

**Rutgers University Senate
Budget and Finance Committee (BFC)
Report and Recommendations on
University Planning and All Funds Budgeting (AFB)
April 2011**

1. The Charge

S-0914 - All-Funds Budgeting Integration: Investigate the integration of all-funds budgeting with the university planning objectives and its implementation. Also investigate how all-funds budgeting applies at the department level

2. Acknowledgement

This charge provides the Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) the opportunity to summarize and report to the Senate our continued interest, work and ongoing discussions within the committee as well as with the University administration regarding the completion of implementation of all-funds budgeting. Our work started with the issuance of Charge S-0504, and the subsequent report on that charge that was adopted by the Senate in January 2008¹. Following the Senate's adoption of the BFC's recommendations on that charge, and in response to a related suggestion made by President McCormick, the BFC went through a series of discussions regarding the implementation and planning processes on all-funds budgeting.

The current charge was dealt with extensively in several meetings of the Senate's Budget and Finance Committee, and on many other occasions by a designated subcommittee during the 2008/9, 2009/10, and 2010/2011 academic years. Members of the Budget and Finance Committee met with many members of the Rutgers community for formal and informal discussions regarding this charge. The committee formally interviewed eight deans and equivalent unit heads, in addition to three who had been interviewed as part of the first phase focus on all-funds budgeting (hereinafter, "unit head" applies to all levels between department head and central administration, including deans, executive deans, chancellors, etc.). We had multiple discussions with EVP Furmanski, and VP Nancy Winterbauer regarding academic planning at Rutgers. Below the decanal level there were multiple types of input, including four formal interviews with department chairs and many informal discussions; discussions within the AFB committee, which included faculty members, students, staff, and deans; and group discussions with the University Senate's Faculty Caucus and the AAUP executive board.

The information, help and support received from these colleagues is gratefully acknowledged. Unless explicitly quoted, we cannot separate the committee's opinions and suggestions from those brought to our attention by others, and we assume the responsibility as if they were originated by us.

¹ This report is attached here in Appendix A, in order avoid unnecessary repetition of information.

3. Scope of the Charge

The scope of this charge is limited to the Rutgers University budget that is subject to all-funds budgeting (AFB) rules. Currently, only the academic units of the university operate under these rules. AFB has not yet been implemented in the administrative units. Rough calculations suggest that only about 35% (to 45%) of the budget is covered by this academic planning.

4. Findings

Executive Vice President Furmanski has stated repeatedly that all-funds budgeting is subordinate to planning, and that the main priority of planning is academic excellence. While budget awareness throughout Rutgers is essential in times of financial constraint, it cannot create excellence. Planning is intended to focus on the key priorities of the University. This is a heavy burden to put on the planning process, and it is therefore essential that it be as effective as possible. Our charge was to assess how well it is working.

A few themes emerged clearly from these inquiries:

1. The current planning process is a major improvement on the past

Those with long memories recalled that a decade ago resources were allocated almost entirely ad hoc between the central administration and deans: when deans had special requirements – important hires, new initiatives, and building projects – they went to the administration and asked for special consideration. The University became a tangled web of special agreements, some of which had been made many decades before and therefore made it impossible to develop consistent strategies. This ad-hoc approach has been greatly modified in recent years, primarily through ongoing discussions and consistent application of policies. All the deans we spoke to agreed that the current system described below, on balance, is a major improvement.

Currently, the key short-term planning mechanism is a yearly conversation between administration's academic officers and each dean (or equivalent). In New Brunswick, this officer is Executive Vice President Furmanski while Chancellor Pritchett and Chancellor Diner handle these responsibilities in Camden and Newark respectively. At these meetings, the deans are asked to review their unit's recent accomplishments, and provide a plan for achieving their strategic goals. Deans are expected to seek resources for new initiatives on their own, and to ask for central administration's resources only when they contribute to important University priorities. Even in those cases, the University contributions are ordinarily temporary loans rather than long-term commitments. As a result of the all-funds-budgeting process, the rules regarding resource allocation are far more reliable and transparent than in the past. Still, some budgetary aspects continue to remain obscure, even to some of the deans.

