Working Group for Enhanced Planning Tools Project

Project Title	Enhanced Planning Project (Phase 1)
Problem Statement	**Framing the Project**: To fulfill our mission in a competitive environment, we need to assess the quality of our academic and administrative programs against our institutional priorities and allocate resources accordingly. At this time, we require evidence- based and transparent process to align our resources to priorities across the institution. Budget reductions have been achieved through across the board cuts. As financial pressures continue, we have determined this is not a sustainable approach if we wish to meet our objectives and maintain a high level of institutional quality. Some key questions must be addressed: • How can we enhance the quality and success of our teaching, learning, research and service to the community by optimizing the alignment of our resources with our priorities? • What is the best process to help us make strategic choices on where to invest limited resources in accordance with institutional priorities?
Project Goal	To develop a process with a set of standard criteria that will be used to align priorities and resources so that we ensure quality and success in our education, research and community missions now and in the future. Priorities are as outlined in the Strategic Plan with a sharper focus as determined by the President resulting from his consultation process.
Project Outcomes	In order to achieve the project goal of aligning resources with priorities, the outcomes will include the following: • A set of standardized criteria against which to assess quality, cost and relevance of programs and activities in support of institutional priorities • For these criteria an institutional data set updated periodically and sufficiently robust to enable differentiated budget allocations by university decision makers at all levels. • Data to be used by the Vice Presidents to inform the design of a comprehensive process for decision making. Once the process is approved by the Executive,

Project Title	Making Choices (Phase 1)
	oversight of its implementation will the responsibility of Integrated Planning (Phase 2)
Project Sponsor	Reeta Tremblay, VP Academic and Provost
Project Chairs	Catherine Mateer, AVP Academic Planning
Scope	Task a working group with the following responsibilities / deliverables • Develop and recommend to Integrated Planning a set of criteria that can be measured and reported. • Recommend a process for identifying, gathering, reporting and comparing the information. • Recommend the appropriate unit of measure for the criteria (e.g. Faculty, department, program etc.) • Develop a project timeline • Develop a project consultation and communication plan • Oversee the gathering of the information • Report out as per the communication plan <u>Project Out of Scope</u> • We will not undertake a full program prioritization and ranking process as outlined in the Dickeson book. Criteria selection and the data gathering process may be based on principles as identified by this prioritization method. • We are not proposing a decentralized approach to university budgeting • This process does not include reviewing the current budget model/process. A review of the budget model/process will be undertaken separately but linked to this process as appropriate • Solutions and opportunities to address the structural deficit will continue in parallel with the Smart Choices Project • Decision making process (refer to project outcomes phase 2)
Project Team Members	AVP Academic Planning – **Chair** AVP Financial Planning and Operations AVP Student Affairs AVP Research

Project Title	Making Choices (Phase 1)
	CIO Director University Communications + Marketing Director Institutional Planning and Analysis Deans (2) Manager, Office of the Vice President Finance (resource)
Key Partners	• Advisory Committee to the Working Group: (TBD approx. 10 participants e.g. Vice Chair of the Senate, Chair (1), SC on Academic Planning (3), SCUB (3) Other portfolios (3), students (2)) • Full campus community with focus on academic and administrative leadership.
Approach:	1. Establish criteria 2. Identify and collect data 3. Link data to criteria 4. Communicate information
Principles	Project 1. Build trust through open and transparent process 2. Plan effectively 3. Plan longer term 4. Develop measurable goals 5. Support a culture of accountability at all leadership levels 6. Engage internal stakeholders, communicate and inform Criteria developed to inform decision making 1. Measurable 2. Aligned with core mission 3. Consistently applied 4. Meet obligations to external stakeholders 5. Provide public accountability 6. Service and academic criteria metrics may differ 7. Transparent and open 8. Easily obtainable, easily understood, repeatable and sustainable
Milestones	**Draft High level** Oct – Early Nov - Project concept sign-off (President, Integrated Planning) then to Deans and Senior Leaders Nov – Assemble Team – complete draft of high level project charter, short term communication plan

Project Title	Making Choices (Phase 1)
	Dec – Kick-Off (week of Dec 9th with budget session) Jan/14 – March/14 Develop Criteria April/14-Sept/14 Data Collection Oct/14-Dec/14 Communication
Constraints	• Campus capacity to respond to data collection exercise. Some processes may need to be modified, delayed or stopped to ensure completion in a timely manner. • People may be concerned that this is a pre cursor to program prioritization and therefore communication will need to be very clear. • Project will need additional analyst resource to be successful.
Budget	$150,000 – 200,000 Analyst will be seconded for data collection and analysis and department support. Analyst should be engaged for at least one year and potentially longer to support budget changes. Budget noted above is for one year.
Expected Completion	December 2014