Chairs’ & Center Directors’ Meeting Minutes

Date: March 7, 2016
Location: WCH – Room 443
Attendees: Reza Abbaschian
Maria Anguiano
Guillermo Aguilar
Alex Balandin
Matt Barth
Bir Bhanu
Mitch Boretz
Marek Chrobak
Jay Farrell
Stephanie Flores
Robert Haddon
Matt Hull
Pat Hartney
Nosang Myung
Walid Najjar
Masa Rao (for Ashok Mulchandani)
Ravi
Kambiz Vafai

Absent: Ashok Mulchandani
Akula Venkatram
Sharon Walker
Albert Wang

1. Welcome and call for agenda items – Reza
No items were added to the agenda. Reza welcomed Maria Anguiano, Matt Hull and Stephanie Flores from UCR’s Financial Planning and Analysis Office.

2. Approval of minutes – Pat
The revised minutes of the February 22, 2016 meeting were unanimously approved.

3. Budget Model – Maria Anguiano
Maria, Matt and Stephanie gave a presentation on UCR’s new budget model including cost pools and Service Level Agreements (SLAs). Important points discussed during this presentation were:

   - Tuition revenue for each academic unit is generated from 60% workload, 20% major headcount and 20% performance (1st year retention; 4-year graduation). An academic org is given the graduation credit for a student that left the org but graduated in another UCR org.
   - BCOE’s share of the additional freshmen being admitted by UCR this year is estimated to be $335K (for 28 new BCOE freshmen). Additional BCOE freshmen would generate additional revenue at the same rate.
- Academic orgs receive 100% of graduate student tuition revenue. The Grad Division still provides grad student fellowship funding but NRT will no longer be included (or charged for most grad students). Policies regarding grad student funding will be reviewed by campus during FY16-17.
- 5% of all contract and grant indirect cost recovery (ICR) will be allocated to PI’s. This amount should provide approximately twice the amount available to PIs under BCOE’s previous ICR allocation policy.
- 10% of all contract and grant ICR will be allocated to the department where the indirect costs were generated.
- It was suggested by Chairs that additional ICR incentives be considered such as an increase in percentage of ICR return to orgs after reaching prescribed thresholds.
- BCOE’s PhD Reward Program is being suspended until the impact of the campus’ new budget model is known.
- The new budget model includes elimination of most internal recharge transactions. Most services from Physical Plant, EH&S, C&C, etc. will be provided at no direct charge to units.
- The Chairs/Directors voiced concerns about how service providers will provide responsive service if they will no longer be paid directly by units. Maria and Matt responded that the SLA Governance Committee is charged with reviewing service providers’ actual (financial and qualitative) performance each year. This review will include feedback from customers. UCR is purchasing survey services from UCSD to assist in this process. The data from UCSD will include objective survey analysis and metrics. UCR’s SLA Governance Committee includes two Deans (Smith and Pena) and three CFAOs (Vogel-Farias, Sharp-Aten and Ruiz) along with VC Sandoval and the Chair of the Academic Senate.
- All Strategic Investment Fund (SIF) proposals from an academic org will need to be prioritized by the Dean.
- The Budget Office is planning to provide a list of SIF funded projects at the end of each fiscal year and will consider providing quarterly lists of these projects on its website. It was stressed by BCOE that knowing which projects are being funded is important information for future proposals.
- The Chairs and Directors voiced concerns about the impact of the new budget model on BCOE. Maria offered to attend a future Chairs/Directors meeting to review these impacts.

4. Budget Metrics — Pat
Pat distributed the latest list of BCOE suggested metrics and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). 5-10 metrics and KPIs need to be included in BCOE’s budget submission (due on March 10th). Pat asked for final feedback and suggestions. Input included adding Fellows as a Percentage of Faculty; Chaired Professorships as a Percentage of Faculty; and Publications or Citations per Ladder Rank Faculty. Pat indicated that we should be able to obtain this information for BCOE faculty but comparison data for other academic units or institutions may be hard to obtain.

