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Introduction:

On April 6, 2016, the UWRF Faculty Senate acted on a request from Chancellor Dean Van Galen to create a Budget Process Review Task Force. The task force was given the following objectives:

1) Review/learn about major aspects of the University’s GPR/tuition operating budget.
2) Gather additional information and feedback on budget-related questions, ideas or concerns from key constituents on campus.
3) Make recommendations for improvement in the areas of budget-related communication, training, clarity of responsibilities, and transparency.

Though related to the work of the task force, the review of academic programs or curricular matters, analysis of how resources are currently allocated at UWRF, or identification of new funding sources were not part of the objectives.

This report is the final product of the task force and provides observations and recommendations related to the UWRF budget process.

Review/learn about major aspects of the University’s GPR/tuition operating budget:

The Task Force reviewed and learned about the University’s operating budget primarily through PowerPoint presentations and discussion led by Elizabeth Frueh, Assistant Chancellor for Business and Finance at UWRF, who thoroughly answered questions as raised by the members of the Task Force. Additional discussions about the budget process ensured that every member of the Task Force had a comprehensive understanding of each major aspect of the operating budget. The following points were presented to and discussed by the Task Force:

● UWRF campus’ budgetary relationship and role with respect to the State of Wisconsin and the UW System;
● Policies pertaining to acceptable uses of GPR funds;
● The relationship between enrollment, tuition target, and resources available to the campus;
● Policies, processes and practices for campus budget management, including the annual budget request process (and the associated Budget Review and Recommendation Committee), funding of strategic plan requests, the “central pool”/reallocation, year-end carry over funds;
● The roles and responsibilities of the university budget office and budget managers across campus, including the information made available to budget managers and unit leaders (primarily through WISDM);
● Current processes for communication of budget decisions to campus stakeholders.

Some important contextual notes emanated from the discussions that would be important for any reader of this report to be aware of before continuing.

1) **Budget process.** The budget process refers to the submission and vetting of budget requests through an annual solicitation and review cycle. Historically, the requests were
related to personnel, supplies & expenses, space & facilities, information technology, or equipment. In recent years, the requests have been largely limited to personnel requests and strategic initiatives. A key recognition is that a very small portion of the UWRF annual operating budget is decided through this process. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16, approximately $650,000 (2.0%) of the University’s $32 M operating budget (fund 102) were allocated as discretionary funding through the budget process. The remainder is allocated through an incremental budget process (see below).

2) Incremental budget. UWRF uses an incremental budget process whereby each unit starts a fiscal year with the prior fiscal year’s budget for supplies & expenses, capital, limited term employees, and student assistance. The unit also starts with the prior fiscal year’s budget for continuing permanent employees. Therefore, the largest portion of the UWRF annual budget is not part of the budget review process. Additionally, central position management (i.e. pooling) and vacancy review for University Staff and Non-instructional Academic Staff according to Administrative Policy AP-06-112 has been implemented. The Budget Office has meetings with each of the colleges to confirm permanent employees, salaries, full-time equivalents (FTE), supplies & expenses, capital, limited-term employees (LTE), and student assistance.

3) Structural deficit. UWRF has a historical imbalance between the budget allocated across campus to the various departments and units in fund 102 (and some departments in fund 131), and the budget authorized from UW-System for fund 102 spending. The structural deficit—the gap between budgeted spending and actual spending—has occurred at UWRF for many years (certainly as far back as the mid-2000s). This annual structural deficit was routinely addressed using “excess tuition” when the University exceeded its tuition target—excess tuition is generated by the campus when total tuition exceeds the target set by UW-System and UWRF. Thus, as long as enrollment was strong the structural deficit was not a practical issue.

As further background, beginning in FY 2008-09, fund 131 was used to budget expenses for the Instructional Academic Staff employed by the College of Arts and Sciences. These expenses were moved to fund 131 largely as a result of Campus exceeding the FTE’s authorized for fund 102 and the need for a means to account for the additional FTE’s. These expenses also need to be counted towards the structural deficit.

