

UFV Budget Model Review Project Charter

Executive Sponsor	Mark Evered, President
Executive Leaders	Jackie Hogan – Chief Financial Officer Eric Davis – Provost and Vice President Academic
Administrative Support	Kasey Merritt, Executive Assistant
Project Team	Jackie Hogan – Chief Financial Officer Eric Davis – Provost and Vice President Academic Mark Brosinski – Budget Manager Ian McAskill – Integrated Planning Betty Poettcker – Director of Finance Karen Evans – Vice President, Student Karola Stinson – Vice President, External Diane Griffiths – Associate Vice President, Employee Services Jacqueline Nolte/Elizabeth Dennis – Faculty of Arts Rosetta Khalideen/Fiona McQuarrie – Faculty of Professional Studies Ora Steyn – Faculty of Science Sue Bridgen – Faculty of Access/Continuing Studies Harv McCullough – Faculty of Trades and Technology Yvon Dandurand – AVP Research and Graduate Studies Laurie Klesh – Director of Information Technology
Creation Date	October 22, 2010

1.0 Project Purpose

The purpose of this project is to review and recommend a budgeting process that ensures resources and funding allocations are aligned with strategic goals, encourages and provides incentive for planning and innovation, and provides transparency for decision making.

2.0 Project Background

UFV currently uses an incremental budget model which means that each new fiscal year a budget unit's starting point is its previous year's base budget. Incremental budgeting builds upon historic spending patterns, allowing gradual changes in resource allocations as circumstances warrant. There are no explicit links between a unit's responsibilities and its budget.

Incremental budgeting promotes financial stability as units generally receive similar resource allocations each year. From a management perspective, it is simpler to implement and oversee than many other budgetary approaches. Some of the problems with this budget approach are that resource decisions do not require full consideration of what is being accomplished with the base budget or the impact that resource allocation decisions have on future revenues. Because the status quo is assumed for much of the overall budget, incremental budgeting may not integrate effectively with strategic planning or optimize what could be accomplished with an institution's resources. Incremental budgeting also often leads to inadequate consultation and/or understanding of resource allocation decisions by the university community. This can result in a disconnect between central decisions and the implementation of these decisions by faculties and administrative units.

While the incremental model has worked well for UFV in the past, there are concerns now that it is becoming more difficult to effectively and efficiently support the strategic goals of the university.

3.0 Objectives

- Objective 1: To advance the university's strategic goals through a greater alignment between financial resource allocation and university priorities.
- Objective 2: To improve the understanding of fiscal matters among faculty, staff and administrators and promote fiscal responsibility
- Objective 3: To achieve greater transparency and accountability in department, division, campus and university fiscal decision making
- Objective 4: To promote decision making and governance consistent with legislation and best collegial practice
- Objective 5: To promote revenue-generating opportunities that provide the financial support needed to fulfill the goals of the University while respecting its values and integrity

Objective 6: To ensure controls, policies, and procedures are established to support the transition to the new budgeting model

Objective 7: To provide advice and training for the process of adopting the new budgeting model.

4.0 Critical Success Factors

The following factors are critical to the project's success:

CSF 1: Ensure that the change in budget model doesn't affect the operational strength and competitiveness of UFV

CSF 2: Ensure the change in budget model is clearly communicated with responsibilities and accountabilities defined

CSF 3: Ensure project milestones are broadly communicated and consultation opportunities are provided

CSF 4: Ensure adequate controls and training provided to support the transition

5.0 Project Governance

The following identifies the roles, responsibilities, and relationships for key individuals, teams or committees assigned to this project.

Role	Responsibility
Executive Champion <ul style="list-style-type: none">Mark Evered, President	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Champion projectSupport commitments madeProvide strategic direction
Executive Leaders <ul style="list-style-type: none">Eric Davis, Provost & VP AcademicJackie Hogan, Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide strategic direction and timely decisions related to issues raised by the project teamSupport commitments madeMonitor project progress
Project Team <ul style="list-style-type: none">Jackie Hogan, CFO (Chair)Eric Davis, Provost & VP AcademicKaren Evans, VP StudentKarola Stinson, VP ExternalDiane Griffiths, AVP Employee ServicesMark Brosinski, Budget ManagerBetty Poettcker, Director of FinanceIan McAskill – Integrated PlanningJacqueline Nolte/Elizabeth Dennis –ArtsRosetta Khalideen/Fiona McQuarrie – Professional StudiesOra Steyn – ScienceSue Bridgen – Access/Continuing StudiesHarv McCullough- Trades and Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Ensure project objectives and deliverables are achievedManage the project scopeResponsible for project status reportingIdentify and resolve issues, risks and critical dependenciesLiaise with all partners/stakeholders to ensure their expectations and deliverables are managedUndertake research/analysis, develop options and identify recommended approach

6.0 Project Work Plan Overview

The following is an overview of the proposed project work plan, identifying significant milestones and deliverables with accompanying completion dates.

Deliverable / Milestone	Target Completion Date
Project Charter – approved	October 2010
Report #1- different models considered	November / December 2010
Report #2- new budget model recommendation	January /February 2011
Report #3 - Implementation plan developed	April 2011
Implementation and transition year	April 1, 2012
Feedback/follow-up, review	March 31, 2013