

Meeting Notes

Integrated Planning Committee Meeting

November 28, 2016

3:30pm – 4:30pm

A-2029

Attendance:

Paul Chancey, CIAP
Dr. James Feehan, Humanities & Social Science
Dr. Noreen Golfman, Provost & VP(Academic) (Chair)
Renata Lang, MUNSU
Keith Matthews, Associate Director, Academic Budgets
Dr. Donald McKay, Medicine
Dr. Aimée Surprenant, Graduate Studies
Dr. Ian Sutherland, Music
Lynn Taylor, CIAP
Jacqui Walsh, Business & Economics, Grenfell
Dr. Wilf Zerbe, Business Administration, St. John's

Not attending:

Lori Pike, Budget Office

1. Review of meeting notes from November 7, 2016

The meeting notes from November 7 were accepted by the committee.

2. Budget Framework Document

A document entitled "Multi-Year Budget Framework" was distributed for discussion. Dr. Golfman explained that it will serve as the basis for a discussion by the Board of Regents about the budget requirements of the university for the next three years. The document describes anticipated shortfalls of \$6.2 million in 2017-18, \$8.8 million in 2018-19 and \$11.4 million in 2019-20. A key component of this deficit is deferred maintenance of university infrastructure. The government has indicated that it is willing to have an annual discussion about deferred maintenance, but it is not known if additional funding will be provided and alternatives need to be considered.

The framework provided information about the use of campus renewal fees at other universities. If such a fee were implemented at Memorial, it could generate additional revenue of \$4.3 million in 2017-18, \$5.0 million in 2018-19 and \$5.7 million in 2019-20. This would significantly reduce the anticipated operating deficit. The fee would apply to all students.

There are still a number of unanswered questions that could impact the bottom line of the budget framework. Pension expenses are one of the biggest unknowns. University and employee contributions are expected to increase in 2017-18, and it is not yet clear what additional obligations may occur in future years.

The budget framework is a fluid document and it is anticipated that adjustments will be made once the university has more in-depth discussions with government over the coming months. IPC will be kept apprised of developments in this area. Dr. Golfman also indicated that detailed revenue and expenditure information is being developed by Lori Pike and it should be ready for distribution to the IPC in January.

The committee provided feedback on several points in the Budget Framework. It was noted that the document assumes a largely a status quo budget with enrolment and salaries being constant for all three years. In response to a question from a committee member, it was acknowledged that it is not known how the deficit will be eliminated yet, but the university is required by legislation to have a balanced budget. There were also some questions about the detailed revenue and expenditure projections reported in appendix A and the numbers reported in the main text of the document. Dr. Golfman agreed to pass them along.

Before leaving the topic of the university budget, Dr. Golfman provided some clarification about the roles of the IPC and the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC). It is anticipated that the committees will work in a highly complementary fashion: PBC is responsible for reviewing the university frameworks and will share the outcomes of their work with the IPC; IPC will report to PBC about their discussions regarding strategic direction and funding allocations.

3. Discussion of Strategic Direction document

Dr. Golfman reminded the committee of the history of the Statement of Strategic Direction and asked for the committee's advice as to the nature and extent of the consultation that should occur as the committee works to complete its development. Her view was that once IPC is happy with the strategic direction document, one possible process would be to share the document with Academic Councils, PBC, and then Senate for comment. Feedback could be incorporated into the document after which it would be sent to Senate and the Board for approval. There was agreement that consultation was important to ensure everyone is aware of how the document was developed and the rationale for the priorities set out in it. The final document will provide a framework to assist in determining priorities and in making decisions about how to make up the deficit.

The committee began to discuss the 10 points set out on pages 9 and 10 of the document and what revisions they may require. Some of the discussion points included:

- The bullets provide insight into how to spend money but not how to prioritize. More direction would be helpful within each bullet.
- It is important to differentiate directions from actions.
- The bullets have a broad scope and could perhaps be placed in a more logical order.
- It was suggested that the committee could turn each bullet into a positional statement, which would give the committee something to debate.
- There were questions as to what information is available to support the statements made in the document.
- There were some who felt that neutral and consistent wording was important. Others felt that the document should make relatively strong statements, supported by clear rationale. This would occur once the committee had carefully considered its position on each and decided it an issue was to be deemed strategic or not.
- There was agreement that positions on issues should be logically consistent and aligned with reality.
- The statement of strategic direction should also address outcomes.
- The bullets should be aligned with the frameworks so that the objectives can be integrated. There has to be more accountability in the frameworks but there are also disconnects among them. PBC is responsible for reviewing the frameworks and addressing the assessment issues.
- It was recognized that the university already has frameworks and plans in place that will place some parameters on how much IPC can do in developing the statement of strategic direction. There may be some opportunity to modify frameworks (eg, the teaching and learning framework) but it is not clear how much impact can be had. Some felt that IPC may have to question aspects of the frameworks in order to do what they are being asked.

For the next meeting, it was agreed that the discussion needs to be more focused so that consensus can begin to be built. It was suggested that everyone re-read the current draft document and think about the bullets for the next meeting.

4. Other Business

No other business was raised.

The next meeting of the IPC will be held on Monday, December 12 at 3:30pm in A-2029.

DRAFT