

Budget Council Agenda
Tuesday, January 24, 2012
3:30 - 4:30 pm

Terry Leist
Sue Leigland
Jeff Jacobsen
Wendy Stock
Allen Yarnell
Don Mathre

Anne Camper
Sheron McIlhattan
David Singel
Blake Bjornson
Jim Rimpau

Martha Potvin
Shelley McKamey
Doralyn Rossmann
Jeanne Wilkinson
Joseph Steffens

I. Call to Order

In Chair Terry Leist's absence, Jim Rimpau presided over the meeting.

II. Approval of Minutes of December 13, 2011

Shelley McKamey moved to approve the minutes and Sheron McIlhattan seconded the motion. Unanimous approval was given.

III. University Wide Information/Announcements

There were no University announcements to report.

IV. Update:

- Investment Proposal Process: scoring method, etc.

78 investment proposals were received by the Budget Council. Considerable discussion followed on the process for scoring and ranking the proposals. David Singel suggested that the group share the workload with a comprehensive review. He explained a process which is similar to reviewing grant proposals. Each member is given an assignment of proposals. Each proposal has three reviewers: primary, secondary, and reader.

The primary reader will give a summary of the proposals with their pros and cons, while the secondary and reader will have the chance to add or disagree on the comments. Only primary reviews comments will be part of the public record and passed to the requestor. The primary, secondary and reader will provide their final scores, which is then calculated and ranked.

After computing the ranking, there was considerable discussion on possible ways to divide the proposals into groups for public hearings.

It was questioned on the primary reader's ability to score the proposals if there is no familiarity or expertise in that area of the University and the discussion was there should be enough rationale to understand the proposal topic. The proposals have been randomly assigned and once distributed, any conflict of interest, such as a direct beneficiary or in the same office, must be reported immediately for reassignment. Proposals are to be distributed at the end of the meeting so any conflicts can be taken care of right away.

Communication of the proposals and hearing process will be drafted by Kathy Attebury. Investment proposals will be placed into broad categories so the campus will have a general idea of the pool submission, at the request of President Cruzado.

There are three kinds of funding requests that should be taken into account when reviewing. The Budget Office looked through all proposals to give budget direction to the reviewers ahead of time, using color coding.

Discussion included base funding for three years, with a reevaluation to extend funding on the 3rd or one-time funding for three years, allowing the assessment of the 3rd year for permanent funding, allowing proposals whose clear commitments haven't been honored taking top priority. Faculty lines originally included have been given to the Provost Office for consideration, unless there was other funding was requested. It was also noted to communicate with ITC on available funding if IT costs were part of a proposal.

The Budget Office distributed proposal assignments to council members and explained the ranking and scoring by the primary, secondary and reader reviewers. There was consensus the scoring would be 1-10 and entered on a matrix provided by the Budget Office.

V. Information Items:

None

Meeting adjourned

Next meeting of the Budget Council will be February 28, 2012.