

Full Cost/Fixed Costs/Administrative Requests

FY10 Budget and Planning Guidelines Planning Groups Roles and Responsibilities:

Planning Group MAU-based Lead/Co-Lead:

Role: Serves as the chair of the planning group.

Responsibilities:

Acts as the primary spokes person for the planning group.

Communicates progress and issues of the planning group at various budget and planning meetings.

Communicates progress and issues of the planning group at President Cabinet meetings.

Contributes to and assures criteria are established for the prioritizing program requests.

Assures the various campus issues are addressed in the planning process.

Statewide Facilitator:

Role: Supports and coordinates planning group meetings, and serves as primary liaison between the planning group and the President, Planning and Budget Office, and SW executive staff.

Responsibilities:

Planning Group Leads and SW Facilitator

Planning Group MAU-based Lead	Statewide Facilitator	Campus Representatives and Service/Outreach Representatives ¹
Health Fran Ulmer, UAA Chancellor	Karen Perdue	Use the group currently in place plus Service and Outreach Reps.
Research (AK Relevant) Climate, Energy, Natural Resources/IPY Steve Jones, UAF Chancellor	Dan Julius	TBD, Climate has a group started - add to that established group
Teacher Education John Pugh, UAS Chancellor Student Success (Co-leads) Mike Driscoll, UAA* Dana Thomas, UAF James Everett, UAS	Melissa Hill Dan Julius	TBD – Deans, Teacher Mentoring Use the group currently in place plus Service and Outreach Reps. *Linda Lazzell will srn<will (w 0.C /P MCID 29 Bf1

Planning Groups Expected Outcomes Document Instructions

Guiding Principles

Since this process is running parallel to the MAU budget process it is understood that this document may be revised to incorporate the MAU expected outcomes document. This is a draft document and these are not expected to be static documents but will evolve as more information becomes available. The health, engineering, and student success groups are more mature in the planning process, with health being the most mature. It is anticipated that the structure of the summary document for these groups will be more refined than the other areas, and will help serve as models as the other groups develop.

Areas to address

- § Briefly discuss current status of programs in the discipline area
- § What are the criteria for evaluating the requests that are forwarded?
 - Below are examples of criteria for review used for the FY09 Health Review:
 - Data driven
 - State need for program or expansion
 - Consistent with the Academic Plan
 - Employer partners/site readiness
 - Sustainability
 - Program readiness
 - What is needed to get students ready—pipeline activities?
 - Induced course load/GER capacity
- § Must clearly demonstrate quantitative effect program request will have on relevant common, systemwide performance measures.
- § What strategy specific sub-metric(s) will be tracked to measure intermediate progress toward moving systemwide metric goals? For example, a budget request for a new high-demand program might track applications and enrollment in the program as an indicator of eventual increases in high-demand graduates.
- § Provide an assessment of State need as specific as possible given the maturity of the planning group area.
 - What is the immediate need?
 - What is the 3-5 year outlook?
- § What programmatic areas are most likely to generate the support needed to obtain legislative funding?
- § What programs would leverage existing strengths at each of the MAUs?
- § What programs would return the most positive results for a reasonable investment?
- § Discuss the current service gaps in the program planning group area (i.e. Teacher Education-Special Education)
- § What are the future facility requirements including infrastructure and information technology associated with the program?

Timeline

Please submit this document to Statewide Planning and Budget no later than April 11th. This document will be discussed at the April 16th President's Cabinet Meeting with the Chancellors and the Vice Presidents and be di

Chancellor's Expected Outcomes Document Instructions

Guiding Principles

- § Since this process is running parallel to the Statewide Planning groups process it is understood that this document may be revised to incorporate the Statewide Planning groups expected outcomes document. These are not expected to be static documents but will evolve as more information becomes available.
- § This document demonstrates the alignment of the MAU's key goals to the system priorities.

Areas to address

- § MAU priorities and compelling advantages aligned with SW planning group areas (listed below) – incorporate appropriate Outreach, Cooperative Extension, K-12 linkage
 - Health
 - Engineering and Construction
 - Career and Tech. Workforce (other)
 - Teacher Education
 - Student Success
 - Competitive Research
- § The BOR strategic plan goals including system performance measures
- § Specific MAU strategy measures (i.e. Anchorage requested external sponsored program expenditures in addition to external sponsored research, Fairbanks wanted Bacc. retention rates, and specific external research measures)
- § Role of each campus in addressing the anticipated outcomes of the SW planning groups
- § MAU 3-5 year outlook
- § Future facility requirements including infrastructure and information technology
- § Identify planning assumptions, environmental scan, key internal and external conditions

Timeline

~~Statewide~~ Submit this document to Statewide Planning and Budget no later than April 15