Dev.: 0.83 Consensus: 76.51

Transparency is not only creating access, making available or allowing full disclosure. Transparency should be a balance between transcribing data and visualizing data (which helps making sense of it).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raters</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>22% (2)</td>
<td>11% (1)</td>
<td>56% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Rating: 4 Standard Dev.: 1.33 Consensus: 57.74

I agree with nearly everything others have said previously, and would just like to re-iterate that one of the most important parts of transparency is making available to appropriate stakeholders the rationale for why a budget decision was made.
Rank | Idea (hide comments) | Profile | PostDate
--- | --- | --- | ---
8 | 25%(2) 0%(0) 13%(1) 13%(1) 50%(4) | JED | 11/12/13

Mean Rating: 3.63 Standard Dev.: 1.65 Consensus: 41.62

Comments (0)

**All stakeholders should have full access to the decision criteria used in allocating funds.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raters</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%(0)</td>
<td>10%(1)</td>
<td>40%(4)</td>
<td>30%(3)</td>
<td>20%(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Rating: 3.6 Standard Dev.: 0.92 Consensus: 73.6

Comments (1)

These decision criteria should be linked to the specific components of the University's strategic plan. Please note that a strategic framework does not have enough depth and specificity to make meaningful links.

< Posted by **SPH** November, 16, 2013 4:19 PM

**Agree**

I agree that all stakeholders should have full access to all information; however, I'm not entirely sure I am in full agreement with regard to how a 'stakeholder' is defined. Clearly, it would include faculty, given that our system is built on the concept of shared governance. However, I'm not entirely convinced (yet) that the general public should be given unfettered (or equivalent) access simply because the CSU is partially funded by tax dollars. I may be convinced otherwise; however, my gut feeling is that faculty (and especially faculty governing bodies) should be given complete and unfettered access to all budget items and all details. However, the general public would receive an easy-to-read/understand synopsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raters</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%(0)</td>
<td>22%(2)</td>
<td>33%(3)</td>
<td>11%(1)</td>
<td>33%(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Rating: 3.56 Standard Dev.: 1.17 Consensus: 64.6

Comments (2)

To clarify, by "synopsis", I'm speaking of the type of information available at http://afd.calpoly.edu/budget/inforeports.asp. By "complete and unfettered access to all budget items and details", I'm speaking of details within the categories provided on that link, as well as documentation on how (and why) the decisions were made with regard to the amounts allocated to each area in the budget.

< Posted by **Andy McMahan** November, 13, 2013 5:11 PM

**Strongly Agree**
Budget transparency means all stakeholders have full access to all information. In the case of the CSU, a public tax-supported institution, the stakeholders include the public at large. Therefore, Cal Poly should develop and maintain a public Web page that fully discloses all details of our institutional budget. The Web page should be organized for easy understandability by anyone. It should be hierarchical, showing income and expenditure at high levels but allowing anyone to drill down into as much detail as desired. See http://opengov.com/ for software and ideas how to accomplish budget transparency for a public institution.

Comments (2)
William, excellent ideas, thanks for expressing your thoughts, it is very important to increase the awareness of these ideas, I was not aware of them otherwise. Many budget related ideas are "buried" and it is good to bring them to our attention and to be able to debate their merits.

Financial statements use "plain English" reporting. It should not take a degree in accounting or finance to understand a report.

Comments (1)
I very much agree with this sentiment. There should be a "plain English" version as well as the full "detailed version" for reference.
Normalization is important, the parameters need to be carefully chosen to be able to determine the proper allocation for each department.

Posted by Cole McDaniel November, 16, 2013 7:10 PM

The definition of transparency is not the biggest issue we face and almost seems like a red herring. It is more important that we identify the most important issues that we would like to see transparent, e.g., who gets the next new hire and why that entity received the next hire. The problem with wanting transparency with everything all in "plain English" is that you will need an army of individuals to provide this. Given resource constraints of the university we need to settle on the most important areas that we would like to see transparency so that there is a level of trust between the administration and the faculty. We should focus on the most important issues in the budget and its process that we would like to see transparent.

I would agree with Andrew that the level of transparency that we need as a University would not need an army of individuals. The point I was trying to make was in regards to others who have posted that they would like to see transparency in everything in understandable and plain English. When you add the word everything into the qualifier of what you want to see, I would argue that you are going to need a large group of people to assimilate and then provide the information everyone would like to see. I agree that a predictable budgeting model would be helpful.
All stakeholders have full access to all information.

I agree that all stakeholders should have full access to all information; however, I'm not entirely sure I am in full agreement with regard to how a 'stakeholder' is defined. Clearly, it would include faculty, given that our system is built on the concept of shared governance. However, I'm not entirely convinced (yet) that the general public should be given unfettered (or equivalent) access simply because the CSU is partially funded by tax dollars. I may be convinced otherwise; however, my gut feeling is that faculty (and especially faculty governing bodies) should be given complete and unfettered access to all budget items and all details. However, the general public would receive an easy-to-read/understand synopsis.

Posted by Andy McMahan November 13, 2013, 5:00 PM

<Posted by JED November, 14, 2013 6:11 AM> Disagree