Executive Summary

The 18-member Alignment and Allocation Task Force (AATF) has been meeting since October 2019 to provide feedback on President Neuhold-Ravikumar’s charge to deliver a basis for assessing how to align resources among university units to streamline and more productively use these resources in the future (see letter attached to the end of this document for AATF membership). The charge highlighted the need to be nimble in this process and to ensure that the decisions we make are in alignment with our stated goals and expectations as currently laid out in the UCO Vision 2020 strategic planning document. The AATF quickly recognized that, to accomplish this goal, there must be both a quantitative mechanism for assessing performance among units as well as a qualitative “checks and balance” system that ensures that data-driven decisions are compared against UCO’s core values that are often described as the “Four Pillars of Progress:” Student Success, Transformative Learning, Value, and Place. Therefore, early in this document, we wish to state our commitment to the important groundwork of our thinking, as an urban university composed of students from the Oklahoma City metropolitan area, and with service to the workforce, which supports the economy and the quality of life that we, and our students, enjoy living within this region of the state.

At the outset, we thank the entire UCO community for supporting the Task Force and providing input on the process, both in forums and through the website portal, that was provided for such feedback. Below, we provide five “takeaway” points from the document:

1. **A Commitment to Planning:** UCO has been a leading university within RUSO and the State of Oklahoma for its planning activities, as evidenced by receiving the *Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award* and establishing a strong presence at the annual Higher Learning Commission conference; this includes special recognition of presentations and associated proceedings articles. UCO developed the Self-Study for Continuous Improvement (SSCI) and accreditation reports that are regularly required within the Division of Academic Affairs for two decades now. Indeed, Vision 2020 remains a viable and important planning document on our campus. While we recognize that new strategic planning will likely follow the submission of this report, we also wish to convey the importance we place on existing planning processes. This report will, in fact, suggest one additional document (under “Qualitative Variables and Guideposts” below) that is designed to create a common (albeit brief) planning document among both academic and support units across the campus.
2. **Appreciating our Mission and Vision:** While recognizing the importance of aligning our activities with opportunities that may arise on a moment’s notice, the Task Force also agreed that UCO must demonstrate a commitment to specific values that we wish to define us. This document begins with UCO’s Mission, Vision, and Strategy Statements. Vision 2020, our current planning document, was a carefully crafted product of an intensive, campuswide shared governance process; it yielded the “Four Pillars” (noted previously) that we have come to recognize as underlying our mission and guiding our vision for the future. These Pillars remain a viable part of our planning and budgeting process through the activities of the University Planning Council (UPC). Accordingly, the Task Force members strongly recommend that we remain the student-centered institution that promotes student success and access within the diverse Oklahoma City metropolitan area.

3. **Having a Fair and Data-Driven Approach to Decision-Making:** The Task Force unveils within this document the guiding principles and preliminary quantitative variables that will be used to facilitate the assessment of the performance of university units. While still preliminary in nature, this model is intended to guide a more uniform (and clearly delineated) process for assessing how to reallocate resources when opportunities arise to do so. The responsibility for the development of the enrollment and financial data processing will be shared among the Offices of Enrollment Services, Institutional Effectiveness, and Finance and Operations on the UCO campus. The output from these offices will, in turn, inform decision-making at the Cabinet level and among divisions through the University Planning Council.

4. **Maintaining a Focus on Students and the UCO Community:** The Task Force recognizes the need to bring together the two main elements of its efforts. Namely, that any results of the performance model will be guided by our Mission, Vision, and Strategic Planning process. Simply because a unit does not provide a high return on investment does not mean that it will lose its resources. The role of a unit in maintaining the guideposts (strategic pillars) for our collective values is a paramount consideration and should not be subverted by a quantitative outcome alone. We understand this issue of evaluation as the crux of the alignment and allocation process that will then lead to revenue decisions, but only after an appropriate deliberation that will interface the qualitative and quantitative outcomes of the planning mechanism.
5. **Maintaining Flexibility as well as Stability during Times of Change:** The outcome of this process must respect the speed with which change can occur in society and how new needs must be reflected in our allocation process as we align to these changes. During the creation of this document, for example, the coronavirus disease pandemic changed how we did (and likely will do) teaching and mentorship for our students. To accomplish this outcome, the Task Force was quick to focus on creating the most feasible and non-time-consuming process for incorporating both the qualitative and quantitative elements of the proposed process. We recognize that it makes little sense to make decisions that result from data analytical processes that are too complex to explain to our colleagues. As a public university, we are committed to a shared and timely deliberative process of creating conclusions about funding our future.
Report of the Alignment and Allocation Task Force

The test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function.

- F. Scott Fitzgerald

**Introduction and Background**

Public universities in the state of Oklahoma have seen, on average, prolonged declines in enrollment, coupled with reductions in state-appropriated funds (Halter 2019). The combination of these factors has created a “perfect storm” of increasing tuition and reduced services to students on these campuses, as a way to compensate for this sudden and precipitous decline in revenue. This impact is especially difficult to sustain for comprehensive universities like the University of Central Oklahoma (UCO) because of the lack of other sources of revenue, such as endowments and extramural funding that are common to research intensive universities (Fryar 2014). Oklahoma is not alone in this dilemma, with countless institutions losing levels of state revenue on short-term bases that can then generate a crisis mentality, such as at the University of Alaska system that was faced with a 41 percent loss of state-appropriated funding within a single academic year (Fain 2019).
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**Figure 1.** UCO fall enrollment and state appropriations (2008-2020).

Indeed, overall, state funding in Higher Education has experienced high fluctuations in revenue allocations across the country (Seltzer 2019). As if to ensure the uncertainty facing Higher Education, the recent coronavirus pandemic has increased financial uncertainty as institutions struggle to maintain quality education for students who are currently isolated from the classroom (Friga 2020).