The consensus among the participants interviewed was that these planning discussions are very constructive, helping units focus their priorities and achieving a considerable degree of strategic coherence. Units do not need to come hat-in-hand for basic ongoing expenses, as in the past, but must discuss and justify proposals for new investments and initiatives. A number of deans stressed that VP

Furmanski has been consistent and has kept commitments; he has not sought to “grab back” funds from the units in order to meet other needs, which has given the deans a sense of confidence in making multiyear plans.

2. *Opportunities for improvement*

- a. *The planning process and its relation to all-funds budgeting is poorly understood by most faculty and staff.*

The concept of all-funds budgeting has begun to affect action at all levels, but almost no one of those we consulted below the decanal level understands the all-funds-budgeting process and how it relates to the planning process. As one dean put it, “What has gotten through is the revenue-generation message.”

Most department chairs – to say nothing of faculty or staff in general – are just beginning to grapple with the AFB incentives, and remain almost completely unaware of other planning priorities. They do not understand the broad flexibility embedded in the AFB process that allows deans to pursue a variety of creative revenue-generating possibilities, nor how any of these choices might affect a unit’s overall planning priorities. As a result, we are concerned that a fear expressed by this committee in our January 2008 report to the Senate may be materializing: AFB has largely focused chairs and faculty on increasing class size, and has dominated other academic values and priorities at that level.

Many in the University remain hostile to the idea of all-funds budgeting, seeing it as essentially pushing towards larger classes and lower costs. Student representatives to the BFC, and even some of the deans we interviewed, echoed this concern. The administration notes that the pressure on costs comes not from AFB but from cumulative state budget cuts over the last decade or more. AFB has nevertheless become a focus of much of the resulting tension. This suspicion may lead to further tension without increased understanding and engagement.

- b. *Planning processes are poorly understood and inconsistently applied below the decanal level*

The goal of all-funds budgeting is to help units plan more effectively by giving deans more budgeting predictability and transparency, as well as flexibility over the use and generation of revenue. EVP Furmanski has often expressed the philosophy that units must work out their own planning mechanisms, and that no “cookie cutter” approach dictated by the central administration could succeed across the diverse structures. Such a philosophy of decentralization certainly has its attractions, but there are many units where there is little or no open discussion of planning, and very few in which faculty and staff are genuinely aware of and engaged in the process. This leads to unresolved tensions between local values and priorities and the broader challenges facing the University.

In a few units, especially some smaller ones, chairs and faculty are fairly well tied in to the larger planning process and have regular meetings with the unit head around budgets and priorities. In most cases, however, those we spoke to were at best dimly aware of such processes.

We did not find a consistent desire for more engagement. Some advocated it, but others were pessimistic about its potential. Without a wider survey of a random sample we cannot be sure of the distribution of these views. Several deans said they found it difficult to engage faculty and department chairs in planning efforts because departments have little incentive to consider broader unit and university interests; thus, they see little reason to take the extra time to conduct discussions, write reports, and so on, unless there is a direct threat to programs in which they are involved.

Unit heads we interviewed expressed very diverse philosophies about how to handle planning. Some sought to systematically increase engagement of faculty and staff, but others were more concerned with maintaining sufficient discretion and resources needed to manage changing demands.

c. There are inadequate mechanisms for creating and discussing long-term visions.

The university's system for planning, as now established, centers on individual units and their yearly objectives, or multi-year projects. There seem to be few ways of developing or communicating the longer-term direction of the University and how different parts can contribute to that direction. Raising the visibility of Rutgers' strategic goals and priorities, and promulgating standards that frame decanal planning meetings, would strengthen the overall context for planning at the decanal level. Several deans said that they do not have enough opportunities to exchange information and ideas with their peers, outside of focused projects and task forces. While EVP Furmanski has encouraged partnerships among deans, and there are some successful examples, some feel that more opportunities for general exchange would be helpful. Deans also told us that they would benefit from discussions of strategies for dealing with what appears to be a broad and deep shift in attitudes towards public universities, and a fundamental change in financing models. The University's plans to combat these growing dangers are not widely known. One dean noted that Cornell has recently conducted such a process. Providing mechanisms for broader exchange of practices among the deans for internal planning, as well as sharing plans across decanal units would strengthen overall University planning.

d. Some units have moved forward with more coordinated planning processes.

