



June 26, 2008

Iowa State University Resource Management Model Implementation

Feedback from Advisory Committee Participants

Submitted By:

David Maddox
BearingPoint, Inc.
McLean, VA

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
1. First Year Went Well.....	3
Year of Orientation	3
Logistics	4
Quality of Discussion	4
Limited Impact in First Year	4
2. Role of the Advisory Committees.....	5
Reasons for caution on extending the roles of the Advisory Committees.....	7
If the Advisory Committees go deeper into making and evaluating budgets	8
Steps that could make it more feasible for Advisory Committees to take on a heavier role.....	9
3. University Budget Advisory Committee	10
Relation to Advisory Committees	10
Role of UBAC	10
4. Committee composition.....	11
5. Information	12
6. Communications.....	12
7. Organization.....	13
Summary of recommendations	14

Introduction

BearingPoint was asked to conduct a series of feedback sessions with those involved in the Advisory Committee process—the members of Administrative Service Center Advisory Committees, the administrators receiving advice from the committees, the lead staff members supporting the committees, and members of the University Budget Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee structure is a critical element of the Resource Management Model and one of the major changes from past practice. It also involves a large number of people and therefore a significant amount of time.

It is appropriate to start by recalling the intended purposes of the Advisory Committees.

The final report from the Budget Model Review and Implementation Committee in May 2007 contained the following statements (emphasis added):

...need for transparent mechanisms providing broad-based advice and counsel for budgetary and programmatic decisions. To ensure the balance between administrative management roles and advisory input into administrative decision-making, the model includes key, consultative advisory committees. These committees are not intended to supplant other advisory groups or mechanisms.

The primary purpose of the advisory committees is to provide advice to administrators throughout the budget process.

The advisory committees' recommendations are advisory to the administrator and focus on recommending the level of funding required to efficiently provide the type and quality of service desired by the university community.

Administrators must consider advisory committee commentary and recommendations when developing budget plans/requests and provide feedback to the advisory committee.

All from page 30

Each of the Advisory Committees is charged to advise the appropriate administrators on the level of funding required to provide the services the university community desires. The University Budget Advisory Committee has a somewhat different, broader role than the other advisory committees.

UBAC advises the Executive Vice President on a broad range of functions that cross the entire university. Its deliberations are informed by advice from the respective administrative units, with clear accounting for all advisory committee recommendations and commentary. The committee's primary roles include:

- Make recommendations on the annual distribution of revenues, reductions, and allocation changes
- Identify and/or prioritize long-range initiatives within the Resource Management Model
- Make recommendations on the use of the Institutional Excellence Fund

- Review the budgets of the Offices of the President and Executive Vice President and Provost on a regular basis to ensure that these administrative functions of the university are being carried out effectively and efficiently
- Provide advice and input to the Executive Vice President regarding the annual preparation and presentation of a unified set of budget recommendations to the President.

Page 30-31

Finally, the Executive Vice President and Provost made the following statement in her first budget development memo, dated October 16, 2007.

In this first year of the Resource Management Model, I expect that the early work of these advisory committees will be heavily focused on gaining an understanding of the activities that are included in the expenses pools and the funding structure for those activities. In addition the committees should develop a sense of priority for the services and activities included in the expense pool. During the fall semester the advisory committees should consider whether services/activities should be enhanced or augmented and the cost implications of doing so.

In getting feedback on the Advisory Committees, we were interested in determining how well the committees seem to be on track to fulfill the purposes described here, as well as how well the committees were managed logistically. In addition, whenever an organization starts up structures like the advisory committees, it will learn more about how they can fulfill that purpose, and even refine what their purpose should be. However careful the design process may be, the organization will evolve its understanding of what these sorts of groups can and should do.

1. First Year Went Well

Overall, the Advisory Committees worked well in their first year, well-organized, meeting most expectations for the year, and achieving high levels of participation.

Year of Orientation

In general, participants in these groups spoke about the committees and the process positively. The most frequent comment about this year was that it provided a great opportunity to learn about what these administrative areas do. Each of the Administrative Service Centers encompasses many units and activities, and most members of the university community are unaware of the entire range. For all of the groups (with the partial exception of the Library Advisory Committee, which was based on an existing advisory group), the committees consisted primarily of people getting their first exposure to the whole picture.