Like other universities across Oklahoma (Halter 2019), by the beginning of the 2019-20 academic year, UCO had lost millions of dollars in state-appropriated funding compounded by a decrease in enrollment (Figure 1). That same summer (2019), as President Neuhold-Ravikumar entered as our new president, the President’s Cabinet met to begin what was meant to become a
campuswide deliberation concerning these circumstances. This included the understanding that a planning body needed to be established with a focus on developing criteria for aligning budgetary parameters with UCO’s strategic planning priorities, including those of Vision 2020 (Vision 2020). This group was appointed as the Alignment and Allocation Task Force (AATF). While the University Planning Council (UPC) has traditionally held such a planning role, the AATF was meant to create a specialized focus on the issue of alignment and to report regularly to all segments of the campus through forums and a website. The Task Force membership also included a wide array of members who reflect the diversity of the campus. Student (UCO Student Association) members were also included on the Task Force to ensure their representation.

Task Force Efforts: A Narrative –

President Neuhold-Ravikumar provided a formal charge to the Task Force on Oct. 29, 2019 (Appendix A). This gathering followed an introduction of the Task Force members to the campus community on Oct. 8, with an opportunity for feedback from those attending. Within this charge were five elements that included (1) reviewing best practices, (2) gathering feedback from the campus community, (3) working beyond normal administrative boundaries, (4) providing a new perspective on campus allocation of funds, and (5) allowing the university to respond to opportunities and threats in the state and education industry. Below, we review these areas within our deliberations during seven meetings leading up to the last campus forum on Feb. 25 of this year (2020), as well as follow-up meetings among subcommittees generated by these earlier efforts. The body of the remainder of this report will respond specifically to the qualitative and quantitative guidelines the Task Force developed and how an alignment and subsequent allocation process would be carried out. Subcommittees were formed to enhance the writing process in these critical areas and the efforts of these subcommittees are described below.

On Nov. 12, the Task Force met and discussed more than two dozen documents pertaining to other universities in the country that had gone through a similar process (Appendix B). The AATF reviewed these institutions with the objective of learning best practices of alignment and allocation processes among other institutions with similar objectives. The AATF recognized that both qualitative and quantitative variables could and should be established as complementary considerations in any fiscal planning process. Important qualitative variables were characterized as planning “guideposts” (see Table 2, below) that would allow the campus and its leadership to interpret the results of any quantitative mechanism that determines revenue allocation among campus units. An assignment was then made to the AATF to develop a list of both quantitative and qualitative planning variables derived at least in part from these case studies and that would be reviewed at the next meeting.
At the following meeting of the AATF (Nov. 26), a list of approximately 10 variables per category was established after an extended discussion (Figure 2). The conclusion of the Task Force at that time was that the highly ranked variables affirmed the value of our current UCO Strategic Plan (Vision 2020) and would continue to provide the guiding principles (“guideposts”) that have directed our planning processes for nearly a decade. These include the pillars of (1) Student Success, (2) Transformative Learning, (3) Value, and (4) Place. All of these pillars are still under continuing review and modification by the UPC and remain viable and important to the future of the institution, including in UCO’s accreditation review process through the Higher Learning Commission (HLC 2017); these pillars also form the basis for our required Quality Initiative with the HLC that was approved by them in 2019 (HLC 2019). Indeed, many of the variables identified during the discussion affirmed institutional commitment to these four pillars. The AATF was asked to rank variables in each category prior to the next meeting.

Our next meeting began with a discussion of variables as ranked by the AATF (Table 1). Two subgroups were then formed to ascertain key takeaway messages from the respective discussions and to be followed by written summary statements. These statements were consistent with the strategic planning priorities described above, and the attention of the AATF then began to transition to an assessment of how to develop a quantitative model for producing estimates of performance measures of units across campus that can be used to evaluate allocation levels among units. The next meeting (Jan. 21) of the

Figure 2. Board work during discussion of key factors.

Table 1. Ranking of qualitative and quantitative factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Qualitative Factors</th>
<th>Quantitative Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategic Plan with Pillars</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workforce Needs</td>
<td>Credit Hour Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mission (RUSO and OSRHE)</td>
<td>Persistence - Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stakeholders/Job Market</td>
<td>“Pain Index” (Workload)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SSCI Assessment</td>
<td>SSCI Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Accreditation Reports</td>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Summer Revenue Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Disciplinary Focus</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Competitor Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NCAA Reports</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AATF included several presentations about how to develop performance criteria that maintain fidelity to institutional values and workload balance across units during a process that could involve the reallocation of faculty and staff positions. The following two meetings (Feb. 4 and 11) served as follow-up discussions of these models and the basis for the creation of four writing teams that would focus on the major topics described in this document: (1) Introduction and Background (current section), (2) Qualitative Variables and Guideposts, (3) Quantitative Variables and Model, and (4) the Application of Variables to the Alignment and Allocation Process.

Campus Feedback –

To date, the primary methods of acquiring campus feedback have been from forums, one on Oct. 8, 2019 (Figure 3), and the other on Feb. 25, 2020, and from a website that takes asynchronous feedback from the entire campus community through a comment function. This feedback was accessible to the AATF members and has been discussed within the Task Force. However, the AATF had several discussions about finding supplementary means of garnering feedback from the campus. The Task Force considered, for example, additional outreach to the campus that might include focus groups and workshops. Notwithstanding these suggestions, it was clarified during those discussions that the charge to the AATF was not to establish another strategic planning process for the campus but, instead, to develop assessment mechanisms that are consistent with existing and widespread planning goals that were established with UCO’s Vision 2020 Strategic Plan and which is regularly revisited by the UPC, a body that includes membership of the President’s Cabinet; University Deans; and the Faculty (Senate), Staff (Senate), and Student (Association) representative bodies. Therefore, as a means to provide feedback from units across campus and remain consistent with the Vision 2020 Strategic Plan, a qualitative survey was initiated to provide annual feedback to decision-makers in the President’s Cabinet and UPC; this document is detailed below.