Some units have begun to engage faculty and staff to a greater degree in planning. The School of Arts and Sciences-New Brunswick conducted a thorough, long-term planning process over the past two years, involving committees that included chairs and faculty, as well as an advisory council of alumni and donors. The School of Environmental and Biological Sciences has created a new position of associate dean for planning and budget, and has asked chairs to provide plans in preparation for the annual meeting with Vice President Furmanski. Many units, although not all, have moved towards increased budget transparency. Our discussions with faculty and chairs indicate cautiously positive reactions to these initiatives, though they are generally too new to have had major impact, and many people are reserving judgment. Nevertheless, the lack of consistency in planning processes across the university, even in principle, is marked and, in our view, troubling.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We believe that the directions set by the administration have led to major improvements in budgeting transparency and predictability, in planning, and in shared understanding throughout Rutgers University. At the same time, we believe the time is right – indeed, there is an urgent need – to move beyond the current level to a more systematic planning approach, and to increase awareness of, and involvement in, planning within units.

The Budget and Finance Committee does not feel it would be appropriate to recommend detailed processes. There was general agreement within the BFC on the need for greater involvement and shared understanding, but it was felt the specifics should emerge from discussions among administrators, faculty, and staff. There is no appetite for a new set of bureaucratic procedures.

The following are some general recommendations for enhancing planning processes across the university:

- Develop more discussion of long-term strategies as well as the annual priorities.
- Articulate the University’s strategic plans and priorities more widely in the community to create a better context for unit planning.
- Continue and accelerate efforts to increase the transparency of budgeting mechanisms throughout the University in the academic and in the administrative units.
- Develop principles for planning processes to be consistently applied across the University and at various levels, such as increased transparency and involvement.
- Create forums for leaders, especially at the decanal level, to share information and best practices around planning and revenue generation.

While the thrust of our recommendations is a call to develop more consistency in planning processes, we also want to avoid the two major dangers of bureaucratization of the academic planning process, on the one hand, and excessive centralization, on the other. Rutgers’ tradition, as one dean noted, allows an unusual degree of unit autonomy, and the academic tradition certainly values autonomy for faculty. Attempts at some universities to strengthen administrative control by fiat have created destructive conflict. Thus we believe that the appropriate approach is one of engagement through multi-level discussion, and, in particular, consultation with a variety of faculty members that are not an integral part of the administrative pyramid. However, the pressure on public universities is rapidly increasing and creating serious challenges which require attention to more coordinated involvement of all members of the community.

Budget and Finance Committee

Spiegel, Menahem, RBS-Newark/NB (F), Chair

Atkins, Robert, CCAS (F)

Barone, Joseph, Pharmacy (F)

Canavan, Peter, SEBS (S)

Di Vito, Timothy, Camden Staff
Dutta, Manoranjan, SAS-NB (F)
Farmer, Jr., John, Law-N Dean (A)
Farris, Thomas, Engineering Dean (A)
Fehn, Bruce, Sr. VP for Finance and Administration (A) - *Administrative Liaison, Executive Committee Liaison*
Figueira, Thomas, SAS-NB (F)
Gaunt, Marianne, VP for Information Services and University Librarian (A)
Grant, Crystal, Newark Staff
Heckscher, Charles, SMLR (F)
Jasey, Kyle, RBS:Grad.Prog.-N/NB (S)
Lerner, Zachary, SAS-NB (S)
Loftus, Barbara, NB Staff
Mann, Adrian, GS-NB (F)
McKeever, Kenneth, At-Large NB (F)
Miller, Mark, SEBS (F)
Molloy, Christopher, Pharmacy Dean (A)
Muse, Jonathan, Camden Staff
Narayan, Sughosh, RBS:UN (S)
Nayyar, Aymen, SB-C (S)
Norville, William, Alumni Association
Patel, Bhavin, SAS-NB (S)
Pinchuk, William, PTL-C (F)
Rosario, Daniel, NCAS (S)
Sabo, Lester, SAS-NB (S)
Sahi, Siddhartha, SAS-NB (F)
Samarakone, Richard, Engineering (S)
Shafer, Glenn, RBS-N/NB Interim Dean (A)
Singh, Sandeep, CCAS (S)
Singh, Saurabh, RBS:UN (S)
Wilson, Robert, At-Large NB (F)
Winterbauer, Nancy, VP for Budgeting (A)
Wyhopen, Carl, Alumni Association

