Models with components we may want to draw from for a GRCC budget process

Buffalo State

Strengths:

- Well defined timeline and structure
- Student input
- Allows for revenue enhancement along with expense reduction
- 2 year process
- Combined cross college cuts with specific department reviews

Weaknesses:

- Not clear on contractual restraints
- Does not talk about personnel costs
- No appeal or review process

University of Nebraska – Lincoln

Strengths:

- Focus on mission and vision, adopted by Academic Senate
- Criteria used seems to reflect values and references program quality
- Student involvement
- Budget hearing and appeal process included
- Flowchart explains process
- Clearly defines criteria/circumstances that define decisions around possible budget reductions

Weaknesses:

- ‘convoluted’ model
- Low on values/mission
- Very detailed, too prescriptive and time consuming
- Very heavily focused on academics
- Lack of communication between committees

Southern Nevada

Strengths:

- Strong engagement process – all stakeholders, including students were a part of the process
• Based on mission and vision
• Clear, well defined process
• Strong communication strategies (FAQ, website)
• We liked the “changing business practices’ component

Weaknesses:

• Actual decision making process was weak
• Significant ‘input’ - not clear on how it all translated into decisions around budget

Algonquin

Strengths:

• Bottom up process and governing group oversight
• Comprehensive – process looked at all programs
• Established targets and priorities
• Opportunities for community input (town hall meetings and on-line input opportunities)
• Clear continuum of program revitalization
• Good parameters

Weaknesses:

• Clear budget targets identified
• Emphasis on non-academic
• Process was not clear
• Do not like zero based budget approach

Western Washington

Strengths:

• Related to mission and vision, focused on teaching and learning
• Inclusive, collaborative, college-wide, bottom up process
• Transparent
• Data driven
• Long term approach – sustainable
• Focus on costs and efficiencies “exclusive’ of salary – protects human capital
• Method of budget reduction is identified
• “Untouchables’ are identified up front
Weaknesses:

- Process may be too cumbersome
- Omitted “intangibles”
- Budget panel may be too large
- No external community involvement

**Processes that were not considered to be good models for GRCC**

**Lansing Community College:**

Strengths:

- Evaluated every program
- A second analysis completed on ‘loner’ programs
- Used supporting documentation and economic trends/forecasting
- Thorough, accountable, objective
- Multiple options for program planning (continuation, elimination, problem solving)
- Considered implications of recommendations

Weaknesses:

- No community input
- Only looked at academics
- Not flexible
- Cold – not user friendly
- Clinical – may lack affective considerations

**Diablo**

Strengths:

- ‘none’
- Incorporated strategic goals and student success – considered how decisions would impact students
- We liked the integration council included in the model

Weaknesses:

- Started with staff elimination
- Did not discuss revenue increases
- Does not appear collaborative, very top down
- Not a true process, more of an assessment than an plan or a process