5. Other Topics/New Items
Jay stated that the projectors in WCH 205/206 and Bourns A265 are frequently not working properly. Pat will look into this problem.

Due to time constraints, all other topics were postponed to the next Chairs/Directors Meeting.
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Please note next meeting will be on: Monday, March 21, 2016

Future Meeting Dates

2015
Monday, September 28
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2016
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Budget Model Cost Pools and SLA Update Meeting

December 2015
Agenda

1. Budget Redesign Process
2. Tuition Allocation Methodology
3. F&A Faculty Reimbursement
4. Budget Model Cost Pools
5. Service Level Agreements
6. SLA Governance Committee
7. Strategic Investment Fund (SIF)
8. Cognos Project Update
Budget Redesign Process
UCR is migrating to a more performance and incentive-based budget model in order to align resource allocations with our strategic goals and drive transformation.

What did we do?

✓ Assessed and evaluated our current resource allocation process;

✓ Reviewed national leading practices for resource allocation in higher education;

✓ Created a pro-forma budget model

✓ Developed a plan to aid UCR in implementing an Incentive-Based Resource Allocation and Budget Model
When asked to describe the current Budget process, an audience of faculty & staff said that the process is...
To no surprise, the Current Funds Flow required a "secret decoder ring" to understand.
When faculty & staff were asked to describe what came to mind for a future budget process...
## Linking Guiding Principles to Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Transparent</td>
<td>Ability for campus to understand flows of revenue and use of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Incentivized</td>
<td>Tuition will be distributed based on performance (student credit hours, majors, graduation rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Strategic</td>
<td>Create Strategic Investment Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Risk Tolerant</td>
<td>Reward entrepreneurial behavior by department/unit (e.g., expanding masters degrees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Logical</td>
<td>Costs decentralized to benefiting units (rent charge and utility charge)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Streamlined approach resulting in a clearer and more transparent view into the institution's resource use.
# Budget Model Categories

## Revenue Generators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Units</th>
<th>Auxiliary/Self-Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCOE</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>UNEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS/OR</td>
<td>Palm Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSOE</td>
<td>BAS - Bookstore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA</td>
<td>BAS - Child Dev Ctr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>BAS - TAPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAS - Housing/Dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAS - UCR Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;B - Faculty Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VCSA - HUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VCSA - Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VCSA - Rec Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cost Pools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Student Support</th>
<th>Asset &amp; Research Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;C</td>
<td>BAS - HR</td>
<td>Graduate Division</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS - Physical</td>
<td>BAS - Accounting (BFS)</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>BAS - All Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>VCUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS - Police</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research &amp; Econ Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellor/EVC</td>
<td></td>
<td>VP Units (VPUE, VPIA, AP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campus Budget Model: Tuition Allocation Methodology
Tuition Allocation Weighting Discussion Output

- **Instruction**: (Student FTE) 0% - 100%
- **Majors**: (Student Headcount) 0% - 100%
- **Performance**: (TBD - Graduation Rate) 0% - 100%