APPENDIX A:

Rutgers University Senate Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) Report and Recommendations on All Funds Budgeting (AFB) January 2008

1. The Charge

Charge S-0504: Review and evaluate the processes and policies related to All Funds Budgeting. Report to Senate Executive Committee by May 2007.

2. Acknowledgement

This charge was dealt with extensively in several meetings of the Senate Budget and Finance Committee and on many other occasions by a designated subcommittee during the 2006/2007 academic year. Members of the Budget and Finance committee met with many members of the Rutgers community for formal and informal discussions regarding this charge. The subcommittee met with Executive Vice President Philip Furmanski and Vice President Nancy Winterbauer for lengthy discussions, as well as with provosts, deans, department chairs and other faculty members, administrators, and staff. We gratefully acknowledge the help, information and support received from each and every one of these colleagues. Unless explicitly quoted, we cannot separate the committee's opinion and suggestions from those brought to our attention by others, and we assume the responsibility as if they were originated by us.

3. Summary

The University Senate's Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) and the University administration consider the implementation of All-Funds Budgeting (AFB) a move in the right direction for the university community. AFB is expected to increase the transparency and efficiency of shared governance by creating budgetary incentives and by shifting fiscal responsibility from central administration down to the functioning units. However, as is often the case, the details are of major importance for the success of the initiative.

The detailed report below reviews the AFB issues raised in our lengthy discussions. Implementation of AFB is a long process, and one of the recommendations of this report is to maintain an ongoing, open discussion with the administration regarding some issues that are important to all members of the Rutgers community.

At the current rates, the scope of AFB and the automatic payment received from tuition is somewhat limited. As total tuition income is less than the cost of education, the "net tuition" received by the units is usually smaller than their operating expenses, necessitating allocation of additional funds (sometimes

referred to as “Basic Subsidies”). The lack of clear information regarding the allocation of these additional funds might undermine some of the main goals of AFB, as discussed below.

4. The current state of AFB

1) All-Funds Budgeting has so far been presented and understood primarily as a new method of allocating revenues and expenses, emphasizing local responsibility for generating revenues. However, the leaders of the effort – Executive Vice President For Academic Affairs Philip Furmanski and Vice President for University Budgeting Nancy Winterbauer – are seeking to fundamentally reframe this characterization: they emphasize that budgeting is only a part of a larger effort which centers on *planning*. Their goal is to “create a process where people lay out their visions and plans, with a sense of the budget for accomplishing them.”

2) For the planning system, according to Executive Vice President Furmanski, *the single priority is academic excellence*; budgeting goals are subordinate.

a) The fundamental planning process is a regular planning dialogue between units and administration. Deans are expected to present their priorities and to justify them as ways of improving academic excellence. Each academic unit is responsible for defining its own mission and criteria of academic excellence.

In these meetings EVP Furmanski seeks a conversation about progress to date, planning for the future, and needed investments. He asks deans what investments they have made to advance their missions, what programs they propose for the future, and how they propose to provide the needed resources. This planning, with a clear view to the funding needed to accomplish the plans, is intended to encourage serious consideration to the tradeoffs between various spending choices, and to encourage realistic planning within available resources.

b) Units ordinarily must generate the resources to fund their academic plans. At times, however, the criterion of academic excellence may mean that certain initiatives will be funded by the administration even when money is not available to the unit. Conversely, some activities of units may not be allowed even if these units have the requisite money.

c) To the extent that the central administration provides funds for new initiatives, it does so as an investment. It acts as a “bank” rather than as a “foundation,” and expects a plan for repayment or at least self-sufficiency over time.

d) There is no specific required planning process beyond the decanal level. The administration urges all units to conduct internal planning discussions, but believes that the format should be left flexible to accommodate differences of history, size, etc.