As was expected in this first year (and expressed in the Executive Vice President's letter), the first few months of the committees' meetings were devoted to presentations on each unit, an essential orientation for the committee members. It was a lot of information, but all of the feedback indicated that the presentations and information were well organized. One of the questions we asked was whether the

committee members received the right amount of information—not buried in more detail than necessary, but getting enough to understand the units. The answer to this question was consistently yes, although some participants did acknowledge the challenge of absorbing so much in such a short time.

In addition to being helpful for the committee members, there was a strong belief that the process of preparing these presentations was helpful for the managers of the units. It gave them the opportunity to articulate the service they provide the university, which has inherent management value. There was a sense that it is healthy for the university and for the units for this information to be made more or less public—the benefits of transparency.

Logistics

From a logistics point of view, the meetings were described as well-run, with good notes provided, and materials frequently available on the Internet. Participants were very conscientious about attendance and participation—these committees required a significant time commitment, so one cannot take for granted that all the members would be able to keep up with the meeting schedule. The issues that came up in regard to logistics included some concern that the amount of decision-making falling during December and January does not match student schedules well, and some preference that meetings be held in the same location each time rather than moving around.

Quality of Discussion

Some of the most important positive statements about the advisory committee process related to the nature of the committee composition and conversation. There was appreciation for the broad array of views represented, and several of the feedback sessions mentioned the value of the perspectives students brought to the conversation. At critical junctures, student participants raised critical questions and provided concrete descriptions of the value of certain services and activities.

Participants reported that the meetings had a good tone, with a sense that everyone was in this together. There was a lot of confidence expressed in the management and judgment of the Administrative Service Center administrators. The proof of this may be in the degree of convergence between the views of the administrators and the committee members on priorities for each service area. It seemed to indicate that the administrators are on the right track in evaluating what the community wants and needs.

Limited Impact in First Year

When we asked what impact the committees had this year, the results were mixed. Everyone acknowledged that the impact was probably limited. In almost every case the committees confirmed the priorities of the administrator and did not shape those priorities. In a few cases, they encouraged the administrator to ask for more resources. This is an indicator of that convergence in views, but it's not clear how helpful that is. While on the one hand the administrative areas wanted to find that they are on the right track, they also at times wanted more push-back. In some

cases the committee's advice to ask for more resources conflicted with the administrator's judgment about feasibility.

In her letter, the Executive Vice President asked that the advisory committees "consider whether services/activities should be enhanced or augmented and the cost implications of doing so." It can be said that the committees considered enhancing activities, but the cost implications were limited to whatever information they had on the cost to the Administrative Service Center. The committees did not have the tools this year to look at the full range of cost implications, which would include the impact on the units that would have to pay for these enhancements in the form of allocated costs or reduced availability of central funds.

The committees' impact was felt in subtler ways, such as cases where the administrator was able to adopt language and arguments from the committee discussion. It may be the case that the impact will be felt over many years as the input seeps into the thinking of the administrator and the managers in each area.

At the time of our meetings with the committee members, they were waiting to hear back about the impact of their decisions. It is likely that most of the committees will have discussions of the results at their first meeting in the Fall, but the administrators should consider getting in touch with members before then.

The limited impact this year has risks for the future. If participants do not think they are having an impact, they will be less interested in participating. The process requires a lot of work (and paper, as was mentioned), and this won't be worth it if the groups aren't having an impact.

2. Role of the Advisory Committees

The questions about the committees' impact leads to the question of their role—what impact should they have, especially when it comes down to practical terms of working with these diverse groups within time and other constraints. The question of role is also the most complicated, involving several possible roles, and many ideas emerged on how the committees could play these various roles in the face of technical and other challenges.

To some extent, the desired impact is stated in the material cited at the beginning of the report:

- Provide advice and counsel for budgetary and programmatic decisions
- Recommend the level of funding required
- Influence the administrators when they put together budget proposals

However, the role of the committees and the nature of their intended impact is also to some extent up for definition and refinement. Many of the participants said that going into this year they weren't sure what their role was and felt like the groups figured it out as they went along. Many also expressed an expectation that the role will be different in future years.

In the conversations about the role of the committee, a number of metaphors came up:

- A utility board that sets rates
- A grant review panel, approving proposals across a variety of disciplines
- A sounding board, where administrators try out their ideas
- Representatives of the community who express its interests and will
- A focus group, designed to give some idea about people's attitudes and needs

The main point of these various metaphors is that it shows the variety of ways people can think about the role of the Advisory Committees. The core distinction here may be between a purely advisory role and one that takes on aspects of design or approval—while it is clear that the committees are to be advisory, some advice can take on weight similar to approval. ISU needs to be intentional about where the role of the committees falls on that split between advice and approval.