Regarding the historical magnitude of the structural deficit at UWRF, while the University is required to submit a balanced budget to UW System, it is difficult to be certain how large the imbalance was prior to FY 2012-13 when the current Assistant Chancellor for Business and Finance came to UWRF. However, in FY 2011-12, under a previous budget director, the structural deficit appears to have been approximately $4.1 million. This was at a time when total fall campus enrollment was over 6,700 students compared to about 6,000 today, and there was significant excess tuition to help offset the structural deficit. The UWRF Administration’s longer term plan was to address the structural deficit with new funding. However, there have been a series of budget lapses, budget cuts, and tuition freezes since that time, which have made it difficult to address the structural deficit without relying on excess tuition.
For FY 2015-16, the budgeted structural deficit was $1.9 million. However, the actual expenditures in excess of the budget authorization was $1.5 million. Though lower than budgeted, the actual expenditures still need to be funded. UWRF first applies any excess tuition funds (after meeting its tuition target) to cover this shortfall. If additional funds are needed for the shortfall, the tuition fund balance is used. In FY 2015-16 the excess tuition available was insufficient to cover the structural deficit, meaning we will use fund balance to cover the remaining structural deficit. In light of our current campus enrollment (and the absence of the large tuition revenue from Brazil Scientific Mobility Program students we had over the past two years), we anticipate having little if any excess tuition revenue for the 2016-2017 year. Thus, once again, our fund balances will need to be used to cover the structural deficit. The result will almost certainly be a decline in our tuition fund balance to a level that causes great concern, representing a trend that is not sustainable unless other factors change.

Options to address the structural deficit include:
- Campus voluntarily taking a budget cut in Fund 102 and/or the applicable departments in Fund 131.
- Using new funding as it becomes available either through state funding or tuition increases.
- Continue to use our limited fund balance to cover the overspending.
- Increase tuition revenue through increased enrollment (that is, generate more “excess tuition”).

4) Budgeting versus accounting. As the task force reviewed the pertinent information and solicited input from the campus community, it became clear that there are questions related to accounting and fund management in addition to the budget process. For clarity, budgeting refers to the allocation of University resources to the different departments and units on campus. Accounting and fund management has to do with the tracking of expenses against the department or unit budget. The majority of the UWRF budget is distributed through the incremental budget process described above. A small portion of the budget is allocated through the budget process. Budget managers then use tools like WISDM and eSIS to manage expenditures.

Gather Additional Input and Feedback:

The Task Force developed a Qualtrics survey to gather input from the campus community. A solicitation to participate in the budget survey was e-mailed directly to individuals who are listed as department budget owners in WISDM, and to Program Associates and Dean’s Assistants (approximately 250 individuals). The solicitation was also published in the Falcon Daily on two occasions.

The survey had 76 respondents, although some respondents did not complete all parts of the survey. Of the 76 respondents, 54 (71%) indicated that they were currently responsible for managing or monitoring UWRF College/Division, Department or Program budget in WISDM. The respondents represented a broad cross-section of campus and were distributed as follow:

38% Faculty/Academic Staff
The survey asked “Do you need more information on the sources of funding that can supply funds to your annual budget?” The majority of respondents (67%) said ‘No’. Follow-up comments suggested that there is a need for more information and transparency in the budget process. Some respondents indicated uncertainty with terminology, such as GPR, PR, FUND 102, Fund 131, etc.

The survey asked “Do you need more information about the process for establishing your annual budget?” The majority of respondents (61%) said ‘No’. Follow-up comments indicated some respondents wondered where their allocations come from and how those allocations are determined. Some respondents expressed interest in having a better understanding of the entire process and fuller disclosure of the entire process (transparency).

The survey asked “Do you need more information about the decision making process as it relates to our campus FTE allocation and hiring?” The majority of respondents (63%) said ‘Yes’. Follow-up comments questioned how programs are evaluated in the decision making process and who is involved in the decision making process. There were also comments regarding how decisions are communicated and communication of the rationale for the decisions. Discussion within the Task Force identified that some information such as a budget process flow diagram and timeline are available, and yet some respondents indicated wanting access to such information. This suggests an issue with communication. Also within the Task Force there was discussion related to misunderstanding or miscommunication about FTE pooling and which types of position are subject to pooling and which are not.