3) As a budgeting mechanism, the All-Funds Budgeting has two main purposes:

a) To create a transparent, consistent process for allocation of resources across the University. In the past, budgets were heavily influenced by tradition and special deals. The AFB effort aims to move beyond this to a consistent set of principles and processes. This is a complicated problem in itself, requiring new databases, reporting processes, etc., and the process is still incomplete.

b) To make all levels of the University “budget-aware,” especially faculty, staff, and others who have rarely paid attention to the financial consequences of their decisions.

i) Goals as stated by Vice President for University Budgeting Nancy Winterbauer include:

- “more attention to increasing revenue sources that units have greater control over”;
- “greater incentives to increase certain revenues by equitable and more aggressive allocation to generating units”;
- “clearer understanding of effects of actions on revenues, e.g. enrollment/tuition link and effects of tuition discounting”; and
- more flexibility in the use of resources to encourage better use of limited funds and deliberations regarding possible tradeoffs of various spending choices.

Thus the budgeting system seeks to increase decentralization and local responsibility for revenues. For example, it has become easier to move dollars between salary and non-salary categories, and the indirect cost return to units for grants has been increased from 10.5% to 42% this year (FY08), with an eventual goal of as much as 50%.

The budgeting system provides strong incentives to maintain or increase unit enrollments: enrollment declines or increases can have immediate and very visible impact on departmental budgets.

Vice President Winterbauer: “When you’re making choices about enrollments and class sizes, you want to think about what you want to accomplish and also about revenue consequences.”

4) These changes involve deep cultural reorientations which are expected to take some years to percolate through the University. In EVP Furmanski’s words, the goal is “a culture of self-determination” in which units take active responsibility for academic excellence within a realistic budgetary framework, with less dependence on central administration.

5) AFB implementation at Rutgers

a) There are two basic rules for budget allocations between central administration and the decanal units:

- i) 55% of tuition dollars are returned to the deans; 45% is held by the central administration for shared services and administrative overhead.

- The returned dollars are then further divided: 70% to the dean of the teaching unit, and 30% to the enrolling unit.
- Exceptions: 85% of tuition from qualified off-campus and Internet courses are returned to the originating unit. Similarly, 77% and 80% of Summer Session and Wintersession tuition are returned to the units.

ii) 42% of research Indirect Cost Return (ICR) dollars are currently (FY08) returned to the dean of the originating units (with plans to continue increasing this share); the remainder is held by the central administration to support administrative costs.

b) The 45% share for central administration covers *actual expenses* for shared services such as power, maintenance, etc. It does not include any “reserve” funds for investment or special allocations. As a result, it could vary in the future depending on expenses. Sharp shifts in energy costs, for instance, could lead to changes in the 45% share.

c) Deans have discretion on how they distribute the returned dollars within their units.

d) Funds for investments in new initiatives, etc., come from other sources, such as primarily donations, summer school tuition, and indirect cost return (ICR) from research grants. These are allocated and disbursed campus-by-campus. New Brunswick initiatives, for instance, are funded by New Brunswick donations, Summer Session, and ICR.

6) The implementation is still in a relatively early phase, with many incomplete elements:

a) AFB has not yet been fully implemented in all the appropriate administrative units.

b) In the academic units, decision processes vary widely in structure and effectiveness. Some provosts and deans discuss allocations with their subordinates; others apparently do not.

i) AFB has apparently not been rolled out in Newark as far as it has been in New Brunswick.

c) When AFB was started, each decanal unit was given a "basic subsidy" to maintain its budget at historic levels. Subsequent budget adjustments were made from that base. Unit budgets still contain a "basic subsidy" line which is relatively constant but may vary with changes in the state budget. The subsidy has indeed changed as state appropriations have varied both up and down.