With the arrival of the national, state, and institutional responses to the coronavirus pandemic by mid-March 2020, there were no longer opportunities for the AATF to physically meet or create forums, workshops, etc. as described above. Therefore, and as had already been discussed in the last physical meeting together, the Task Force shifted to subcommittee meetings which focused on writing sections of our Alignment and Allocation report, including further developing...
the Quantitative and Qualitative components of our recommendations. The membership of these two subcommittees was defined and each team included individuals who would be essential to creating these portions of the document and who would then address those two parts of the full report. Each of these Subcommittees worked with the goal of submission of the final document to President Neuhold-Ravikumar by the end of June 2020.

The Task Force reconvened (virtually) as a whole on May 5, 2020, to report on the work of the subcommittees that had continued to work together on their respective portions of the broader report. At this meeting, feedback was garnered from the written work provided by each subcommittee, in order that it be added to the developing final report. Both subcommittees provided valuable opinions and the co-chairs began integrating the Quantitative and Qualitative components into our plan while continuing to seek input from the full Task Force. The entire Task Force met, again, virtually on June 16, 2020, to discuss progress on the final report and once again added further clarifications to the document. Finally, the Task Force met on June 23 to have a final discussion about content and editorial needs before finishing the report.

Qualitative Variables and Guideposts

Early on, members of the Alignment and Allocation Task Force unanimously agreed that the assessment of qualitative data would need to be included in any university alignment and allocation tool, and that these measures should be easily accessible for all units on campus (both academic and support units). In every meeting of the Task Force, the shared belief that our planning pillars, or guideposts, are at least as important in decision-making efforts as quantitative measures was reinforced. When the Task Force first divided into working groups for discussion, many qualitative measures (variables) were mentioned for potential inclusion in the measurement tool.

First, and as described above, it was noted that qualitative guidelines should generally fit within a framework: the UCO Strategic Plan (Vision 2020) and its current pillars (https://www.uco.edu/strategic-plan), as well as UCO’s Mission, Vision, and Strategic Statement. With this in mind, it was imperative that the tool be flexible enough to adapt as university strategic plans evolve over time (Carlson 2019). Second, the team determined that a qualitative and quantitative data assessment must be collected and used simultaneously in order to create a consistent tool that applies a transparent and holistic approach to all university units. The inclusion of qualitative data provides an opportunity for better alignment throughout the university while also ensuring access to information that highlights successes and best practices among units, which can then be shared broadly across campus.

Third, it was the goal of the Qualitative Subcommittee to ensure that gathering this information was not an overly laborious process given the volume of existing information available to the campus community. Information that can be gathered from either accreditation or assessment
reports can be used for many units on campus. These reports represent a great deal of work already undertaken by the campus community and with relevant data that are already incorporated into them. Additionally, units will be able to track these data annually, garnering information for future assessment and accreditation reports. The Subcommittee therefore followed up with selected academic units to ensure that the qualitative variables required by the tool could be easily and efficiently found in existing reports. This part of the process is still ongoing but the Subcommittee has provided a preliminary survey as described below.

We knew that a method for gathering qualitative data had to be developed since there are no standardized assessment reports across all university units. In order to accomplish this goal, then, the Subcommittee focused on the incorporation of meaningful measures that could be useful to units in aiding and enriching the vital work that they do. In this manner, the Qualitative

Table 2. Terminology for Guideposts (Vision 2020 Pillars) and Qualitative Data (see Qualitative Feedback Tool or QFT in Appendix C).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideposts (Vision 2020)</th>
<th>Qualitative Data (QFT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Success</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Learning</td>
<td>Financial Stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>SWOT Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for incorporation into the qualitative data collection included items (data) related to (1) Strategic Planning, (2) Financial Stewardship, (3) SWOT Analysis (see below), and (4) Adaptability. To more easily distinguish these “Qualitative Data” from the “Guideposts” described below, we have created a reference table that relates the terminology associated with these two groups of factors (Table 2). We anticipate and intend that the entire Qualitative Variable survey (“Qualitative Feedback Tool”) will only require two to three hours to complete for any given unit.

Guideposts: Connecting to Mission and Vision –

The Task Force’s Qualitative Subcommittee recognized that any tool used to measure unit performance should respect UCO’s existing strategic planning process. Qualitative considerations should therefore fit within our existing institutional identity and framework as reflected in our mission, vision, and strategic plan, as we discussed during our Task Force gatherings (Figure 4).
Mission
The University of Central Oklahoma exists to help students learn by providing transformative education experiences to students so that they may become productive, creative, ethical, and engaged citizens and leaders serving our global community.

Vision
The University of Central Oklahoma will be one of the nation’s top metropolitan universities, serving our community while providing our students the opportunities to achieve their highest level of leadership potential.

Strategy Statement
The University of Central Oklahoma will actively respond to the needs and opportunities of the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area by pursuing innovative partnerships, by adhering to our fundamental commitment to provide transformative teaching and learning experiences to our students, by engaging our students in experiential learning activities that advance the quality of life for all, by supporting lifelong learning and work force development and expansion, and by the impactful contribution of our research and professional services expertise to the metropolitan area.

As you can see from the text above, UCO’s Vision 2020 reflects two critical elements of any organization: our Mission and Vision. Our Mission statement defines our purpose as existing to help students learn by providing transformative educational experiences, with the goal that those students...
become productive, creative, ethical and engaged citizens and leaders serving our global community. To facilitate our Mission, our Vision carries its weight in two parts. First, UCO will be a top national metropolitan university. Second, all student experiences will be rooted in Transformative Learning so our graduates are productive, creative, ethical, and engaged citizens and leaders who contribute to the intellectual, cultural, economic, and social enhancement of their communities.