The survey asked “Do you need more information about the funds available to your department, division, or program each year (final budget and reserves)?” Approximately half of the respondents (49%) said ‘Yes’. Many of the follow-up comments were related to a general call for more information about the process being available and clearer communication and transparency in the process.

The survey asked “Do you need more information about how to monitor and manage your department, division, or program’s spending against budgeted funds using WISDM?” A majority of respondents (64%) said no. Many of the follow-up comments indicated that training on the use of WISDM would be very valuable, particularly for new budget managers (e.g. Department Chairs, Program Directors, Department Associates, and others). Within the Task Force there was further discussion about clarifying the language in position descriptions for individuals with budget manager responsibilities (e.g. such as Department Chairs) and then making sure that budget management is a documented part of the periodic performance review of that employee.

The survey asked respondents to “Please comment on any budget process questions, ideas or concerns not addressed in the questions above.” Several of the comments related to transparency and training. The transparency aspect included suggestions for improved communication about the budget process, making budget information available on the web, and justification for budget decisions, particularly those related to position allocation.

The training aspect included suggestions such as training opportunities (face-to-face and online) for budget managers and accountability for budget managers.
Additionally, several comments expressed concern about how general education has been funded.

The survey asked “What would be the most effective method to share the additional budget process information with you?” The responses partitioned as follows:

- 36% Group training sessions
- 26% Diagrams and written documentation on the web
- 17% Training videos on the web
- 21% Other

Many of the follow-up comments suggested that all three methods of information dissemination would be useful. Many follow-up comments also reinforced the desire for increased transparency in the budget process and more training opportunities.

The survey asked “How would you rate your understanding of the budget process?” The responses (76) partitioned as follows:

- 13% Very Good
- 36% Good
- 30% Fair
- 17% Poor
- 4% Very Poor

For those that indicated that there were currently responsible for managing or monitoring a UWRF college/division, department, or program budget, the responses (54) partitioned as follows:

- 15% Very Good
- 41% Good
- 31% Fair
- 11% Poor
- 2% Very Poor

There does not appear to be a large difference in the level of understanding of the budget process for those that reported managing/monitoring budgets and those that do not. However, there is no way to gauge the previous budget experience of the individuals that do not currently manage/monitor a budget (e.g. a former department chair).

Summary observations from the survey:

1) **Transparency.** The budget process needs to be made more transparent. Suggestions included posting the budget process timeline on the web (which is already done, but some respondents seem unaware), clarifying roles played in the by various individuals, units or committees (advisory versus decision making) and at which points budget requests get vetted and prioritized before advancing the top requests to the next level of consideration, posting the budget requests on the web, direct communication to the requester and broader communication to the campus community of funded requests, and written justification for funded requests.

2) **Training.** There needs to be opportunities budget-related training. Suggestions included training for budget managers on the use budget the tools (e.g. WISDM) used to manage the budget. The training should be a mix of face-to-face, written documentation on the web and
training videos on the web. Discussion within the Task Force further identified that the position descriptions of budget manager should include budget management as a review criteria and that budget management should become part of the periodic performance review. There was additional discussion about producing a budget manager’s handbook.

3) General Education. The funding of general education came up primarily in the survey item asking about other budget questions not previously addressed in the survey. There is continued concern by some about how general education is funded. Clarity in the funding of general education and clarity in the expectations of academic units (colleges, departments, and programs) for supplying courses/seats for general education would be beneficial.

In discussing the overall UWRF budget process, including the results of the survey, several areas of concern and attention emerged. A brief summary along with specific recommendations for each area follows:

**Campus Culture:**

Understanding and implementing budget decisions at UWRF requires the development of a campus-wide culture of openness and good stewardship. The funds that are used for University programs and curricula come largely from state funding and student tuition/fee sources which require they be used in manners that reflect the mission, vision, and values of the University. We all need to be more open on the “what” and “how” of funds tied to programming, and be more intentional and visible while making decisions and implementing expenditures.

**The culture requires more access and availability:**

Budget information needs to be made available on platforms that can be understood by the various stakeholders of the University. Such information needs to include basic understanding of how the budget process moves through the University, how funding decisions are made and who is involved in those decisions, and what timelines are being implemented. Meetings where funding decisions are being made should be open to members of the University community.