There are three major areas in which the Advisory Committees might play a larger role in the future, each described below.

Potential Role #1: Constructing Budgets

A critical question is the extent to which Advisory Committees should be involved in the construction of the budget. The budget conversations this year were related to proposals for additional funding. This was a function of the unusual nature of the 2009 budget development as a transition year. In an effort to establish baselines, the university was considering what expenses should be within the base. Now that the base has been established and the Advisory Committees have received an orientation on what is in the base, they could try to play more of an upfront role in putting together the budget, introducing budget formulation priorities and evaluating the level of expense that will be charged to the Resource Responsibility Centers.

Potential Role #2: Assessing Total Resource Base and Service Levels

This year, the Advisory Committees heard about the entire range of activities and received information about funding, but they did not assess the use of the unit's current resource base. Moreover, the Advisory Committees did not really have information on the impact their decisions would have on the Resource Responsibility Centers. This year, because the baselines were being established, incremental spending only has an impact on the Resource Responsibility Centers in the general sense of reducing resources that would otherwise be available, not in specific ways as will be the case when increases may go into overhead allocations. (Although if increases are funded "off the top," the situation will continue to be more like this year.)

In the future, the committees might also address the trade offs necessary to maintain service levels within flat resources, or in cases where inflationary and volume pressures outstrip new resources. The committees would become a party to discussions on internal allocations within the Administrative Service Centers, which in practical terms are critical to the question of overall service levels.

- This year the deliberations of the Advisory Committees didn't deal with internal resource competition, but there was some acknowledgement that it is in the background. Administrators are hearing some comments like

“why wasn’t there some discussion of reducing cost or service.” However, people also recognize that the services these units provide are critical.

Potential Role #3: Programmatic Guidance

The Advisory Committee could be thought of as the standing strategic planning committee for each area, involved in charting future direction for the area and helping the administrator decide on priorities for the use of resources, whether the total pool of resources goes up, stays the same, or diminishes. The committee could be involved in creating multi-year strategic plans, or reviewing them. It is likely that committees will become increasingly interested in the multi-year priorities, because they will guide the trajectory of costs and services in each unit—if the committees become more involved in the cost impact on the Resource Responsibility Centers, discussion and debate over strategy may be essential.

Reasons for caution on extending the roles of the Advisory Committees

On their face, these extensions of the Advisory Committee roles are reasonable. For example, it would seem to be the case that the charge to the Advisory Committees to evaluate the funding level required to provide the necessary type and quality of service would necessarily involve assessing the entire range of activities and all of the funding available. However, there are several issues that could limit the ability of committees to step into this sort of analysis—while there are plausible responses to these concerns, the concerns must be taken seriously.

- First of all, the budgets are complex, and the committees faced enough challenge in developing a basic understanding of the range of services involved. Some participants acknowledge this, and the complexity of matching resources and programs.
- In discussing the activity of the committees this year, it was noted that some of the lack of tough questioning could be attributed to the lack of committee members with broad administrative experience. That same issue might make it difficult for them to take a more active role in shaping the budget or making specific tradeoff recommendations.
- Other comments included the possibility that the administrators have political insight that they may not be able to share with the committee, and that the size and diversity of the committees (one of their strengths) makes it difficult for them to arrive at a single, unified set of recommendations.

Perhaps the most important consideration is that the role of the committee is advisory to the administrator, and that it is important to preserve the power of the administrators to lead their units and manage their budgets.

There were several areas of concern related to the impact of the Advisory Committee process on the role of administrators:

- The process seems to limit discretion of administrators. Once the Advisory Committee signs off, it becomes harder for the administrator to change directions, even if subsequent events and developments suggest that is the best course.
- There is a question now on how to handle changes that occur between time committees do their work and the final budget.

- Administrators didn't have the same kind of access to decision-makers in the new configuration. One solution would be to include time for each ASC administrator to meet with the EVP on budget priorities, decisions, and trade-offs. The Resource Management Model is not intended to change the organization chart—current lines of communication and authority need to be preserved.

Recommendation: Institute a formal step in the budget process for ASC administrators to meet with the Executive Vice President on budget priorities, decisions, and trade-offs.

If the Advisory Committees go deeper into making and evaluating budgets

If the Advisory Committees should go deeper into the budget process, what should they cover, and how can they do it? There's a variety of aspects of the budget the groups could look at, and with any of them technical considerations about how to bring relatively large, diverse groups like these into the assessment and advisory process.