**Identified Clusters:**
- Instruction: 50 - 80%
- Majors: 10 - 30%
- Performance: 10 - 30%

**What We Picked:**
- Instruction: 60%
- Majors: 20%
- Performance: 20%
# Tuition Allocation: Benefits & Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Is the best surrogate for true cost of providing instruction and enables schools with heavy teaching loads more options in allocating resources.</td>
<td>- Provides an incentive for schools to offer quality advising to retain majors, thus also improving graduation rates.</td>
<td>- Optimizes the “appropriate” teaching of courses, availability/timing of courses, and space utilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enables larger lower division classes which allows students to fulfill general education course requirements faster.</td>
<td>- Promotes competency in students and quality of education within majors.</td>
<td>- Using Performance as a factor promotes student success as outlined in UCR 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creates opportunities for post-docs and TAs to teach lower division courses, allowing faculty to teach more complex, upper division courses and conduct research.</td>
<td>- Results in a manageable number of students in each major to focus on and improve.</td>
<td>- Low weighting prevents a major decrease in quality of education simply to graduate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- May lead to colleges duplicating efforts and teaching classes already existing elsewhere.</td>
<td>- Low weighting prevents poaching of students from other schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Larger classes may lead to a decrease in quality of education provided.</td>
<td>- Schools are not heavily incentivized to attract students to enroll in the school’s majors.</td>
<td>- May be difficult to find a metric that best measures Performance equitably across all schools and colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- May not provide enough resources to cover advising in schools with higher major enrollment-to-instruction ratios.</td>
<td>- Increased selectivity may impact student demographics and cause a shift away from UCR’s strategic goal of promoting diversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tuition Revenue Calculation

✓ A Tuition Revenue yearend true-up will occur based on actual workload.

✓ Workload will be calculated using Spring, Fall, and Winter quarter data to establish 7/1 Budgets.
# Hold-harmless Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Model</th>
<th>New Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost Budget</td>
<td>$58 M</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$38 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Revenue</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Expenses</td>
<td>$54 M</td>
<td>$54 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Expenses</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$24 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>$4 M</td>
<td>$-40 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvention</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$44 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Forward</td>
<td>$4 M</td>
<td>$4 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013-2014 Actuals used in the model shown above
## UG Tuition Allocation Scenario Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHASS</th>
<th>BCOE</th>
<th>SOBA</th>
<th>CNAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UG Headcount Major</strong></td>
<td>10,050</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>4,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition Revenue for Headcount Major</strong></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$1,073 Per Student based on 2014-2015 UG Headcount Major</strong></td>
<td>$1,073</td>
<td>$1,073</td>
<td>$1,073</td>
<td>$1,073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenario 1
Establish alumni growth of 3.1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHASS</th>
<th>BCOE</th>
<th>SOBA</th>
<th>CNAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headcount Majors Change</strong></td>
<td>557</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Tuition Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$597,661</td>
<td>$133,052</td>
<td>$62,234</td>
<td>$280,053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenario 2
Establish alumni growth of 6.25%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHASS</th>
<th>BCOE</th>
<th>SOBA</th>
<th>CNAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headcount Majors Change</strong></td>
<td>610</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Tuition Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$654,530</td>
<td>$187,775</td>
<td>$37,555</td>
<td>$193,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### So What Is My Budget for 2016-2017?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>2016-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost Budget</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tuition Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$38 M</td>
<td>$38M + Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Revenue (Course Fees, etc.)</strong></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$54 M</td>
<td>$54M +/- Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$24 M</td>
<td>$24M + SLA Cost Increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net</strong></td>
<td>-$40 M</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subvention</strong></td>
<td>$44 M</td>
<td>$44M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIF</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster Hires</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carry Forward</strong></td>
<td>$4 M</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013-2014 Actuals used in the model shown above*
Graduate Student Tuition Allocation

Academic Units receive 100% of graduate student tuition revenue.

The Graduate Division allocates a package using funds from the Academic Units and SIF to cover costs associated with graduate student fellowships.
Budget Model is managed through COGNOS reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNOS Reports</th>
<th>New Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost Budget</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>$38 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Revenue</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Expenses</td>
<td>$54 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Expenses</td>
<td>$24 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>$-40 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvention</td>
<td>$44 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Forward</td>
<td>$4 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013-2014 Actuals used in the model shown above
F&A Faculty Reimbursement
F&A is indirect cost recovery from the granting agency

FY2016-17 UCR
F&A Dispersal

- 5% PI
- Department
- VCRED
- College
- Campus SIF

✓ Recognition of PI's efforts to perform research
✓ Redirection of existing revenue, not new revenue
Cost Pools
Moving to Cost Pools and Cost Allocations