To assist in achieving our vision, UCO developed four strategic directions: (1) create a culture of collaboration and change, (2) redefine Central as Oklahoma’s metropolitan university, (3) align our outcomes with our mission and vision, and (4) align our resources to serve strategic stakeholders. From those directions, UCO developed four “Pillars of Progress” which serve as guideposts for our campus. Those four pillars are: (1) Student Success, (2) Transformative Learning, (3) Value, and (4) Place. Everything we do at UCO should connect back to one or more of these pillars. Within the individual pillars there are a number of strategic goals.

Under the Student Success Pillar, UCO has developed the following strategic goals: a) improve retention rates at all levels, b) improve graduation rates, c) ensure students meet learning outcomes, and d) prepare students for post-graduation life. These student-centered goals are designed to ensure that students are given every opportunity to fulfill their educational objectives here at Central. These goals recognize that not all students are here to receive a degree, but that some come to continue their education in other ways which may not be degree or certificate seeking.

Under the Transformative Learning Pillar, UCO has developed the following strategic goals: a) increase the number of students engaged in High-Impact Educational Practices with an emphasis on Transformative Learning activities, and b) increase the number of faculty and staff members engaged in Transformative Learning. These goals recognize the need to provide an opportunity for access to Transformative Learning for staff, students, and faculty members.

Under the Value Pillar, UCO has developed the following strategic goals: a) increase financial support for students, b) improve our stakeholder’s sense of UCO’s value, and c) increase the number of majors/programs with specialized accreditation. The goals under the value pillar are designed to help illustrate that here in the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area, students are getting a tremendous value for their educational investment. There is no need to leave the Oklahoma City metropolitan area to get education and experiences from other universities. UCO carries many of the same accredited majors/programs that in the past students had to leave the area or state to obtain.

Under the Place Pillar, UCO has developed the following strategic goals: a) enhance both physical and virtual learning environments (campus and metro), b) grow our relationship with the Oklahoma City metropolitan area, and c) create an environment that fosters and protects diversity and intellectual expression. To achieve our mission and vision, UCO must respect the Place Pillar by developing our learning communities, both on campus and outside of campus. Respecting diversity and growing the relationship with the greater metropolitan area are paramount to these goals.
Qualitative Variables for a New Survey –

Respecting UCO’s existing guideposts, the Alignment and Allocation Task Force’s Qualitative Subcommittee sought to develop a tool that builds from UCO’s strategic framework, while maintaining the flexibility necessary to adapt as our framework may evolve over time. (That survey document is found in Appendix C.) This qualitative tool will be used annually and the timing and nature of that use will be developed through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness working in conjunction with the UPC. The four proposed variables are provided, below.

1. **Strategic Planning**: In this section, units will describe how their activities support the UCO Mission and Vision, as well as the four Pillars. Individual units should indicate which strategic goals under each pillar are impacted by their activities. The questions in this section allow the units to provide a narrative that explains their alignment to the university mission, vision, and strategic plan as well as the contributions they make to the university as a whole.

2. **Financial Stewardship**: The focus of this section is to assess processes and practices that impact how resources are currently used. The individual units are asked to identify areas where money can be saved and university assets can be preserved, as well as areas where an additional investment of resources would improve function. General statements about financial oversight and current management of money are also appropriate in this section.

3. **SWOT Analysis**: SWOT stands for Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats, and a SWOT analysis is designed to facilitate a realistic, fact-based, data-driven look at the strengths and weaknesses of an organization and its initiatives. A SWOT analysis typically provides the framework for an internal and external evaluation of a unit. Units can identify internal strengths and external opportunities, and evaluate how best to exploit those opportunities given current and future resources. Internal weaknesses and external threats also can be identified, and strategies for mitigating those threats can be evaluated through this process.

4. **Adaptation**: In this section, individual units will be asked to provide a narrative that explains their ability to respond to the changing demands of students, faculty, and staff. Trends, best practices, and development of unique student/faculty/staff needs are all considered in this section.

Quantitative Variables and Model

UCO must have a reliable, up-to-date, decision-making tool to adjust to changing needs as our university evolves and adapts to internal and external influences. Resources are finite and areas
need to be evaluated both in a quantitative and a qualitative sense for proper stewardship by the administrators who serve the institution. Quantitative analysis is primarily data-driven (with measurable, continuous variables), so it relies more upon data we collect internally. It is extremely important that these data be accurate so that proper information is available to university decision makers. All levels of the university should strive to be sure the data from their unit are reflected in a correct and timely manner within university records. In the case of the Division of Academic Affairs, for example, analysis must be done at several levels, but the initial numbers will be computed for consideration by the unit administrative level (inclusive of all programs) before being synthesized at the college level and, then, at the Office of Academic Affairs for presentation to the President's Cabinet and University Planning Council. In the case of campus entities that are identified as cost centers, the basic unit will be evaluated and then elevated to the vice president level for analysis.

**Important Components of the Quantitative Model –**

Several important components were agreed on as requirements for the quantitative assessment tool to function properly. The following section summarizes these areas.

1. **Contribution Margin Analysis:** The primary function of this tool is to measure income generated by the unit compared to expenses incurred by the unit. At a base level, this implies that variable revenue, generally tuition and fees, would be collected by an academic department, for example, and then all variable expenses incurred to generate this tuition would be compared with the income. However, the university must not just break even at the unit level, but must operate well above this level to allow for general university overhead to be covered. In this sense, we must look at the contribution margin, or the percentage generated above cost recovery, to see the revenue generated on the resources the university invests in a unit. This part of the analysis will produce a quantitative measurement of productivity as it relates to their revenue ratio. Units with lower or negative contribution margins may need to look for ways to increase revenue or reduce expenses to improve their revenue ratio. This analysis will work in conjunction with the qualitative analysis described above to allow a comprehensive review of unit operations.

2. **System Timeliness and Integrity:** A tool is only useful so long as the data it employs are reliable. It is imperative that the data used to populate any quantitative assessment are trustworthy. Beta testing of the tool is being done in order to achieve the highest possible level of confidence in the data integrity. The vast majority of the data are already available and are collected and are being vetted by the university. However, units must submit reports in a timely and accurate manner
so as to provide a financial tool that is auto-populated, either in real-time or at regular intervals. This will allow financial decisions to be made with alacrity at every level of the university infrastructure, when the need arises.