Some of the possible areas for the Advisory Committees to consider:

- Service mix
 - Service levels and possible cuts in services.
 - Duplications of service, coordination between ASCs and colleges.
- Internal and external impact of budget decisions
 - Who should do what/fund what. (This was discussed by some Advisory Committees this year.)
 - Look at all funds—RRC portions, activities funded from charge-backs.
 - Fee structures. Consistency of methods for setting and applying internal charges.
 - How ASC costs are allocated to RRCs and the impact of decisions/changes.
 - Reallocations within an area if funding is not approved.
- Managing the process. In all of these cases, the proper role might lie with UBAC more than the Advisory Committees, and even more might be a responsibility of the EVP.
 - Referee the "rules" of RMM.
 - Evaluate the deans' budgetary actions, look at allocations down to the department level. Some people on the committees are concerned that local decisions about resource allocation will create disincentives. Others described the potential role as more one of reporting than intervention.
 - Accountability for allocations. Establish processes and policies to follow up on allocations to see if units receiving those allocations succeeded in producing the programs and results for which the allocation was made.
 - Discussion of the "common good." Several times over the last year the question of the common good has come up. Some people think Iowa State University should continue to discuss what services and programs are common goods and look at the means of funding them.

- Programmatic oversight
 - Do committees need to hear reports on developments in their area throughout the year, not just during the budget development cycle? (For a few examples, ISU Alert, changes in regulatory requirements, or a potential move to g-Mail.)
 - Should the committee review information on the effectiveness of the units in their Administrative Service Center?

Recommendation: Advisory Committees need to expand their role in certain areas from their activity in 2007-08, but in keeping with the guidelines for the committees. They need to:

- *Consider cost impacts of their decisions on the RRCs. This will require access to institutional planning models.*
- *Discuss desired service levels.*
- *While the Advisory Committees are not in a position to serve as the Strategic Planning Committee for the units, they should receive reports on the units' strategic plans and specific future program and service developments.*

Steps that could make it more feasible for Advisory Committees to take on a heavier role

If the Advisory Committees are to take a more active role in the analysis and evaluation of budgets and service levels, there are some steps they might take to make it more feasible to get to this level of detail.

- Divide the committees into subcommittees to go deeper into budget details and evaluate funding, service levels, and tradeoffs. This will be most appropriate where there are discrete sub-units within the Administrative Service Center.
- Provide budget parameters or a fixed dollar amount so that discussion occurs with some sense of boundaries. Priorities are different if constrained. This would be helpful even in a process similar to this year.
 - Committee members wondered whether units should look at blue sky ideas or focus on the incremental steps to advance their program.
- Provide information on the overarching goals for the Resource Management Model, i.e., the basis on which the entire system will be evaluated. This information could be used by the Advisory Committees as a basis for evaluating proposals and funding priorities.
- Consider "what if" exercises. Have administrators present more information on what will happen if Iowa State University does not do what is proposed.
 - A more sophisticated version of this idea would be to present all proposals within a comprehensive risk framework.
- Have the administrators present the committees with more alternatives. Given the timeline this year, it was probably the case that the Advisory Committees did not have time to consider multiple alternatives for most proposals.
- One person suggested creating separate pools for academic and administrative priorities based on the argument that it is not possible to trade off across that split (e.g., IT resources).
 - Another person suggested splitting proposals between big and small, and create a separate budget for "blue sky."
- Focus the Advisory Committee on the base costs, and leave more ambitious proposals for Presidential initiatives

- Establish whether the Administrative Service Center budget should grow in relation to other factors. Again, this would establish baseline parameters.

Recommendations

- *Divide into subcommittees to do detailed work on the budget*
- *Provide broad budget parameters to guide decisions on incremental resources*
- *Provide guidelines or ground rules for growth in the Administrative Service Center expense base—under what conditions will the University assume that the Administrative Service Center will receive incremental funding, as opposed to assuming that the Administrative Service Center will first try to accommodate increased costs or services within its current resource base.*
- *Delineate the overarching goals for the Resource Management Model*
- *Instill risk assessment into the discussion of allocations and proposals*

3. University Budget Advisory Committee

Beyond the role of the Advisory Committees, there were a number of questions about the role of the University Budget Advisory Committee and the flows of information and decision-making between the Advisory Committees and UBAC

Relation to Advisory Committees

The feedback sessions made several comments that dealt with the relationship between the Advisory Committees and UBAC:

- Most administrators did not get a chance to present to UBAC.
- Advisory Committees wanted a chance to present and explain their priorities to UBAC. UBAC may have been conscientious about discerning the Advisory Committee's intentions, but the members felt disconnected from decisions. Among their comments:
 - "They didn't hear our conversation."
 - One person described UBAC as a "black box"
- One possibility floated was that the chair of the Advisory Committee and the administrator would present to UBAC. This may not be appropriate, since the Advisory Committees are supposed to be advisory to the administrator and it is not clear they should be "making their case" independently to UBAC

Recommendation: Have the Administrative Service Center Administrator present his or her budget proposal to UBAC. The chair of the Advisory Committee should attend this meeting, but not make a presentation.

Role of UBAC

In general, there is a need to clarify the roles of UBAC, the Budget Cabinet, and the Senior Leadership Group when it comes to managing the Resource Management Model and making decisions in the budget process. Some of the specific concerns are

- Which group referees the “rules” of the Resource Management Model? An example of these rules is under what conditions are units allowed to charge other units.
- Which group decides the size of the allocated pools? This question also relates to the role of the Advisory Committees, another place where the university could initiate this decision.
- How far will any of these groups go in evaluating the actions and budgetary performance of the RRCs? Is it appropriate for one of the groups mentioned above to ask the RRCs to prepare business plans for review?
- At the UBAC level, what is the basis for evaluating tradeoffs between units?

Recommendation: Clarify and document the roles of UBAC, the Budget Cabinet, and the Senior Leadership Group.

4. Committee composition

In this section and the ones that follow, various related comments from the feedback sessions are presented, followed by recommendations drawn from the comments, in most cases pulling out participant suggestions that seem most worthy of adoption as a matter of policy.

- Try to put more “constructive skeptics” on the committee. In some committees, the people were selected because they are already engaged with the area—they are already advocates, and they may focus more on details about the areas they know best. The ideal combination is someone who has this level of familiarity but who is able to step back and ask hard questions. It is not necessary to have a committee full of people like this, but have at least a few on each.
- Look for people who have had administrative roles and have an institutional perspective and a sense of where discussions fit in the bigger budget picture.
- Put more of the student representatives on two-year terms if possible.
 - Have the President and Executive Vice President meet with student groups to stress importance of the student representation and encourage them to make these nominations a priority.
- Consider replacing the Dean of the Library with another representative of the Library. Having the Dean there gives the appearance of greater access.
- Minimize change of members within terms if possible. All of the committees are probably following this principle as much as possible already, but it is worth reinforcing the wisdom of this practice.

Recommendations

- *Look for “constructive skeptics” and people with administrative roles or experiences when selecting committee members.*
- *Put some student representatives on two-year terms, and involve the President and Executive Vice President in recruiting student groups to find volunteers.*

5. Information

- Provide feedback on results in this year's budget formulation process. Cover this at the Advisory Committee's first meeting next fall, and also try to send an e-mail summary during the summer. The University could schedule a meeting for everyone to hear from the Executive Vice President and President.
- Provide a budget framework at the beginning. What do we see when we look down the road? This should come from Executive Vice President or President as well as the Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning.
 - Committees didn't realize how little money was available.
- President and/or Executive Vice President meet with each committee to express their appreciation and their expectations from the committee. Cover University priorities for the year and what issues the EVP wants the committee to make or look into this year. Could meet with them during the year, while the committees are at work.
- People need to know that their input is having an impact, or else they will lose interest and engagement in this process.
- Want more on future goals/planning—this year a lot of time was taken with what we do today. The decisions on resource levels and use need to reflect how the administrators expect service to change.
- More (and more consistent) information on RMM policy changes. This should be less of an issue next year as most policy questions will be resolved.
- Need information on impact of the Resource Management Model—how does it change things, how is it reshaping the budget? At this stage most of this information would come from models, perhaps from an analysis of restated budgets. Over time, there will be more information on the actual impact of the Resource Management Model.

Recommendations

- *Provide feedback on results of the FY09 budget formulation process in comparison to each committee's recommendations. In addition to covering this at the first meeting in the new year, Administrative Support Center administrators should send an e-mail update during the summer.*
- *Provide each committee with a budget framework at the beginning of the year, including information on what the administration anticipates going into the budget cycle.*
- *Have the President and/or Executive Vice President meet with each committee to express appreciation for the committee's service, discuss University priorities and budget prospects, and describe the decisions and issues they want the committee to address during the year.*
- *Administrative Support Center Administrators should provide more information on future goals and plans.*
- *Provide information on how the budget is being reshaped under the Resource Management Model.*

6. Communications

- Put meeting materials on the Web.
- Consider streaming major presentations and discussions.

