

University Budget Committee
Minutes of the Thursday, October 29 Meeting

I. Time, Location and Attendance

- 2:00PM, Brookside Room at the Administrative Center
- UBC regular members present: Wayne Vaught (Interim Chair), Provost Barbara Bichelmeyer (joined by phone), Mark Johnson (recording secretary for Tony Luppino), Russell Melchert, Susan Sykes-Berry, Mel Tyler, Larry Bunce, Theodore White, Peter Witte (new At-Large member). Absent: Kevin Sansberry, Peggy Ward-Smith, Curt Crespino and Anthony Luppino.
- UC ex-officio members present: Sharon Lindenbaum and Karen Wilkerson
- Others present: Chancellor Leo Morton, Larry Bunce and Gerald Wyckoff (attending for Peggy Ward-Smith)

II. Presentation for approval of minutes of September 24 Committee meeting

- UBC Interim Chair Wayne Vaught called the meeting to order at 2:05PM
- Chair Vaught called for review of the previous meeting minutes: there were no amendments or changes to the minutes as submitted. Professor Wyckoff moved for acceptance and Susan Sykes-Berry seconded, minutes were approved as submitted
- The agenda for the meeting is found in Attachment A.

III. Report from Chancellor on State or System developments affecting budgeting (if any)

- Chancellor Morton reported that he had no new news from the State or System on the budget and as far as he knew everything remained as it was previously. Larry Bunce was asked to update the committee regarding the recent email relating to the 5 performance funding measures. The synopsis as forwarded to acting Secretary Johnson is as follows:

There are currently five Performance Funding measures for the UM System:

- Student Success and Progress: First-year Retention
- 150% of Time Undergraduate Graduation Rate
- Quality of Student Learning: Professional/Occupational Licensure
- Percent of total education and general expenditures expended on the core mission
- Business and Industry Sponsored R&D Expenditures for Science & Engineering (S&E)

The UM System just reported that we once again were successful on all five measures. Again, this is reported as a System, not individual campuses.

III. Update on Committee for Institutional Effectiveness (item 4 on Agenda, moved forward while waiting for Provost Bichelmeyer to join the meeting by conference call)

- Gerald Wyckoff, informed the UBC that this committee was formally the COSCO committee, but going forward will be titled the Committee for Institutional Effectiveness (CIE). The CIE is working with Senate Budget Committee to develop task forces to look at various administrative groups (see Attachment B) (updated list was handed out at meeting). He presented the membership and basic organization and overview of what committees will be tasked with doing. The Task Forces are currently building a list of questions from faculty and other stakeholders as to key data to be collected. Task Forces will disseminate findings to the Faculty Senate and then for broader distribution across the campus. One key issue is how to best capture data and address questions. The hope is to have much of this done by end of the Spring 2016 semester and then follow-up will likely take longer. Chancellor Morton indicated that he had promised to provide feedback from the process to the Senate and would like to do so in a timely manner. Gerald Wyckoff so noted that Senate discussions are being held whether this review of campus administrative units should become part of a continual faculty governance oversight, not just a one time and done operation. He noted that one thing that could be implemented is a rotating review of units presented to Senate. This could be done on a 3-year cycle of review and presentation to the Faculty Senate by the Unit Deans, Directors, etc. would be done to coincide with the review of each Unit's Dean. Concern was raised by the UBC about the lack of representation from many campus units on these Task Forces.
 - Question: Where will data come from? Larry Bunce replied that he expected his office would be a key resource for providing much of the data. Gerald Wyckoff responded that there is a need to centralize data collection and figure out what data we need to collect that we are not collecting right now.
 - Question: Will metrics and actionable items result? Gerald Wyckoff responded that yes, this is the goal. Mark Johnson raised the concept about the need to make data driven decisions and developing data dashboards that can capture real-time data. This was a concept that he noted came out of his reading the book "Exponential Organizations" by Salim Ismail, which describes how cutting edge corporations use these approaches to effectively manage operations. There was considerable follow-up discussion in this regard and various examples described from different units as to how they attempt to track data relating to grants, budgets, etc. There was a unanimous consensus that there is a need to look at best practices across units with the goal of driving towards a central plan that would be implemented across all units in this regard. The committee expressed strong support for moving in this direction - to data driven decision making and implementing

measures to achieve this, which Chancellor Morton noted has not consistently been part of the past culture at UMKC.