3. **Historical Overviews:** Year-over-year comparisons and historical data will be included as part of the roll-out of this tool. This will allow users to identify changes in revenue and expenses over time and forecast trends into the future. Such comparisons already exist and are regularly distributed by the Institutional Research and Enrollment Services Offices at UCO. These reports provide input to the President’s Cabinet and Deans’ Council and will be easily modified for use in the model.

4. **Responsibility and Control:** Revenue attribution and expense responsibility are properly placed in the units that can make decisions that would affect those attributions and responsibilities. Therefore, each revenue attribution and each expense responsibility are only reported at a single source, and the source was chosen as the unit responsible for creating that revenue or spending that expense. In essence, costs are not calculated on the shoulders of those who cannot manage them. In the case of the Division of Academic Affairs, a total of 126 programs (211 majors) are currently offered on the UCO campus (*Table 3*); it is therefore important that the management of these many offerings rest with the Department Chairs or School Directors and Deans in order to follow existing budgetary planning pathways.

5. **Revenues and Expenses:** Revenues and expenses that are not controlled by a unit can still impact that unit. These revenues and costs, while not calculated as part of the budget total of a unit, are still included in the quantitative tool so that administrators can understand what non-controlled revenues and expenses affect their unit and in what amounts. These might include tuition reductions due to scholarships or expense increases because of debt service. The institution must absorb the impact of these decisions, further illustrating why just operating above financial breakeven is insufficient for the overall institution to cover costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Minors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.* Degree, Program, Major, and Minor offerings among degree types at UCO.

**Cost Centers vs. Revenue Generators** –

Although the primary function of UCO is teaching and revenue generating academic units
will be analyzed department by department, we must also analyze the efficiency of cost centers that typically do not generate independent revenue but may be necessary to do so, or add value to the student experience. Where academic revenue centers can be financially analyzed by contribution margins, cost centers cannot as they do not generally generate revenue. When they do have income, they can be analyzed in light of cash flows and expenses. However, pure cost centers are generally analyzed based on internal reviews or peer comparisons. Peer comparisons are also used to understand a range of expected contribution margins for revenue generators.

**Peer Comparisons –**

An important aspect of analyzing the data collected by a quantitative assessment is the use of peer comparisons. Whereas the contribution margin acts as the primary tool in understanding the financial performance of revenue generating units, peer comparisons act as the primary tool for understanding the performance of cost centers.

These peer comparisons usually result in two important numerical financial results that are both utilized to give an overview of how a cost center is funded at UCO in comparison to how the same cost center is funded at a peer institution. These two financial comparative tools follow, below.

1. **Cost Per Student:** How much do we spend on each student, on average, in cost centers?

2. **Percentage of Total Budget:** How do our costs compare with other schools in comparison with our budget?

   These two quantitative results (Cost Per Student and Percentage of Total Budget) are then used to understand if a specific unit is funded at higher or lower rates than at peer institutions. This result should reveal whether the university’s investment in a specific unit is funded at, above, or below peer institution rates – both at a per student level, and as a percentage of total budget.

**Defining Our Peers –**

The Quantitative Subcommittee identified a series of attributes that we recommended in order to be considered as peers to UCO. These include the following attributes:

1. **Public Four-Year Institution:** Public, four-year, state universities in the United States that do not offer a doctorate.

2. **Student Population:** Institutions with a similar student population of between 12,000 to 17,000. This allows us to focus on institutions with similar opportunities for economy of scale.

3. **State Median Income:** Institutions in states with a median household income within 10% of the Oklahoma median income were considered by the Subcommittee. The median family income in Oklahoma in 2018 was
$51,924 (US Census Bureau). Therefore, the states where we looked for peer institutions included Arkansas, New Mexico, Louisiana, Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, Missouri, Montana, Florida, Idaho, Maine, Indiana, Ohio, South Dakota, and Michigan.

4. Metropolitan University: Institutions were also considered if they were located in a metropolitan area of a mid-sized American city.

5. Endowment Size: Institutions with endowments of 25 to 50 million dollars in assets.

6. Teaching Focus: Institutions without a Tier-1 Research status but with some research component to their faculty expectations.

Following the analysis above, and working with various lists of peers used for other purposes, we narrowed the peers for this analysis to the following universities: (1) University of Missouri, Kansas City; (2) Youngstown State University; (3) University of North Florida; and (4) University of Missouri, St. Louis. Other peer groups are available and sanctioned through our governing boards (Regional University System of Oklahoma and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education).

The Basic Analytic Model –

We will gather data from Banner, Paycom, and other institutional management systems to be able to use the methodologies described above. A specific focus will be to use already generated data to the broadest extent possible and to automate the calculations within the model to minimize staffing to maintain it. We plan to store the data within a database created by IT, with the goal to automate the population of the database annually. We will use an already available reporting tool to compile and disseminate all the data.

1. Included Revenues: Revenue data for academic units will likely be collected and analyzed by program but administered at the departmental level. Tuition and course fees will be charged to students taking classes in a specific academic unit. Revenues will be assigned to departments by course prefix. In situations where prefixes do not match teaching faculty, adjustments will be made on the expense side. External funding including grants, fundraising, or other revenues generated will be assigned to the appropriate unit. If such revenue cannot be assigned to a specific unit, it will be assigned towards overhead at the lowest level applicable (e.g., college, division, or university). State appropriations and other revenue sources not directly applicable to academic units will be brought into the model and assigned towards overhead costs at the university. Any revenue assigned towards general overhead costs will reduce the amount of contribution margin that academic units need to generate in order to balance the budget.
2. **Included Expenses:** Expenses will be broken out between those supporting the academic units and those supporting the general operations of the university. The expenditures supporting the academic units will be brought in at the lowest level possible in order to identify the costs associated with programs. The expenditures supporting general operations will be brought in at the lowest level possible and will be rolled up by division/unit. Generally speaking, we will use the University’s organization structure, as defined by the National Association of College and University Business Owners (NACUBO) standards, to define the roll ups by division/unit. These expenditures will include the following 10 variables calculated at the level of the unit: (1) compensations and benefits, (2) office and classroom supplies, (3) travel expenses, (4) research expenses, (5) professional development costs, (6) scholarships given by the unit, (7) accreditation expenses and fees, (8) building expenses for occupied space (including debt), (9) expenses paid for departmental students (including advising costs), and (10) any other expenses that can be allocated and controlled by the unit that are as yet to be determined and announced to the campus community.