5. Current views of faculty, staff, other stakeholders, and the administration:

We have found that understanding of the AFB initiative among faculty and staff is still poor. There is very little knowledge of the *planning* process in most units, and the *budgeting* process has gotten somewhat more attention and is often viewed with concern. The administration acknowledges need for better communication and education, but it also argues that many of the concerns are unfounded.

Widely-expressed concerns, along with the administration’s current view:

1) Allocation of expenses:

a) Units are now required to cover salary and FASIP increases for their faculty and staff. This raises the possibility that some units might not be able to cover negotiated contractual increases, or that units might have incentives to deny merit increases to individuals who are eligible for merit increases. Some see this as a kind of “unfunded mandate.” Similar concerns may apply to recruiting and to the salaries of new faculty.

The administration believes that this concern is a fundamental misunderstanding. If salaries increase, other budget items must be reduced. This was true both before and after the introduction of AFB. AFB merely clarifies this link, and gives local units more discretion in making the needed cuts or finding new revenues to avoid them. In unusual cases, where units have real problems covering commitments, central funds may be used to help, ordinarily on a “loan” basis.

b) Some units that have received ICR increases say that they have been asked to take on other expenses that previously were borne by the central administration, such as electricity or building renovations.

The administration says that despite these perceptions, all basic shared services, including electricity and building maintenance, continue to be paid from the central funds. Renovations and expansions of plant may be paid for in a number of ways, such as: from local all-funds budgets, from special investments by the central administration, or by state bond issues.

2) Uncertainty and difficulty in planning unit budgets

a) AFB is resulting in a considerable increase in variation of unit budgets from year to year. The normal quasi-random fluctuation of enrollment and grants will have deep impacts on operating budgets and make it difficult for the units to plan for the future.

The administration’s view is that units must begin to engage in contingency planning with a recognition of the likely range of variation. For particularly onerous or unexpected changes, the administration has enough discretion to help.

The administration has rejected notions such as rolling averages or “insurance” against sudden changes because they have found that these allow units to let problems go unaddressed for too long; and because they believe it is better to have a hard rule with some flexibility in the system. They acknowledge, however, that this is an issue worth watching.

3) Excessive focus on grants and enrollment increases, potentially at the expense of other priorities. Various parties we have spoken have expressed concerns such as:

a) that support for PhD programs and others with low tuition returns will be reduced;

b) that faculty will avoid independent study, mentoring, special research experiences, and other low-enrollment teaching;

- c) that inter-unit collaboration will be discouraged;
- d) that service to the state and outside constituencies will be diminished;
- e) that excellence in teaching and research will take a back seat to entrepreneurial success with enrollment and grants;
- f) that student research and laboratory experience will be discouraged because it does not contribute to enrollments;
- g) that support for longer-term planning and ongoing support will take a back seat to short-term concerns; and
- h) that support for faculty and staff positions will shift from full-time positions to part-time staff, resulting in less effective support for all Rutgers constituents.

The administration recognizes a tension that must be continually managed. The problem in the past, in the administration's view, has been that unit decisions have been completely disconnected from budget considerations; but they also see it as important to avoid going to the opposite extreme, "where enrollment drives everything."

The administration also believes, however, that the planning process will enable the University to avoid the danger of overemphasis on budgeting incentives. For example, even though PhD programs and laboratory experiences are often not the best ways to maximize revenues, they are central to the core mission of academic excellence. Therefore, units will not be allowed to drop them for purely financial reasons. The central administration will place a high priority on working out mechanisms of sustainable funding. Similarly, there is nothing in the current system that discourages collaborative efforts, and the administration will continue to encourage them.

4) Lack of transparency:

- a) There does not appear to be consistent handling of allocation below the decanal level. There is even considerable variation at the Provost level
- b) There is considerable variation in the implementation of planning across the campuses. Newark has adopted a more centralized approach, and Camden a more decentralized one, than New Brunswick. There also seems to be considerable variation in approaches among deans. Again, this makes planning inconsistent and opaque.
- c) The "basic subsidy," and variations in it, have not been clearly explained.

The administration's view is that there should be considerable local discretion, but that there will be a gradual clarification of the overall processes and guidelines.