- Make orientation and training for budget materials available on the University website
- Make budget timelines and decision mechanisms available on the website
- Make budget requests available on the website
- Make basic budgets available on the website
- To help students understand, the timeline and process should be published in appropriate venues (i.e. Falcon News Service, WRFW, Focus on You TV Station)

**The culture requires more modeling of Openness, Accountability & Responsibility:**

Budget facilitators need to be proactive in providing information and allow for inclusion in considering how monies are provided to implement programs of the university. An active approach of trickle down and feedback of communication of communication about funding requires Executives/Deans/Chairs/Faculty/Staff should all do more to be aware of their budgets. Position descriptions for persons who will operate as account managers should include clear expectations that accounts will be effectively managed.
• More role-modeling should be done – for example, Executives need to consider making active information available to the campus community. Deans should explain the College budgets to their chairs. Chairs should explain the department budget to their faculty. Everyone should seek feedback for information to inform future decisions. Minutes should be taken at meetings where funding decisions are made, and be easily accessible and informative.

• Every Dean/Director/Unit Leader has to understand what budget lines are under their control and explain the basics of the budget process and lines to their stakeholders. Training in WISDM and eSIS should be made available. Part of the responsibilities of every Dean/Director should be demonstrated accountability.

• Every chair has to understand what budget lines are under their control and explain to their faculty and staff. Training for chairs in WISDM and eSIS should be made available and part of a chair’s responsibilities should be demonstrated accountability.

• Persons who hold account management responsibilities should be given orientation to how to forecast and observe their budgets and be evaluated on their budget management as part of their job responsibilities.

The culture requires efforts at vertical and horizontal communication by decision makers at all levels

• Formal communication about budget decisions should be regularly made that include the rationales for decisions, making evident how budget decisions are tied to the direction of the campus, strategic planning, mission, etc. In the spirit of openness and inclusion, information about all budget requests that are developed and not just the requests forwarded at each level for consideration, should be made available to the campus community. Deliberate effort must be made to communicate to campus stakeholders how monies will be allocated.

• Decision-makers that discuss, recommend, or decide how monies will be spent need to consider how to make their meeting processes as open and rational as possible. Every consideration should be given to making public notification about meetings, and every consideration should be given to making records of meeting process that can be available to stakeholders in the campus community.

• Decision makers need to develop a mindfulness about the interrelatedness of budget decisions in areas other than their own. Asking openly and collegially such questions as “How will this decision impact other departments or units on this campus?” and being proactive in seeking information from collateral units to explore potential consequences of a budget decision.

Orientation and Training:

To ensure there is sufficient and on-going understanding of the campus budget, orientations and trainings about various systems and processes need to be provided to deans, department chairs, unit leaders, faculty, and staff who oversee, utilize, or show interest in budget practices. The following recommendations regarding orientations and trainings have been developed by the Budget Process Review Task Force:
Training Participants
- As the University moves forward with a training program, training should initially begin with chairs, department directors, and program associates.
- A training program should be developed for chairs and equivalent non-instructional positions. The level of training should correspond with level of budgeting responsibility of the position.
- Each Budget Manager should be required to complete at least some level of training regarding WISDM, eSIS, and budgeting processes.
- Training should be provided to help users distinguish between budgeting and accounting principles, processes, and decisions.

Web Updates
- Budget presentations and trainings should be streamed online and allow for open chats with administration to quickly answer questions.
- Blog entries should be posted on the University’s website to provide information and answer questions regarding budget processes and decisions.

WISDM and eSIS Training
- User manuals for WISDM and eSIS should be available.
- Formal WISDM training should be available and completion should be required of all WISDM users.
- An advanced WISDM training should be available and offered to those who use the system frequently and at a deeper level than the occasional user.
- Budget Managers should be notified when they are appointed and added as Managers in WISDM.
- eSIS training, that includes information regarding chargebacks and the process for finding data such as student/faculty ratio, should be provided to pertinent users.

A Priori Discussions:

Greater awareness of all budget requests/initiatives across campus and the potential effects of these requests/initiatives on other programs/Departments/Colleges/units.