- Clarify the extent to which discussion and information in meetings are confidential.
- Look for ways to communicate back to constituent groups—faculty, students, P&S staff, college leadership. However, members don't serve on the committee as a representative. Their advice to each other was to be selective about what you can take back. They also noted that other points of communication are in place, such as college IT specialists who work closely with ITS.

Recommendations

- *Put as much committee material as possible on the Web.*
- *Stream major presentations and discussions for reference by committee members and in some cases to communicate to the rest of the campus.*
- *Clarify the extent to which committee discussion and information are confidential.*

7. Organization

This year the committees were well-organized, so most of these comments are observations more than recommendations

- Next year the groups expect an earlier start, and not as much time spent on background
- Provide an orientation session for new members, including people who start mid-year
 - Most of the committees probably already have plans to do this.
- Don't change the meeting location and time.
- Consider timing, especially student schedules. If there is a January deadline for feedback, with decision by mid-January, that creates a tough fit with finals and break. May have to reach decisions even earlier.
- There are other reasons to look at the calendar. The University Budget Advisory Committee may want to do its prioritizing earlier, so it would need input from the Advisory Committees earlier.
- One option would be to ask the committees to do real advance planning—e.g., they would have used this Spring to provide ideas for FY10, which the administrator would factor into the preparation of the budget in the Fall. This approach would redirect the committees from a focus on preparation of the next budget proposal to a longer-term view.
- Make sure materials get to committees with enough time for review
- In another timeline question, the salary package may require revisiting the rates for allocated costs during the budget cycle.

Recommendations

- *Provide an orientation session for new members, including people who start mid-year.*

Summary of recommendations

Position of Administrators in budget process

- Institute a formal step in the budget process for Administrative Service Center Administrators to meet with the Executive Vice President on budget priorities, decisions, and trade-offs.

Role of Advisory Committees

- Advisory Committees need to expand their role in certain areas from their activity in 2007-08, but in keeping with the guidelines for the committees. They need to:
 - Consider cost impacts of their decisions on the RRCs. This will require access to institutional planning models.
 - Discuss desired service levels.
 - While the Advisory Committees are not in a position to serve as the Strategic Planning Committee for the units, they should receive reports on the units' strategic plans and specific future program and service developments.

Enabling an expanded Advisory Committee role

- Divide into subcommittees to do detailed work on the budget
- Provide broad budget parameters to guide decisions on incremental resources
- Provide guidelines or ground rules for growth in the Administrative Service Center expense base—under what conditions will the University assume that the Administrative Service Center will receive incremental funding, as opposed to assuming that the Administrative Service Center will first try to accommodate increased costs or services within its current resource base.
- Delineate the overarching goals for the Resource Management Model
- Instill risk assessment into the discussion of allocations and proposals

Relation of UBAC and Advisory Committees

- Have the Administrative Service Center Administrator present his or her budget proposal to UBAC. The chair of the Advisory Committee should attend this meeting, but not make a presentation.

Role of UBAC

- Clarify and document the roles of UBAC, the Budget Cabinet, and the Senior Leadership Group.

Committee Composition

- Look for “constructive skeptics” and people with administrative roles or experiences when selecting committee members.
- Put some student representatives on two year terms, and involve the President and Executive Vice President in recruiting student groups to find volunteers.

Information

- Provide feedback on results of the FY09 budget formulation process in comparison to each committee's recommendations. In addition to covering this at the first meeting in the new year. Administrative Service Center Administrators should send an e-mail update during the summer.

- Provide each committee with a budget framework at the beginning of the year, including information on what the administration anticipates going into the budget cycle.
- Have the President and/or Executive Vice President meet with each committee to express appreciation for the committee's service, discuss University priorities and budget prospects, and describe the decisions and issues they want the committee to address during the year.
- Administrative Service Center administrators should provide more information on future goals and plans.
- Provide information on how the budget is being reshaped under the Resource Management Model.

Communications

- Put as much committee material as possible on the Internet.
- Stream major presentations and discussions for reference by committee members and in some cases to communicate to the rest of the campus.
- Clarify the extent to which committee discussion and information are confidential.

Organization

- Provide an orientation session for new members, including people who start mid-year.