

Memorandum

To: Gary Laver

From: Sean Hurley, Chair, Budget and Long Range Planning Committee

Date: 6/17/2015

Re: Budget and Long Range Planning Quarterly Report

The Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (BLRP) met officially five times this spring quarter to conduct its business. These dates were April 10th, April 24th, May 1st, May 22nd, and May 29th. On May 17th, the chair met with Kimi Ikeda and Victor Brancart to discuss appropriate budget metrics and concerns that the faculty were having regarding MPP pay and the faculty turmoil regarding the President's released plan for equity salary adjustments. The focus of this quarter's meetings was to discuss university budgetary matters which came into sharp focus due to the campus upheaval regarding administrative salaries and the recent raises they received.

At the beginning of the quarter in our first meeting, the committee debated whether it wanted to submit a resolution this year regarding strategic planning and/or budget. The consensus of the committee was that there were going to be many resolutions coming forward at the end of the year, so it would make more sense for the committee to submit a resolution in the fall or winter quarter. A couple of resolutions were discussed at this meeting and should be followed up next year. One of the resolutions that could be written should discuss the need for a better set of financial dashboards. Another resolution the committee could write in the fall is regarding the President's vision. This resolution could talk about the Senate agreeing with his vision but the university needs a better set of tangible metrics built around this vision. In one of these resolutions, there should be a request that the administration provide the Senate with quarterly reports of key metrics/performance indicators.

At the next meeting of the BLRP committee, Victor Brancart came in to give a demonstration of the university's financial dashboards. This presentation was meant to familiarize committee members on how to navigate the financial data that is located in the university's financial dashboards. This meeting occurred after the President had his first listening session with the faculty regarding the turmoil that erupted when he announced details to his equity program. After the presentation,

discussions at this meeting revolved around the current vacuum of meaningful university metrics and the potential problems that arise from the lack of information. It has become clear to the committee that a set of metrics needs to be built soon and tracked by the university. This will require representatives of the administration and the faculty sitting down and identifying the important metrics that a university should be tracking and developing agreed upon definitions.

Many metrics were discussed at the last couple meetings of the year, but no consensus was gained on which are the most important to be tracking. It is envisioned that having a good set of metrics will help the university in terms of planning. One of the metrics discussed was the number of MPP's on campus that are for direct academic purposes in comparison to those who are not. It is believed that metrics regarding advancement need to be built given the investment the President has made in this group. These metrics need to go beyond a bottom line dollar value and should be linked to the University's strategic plan, specifically the objectives. Another important set of metrics should revolve around class size that go beyond just reporting an average. It is believed that it is important to understand the different distribution of class sizes. Another set of metrics that could be built are based on SCU generation by different sets of faculty, e.g., full-time lecturers, part-time lecturers, tenure-track, and tenured-faculty. SCU generation metrics can also be examined based on classroom sizes, rank of faculty, colleges, departments, etc.

In the final meeting, the chair of BLRP posed the question to the committee members of is there a need for the BLRP committee to exist? This is coming in light of the President creating a new committee on planning, process and budget which may have the appearance of the President circumventing the BLRP committee. There was strong consensus that the BLRP committee has an important purpose and should continue to exist.

There are three primary recommendations that the committee has this year. First, the Academic Senate should formalize that the chair of the Budget and Long Range Planning committee or the individual's designee should be a permanent member of the President's Advisory Council for Planning, Process and Budgeting. Since BLRP is the budgeting and planning arm of the Academic Senate and has as its purpose to maintain currency on planning budgeting matters, it seems natural for this committee to have representation on the President's committee.

The second recommendation the committee has is to charge next year's BLRP committee with writing a resolution asking the President to develop an official written strategic plan that has at its core measurable objectives and metrics. It is believed by the committee that a written strategic plan would help the President convey his ideas and allow for the university community to track the progress of the university as it moves forward.

The third recommendation by the committee is that next year's BLRP committee should work with the administration to develop a set of meaningful metrics that can be tracked. One thing the campus learned this year is that when no metrics exist, individuals will develop their own metrics. These metrics may be valid or they may have issues. It is believed by the committee that some of the issues that occurred this year could have been minimized if there was a set of metrics that existed that both the faculty and the administration agreed upon. These metrics should be built with the idea that they are indicative of determining how well the university is doing. The chair of BLRP will be meeting with Kimi Ikeda and Victor Brancart this summer in hopes of getting a head start on building some of these metrics. It is envisioned that by the end of fall or winter quarter, the full Senate could debate these metrics and formalize them in a resolution.