Budget requests/initiatives from one unit can have direct effects – positive and negative – on another unit not involved in its development. Efforts must be made to make other units aware of potential requests and allow for input and/or response during development as well as final considerations for funding or not.

- Develop a two-stage budget request process. In Phase 1, basic ideas for requests from each unit are shared with other unit leaders and College Deans who will then distribute within their units for response; alternatively, an online mechanism for accomplishing the same could be developed.
- Following this response period, Phase 2 would follow with final request development involving other units and/or their input as appropriate.
- In addition to the above, consider development of sign-off mechanism indicating awareness of proposals in development and acknowledging potential effects. Any concerns identified with proposals from other units should be considered in final decisions on funding.
Collaboration between units at UWRF in development of budget requests/initiatives will lead to increased efficiency in use of funds as well as creativity and synergy in ideas and activities. Both in the short term and long term, budget efficiencies as well as enhanced idea development will result from an increased focus on collaboration across units.

- Facilitate discussions across UWRF units focused on collaborations in budget requests/initiatives in advance of or at least at time of basic idea development. This will need to involve Unit Leaders and College Deans working within their own units as well as across others.

Awareness and collaboration must start earlier in the budget process timeline to be effective. For the above two themes (awareness and collaboration) to be facilitated, sufficient time must be allowed in the budget cycle.

- Budget cycle expanded, at least on front end, with target dates for awareness and collaboration built in that allow adequate time for engagement and response.

Increased emphasis on creative and long term budget requests and initiatives while maintaining some flexibility for reactive and short term needs. Particularly during times of budget stress, there is a tendency to focus in a reactive mode only on short term needs. More emphasis must be placed on planning for the long term and being creative.

- Designate some portion of flexible funding available for creative, long term ideas.
- Facilitate discussions across UWRF units.

Information Access:

In order to develop a campus-wide culture of good budget stewardship and to facilitate appropriate discussions on budget requests and initiatives, detailed information about the budget and its process must be readily available and easily accessible to all members of the campus community. It is clear from the input the task force has received that perceived lack of transparency in the budget process is a problem. Providing easy access to as much information about the budget as possible must be a priority, since the individuals who need such information will seek it out. The following practices should be implemented to improve access to budget information:

- Bring basic budget information together in a readily accessible format that is linked from the University webpage in an obvious way in the Resources for Faculty and Staff section. A format similar to the DoTS Knowledge Base could be used to present basic Budget 101 type information. This knowledge base should be continuously updated and used as a training tool for new budget managers. The Knowledge Base could also be used as the repository for annual budget requests, which should be retained and made readily available to the campus community. Every effort must be made to unify budget information, rather than scattering it across various webpages and server spaces.
- Provide informative minutes of all meetings that include discussion and review of budget requests, especially those of the Budget Review and Recommendation Committee. Although this committee makes recommendations rather than final decisions, keeping a public record of
those recommendations will contribute to a better overall campus understanding of how final budget decisions were made.

- Ensure that data from program assessment plans is fully considered when making budget decisions. A clear link between final budget decisions and data collected through the program assessment process must be established and clearly outlined when budget decisions are communicated.
- To be fully understood, budget data needs orientation and context. Context, provided in plain language that everyone can understand, will improve everyone's understanding of their own unit's budget in the context of the overall university budget.

Forecasting Tools:

Currently, Excel is the primary tool used for forecasting. During the summer of 2016, a task force has been charged with reviewing the tool presently used to forecast enrollment. In addition, Excel is used to monitor tuition target and ending fund balances but these tools are typically used for current year analysis with limited multi-year outlooks. The lack of advanced forecasting tools is a common issue on all UW System campuses. As a result, in February 2016, UW System started a planning effort for a new budgeting, planning and forecasting system. The four functional areas that have been identified to be included in the planning project are:

- **Annual Budget:** A prospective one year operating financial plan prepared by each institution and presented to the Board of Regents in June or July for the upcoming fiscal year, beginning July 1st and going through June 30th of the following calendar year. This can include outgoing expenses, incoming revenue, and rates established to achieve the budgeted revenue where applicable.
- **Estimated Actuals:** An update of outgoing expenses, incoming revenue and fund balances for the current fiscal year ending June 30th.
- **Multi-year Forecast:** An update of outgoing expenses, incoming revenue, fund balances and rates based on the estimated actuals and incorporating the annual budget for a minimum of six years.
- **Strategic Financial Plan:** Scenario based analysis of institutional cash flow, net reserves, incoming revenue, outgoing expense, and projected fund balances for a multi-year time horizon.