6. Assessment

We agree that many existing concerns are either results of a lack of information and understanding of the AFB effort, or artifacts of its incomplete development, in which many aspects are just starting and have not been worked through. We also believe that the overall goals of transparency and budget awareness, as stated by the administration, are positive and indeed vital to the future of Rutgers University.

However, there remain two major concerns which we believe could fundamentally undermine the goals expressed by the administration:

1) Inadequate planning mechanisms

The administration properly stresses that AFB should work within, and be guided by, a larger planning framework, but it does not have in place a widely understood or credible planning process. Planning seems to be ad hoc and weak compared to the clear incentives provided by AFB for maximization of tuition and research dollars.

In New Brunswick, priorities are set by annual discussion between Dr. Furmanski and the deans.

However, there is little transparency to this process, little awareness of it among other stakeholders, and little opportunity for debate. **The planning criteria may be clear to the administration but they are not widely understood or accepted among the constituencies.**

Given the fact that, at the unit level, the planning process is opaque and the AFB rules are clear, the latter are likely to dominate decision-making within the units, with a resulting overwhelming stress on maximization of tuition and research dollars. Discussions between the deans and EVP Furmanski may be able to prevent large distortions of the incentive system, but they are too blunt and infrequent to guide daily decision-making that may respond too heavily to the tuition and research incentives.

2) Lack of stakeholder involvement

AFB has strong potential effects on academic programs and administrative functions. Though the original plan was developed by a task force which included faculty and staff, there has been little sense of involvement in this vital process from the bulk of the faculty or other stakeholders. The New Brunswick Faculty Council has protested the lack of faculty involvement in the budgeting process.¹ Staff have, for the most part, been even less involved.

One result of these two weaknesses is that stakeholders, including many administrators, are far more focused on the budgeting aspect than on the planning aspect of All-Funds Budgeting. They do not feel a part of a comprehensive planning process. Some are focused on how to maximize revenues within the AFB framework, others are concerned about the impacts that these strong and simple incentives will have, while few understand or feel connected to the more complex goals sought by the administration.

7. Recommendations:

1) The university should develop a more consistent process for transparent and participative planning at all levels. There should be clarification of strategic priorities other than tuition maximization, with processes for deciding the balance of priorities and appropriate rewards.

The University Strategic Plan highlights several key priorities, including academic excellence, service to the state, and inter-unit collaboration. The Strategic Plan has not been cited by the administration as a reference point for planning. If it is to play this role, it needs to be elaborated and discussed more widely in the University.

2) The administration should establish regular discussions about the budget and planning process with a credible stakeholder group. This could be: an existing group, such as a committee of the University Senate; or a combination of representatives from the Senate, faculty councils, and other key groups; or an entirely new body. This group should:

- a) consider the general issues discussed above, such as how to better integrate planning with budgeting and to better involve the University community;
- b) propose ways to increase the transparency of the process for all constituencies;
- c) continue to review AFB as it develops to avoid unintended consequences and distortions;
- d) help to publicize and generate understanding and debate about the AFB system among the various University constituencies; and
- e) consider and make recommendations about particular matters including:
 - Ways of mitigating the effects of enrollment fluctuations on units. A moving average basis for allocating funds or some type of “insurance against sharp changes” should be considered.
 - Principles for the allocation of funds among and within central administration, decanal units, departments, and other units.
 - The extension of AFB to non-academic units.
 - The handling of salary increases and merit awards in units.
 - The encouragement of collaborative activities between departments.
 - The handling of split lines, shared teaching, and other collaborative issues between departments.
- f) examine the impact of longer-term planning, particularly for university infrastructures.

3) The University Senate Budget and Finance Committee should review this matter again in three years

The direction of change charted by AFB and the associated planning initiatives is vital to the health of Rutgers University. Our hope is to strengthen the process by building wider understanding and commitment, and by better including the key priorities and constituencies of the University. The University Senate, representing all the major University constituencies, is prepared to help actively in promoting that understanding and commitment.

ⁱ Interim Report of the NBFC Budget and Planning Committee on the Proposed All-Funds Budgeting Process, February 27, 2004