Step-Down Allocation Methodology

- **Infrastructure Operations** costs are allocated to *all units*
- **Administration** costs are allocated to *Academic, Auxiliary, and Support Units*
- **Support (Academic / Student Affairs & Research)** costs are allocated to *Academic Units Only*
Recharge Rationalization & Activity

Goal: Eliminate 90% of recharge transactions

FY14 Recharge Transaction Data Stratification ($1,000s)

80% Transactions = 12% Value (<$6M)
Changes to Recharge Funding

✓ Recharge funding will be moved or built into Service Providers' base budgets

✓ Funding calculations were based on a three-year average adjusted to remove large anomalies (e.g., SIS Implementation).

✓ Discussions were held with each dean/vice chancellor and their CFAO on the specific organizational impacts.

✓ Budgetary Entries will occur in early winter quarter.
Remaining Recharge Units

These units address specialized needs at pre-established rates.

Recharge units will be reviewed by the Budget Committee as opposed to the SLA Governance Committee.

*Campus units cannot externally contract out A&E services*
### Example of Cost Pool Allocation

#### Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
<th>Unit 4</th>
<th>Unit 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Pools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure: $39/sq ft</td>
<td>$8,970,000</td>
<td>$14,040,000</td>
<td>$6,630,000</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>$7,410,000</td>
<td>$39M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>1.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Footage</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Research</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Pool</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Level Agreements
Purpose Statement of SLAs

SLAs will provide a vehicle to support the implementation of the budget design, creating operating efficiencies and reducing transaction processing in the service provider units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enables</th>
<th>Consistent service levels across the enterprise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increases</td>
<td>Emphasis on quality of service provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages</td>
<td>Accountability between service providers and customers for level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces</td>
<td>Transaction processing by eliminating immaterial and unnecessary recharge transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines</td>
<td>Core services verses incremental recharge activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates</td>
<td>Transparency to cost and value provided for services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLAs will be important in maintaining consistent levels of quality and expectations.
Balancing Approach

This is the "fundamental tension"

$\text{Services} \quad \Downarrow 
\text{SLA} \quad \Downarrow 
\text{$\text{Cost}$}

Quality and consistency of Services vs. Cost to Provide
Service Level Agreements (SLA) change the conversation.
Core Services: Customers will be provided a high quality service that is sufficient to address their operational needs while also addressing regulatory or policy mandates. The cost of providing this level of service will be assessed to campus units according to an agreed cost driver (Ex: HR uses FTE, Facilities uses Square Ft.).

Premium Services: Customers can opt for an added level of service on a long-term basis to address their unique needs. This arrangement will be subject to a premium-level assessment on top of their core-level assessment (Ex: CHASS contracting additional payroll services from BAS).

Recharges: On an as-needed basis, services can select to address specialized needs at pre-established rates.
Understanding an SLA

Moving from a transaction based recharge billing to a cost allocation requires clearly defined SLAs and understanding of what a SLA should be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What It Is NOT</th>
<th>What It Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Detailed bill between each customers and service provider</td>
<td>✓ Agreement with customers to align service level expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Not set in stone or a final document; a starting point which will undergo an iterative development process</td>
<td>✓ Definition of core services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Clear statement of processes or method of service delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13 SLAs by Cost Pool

**Infrastructure**
- BAS – Physical Plant
- BAS – Police
- C&C

**Administration**
- BAS – Human Resources
- BAS – Business & Financial Services
- BAS – General Administration (VC Office, Risk Mgmt, Mail, EH&S, Receiving)

**Student Support**
- Graduate Division
- Student Affairs

**Academic/Research Support**
- Academic Senate
- Library
- Research & Economic Development
- University Advancement
- VP Units: VPUE, VPIA, Academic Personnel

*The Administration cost pool will include central administration – Chancellor/EVC and Planning & Budget units (no SLAs).*
# SLA Governance Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Initial Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean Smith</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Peña</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAO Ruiz</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAO Vogel-Farias</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAO Sharp-Aten</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC Sandoval</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Chair Barish</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SLA Governance Committee is an advisory committee to the Provost/EVC and Vice Chancellor of Planning & Budget.

