

## Finance Task Team Charter

### Purpose

To establish the roles and responsibilities of the task team of Finance on: **Allocation Model**.

### Charge

The task team of **Finance: Allocation model** has responsibility for successful completion of the analysis of options and a set of recommendations by March 30, 2016

Task teams are to use the first two steps of the four-step process of: **analysis, design**, implementation and audit.

This finance sub-team is to study the finance topic, narrow the set of options, and recommend one for adoption. Updates and recommendations are to be delivered to the CBO/finance group that established this charter. Ryan Low (CFO) is the final decision-maker of questions about this charter and what recommendations get taken to the chancellor and BOT.

The task team's draft report is due April 15, 2016.

### Scope of the effort<sup>1</sup>

- Includes policy regarding allocation of resources system-wide
- Analysis and recommendation should address tuition, fees, appropriation, MEIF, state appropriation,
- Both operations and capital allocation
- Discuss methods for allocation of research / public service missions
- Whether tuition and /or fees stay on campuses or are consolidated
- Measures of performance
- Transition plan from current to future states
- Process to vet enrollment projections in the budgets
- Part of the recommendation needs to include a feedback and adjustment to budget based on actual/budget enrollment
- Includes future debt service

Does not include current debt service

### Key deliverables

Deliverables include:

1. List of key stakeholders for this topic (three rings of stakeholders: a) on team, b) need tight consultation throughout process, and c) get some input and/or review).<sup>2</sup>
2. Summary of all inputs, including benchmarked models (details can be placed in an Appendix)

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes F&A recovery, allocation of doubtful accounts (but these were decided to be on a 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> level)

<sup>2</sup> There is a fourth ring: "all UMS employees", but this will be taken care of by Ryan and OE

3. Description of how the task team narrowed the options, and selected the recommended option (if accomplished)
4. Common lexicon (definitions) of terms and concepts
5. SWOT (or equivalent) analysis of the options (or narrowed options if options number more than 3 in number)
6. Recommendation(s), with supporting rationale
7. Suggested phases / timeline for transition
8. Summary of any minority opinions

### **Assumptions for the team to incorporate and/or test as part of its work**

1. Recommendation will be made in the context of enhancing campus differentiated niches and the overall financial health of the enterprise

### **Team Composition**

The Task Team will be led by Ryan Low, and consist of the following members:

- Claire Strickland
- Laurie Gardner
- Mark Hatt
- Ben Shaw
- Pam Ashby
- Joe Szakas
- Buster Neel
- Miriam White

### **Options/alternatives that should be part of the team's analysis (consideration)**

- Consider the whole continuum between the two endpoints of one budget and allocation
- Formula or incremental model
- Differentiated (hybrid) model

### **Key design concepts for ALL sub-teams to have as a design criteria**

- How does the recommended solution motivate/incent the behaviors we want?
- How does it positively impact multi-campus students?
- How does it positively impact collaborative-degree programs?
- How does it positively influence customer service to students/employees?
- How is the assessment/reflection/review/audit piece built in?
- A preliminary check against accreditation standards.

### **Stakeholders to consider in rings 2 or 3:**

- Presidents
- CAOs
- Cabinets
- Student financials
- Enrollment managers
- Admissions (UG/Grad)

- Financial aid directors
- Student government leaders
- Faculty representatives (deans, chairs, etc.)
- Functional leads (Dick, Lynda, Chip, etc.)
- Legislative check-in on back-end of process