**Planning & Finance Committee Meeting Minutes**

**January 24, 2018**

Present: Chan, Hendrix, Kalter, Crowley, Lacy, Lewis, Mainieri, Martinez, Marx, Nikolaou, Noel-Elkins, Pryhuber, Rubio, Standridge

Not Present: Bates, Crowley, Hoit, Meyer (sabbatical), Schaab

* Meeting purpose: Need to start deliberations about annual report
* Key take aways
	+ Purpose of the report needs to be clearer
	+ Committee wants the report to be different than previous years, but still unclear exactly what direction would be best. Some ideas:
		- Report should focus on longer term items, perhaps priorities that reach across several offices
		- Maybe the report this year is more of a way to gather information for this committee to act upon in the Fall
		- Committee may want to consider trends in the reports over the past several years for context
		- Committee may want to consider financial data in concert with report information – though committee unclear how to ‘judge’ financial data/allocations
		- Committee may want to present information in terms of the committee’s views on opportunities and threats
* Expanded notes:
	+ Start with last year’s responses and anyone’s comments/reactions
		- Martinez question: Is there something specific we should be doing with the reports?
		- Each committee recommendations seemed to be addressed already on campus between reports
		- Recommend something new, but hear back about things already done
		- Perhaps the report from the committee should be more directed
		- Wondering what we’re doing on campus that isn’t in the reports that we should be evaluating? What is the purpose of the report?
		- Noel-Elkins: On the response side, offices are asked to respond to specific items without the context from this committee. Responses are what’s being done on that item. If committee wants something different, need to specify what types of responses the committee wants. Not all items in the recommendations fits nicely in one office so who the response come from?
		- Marx: Agree that the purpose of the report needs to be clearer; have tried to move the report to more long term recommendations as opposed to short term report. Pleased with responses to last year’s report that really addressed the items in the report.
		- Kalter: Agree that we need to continue to have a long-term view with the report. Part of functions seems to be to consider to look at the big picture and evaluate how funds are being allocated.
		- Martinez: We are a body that can look across a university at more big picture projects that span many units on campus.
	+ Marx: What should our approach be with this year’s report?
		- Martinez: Do we want to bring finance back into this? Do we consider budget?
		- Marx: Financing is decided elsewhere
		- Kalter: Why? Does this committee have the expertise to consider finances?
		- Marx: We don’t have the information to do that and perhaps it’s outside of the scope of this committee.
		- Kalter: We do have as part of our responsibility to steer the administration away from bad decisions and toward good decisions in terms of funds allocation.
		- Martinez: We make priorities so we know where to make allocations.
		- Noel-Elkins: Each year the report has new items that don’t seem to be connected to previous year’s priorities. Can we look at several years of these reports to see the patterns in what the priorities are over several years?
		- Martinez: Would like to see the VP responses to address what the opportunities and threats are in a particular area
		- Kalter: Administrators would also like to hear what this committee’s ideas of opportunities and threats
		- Hendrix: Report seems similar to Educating Illinois progress report so would embrace change to the approach to the report
		- Marx: Would like the report to more of a dialog between committee and administrators so we get the types of questions we spoke about here answered in the responses
		- Nikolau: Can we get the reports from the past several years?
		- Martinez: If we really want to see the university’s priorities, we need to review the university budgets from the last several years.
		- Nikolau: But the budget wouldn’t show what the priorities of this committee have been.
		- Kalter: We have the fact book each year that displays financial basics (pie charts) – is that information fine grained enough to be useful to this committee? Can we ask in the response for more specific financial information in the particular area we’re interested in?
		- Lacy: The finance side of things seems like it would be beyond the capabilities of a committee that changes each year
		- Hendrix: Not sure how this committee could judge if numbers are two low or high
		- Martinez: Can look at more of a high view – if the numbers are there in a fact book maybe we just bring them out to look
		- Noel Elkins: Responses from offices tend to be just for this committee
		- Kalter: Last year, the committee differentiated between items carried over from previous years and new initiatives. Seems to be three parts to what we want to do: how is the budget being allocated and are there questions in the allocations, new initiatives, update on ongoing initiatives
		- Maybe the report this year is more of a way to gather information for this committee to act upon in the Fall
	+ Ideas for content
		- Threats
			* Students are encountering new challenges with literacy given electronic nature of communication and high school prep – need new types of support beyond traditional concepts of literacy
			* Cutting edge institutions are doing a better job at technology-rich learning and 21st century literacy with proper support and training for students and faculty to leverage those technologies