Task Force members attending were: Thomas Cooley, Leslie Brown, Dall Forsythe, Joseph Giovanelli, Anthony Jiga, Gerald Rosenfeld, Dennis Dilorenzo, Renauld Fournier

Attending as staff to the Task Force were Martin Dorph, Anastasia Crosswhite, and Susanna Stein.

The committee opened the meeting by discussing the Housing Proposal. Dean Thomas Cooley voiced that the proposal has been presented to the University, and feedback was “slightly lukewarm.” Indeed, there were some aspects of the proposal that the University liked more than others. The University did not take to the idea that Administration should be moved out of Faculty Housing units. The University may also dislike the proposed full set of costs. With the knowledge that the University may choose to reject any aspect of the proposal, the Committee agreed that these recommendations are important to the proposal as a whole and therefore should remain.

It was agreed that the proposal should be clarified to separately explain the User Fee and Turnover Fee as two separate components, although those fees are not wholly independent. Neither fee entirely matches up with a cost.

The Committee closed the subject by voting in favor of sending the proposal, along with the corresponding PowerPoint slides, to NYU Executive Vice President Mike Alfano.

The Committee moved on to discussing the budget proposal. Martin Dorph expressed that the proposal needs a stronger emphasis on what can be gained from the transparency and predictability that comes with full overhead cost allocation. The University still wishes to “tax” schools, but it is far better to frame a School’s contribution to the University as payment for centralized services (which, therefore, must be itemized). It is important that schools see exactly what they are paying for, as this knowledge affects a school’s spending motivations and behaviors. In turn, the analysis of these specific costs sharpens the discussion of the nature of a school’s spending. With this knowledge, a school may find providing the service itself is more cost-effective than buying it from the University.

The Committee addressed briefly the concept of “transparency” with the budget to the larger community. It was agreed that a discussion of central costs is expected, but not of individual schools – this assumption affords the schools a little “fog.”

The Committee continued on to discuss the Systems Implementation Proposal. Renauld Fournier presented a proposal on behalf of the Subcommittee (attached).
The proposed Comprehensive System Rollout Schedule should be developed and made available as a website to increase transparency. Standardized templates for the life-cycle of projects would provide structure and consistency; indeed, standardized training needs to be applied to the rollout of all projects. Business process reviews should be an emphasized part of this life-cycle. The proposal also emphasizes consistent communication outlined in a communication plan. This communication includes input from existing advisory groups, regular updates, and very clear and well tested reports.

The proposal also suggests a “cross-functional, cross-process advisory panel” to “provide guidance and assistance” during the process.

The Committee discussed the proposal’s suggestion of an independent training and testing facility. Many agreed that there is plenty of space that would be appropriate for training and testing throughout the University; it is only difficult to find during class hours (generally Monday through Thursday, 11am – 3pm). More communication with the Space Planning Working Group (which operates through the Provost’s office and is chaired by Carol Morrow) may be a better answer than an independent facility.

The Committee briefly discussed the Time and Labor project, which is expected to be rolled out in March or April of next year. It is still in the phase of vendor selection and contract negotiation. Renauld Fornier and Marie Gayle will work on updating the proposal and resubmit it in two weeks.

The Committee moved on to discuss briefly the Value Added Practices Team Proposal (attached). The Committee feels strongly that a Value Added Practices Team created across the University would be very beneficial, but the report also addresses challenges and possible pre-emptive solutions.

The Committee discussed the suggestion of a VAP team surrounding the budget process, and agreed that although it would be difficult, it would be beneficial to have a meeting between the University’s fiscal officers.

The Committee returned to discussing the budget. Martin Dorph and Tom Cooley distributed copies of the trial run of the budget, and the Committee agreed that it was successful. The Committee expressed that there needs to be further clarification with what Schools provide which services to themselves, so that there is no “double counting”; for example, SCPS may or may not be included in “Undergraduate Admissions,” as it has its own Undergraduate Admissions Apparatus. It was agreed that using a step-down process was most helpful in this respect. The Budget Subcommittee agreed to meet the following Wednesday to further discuss the trial run.