

**Budget Council Minutes**  
**July 12, 2022**  
**4:00 - 5:00 p.m.**  
**Montana Room (Norm Asbjornson Hall, room 359)**

**Members:**

Terry Leist	Robert Mokwa	Chris Kearns	Ryan Knutson
Kim Obbink	Dan Miller	Michael Brody	Jason Carter
Chris Fastnow	Craig Woolard	John Ooley	Kathleen Brewer
Halton Stancil			

**Guests:**

Megan Lasso, Brianna Bos, Brittany Thompson, Mackenzie Seeley, Kate Argall, Leslie Schroeder (admin support)

**Absentees:** Robert Mokwa

---

**I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Terry Leist.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

The April 12, 2022, meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

**III. University Information/Announcements**

**a. May Board of Regents Meeting Update**

- Many consent agenda items because any project expense over \$300k goes to the BOR
- Building names go before the board for approval; Gianforte Hall was approved
- Present Law Adjustment process (requests to the governor and legislature) from OCHE

**IV. FY19 Investment Assessments**

**a. New, more formal, assessment process**

- Important for accreditation; plan to continue this every year
- Budget Council members were each assigned six FY19 investment proposals/outcomes to review and score based on a pre-determined rubric; each investment was scored by three different council members; the three scores for each investment were totaled; council to discuss/decide future funding for the three lowest-scoring investments
- Process goals – fairness (because all proposals will be evaluated instead of a few presentations); encourage more intentional, well thought-through proposals

**b. Feedback regarding the process**

- Easy, not too time-consuming, fun to read other department's proposals
- Criteria were hard to score for some investments, i.e., faculty productivity investment had student outcomes which were difficult to assess
- Budget Council may need to initially guide/assist proposal writers to define measurable outcomes so they can be better assessed later; OPA may be able to help with this; perhaps the scoring rubric could be shared with departments before the proposals are written; ultimately proposals shouldn't be funded if outcomes aren't measurable
- Scoring rubric could be reworded to ask: "Did the outcomes affect the strategic impact?"

**c. A possible change to the process would be to look at the top investments each year**

- Once those have been determined, then BC, the Budget Office, and Planning & Analysis could help authors beef up the proposals with measurable outcomes – this process may allow enhancement of

original idea or could result in the opposite; it allows for more input, because proposals could be shared at Terry's monthly meeting with the president and provost

- d. Base funding would only be pulled in extreme circumstances; may be an opportunity to resubmit the proposal or funds may be reallocated
- e. Lowest scoring investments
  - Whole council reviewed and discussed, then recommended whether to retract, redirect, or continue funding
  - HR Evaluation Software proposal – scored zero; due to leadership transition no one even knew about the funding; council agreed to recommend to discontinue this funding
  - Library Trails Coordinator proposal –second lowest; only awarded half (\$30k) the original ask (\$60k); circumstances pivoted so they pivoted also; when leadership changes, we need to ask do they still want to champion this project – if it remains a priority, then reassess; heavy emphasis on collaboration with tribal colleges but that didn't happen (could be due to COVID); council agreed to allow a meeting with Doralynn Rossman to ask what the library would do if they could do it again and what they are doing right now, then bring it back to Budget Council to reassess
  - OPA Administration – third lowest proposal; council agreed to keep this funding to fill the position then come back and reassess at a future date

**V. Public Comment/Member Feedback**

None

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

**Next Meeting: October 11, 2022, from 3:30-5:00 p.m.**