

ABBREVIATED HISTORY OF SPBAC

February 7, 2005

Much of the following text is taken directly from “Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Create a University Planning Advisory Structure,” February, 1993. The complete text of this report is available from the Office of Academic Planning and Review, 621-5900. It should be noted that this report also contained recommendations for the role of the Vice President for Planning. These duties and responsibilities are currently under the direction of the Assistant Vice President for Resource Planning and Management (Ed Frisch).

History:

- ❖ May 8, 1992: President Pacheco charges an Ad Hoc Committee, chaired by Michael Gottfredson, to create a university planning advisory structure saying, “...the establishment of a permanent planning advisory structure...not only would replace many of the current ad hoc committees and processes, but also enable all levels of University administration to have access to faculty, staff, and student input in an organized fashion.”
- ❖ February 10, 1993: The Ad Hoc Committee sends its final report to President Pacheco recommending initiation of a University Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee to be, “The principal University strategic planning body and University level advisor concerning budget policy.”
- ❖ The committee’s recommendations called for a structure that divided SPBAC into two subcommittees: 1) the short-term budget policy subcommittee; and 2) the strategic planning subcommittee. This structure was terminated (by 1995) in an effort to more closely link planning and budgeting.
- ❖ The original plans called for development of a permanent set of data to be used by SPBAC (i.e., the internal and external environmental scans). It was recommended that this data set be maintained and updated to improve confidence in the data. The data are currently gathered and maintained by Decision and Planning Support (DAPS).

Guiding Principles:

- ❖ All activities of the new planning and budgeting structure should be advisory to the President and the President’s cabinet.
- ❖ Strategic planning, long-term budgeting, and short-term budgeting must be mission driven. The mission itself must be created in a participatory, consensual fashion. It must be reasonably specific, consistently followed, and constantly

evaluated. It is essential that the University begin to operate consistently under a shared understanding of the mission, of definitions of centrality to the mission, and with common criteria for the evaluation of our programs.

- ❖ Budgeting, planning, and quality evaluation are all part of the same process.
- ❖ There must be one, and only one, authoritative University structure for planning and budget policy. The mission of this structure, at the University level, is the welfare of the entire University. Those who serve at the University level do so with the understanding that they represent the interests of the entire University community, not the interests of their respective units.
- ❖ At the center of the planning structure should be a University-level committee reporting directly to the President. All member of the University community must grant legitimacy and centrality to this advisory structure. As such, the composition of the University committee must grant obvious influence to critical constituencies.
- ❖ Every phase of the process must be open to the University Community for scrutiny, debate, and criticism.
- ❖ All significant budgetary actions must pass through the advisory structure, including such activities as enhancements (“decision packages” or “program changes”), rescissions, annual budget plans (for the University as a whole and for each if its major divisions), and college and unit hiring plans.
- ❖ The process must allow for substantial faculty consultation and advice at every phase and for every part of the University.
- ❖ The President’s Cabinet and the University Committee are responsible for the identification of cross-functional, or “horizontal” planning problems.
- ❖ The planning and budgeting process must rely on a consensually defined set of data for basic functions of the University. Because current data are inadequate, provision must be made to include data management and quality improvement in the process. The data available to the University planning advisory body must include all financial data for each unit.
- ❖ Every college and academic department must have a strategic planning and budget advisory committee, or must charge an existing committee with this task. Membership should be designed to imitate the general representativeness embodied in the University Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee. Similarly, the major units in the offices of the Vice-Presidents should have standing planning committees. The University should provide...advice and assistance in strategic planning any time it is sought by units in the University.

- ❖ This new structure should be regarded as an experiment. (A sunset review in five years was recommended—SPBAC is currently entering its eighth year of existence.)

Membership:

- ❖ The original committee recommended a planning committee of 18 members appointed by the President, their representative groups, or a combination of the president and the chair of the faculty. Later the Faculty Senate expressed concern over the level of faculty representation and the method by which they were selected.
- ❖ After much discussion and debate, the following committee structure was approved by both the Faculty Senate and University administration. The current committee consists of 21 members, eleven of these are faculty, including the SPBAC chair. Six of the faculty are elected by the Faculty Senate, the remaining four, including the committee chair (who must have served at least one term on the committee prior to appointment to chair) are appointed by the President working in conjunction with the Chair of the Faculty. The Chair of the Faculty and the president of ASUA automatically have seats on SPBAC. The balance of the membership is appointed: two deans; two representatives from the president's cabinet; two non-faculty appointed; one SAC representative; one APAC representative; and one graduate student appointed by GPSC. The two senior vice presidents serve as ex-officio (non-voting) members. All but the representatives of SAC, APAC, and the student members, serve on three-year rotating terms. The others serve at the will of their governing organizations.