Make up of SLA Governance Committee:

- 2 Deans
- 2 CFAOs
- 1 Self-Supporting/Auxiliary Director
- 1 Service Provider
- 1 Chair of Academic Senate P&B Committee
- 3-year terms rotating new members each year
SLA Governance Committee Charter

Advocate
- on behalf of the user

Verify
- that service provision, quality of services, and costs are in alignment with the overall **strategic objectives of UCR** and the needs of the customer units

Review
- each services provider's actual performance, both from a **financial and qualitative** perspective

Assess
- service levels and funding requirements for the upcoming fiscal year

Recommend
- to the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget changes to the levels of service and the funding necessary to support the service
SLA Governance Committee
FY2015-16 Process

Review Base Line Documents
(FY 14-15 Templates/ABRs and pilot SLAs)
Oct/Nov 2015

Provide Feedback to FP&A for Service Providers
Dec. 23, 2015

Call Letters/Templates sent to Service Providers for the Development of 2016-17 Proposed Budget and SLA
Jan. 15, 2015

Review 2016-17 Proposed Budgets and SLAs/Meet with Service Providers
Mar/Apr 2016

Make Recommendations to Provost/EVC and Vice Chancellor P&B for Budget/SLA Approval
April 30, 2016

Approval Letters for SLA and Budget/Rates sent to Service Providers
May 30, 2016
Governance Committee provided FP&A feedback on...

- Development of an SLA Best Practices Document
- Call Letters will communicate specific customer needs or concerns
- Templates aligned with service providers
Strategic Investment Fund (SIF)

SIF Funds will be available for a more focused purpose than the historical annual general funds budget process.
Example of items funded by SIF Funds

- Chancellor's Initiatives & Programs
  - Strategic Initiatives (Targeted Marketing)
  - New Admin. Offices (VP in Int'l Affairs)
  - UCOP Mandates (Sexual Assault Response)

- Capital Renewal
  - Extraordinary Repairs
  - Planning Costs
  - Deferred Maintenance

- Academic Programs & Research
  - New academic programs
  - Research Equipment
  - Strategic Research Initiatives
  - Spousal Hires

- IT
  - New IT systems
  - Major Equipment

- Reserves
  - Bank Loans
  - Emergency funds
  - Fixed Cost increases

- Grant Matching
Mini SIF Process – Cycle Dates

September
January
April

1st SIF Forms Due
15th FP&A Review
20th Provost Decisions
30th Approval/ Denial Letter Sent

✓ SIF Request Forms available on PB website
✓ “The Call” for SIF Requests will be sent via email to Deans/VCs by the VCPB 30 days prior...if funding is available
✓ Approval/Denial correspondence will be sent via email by FP&A on behalf of the Provost/VCPB
✓ Orgs will receive a single letter per cycle for any funding decisions made during the quarter
Consolidating funding decisions into 3 Mini SIF processes will achieve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictability</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Transparency</th>
<th>Use of Strategic Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To all units for the timing of decisions</td>
<td>When considering requests</td>
<td>In decision making</td>
<td>When approving requests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given SIF has limited funding for campus units, SIF requests should be funneled through the CFAO and Dean for prioritization and approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What It Is NOT</th>
<th>What It Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ A resource to correct historical deficits or fund general operating expenses</td>
<td>✓ Funding driven by aligned campus and organizational strategic goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Funds to sustain a program</td>
<td>✓ Seed money for startup of self-sustaining programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ A permanent funding source</td>
<td>✓ Short term high priority investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Substitute for available grant funding</td>
<td>✓ Limited funding available to the campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIF Request Form

