Budget & Planning Committee
Minutes
March 6, 2019

Present: Cody Stoddard, Amy Claridge, Aimée Quinn, Kathy Whitcomb, Roxanne Easley, Ken Smith, Chad Wassell, Kathy Temple, Eric Cheney and Jim Johnson

Absent: Paul Knepper, Stephen Stein, Ian Loverro and Lad Holden

Guest(s): David Pena-Alfaro and Dannel Fischer

Meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

Agenda approved.

Jim moved to approve the February 20, 2019 minutes. Motion was seconded and approved with three abstentions.

David/Dannel. Financial Planning & Analysis – David and Dannel presented the committee with information and data that is used for the budget model. Their office responds to legislative efforts by the state. January-June their office is asked for data about the institution from Olympia. They have to cost out different scenarios requested by the state very quickly. They have been working on moving to a business intelligence community. More data to have another tool to make decisions. They have been working the last two months working on the data behind the RCM model.

They have developed a scalable RCM data model by college and academic department: They are trying to emulate the prior data model and be able to accommodate future models with ease (for example 70/30 vs 84/16). PBAC has been discussion about modeling different model scenarios quickly.

They indicated this data belongs to everybody. In the past there have been miscommunication between faculty and support about the way things are done.

- Gather Data
- Collaborate with traditional stakeholders
- Evaluation: SCH & Majors; Net Tuition Revenue, expenses, Margin; subvention
- Validation: reasonableness tests, model comparisons, Ad Hoc
- Present findings

There are some majors that don't exist.

- SCH & Majors: data from the data warehouse to the student/course/term level; evaluated within data model
- Tuition and Waivers: forecasted estimates provided by FBA
- Expenses: provided by academic departments via CatPlan
- Margin: calculated through data model
- Subvention: provided by Provost

Tasks within the Iterative Process
- Gather Data-ID required data-request data from IE-cleanse data
- Collaborate-validate source data-develop operational pathways-understand how the tool will be used
- Evaluate-build relationships with tables-code equations using SQL, DAX, and M
- Validate - variance analysis-collaborate with IE and Provost-present findings

Ken asked if there is one single database every time we draw from. Do data download, validate it and then do the analysis on this data.

David indicated they feel they are in a good place with finance data, but the student data is a data that they have to cleanse.

What is filtered explicitly?
- IDST College - SCH excluded
- INTL College - SCH excluded
- Summer - SCH excluded
- Blank Majors - SCH excluded (Jim suggested this should go to department of instruction)
- Blank Majors - Major excluded
- Majors in the Summer - major excluded

10% or less of SCH that has been excluded (not including summer).

What is filtered implicitly?
- Remedial courses (cat#=100) - SCH - included
- ESL courses (cat#<100) - SCH included
- Douglas Honors College - SCH included
- McNair Scholar Program - SCH included
- Continuing Education Dept. - include and excluded
- Interdisciplinary Studies Dept. - included and excluded
- Individual Studies Depart - included and excluded
- University Enrichment - included and excluded

Some of these are directly related to a specific college CAH/COTS, etc and some courses are not.

Others filtered implicitly?
- Cornerstone (College in the High school) - major excluded
- Running Start - major excluded
- General Studies Program - major excluded
- Summer majors - major excluded
- HS Enrichment - major included
- Undeclared majors - major included

Assumptions
- First year, post bac, transfers are URGD (undergraduate)
- Graduates only are Grad (Graduate)
- Only primary colleges (CAH, CEPS, CB, COTS) are solved for
- SCH evaluation is driven by independent calculations based on instruction (70) and major (30)
- SCH evaluation for budgeted FYn include winter n-1, Fall n-1, and spring n-2
- (Last winter, last fall and two years ago spring)

More assumptions
- course are evaluated based on the department of instruction not the department of instructor
- majors are listed by their current dept.
- budgeted funds include 'local general' and 'state general'
- State allocations and backfill are not applied to summer sessions
- Only academic plans that are majors (MAJ) are applied to a major count (not Cer, HON, IM, Min, OPT, Pre, Pro, RCE)

SCH Flow Example - went through an example and the RCM model.

David will email some of the slides to the committee.

PBAC - Kathy T and Amy reported that there was agreement to all of the things suggested by the committee. Drafting procedures was charged to a subgroup. Dropped the two proposed model changes for now until the procedures are put forward. Allocations subcommittee brought forward their recommendations and the vote will probably be March 26. Three tiers. 1 top and 3 bottom. Recommend these for further consideration of funding. ~$300,000 in tier 1, ~$400,000 tier 2.

Faculty code/policy - Kathy T sent the most recent working draft on Monday. Was sent out to college budget committees, deans and provost. Friday meeting at 1:00 for feedback from these groups.

Core values statement review - postpone to the first meeting of spring.

Accreditation report follow-ups - Bernadette reported to ADCO about the accreditation report. Concerns about RCM were dismissed by the accreditors. Took that the faculty numbers were lower and that was the problem, but the data didn't prove that and their report reflects that. Would like to ask for this data and look at this at BPC.

Ken did not speak with the BOT directly, but the President did mention class size during the meeting. Data focus groups, the accreditation report does not correctly show the increase in class size. Reach out to chairs on numbers of faculty and then do listening groups to hear issues with RCM. Suggestion of looking back at reports and surveys that have been done over the past five years regarding RCM and put together a report showing the trends and how it is now playing out with the current data. Validation of department level data.

Subgroup resets - Budget summits is more or less done for the year. Faculty Code change and college budget committees is still being worked on. Budget summits and Implementation workgroups could join and divide up the tasks between the listening session and departmental

data. Ken suggested a data wonk group to look at the budget book. Ken would be willing to be in that group. Kathy T will send out information to these individuals to try and organize the new subgroups.

Amy suggested getting something in writing about recommendations for the allocation process for next year.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.