I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Terry Leist.

II. Approval of Minutes from August 27, 2013 meeting

The minutes from the August meeting were approved.

III. Information/Announcements/Updates

• Open House Summary

The Open House went well and the Powerpoint presentation is posted on the President’s webpage. The presenters were interested in getting feedback to see how the new format worked for attendees. Erica McKay reported that the students like the day-long format. They were able to send representatives as available. At the same time, they felt that the content was not focused on students. If students are involved with the University, they understood the information but for many students it wasn’t pertinent. They questioned whether a second day could be added to focus more on students. Terry Leist suggested that a charrette format might be more useful for that purpose.

Nancy Cornwell liked the day-long format but suggested that the event be planned more in advance so people can organize their schedules around it. The event came up quickly this year and that made planning more difficult. Suggestions for changes included using a creative title, having a room nearby for presenters to sit down and answer questions, using a panel format. Because the presentations were so different, a standardized format might be more useful. It was also suggested that the timing of the event be considered to attract a larger audience.
SIP Assessment Process
No feedback was offered from the Council members on the SIP assessment so it was decided to move forward with the original plan. Linda Young questioned the timing of the funds distribution. It was explained that for those receiving funds, it is necessary to have an assessment plan completed prior to receiving the funds.

IV. Current Business

Mission / Role & Scope of Budget Council
Doralyn Rossmann will distribute the draft document electronically to get feedback from the Council. Joel Schumacher questioned whether the educational piece of the council is addressed in the document. Discussion followed on how the Council would participate in the development of training and how to expand on the role of educating constituents. It was agreed that the conversations regarding mission and responsibilities would continue at the next meeting after the Council members review the document.

Linking Budget to Strategic Plan
Kathy Attebury and Megan Bergstedt have worked to create a budget that is linked to the strategic plan. Their estimates are very rough as they have had to make many assumptions on areas and items that they aren’t familiar with. There is overlap between many of the metrics. To continue on this project, the Budget Office will need assistance from others in developing true costs for each item on the strategic plan. The Planning Council is currently looking at the “squishy” metrics or metrics that are difficult to measure in an effort to refine them. As these metrics are refined further, it may be easier to calculate budgets for them.

Training for Budget Council
The Council was provided with training on program and fund types. This is how our budget/expenses are defined by the Board of Regents in terms of programs and are fairly standard across national reporting units. For each index that exists on campus, there is a unique program attached to that index.

Other Items
There was a discussion at the last meeting about creating Frequently Asked Questions but it was felt that we need more feedback to proceed. There are not many examples on other University’s pages. It was suggested that our final document include a link for users to submit budget questions – a “Did you know” section.

The meeting was adjourned.