UW System has started work on the annual budget. The timeline for the remaining three functional areas is scheduled for FY 2017-18 and FY 2019-20.

Summary Recommendations:

A number of suggestions, best practices, and action steps are outlined throughout this report to improve budget-related communication, training, clarity of responsibilities, and transparency. To summarize our discussions and findings, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

1. Create more access and availability to budget processes, timelines, responsibilities, recommendations, impacts, and decisions in a manner that is well-organized, up-to-date, easily findable and available to all members of the University community.
2. Develop greater accountability around the University budget by opening budget review and recommendation meetings to all members of campus, providing easy access to all supporting materials including budget requests, providing informative records of all budget related meetings, encouraging that all budget managers share and vet appropriate information within their units, and providing formal and regular communications to campus of all budget decisions and the rationales for those decisions.

3. Develop an orientation and training program, utilizing various modes of instruction, for budget managers and for all faculty and staff interested in University budget practices. This training should include a discussion of budget outlook, individual and Department/College/Unit responsibilities, processes and timelines, and the use of online budget management tools.

4. Develop a phased budget process to increase discussion and collaboration within and across Departments/Colleges/Units and to encourage more creative and strategic long-term budget solutions.

5. Improve the tools used to forecast enrollment and fully utilize budgeting, planning, and forecasting tools as they become available to UW System campuses.
Glossary:

**Decision Makers** – person responsible for budget decisions as it relates to their department, division, program, grant, etc.

**eSIS** – electronic Student Information System that is used for class scheduling, course catalog, grading, advisor assignments, personal information, and charge-backs.

**Fiscal Year** – the annual budgeting and accounting period. The University of Wisconsin’s fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30. When an abbreviation is used, the year refers to the calendar year in which the fiscal year ends. For example, FY17 refers to fiscal year July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

**FTE** – Full Time Equivalent - FTE stands for full time equivalent. For employment purposes, FTEs for faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) appointments are based on an academic year and FTEs for non-faculty/IAS appointments are based on a calendar year (2080 hours).

**Fund** – In fund accounting, a fund is a self-balancing set of accounts, segregated for specific purposes in accordance with laws and regulations or special restrictions and limitations.

**Fund accounting** – an accounting system emphasizing accountability rather than profitability, used by non-profit organizations and governments. In this system, a fund is a self-balancing set of accounts, segregated for specific purposes in accordance with laws and regulations or special restrictions and limitations.

**General Purpose Revenue (GPR)** - Monies collected from state taxpayers. Funds 102, 104, 109, 402, 403, and 406 are GPR funds commonly used on campus.

**IAS** – Instructional Academic Staff – associated lecturers, lecturers, senior lecturers, distinguished lecturers

**Incremental Base Budgeting** – used for GPR accounts. At UWR, the new year’s budget starts with last year’s budget allocation for S&E, capital, limited term employees, student assistance, and salary budget for continuing permanent employees. Any new funds must be requested and approved as part of the annual budget process.

**Program Revenue (PR)** - Monies which are collected for such things as user charges, tuition, product sales, or reimbursement for costs of services provided. Funds 128, 131, 136, and 189 are commonly used on campus. Special course fees are program revenue. **Segregated fees** are charges in addition to instructional fees assessed to all students for student services, activities, programs and facilities that support the mission of UW-River Falls. Segregated fees are divided into two categories: allocable and non-allocate.
Allocable segregated fees provide substantial support for campus student activities and services that are allocated by students through Student Senate, in consultation with the Chancellor and subject to final confirmation from the Board of Regents. Non-allocable segregated fees are used to support long-term commitments for fixed financial obligations, ongoing operating costs of university buildings. Students make a recommendation to the Chancellor, who selects the campus amounts, and is subject to final confirmation from the Board of Regents.

WISDM – the database tool we use to view budgetary and accounting data from our Shared Financial System.