Departmental analyses will be aggregated by college, and then additional revenues and expenses will be included at this level of analysis. Within cost centers, costs will be aggregated at the level of the vice president.

**Application of Variables to the Alignment and Allocation Process**

A key element of the success of this alignment and allocation process will be the development of a trusting and collaborative relationship among the units. An intermediary body will need to be designated to have the ability to provide input on these decisions. Currently, the UPC has representatives of the major cost and revenue centers (Vice Presidents and Deans) as well as faculty, staff, and student representation through their respective senates. We recommend that this body be conserved in the future and given more time to address broader budgetary issues that confront the campus because it links together all major groups on campus who are impacted by budgetary decisions. The AATF itself may also be conserved at the discretion of the President even though members do not necessarily have broad oversight of the financial operations of their respective units. The President’s Cabinet will be an important body given that the largest revenue-generating unit (Academic Affairs), represented by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Chief Financial Officer, represented by the Vice President for Finance and Operations, as well as the other Divisions, sit in the Cabinet and therefore can directly discuss the results of the analyses. This body will presumably serve as the pivot point for decisions needed by the President to respond to emerging fiscal opportunities and threats to the institution.
Alignment and Allocation Process –

To ensure that there is a predictable and transparent pathway for the campus community to be engaged with the alignment and allocation process, the following are recommended elements of the process:

1. **Data Monitoring**: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (a product of a recommendation of the Vision 2020 strategic planning process), which oversees Institutional Research, will be a hub for sourcing data relevant to the alignment and allocation process, especially for academic units. The Office of Finance (and Operations) will serve as the other (financial) bookend for the process given its access to the budgetary processes on campus. The Office of Enrollment Services will be the “third leg of the stool” in creating a reliable monitoring process that can examine the regularly reported results of the quantitative and qualitative elements of the alignment and allocation process (*Figure 5*). Parameters will be established to notify administrative units when significant changes in their performance are observed.

2. **Cabinet Reports**: Given that the Chief Academic, Enrollment, and Financial Officers will be represented on the Cabinet, a group that meets on a weekly basis, we recommend that this body be “the first among equals” as to being informed of significant patterns that are detected in financial under- or over-performances of units. The Vice President over each Division can then be asked to visit with representatives of these divisional units most familiar with the observed performance change. At that time, a discussion of the qualitative data would ensue. This provides an immediate opportunity to contact the unit of interest to discuss the causes for the change in performance, and to begin alignment corrections as needed in order to recoup losses or distribute gains from and/or to other units. The President will be the final authority on assessing the need for any corrections but in consultation with the divisional representatives.

*Figure 5. Communication/Reporting Process.* Information will flow from monitoring activities of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE), Enrollment Services (ES), and the Office of Finance and Operations (F&O). Cabinet representatives will share any information about their respective organizational units directly with them while the University Planning Council (UPC) will field input both from Cabinet members and campus-wide representatives, including the Staff, Student, and Faculty Senates.
3. **University Planning Council (UPC):** Once initial alignment adjustments are assessed by the Cabinet representatives and divisional offices described above, it will be critically important to receive consultative input from the UPC because this body has representatives from all impacted units, including the academic colleges where some of the most complex but important deliberations will need to be made about specific departmental and/or programmatic changes. UPC is also the caretaker of the Vision 2020 Strategic Plan and where input is provided on internal and external assessment processes that include the Self-Study in Continuous Improvement (SSCI) and Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation processes, housed in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Discussions here are meant to create the “buy in” and campus-level awareness that will be required to have a positive and collaborative atmosphere surrounding the alignment and allocation process.

4. **Divisional (Unit) Responses:** When issues are identified within units that require a correction or modification of financial allocations, or reallocations among units, the Vice President overseeing the respective divisional units will be the point person to guide the suggested changes or, after deliberation within the unit, provide equally effective alternatives to those changes. Communicating these modifications can be made in the ordinary way of the given divisional unit, including within smaller and larger scale meetings, as long as the communication is made promptly and as an institutional priority to the affected unit. Often these requests will be in the form of employment position lines that have recently been vacated (due to retirements, etc.) that can be assessed for use in another unit, the same unit, or absorption back into the corpus of the institution as a whole.

5. **Feedback and Accountability:** It is expected that the units affected by alignment and allocation decisions will be regularly revisited in Cabinet and UPC meetings to determine their needs during the process. This will be an important “checks and balances” portion of the process since, just as circumstances may require a change in a given year, the priorities could shift again depending upon unpredictable events (witness the coronavirus disease pandemic and the State Legislature’s budgetary changes during the last three to six months).

6. **Remembering Institutional Mission, Vision, and Values:** The filter through which any new allocation process must operate is outlined above for the qualitative “Guideposts” of the institution. These historical values, including the four institutional Pillars of Progress that emerged during the Vision 2020 strategic planning process, are paramount to the final allocation decisions we make. To ensure that all units potentially impacted (negatively or positively) by this process have immediate input into the outcome, brief annual reports will be submitted by each unit (see Appendix C). These will be used in guiding allocation deliberations and to make the campus decision makers aware of any special features of the
units that should be considered during the alignment and allocation process. This will serve to fortify shared governance as outlined above among the Cabinet, UPC, and divisional units.

