UNIVERSITY RESOURCES & PLANNING COMMITTEE
November 3, 2023
1:00 PM – 2:30 PM
Meeting Location: CCR

2023-24 URPC:

☒	Jenn Capps, Co-Chair (non-voting)	☐	Samuel Parker, Student (voting)
☒	Jaime Lancaster, Co-Chair (tie break vote)	☐	Vincent Zavala, Student (voting)
☒	Amy Sprowles, Faculty (voting)	☒	Amber Blakeslee, Advisor (non-voting)
☒	Dave Jannetta, Faculty (voting)	☒	Melanie Bettenhausen, Advisor (non-voting)
☒	Ramesh Adhikari, Faculty (voting)	☐	Anthony Baker Ortiz, Advisor (non-voting)
☒	Sarah McCue-Green, Staff (voting)	☒	Kendra Higgins, Advisor (non-voting)
☐	Vacant, Staff (voting)	☐	Michael Le, Advisor (non-voting)
☒	Jeffrey Crane, Dean (voting) Proxy: Megan Siems	☒	Brigid Wall, Notes (non-voting)
☒	Carla Ho'a, VP (voting)	☒	Patrick Orona, Notes (non-voting)
☒	Chrissy Holliday, VP (voting) Proxy: Melanie Bettenhausen	☒	Nate Cacciari Roy, Support (non-voting)
☒	Frank Whitlatch, VP (voting) Proxy: Kevin Furtado	☐	

Additional attendees: Krista Carroll

Meeting Minutes:

1. Welcome and review and approval of the minutes from October 20, 2023
    a. Minutes to be reviewed at the next meeting.
2. Response to forum questions draft here and share out strategy (GOAL = to draft campuswide response by November break)
    a. The group is actively working on pulling written responses together to the questions asked during the URPC forum on October 18th with the goal of sharing the information with the campus by November break. The committee discussed how best to address the questions, provide appropriate context, and strategies to share responses with individuals and the broader campus community.
3. Resource request
    a. Resource request flowchart draft Here
        i. This flowchart is related to one of the questions received at the budget forum and was developed to outline the author's current understanding of the resource request process on campus.
            1. Areas of improvement for the current process: process has been handled verbally or by email; lack of visibility of where in the process a request is; lack of understanding of what has been prioritized for funding and what has not, and context related to the decision-making process.

b. Simplified version (and Questica process)
            i. The UBO is in the preliminary stages of building out a resource request process that can be submitted within Questica, the campus budgeting tool.
                1. Draft process overview: Requests are initiated at the department level and entered into Questica. Leveraging workflow functionality within Questica, requests are reviewed and prioritized at the MBU, and Division level. If a request is prioritized but funding is not identified, it will then go to PAT for review/prioritization, followed by URPC consideration/recommendation, and ultimately President's Office for consideration/funding.
                    a. Anticipated improvements to the existing process: Requestors can see where the request is in the process; Feedback provided at each review step; Promotes visibility of the demand for additional resources across the campus.
                2. UBO will be putting together a budget analyst pilot group to help develop and test these process enhancements, followed by broader campus engagement in the coming months.
4. Discuss structure for cost savings and revenue generation work (as informed by charge) (For reference: Guiding Measures and Principles for balancing budget (URPC 2019 document))
    a. EEP: formalize URPC response
        i. Summarize the points made in previous discussions and draft a committee response.
    b. What other options are there?
        i. Discussion of what other options can be considered, data analysis to inform decision making, and projected budget gap (one-time vs on-going) and reduction targets needing to be addressed.
            1. Committee would like a list of other options that can be considered as cost savings and revenue generation strategies.
                a. Examples of strategies include furloughs/temporary pay reductions, hiring chill of vacant positions, EEP, layoffs, corporate sponsorships, review of low enrolled programs, shared services, program prioritization, etc.
    c. Further conversation on this next meeting when we have baseline + high/low projections
        i. High, low, and base line projections are being developed for a 5-year planning horizon and will be shared in the next few weeks.
5. Divisional Reports
    a. Agenda item was not discussed due to time.
6. Next steps