

Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP)
January 28, 2020
Minutes of the Meeting

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** Comprehensive Policy Review: Environmental Management; New Policy: Major Events (Twin Cities Campus); Senior Leader Consultation: System-wide Strategic Plan; Budget Models]

PRESENT: Frank Gigler (chair), Brian Burnett, Elizabeth Davis, Tony Fussy, Robert Goldstein, Jennifer Gunn, Stephanie Heim, Linc Kallsen, Michael Korth, Jill Merriam, Paul Olin, Carl Rosen, Rod Squires, Julie Tonneson, Erik van Kujik, Sashank Varma, Ben Yawkie

REGRETS: James Pankow

ABSENT: Lisa Babbs, Harrison Frisk, Aleksander Holleran, ZiRui Su, Traci Wollums

GUESTS: Paige Rohman, chief of staff, University Services; Mike Austin, director, Environmental Health and Safety; Chuck Tombarge, chief public relations officer, University Relations

Chair Frank Gigler welcomed the committee and the members introduced themselves.

1. Comprehensive Policy Review: Environmental Management

Mike Austin, director, Environmental Health and Safety, and Paige Rohman, chief of staff, University Services, presented the [Administrative Policy: Environmental Management](#) and [Administrative Procedure: Environmental Assessments and Remediation](#), in addition to other relevant policies and procedures, and explained that the policies were due for a comprehensive review, and have been reviewed and updated in accordance with the review process. Austin provided the following information about the review and updates:

- The goal of the updates is to simplify the documents, which included deleting some fact sheets and other information that can be found on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) website.
- [Administrative Procedure: Wetland Conservation](#) was added as a new procedure to the Environmental Management policies.

Committee members asked Austin to clarify when a property is evaluated for waste clean up, etc. during a potential purchase. Austin explained that the institution would apply any guidelines laid out in the policies before signing a purchase agreement.

Gigler told the presenters that the committee will review the policies and provide any feedback.

2. New Policy: Major Events (Twin Cities Campus)

Chuck Tombarge, chief public relations officer, University Relations, then introduced himself and presented a new policy titled [Administrative Policy: Major Events \(Twin Cities Campus\)](#). As part of the review, Tombarge also provided members with the following:

- [Major Events Policy Consultation - Key Points](#)
- [Administrative Procedure: Major Event Proposal](#)
- [Administrative Procedure: Political Campaign Events](#)

Tombarge explained that the policy was developed to ensure that major events organized on the Twin Cities campuses are more coordinated and organized than in previous years, particularly related to security and administrative support. He noted that a common challenge that the institution has encountered for these major events is coordinating efforts on such a dispersed campus. The goal of a higher education institution is to inspire free speech, foster engagement and facilitate exposure to a variety of topics, and he emphasized that to safeguard those endeavors, the institution needs to be mindful of the logistics of hosting a high profile speaker or a large audience.

Tombarge cautioned that the policy is not intended to “police” or “bless” events, but to be thoughtful and planful, and to connect the right offices and resources to make an event successful.

Gigler asked if all events will be welcomed on campus as long as it meets the application criteria. Brian Burnett, senior vice president, Finance and Operations, confirmed that the spirit of the policy is to apply a common set of rules to all event applications, not to pick between the applications. Burnett opined that the institution has a responsibility to provide a venue for public discourse, and the policy was drafted to support that, and to also ensure safety on campus.

Tombarge added that the policy is also intended to inform the University community about the planning that needs to be considered in order to make an event successful and safe.

Tombarge told members that there will be a communication plan to inform individuals about this policy, in addition to training for the employees that assist with room reservations on the Twin Cities campuses.

The policy will likely be presented to the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) in February and the Presidential Policy Committee (PPC) in March. It will then be posted for a 30-day comment period, and barring any big changes based on feedback, the policy will be in effect in April 2020.

Rohman requested that any feedback from SCFP members be forwarded via email.

3. Senior Leader Consultation: System-wide Strategic Plan

Burnett passed around a [document](#) outlining the five commitments of the Systemwide Strategic Plan, in addition to the goals identified for each commitment. He reminded members that one of the President’s key initiatives is to present a systemwide strategic plan to the Board of Regents (BOR), and he explained that the President will be providing an update on the project to the BOR

at the February meeting. He requested feedback from members regarding the goals, particularly those listed under commitment five: Fiscal Stewardship.

Rod Squires asked for further clarification on what *Goal 2: Align revenue allocation to incentivize forward-thinking mission fulfillment* means. Burnett explained that he believes the President is recommending that revenue allocation be linked more directly to specific goals and objectives identified by the institution. He cautioned that the institution will likely have to identify and focus on some specific areas because there is not funding available for everything. Squires suggested that perhaps the specific goals and objectives should be listed in the plan, particularly because the institution's fiscal mission and academic mission don't always align. Burnett explained that the next step of the plan will be to add action steps under each goal, which will help further define what the goals and objectives would be. Members offered the following additional feedback for Goal 2:

- Should the fiscal mission be decoupled from the academic mission, and how that would inform the decisions and work that individuals choose to pursue?
- Consider simplifying the language in Goal 2.
- Does the University have revenue models that support the mission of the University?

The committee also had a discussion about Commitment 3: MNtersections, specifically noting that the arts and humanities are not articulated in the commitment summary or the goals. Members discussed whether the arts and humanities are represented in all of the commitments, or whether they should be specifically listed in the commitments.

Jennifer Gunn asked how *Goal 3: Build comprehensive long-range capital facilities and land-holding strategies to drive strategic growth* is different than what the institution is currently doing. Burnett clarified that it is an update or reconsideration of what is currently being done. For example, he said, the institution is considering whether to keep the property that the University currently owns, versus selling some property and adding the revenue to the endowment.

Erik van Kujik recommended that “faculty and staff success” be included in the priorities, perhaps added to *Commitment 1: Student Success*. Stephanie Heim suggested that an action item could be added to Commitment 1 that highlights the value of faculty and staff as a way to meet student success.

Burnett told members that further comments could be directed to the University Senate Office.

4. Budget Models

Gigler introduced the final topic by reminding members about a discussion that began at the December SCFP meeting regarding components of the Responsibility Center Management (RCM) budget model and how it differs from other hybrid budget models. He told members that Julie Tonneson, associate vice president, University Budget and Finance, had agreed to join the discussion to further explain the current budget model.

Tonneson began by explaining that the University's RCM budget model is already a hybrid model. She told members that an RCM budget model has many specific components, and that every budget model is slightly different, and therefore could all be considered hybrid models.

Tonneson told members that the University budget went through a comprehensive review eight to ten years ago, and as part of that review, Michigan State University, The Ohio State University, and Indiana University were invited to provide feedback about their models. She said a large budget advisory group was also composed to consider specific tweaks in the RCM model to better serve the institution, and some changes were made at that time.

She explained that there is a lot of choice built into the budget model, and choices about the institutions' specific model were influenced by many factors. For example, she explained, the institution built a model to account for the state appropriations that the State of Minnesota provides, which looks different to each state, and each institution. She encouraged members to think of the University as an economy rather than an organization when considering budgeting.

Regarding interdisciplinary incentives, Tonneson stressed that incentives are an ongoing issue, and they were an issue even before the institution adopted the RCM model. She told members that incentives can be added to the current budget model, but to make that change, it has to be identified as a priority by the institution and the President.

With no further business, Gigler adjourned the meeting.

Bobbie Erichsen
University Senate Office