Final Recommendations to the President

Below, we summarize our chief recommendations for consideration by President Neuhold-Ravikumar. These include the following.

1. **Maintaining Existing Assessments:** The AATF strongly recommends that existing assessment processes be retained and explored for valuable information that is useful to decision-making during alignment and allocation processes. For example, the SSCI document (and assessment reports that sometimes replace them) should be carefully examined (as is currently the case) on a regular basis for patterns of change in programs and majors we support on the campus. Losing this input would not only weaken our knowledge about units over time but would also signal a loss of shared governance processes that the HLC wishes to see during their institutional assessment evaluations. These existing efforts will be utilized in a new way to help us complete the alignment and allocation process.

2. **Pillars as Institutional Guideposts:** The Task Force strongly recommends that UCO know and celebrate its institutional values. Vision 2020 remains our campus-wide strategic planning document and the four Pillars of Progress, namely (1) Student Success, (2) Transformative Learning, (3) Value, and (4) Place should remain central to any alignment process and as a guardrail against a quantitative model that only acts on variables and data without a direct consideration of these institutional values. The qualitative variables assessed in the Qualitative Feedback Tool (*Appendix C*) will inform these values as well.

3. **Data Driven Assessment:** Another important recommendation of the Task Force will be the deployment of a quantitative model for assessing unit performance. We remind the reader of the old adage that a model is only as good as the data it uses. Therefore, the currently outlined model (still being validated) must be regularly reviewed for its practicability and transparency of purpose to the campus community. If it cannot be explained to the people who will be impacted by it, then it is probably inadequate. This is why the Task Force is adamant that along with a clear, data-driven approach to performance evaluation which examines our strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, the model we use must be symbiotic with our values as an institution; those values include a transparent use of the model for the campus community members to examine and thereby understand sufficiently well to support participation in these important decisions.
4. **An Emphasis on Process:** Any successful planning process is characterized by openness and feedback from people who are impacted by that process. Therefore, as outlined above, it is an essential recommendation that we have a system of feedback that is inclusive of the three major groups represented on our campus: faculty, staff, and students. The University Planning Council (UPC) is that crosswalk of input that is needed in an alignment and allocation process; it allows decisions made at the Cabinet level to be commented on in real time and creates the confluence of constituencies that builds collaboration and trust in that process. (One might even consider keeping a liaison of the AATF, if it persists, on the UPC.) In many respects, groups like these represent the gatekeepers envisioned to ensure that the key guideposts are maintained and used to keep the system of “checks and balances” in place for the institution. Such a condition is also understood to be vital by accreditation agencies (e.g., the Higher Learning Commission).

5. **Engaging UPC in the Process:** The Task Force encourages the direct involvement of UPC in the establishment of this newly emerging alignment and allocation process. We recognize that the level of review and analysis will be critical to the success of the process, overall. We are therefore recommending that UPC be charged to discuss and help designate the units at which the performance criteria will be applied and administered going forward. As noted previously, this may be relatively easy to ascertain for academic units, but there will still need to be designations of these units across all UCO Divisions. In addition, the campus-wide qualitative survey (Appendix C) should be further evaluated and administered by the UPC given its institutional role in UCO’s planning and assessment (including for accreditation bodies and SSCIs). We believe these still ongoing quantitative and qualitative processes will go beyond the Task Force’s current charge (and prescribed deadline) and can be effectively determined through a shared governance process that would best fit within the UPC planning processes and as overseen by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The Task Force also recommends, as noted above, that UPC generally maintain a regular and substantive role in the alignment and allocation process given the widespread campus representation provided by its membership.

**Conclusion**

The Allocation and Alignment Task Force now concludes a nine-month exercise to answer the charge of President Neuhold-Ravikumar in creating a series of recommendations outlined above. The Task Force has worked well together during this process and, perhaps, could have truncated the
process with the impact of recent events. Instead we have worked in a unified fashion to complete this document as representatives of the entire university community. We are proud of this effort and encouraged by the fact that we could work on such a potentially divisive topic without conflict and, instead, with a common purpose.

In some ways, this effort allowed us to test drive our values as an institution through hours of physical and virtual meetings as we extended our time into the coronavirus disease pandemic. Remarkably, many of our values are even more obvious to us now than they were previously and the Task Force often found itself rallying around those values of being student-centered: an institution that values learning. We also recognize that change is afoot and by maintaining our values the changes ahead will be made easier and more obvious each time we adjust to the budgetary realities of our time. Our deliberations also made us recognize that while we look at quantitative data during our analyses, some units will still need to be seen through the lens of the broader impact that they have on the university and their necessity in operating the campus.

While our work as a task force now concludes with this report, we recognize that this is only the beginning of an unending effort to keep our institution healthy and viable for the future. It is a beginning point with what are key initial observations and preliminary conclusions that are still malleable with respect to the direction provided by the President with input from the Cabinet, University Planning Council, and other university units during future planning episodes. This document is pliable and capable of being utilized for the greater good of all parts of our campus. Indeed, we have often been asked why we would create an alignment and allocation process before having a new strategic plan. We could do so because of the values instilled into our thinking from Vision 2020 and because we are confident that the recommendations provided here will remain relevant through the next planning process, even if some of our guideposts change with it.
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Appendix A. Charge to the Alignment and Allocation Task Force.

Alignment and Allocation Task Force Charge
This group is charged with 1) defining the metrics, mechanism and process for measuring the alignment of all academic, student and institutional service programs, projects and centers and 2) defining the metrics, mechanism and process to facilitate university decision-making related to the allocation of financial resources to these academic, student and institutional service programs, projects and centers across the institution.
As representatives of our campus community, recommendations made by the task force should reflect the mission, vision and values of our university.
This task force will consider the following in their work:

1. Review best practices against other relevant institutions with a focus on those in which both the institution and the students are thriving.
2. Inform their understanding of current strengths and areas of concern of our current funding allocation method by gathering and considering feedback from within the campus community.
3. Think and reach beyond departmental, college and divisional boundaries.
4. Provide a balanced, holistic and innovative perspective acknowledging that our current allocation method is inadequate if we are to thrive in the new education economy.
5. Make recommendations that enhance the university’s ability to make informed decisions quickly and empower the university to respond nimbly to opportunities and threats in the education industry and in our state.