A 1-2-page form will be available on the P&B Website for units to submit funding requests in a uniform manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2015-16 STRATEGIC INVESTMENT FUND (SIF) REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ORGANIZATION:** | **DATE OF REQUEST:**

**SIF INSTRUCTIONS / GUIDANCE (for this process):**
- Please use the template below to submit your Org's SIF request as well as provide any additional information that will assist in evaluating your request.
- SIF requests should be based on requests that are strategic investments or initiatives that support campus goals, i.e. funding needed for stand alone programs, start up projects, capital initiatives, etc. SIF requests should not be based on hiring faculty/staff, or alignment of department/org deficits.

**NOTE:** There will be (3) Mini SIF Processes each Fiscal Year, which will be in September, January and April.
Based on Mini SIF process timeline, please anticipate your Org's SIF requests to ensure Organizational Excellence in the processing of funding requests.

**SIF TIMELINE for September, January, and April:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Salary Expense</th>
<th>Indicate what Campus Goal/Functional Area the Request Supports</th>
<th>Total Perm Request</th>
<th>Total Temp Request</th>
<th>Org Contribution ($)</th>
<th>Central Funding Request ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request Description</td>
<td>(Select One)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Request:

**PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NECESSARY TO EVALUATE YOUR REQUEST.**

---

**Chief Financial & Administrative Officer:**

Authorized Signature

---

**Dean or Vice Chancellor:**

Authorized Signature
Cognos Project Update
COGNOS Reports: Project Phases

Phase 1: Pilot Financial Data
- 'Proof of Concept' phase whereby provided a small number of campus-wide reports based on PeopleSoft financial data

Phase 2: Expansion
- Deliver 80% of the prioritized and validated reports based on varied data sources

Phase 3: Operationalization
- Operationalizing and maturing the process to implement Report Lifecycle and addition of new reports
COGNOS Reports: Approach

May

Jun

Jul

Aug

Sep

Oct

Nov

Dec

- Requirement workshop w/ CFAOs
- Created workgroups of CFAOs/FAOs
- Presented draft reports to CFAO/FAOs
- VC/Dean Focus Group
- RFP Development for report build-out
Three Levels of COGNOS Reports

Reports are designed to facilitate decision-making at various managerial levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Campus-wide</td>
<td>Chancellor / Provost / VCPB/Senate Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational/Departmental</td>
<td>Vice Chancellors and Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational/Departmental</td>
<td>Chief Financial &amp; Administrative Officers and Department Chairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chief Financial & Administrative Officers

The R'Plan Financial Report displays the current financial position compared to the R'Plan and provides forecast for end of year financial position.

Provides projected year end balances to ensure continued financial solvency.
**R'Plan Detail: Drill-Down Capabilities**

Provides the ability to monitor monthly, quarterly and year-to-date financial performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FYXX Revenue/Funding</th>
<th>Plan Year Carry Forward</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Total PY MX Revenue</th>
<th>Current Year Income</th>
<th>Current Year Projected</th>
<th>Total YTD Revenue</th>
<th>% of Funding rec'd YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endow - Principal Apprx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Cali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Gifts/Grants/Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Service - Edu Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Service - Aux Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding YTD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R'Plan Dashboard

Year to Date Summary -- Revenue and Expenses -- ORGXX

Revenue Year to Date

Revenue/Funding Budget vs. Actuals

Alert if below 10% of Revenue Rec'd

Red under 90%
Yellow 75% - 89%
Green 80% - 74%

Total R'Plan Revenue  YTD Actual Revenue  Revenue Over/(Short)
Budget Evolutionary Timeline:
Process Before Technology

- **FY13-14**: Free for All
- **FY14-15**: Standard Templates Developed
- **FY15-16**: New Budget Process & Evolved Templates
- **FY16-17**: Phase 2 Refinement & Evolved Templates
- **FY17-18**: Implement COGNOS

Streamlining