IV. Process for strategic funding proposals (item 3 on the agenda).

Prior to Provost Bichelmeyer joining by conference call, the committee was informed of this proposal and asked for its thoughts and input.

Chancellor Morton has established a \$1 million pool for next Fiscal year to support proposals to accomplish the Strategic Goals. Provost Bichelmeyer has prepared a draft announcement letter of the program (Attachment C) that details the purpose, guidelines and evaluation criteria; a tentative budget form (Attachment D) and a summary of the Strategic Plan; its Themes and Levers for the UBC to discuss (Attachment E). The goal is to obtain broad based input from across the campus.

- The UBC held a general discussion about the proposal and had several suggestions and questions for additional consideration as the proposal is rolled out to the campus.
 - Who can request support from this program and how much support can be requested?
 - Would/should letters of support be required?
 - Should the Dean be required to review and approve proposals before submission, perhaps a Dean check-off lines should be added to the budget form?
 - What about recurring costs? How will this be handled or not allowed?
 - Suggested by Peter Witte that Provost Bichelmeyer create a no longer than 2 minute video that describes the proposal and what it is about that could be posted on the Provost's website and UMMatters, etc.
- Provost Bichelmeyer called in and discussed the talking points detailed in her draft letter to the faculty. She began by noting that this is an opportunity to advance ideas that support our goals from our UMKC strategic plan. All have opportunity to present initiatives for supporting our Strategic Plan. She discussed timeline detailed in her announcement letter, the criteria for selection and other aspects of the proposal. She then opened the discussion about what needs to be done to make this a better call for proposals.
 - Question: Will this proposal first go to the Deans or all faculty directly? Provost Bichelmeyer said that it was her initial thought to first announce this to the Deans, Directors, and anyone with Administrative oversight, who would then disseminate the proposal down to the faculty level. She felt there needs to be check-off at a high unit level even if proposals are generated by a faculty. Important key aspect to any proposal is there needs to be some evidence that what is being proposed is in fact achievable.
 - Ted White raised the question as to whether proposal would have a page limit, how many supporting letter might be appropriate? Russell Melchert suggested that something like a "white paper proposal" in terms length might be appropriate. Wayne Vaught reiterated the issue raised in preceding discussions about the

maximum amount requested within a proposal and how many proposals can be funded. Provost Bichelmeyer responded that she wasn't sure, but stated that "no idea is too big or too small". Sharon Lindenbaum noted in regards to last year's Strategic Funding Proposals, some were very small and others quite large. Considerable discussion was held about the size and number. Provost Bichelmeyer noted that Item 6 [UMKC Request for Strategic Funding document (attachment F)]: "Describe any cross-unit collaboration, interdisciplinary partnerships, or cross-institutional relationships that will be established with this initiative." is the biggest key in evaluating proposals; in addition to high impact ideas and proposals with a high potential return on investment (ROI) (Item 9, attachment F). It is important that proposals also demonstrate a high likelihood of achieving their stated goals. Overall she stated that it is still good to collect all ideas. She suggested that perhaps there be a limit of 3-5 proposals per unit allowing for cross unit collaborations.

- There was a general consensus of support for limiting number of proposal vetted at Dean/Director level.
- Deans Melchert and White both expressed their appreciation and strong support for this program and the positive impact this could have across campus.
- Provost Bichelmeyer summarized the suggestions she would incorporate
 - Limit on the number of proposals, cross unit collaborations excepted
 - Small proposals welcome, themes
 - Check-off by Deans
 - Letters of support as evidence of cross-unit collaboration and evidence of achievable.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:30PM

Submitted by

Mark L. Johnson, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Oral and Craniofacial Sciences
School of Dentistry