The final report and deliverables are requested by June 30, 2020. Over the following year, the University will work to implement the recommendations of the task force and prepare an aligned allocation strategy in consultation with the faculty, staff and students of the university.

Thank you for your willingness to serve our campus community in this way. I, and every member of the president’s cabinet, support you in this work. Please consider us your partners and advocates as you proceed.

With appreciation,

Patti Neuhold-Ravikumar
President
Appendix B. Website Addresses for Institutional Models.

University of Missouri at Saint Louis:
https://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/files/pdfs/app-action-items-report-5-7-18.pdf
Portland State University:
Southeastern Louisiana University: http://www.southeastern.edu/admin/president/prioritization_acad/
Idaho State:
http://www.southeastern.edu/admin/president/prioritization_acad/
Montana Technological University:
University of Massachusetts at Amherst:
University of California at Davis:
University of Missouri at Saint Louis:
https://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/review/index.html
https://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/files/pdfs/umsl-program-prioritization-report-032218.pdf
https://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/files/pdfs/app-action-items-report-5-7-18.pdf
North Carolina State University:
https://strategicplan.ncsu.edu/strategic-realignment-process/recommendations/
https://strategicplan.ncsu.edu/strategic-realignment-process/questions-and-answers/
Elizabethtown College:
https://www.etown.edu/offices/president/faq.aspx
Metropolitan State University of Denver:
https://www.msudenver.edu/academic-realignment/feedbackreceived/
Keystone College:
https://www.keystone.edu/2019/05/keystone-college-charts-plan-for-the-future/
North Carolina State University:
https://leadership.ncsu.edu/2011/03/14/strategic-realignment/
University of Tulsa:
https://utulsa.edu/truecommitment/academicstrategy/
https://utulsa.edu/truecommitment/#future
https://utulsa.edu/truecommitment/faq/#general
Hanover Research:
https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/hanoverresearch_bestpractices_programreview.pdf
California State University at Los Angeles:
http://www.calstatela.edu/strategicplan/draft-strategic-plan
University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh:
https://uwosh.edu/strategicplan/
Texas A&M San Antonio:
http://www.tamusa.edu/officeofthepresident/strategic-plan/goals-co-chairs.html
University of Texas at San Antonio:
University of Madison at Wisconsin:
Appendix C. Qualitative Survey and Variables.

Qualitative Feedback Tool

The University of Central Oklahoma (UCO) requests your completion of the Qualitative Feedback Tool on an annual basis. Answers to these questions may exist in current documents, such as the Self-Study of Continuous Improvement. You are welcome and encouraged to use as much existing relevant data as possible.

1. Strategic Planning

UCO’s Mission Statement

“The University of Central Oklahoma exists to help students learn by providing transformative education experiences to students so that they may become productive, creative, ethical, and engaged citizens and leaders serving our global community. UCO contributes to the intellectual, cultural, economic and social advancement of the communities and individuals it serves.”

UCO’s Vision Statement

“The University of Central Oklahoma will be one of the nation’s top metropolitan universities, serving our community while providing our students the opportunities to achieve their highest level of leadership potential.”

Core themes: Student success, transformative learning, place & value.

Learn more here: https://www.uco.edu/mission-and-vision

A. In the last year, please describe how your Area, Divisions, Department, and/or Unit (herein referred to as “Unit”) has contributed to UCO’s overall mission.

B. In the last year, please describe how your Unit has impacted the core theme of student success.

C. In the last year, please describe how your Unit has impacted the core theme of transformative learning.

D. In the last year, please describe how your Unit has impacted the core theme of place.

E. In the last year, please describe how your Unit has impacted the core theme of value.

F. In the last year, has your Unit specifically worked to incorporate the 4 pillars of UCO’s mission? If so, how and to what extent?

G. In the last year, what has your Unit done to work towards UCO’s vision?

2. Financial Stewardship

A. In the last year, has your Unit identified any opportunities for savings through process improvement or a revision of processes/practices? If so, please describe.
B. In the last year, has your Unit identified any opportunities for meaningful investments? If so, please describe to what extent, if any, you were able to invest and what sort of return you have seen on that investment.

C. What additional feedback would you or your Unit like to share with the University, if any, in regards to our financial oversight and current management of money.

3. **SWOT Analysis**

A. In the last year, what were you proudest of in your Unit? What were your strengths (i.e. unique selling points, doing something no one else is doing)? How were you able to use these strengths to your advantage?

B. In the last year, what made your Unit struggle? (i.e. lack resources, competition does better?) How has your Unit been able to mitigate your weaknesses?

C. In the last year, what opportunities (i.e. could exploit to your advantage?) How was your Unit able to did your unit exploit to enhance your work?

D. In the last year, what were external threats (i.e. external problems?) that were out of UCO’s or your Unit’s control, but you were able to mitigate?

4. **Adaptation**

A. What does your Unit do to stay current on trends, best practices, and the ever-changing pulse of student and/or employee needs?

B. In the last year, how has your Unit been able to be more responsive to students in an environment requiring more flexibility? (i.e. online, blended classes and/or supporting their success outside the classroom, etc.).

C. In the last year, how has your Unit been able to be more responsive to your employees in an environment requiring more flexibility? (i.e. dealing with kids, office vs. home, etc.).

5. **Additional Information**

What have we not covered in this document that needs to be covered in a review of the previous year for your Unit?

Submitted by:

________________________  _____________________________
Area, Divisions, Department, and/or Unit Director Date

________________________  _____________________________
Vice President Date
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