



Principles and Criteria for Development of the TransformUS Implementation Plan

As of February 11, 2014

This document presents the criteria that the Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning (PCIP) will use to develop the TransformUS implementation plan as well as the principles PCIP will follow as the plan is developed. In developing this document, PCIP had available for its review the criteria used by the Academic Program and Support Services Task Forces (see website), a set of principles developed by the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council (see Attachment One) and considerable feedback from a wide variety of sources including individual meetings with unit leaders. All of this information along with further analysis and judgment will inform the implementation that PCIP will develop to respond to the recommendations of the two task forces. At this time, PCIP anticipates that the implementation plan will describe, at a high level, a set of discrete projects or initiatives which will be developed and implemented over the next few years. According to the nature of the actions, some will be initiated with unit leaders while others will be presented to University Council, Senate and Board of Governors for final approval.

Principles for Process Management

1. ***Transparency and Accountability.*** PCIP will undertake to share its principles and criteria, its general directions, and background information upon which the plan is developed. We will make evident how the actions outlined in the plan relate to the recommendations of the two task forces.
2. ***Evidence informed.*** PCIP will utilize evidence from a variety of sources and conduct further analyses to develop the implementation plan, including operating and budgetary consequences of actions.
3. ***Collaborative.*** PCIP will work with unit leaders and University Council (if it wishes to do so) to identify the actions which can and should be included and it will work with unit leaders to enable localized action.

Criteria for PCIP's Evaluation of Projects/Initiatives to be Included in the Implementation Plan

1. ***Institutional Benefit/Transformational.*** The implementation plan will move the university toward its future vision of being recognized among the most distinguished research-intensive universities in North America. We recognize that the primary mission of any university is learning and discovery and believe that each is best accomplished in the presence of the other. To do so will require that the university have a bias for action and engage in 'bold initiatives', not solely 'incremental shifts'.
2. ***Alignment with Strategic Directions and Foundational Documents.*** The implementation plan will be mindful of the university's considerable work in identifying its goals and priorities within the context of its learning and discovery missions.
3. ***Financial Sustainability.*** The implementation plan will ensure that the savings required to address the current financial challenge are realized and that the university is financially sustainable on a go-forward basis. This will include an examination of all ways in which costs can be reduced such as



duplication of services and re-structuring academic programs and administrative services for simplicity, efficiency, and effectiveness. Opportunities to maintain or increase revenues will also be considered.

4. **Materiality.** The implementation plan will focus institution-wide attention on significant areas of financial saving for action for greatest impact, while referring the implementation of actions of lesser financial consequence to unit leaders.
5. **Build Organizational Capacity.** PCIP will look to identify actions that promote the strength and resilience (i.e. capacity) of units to manage their own affairs within a framework of subsidiarity (i.e. responsibility exercised at the lowest level that is competent for the function in question) and collegiality. This might mean that, for example, fewer but more stable and better resourced departments, coherent structures to support interdisciplinary programs, reinforcement of internal college resource allocation priorities, and reinforcement of the role of deans and administrative unit leaders within a context of collegial governance.
6. **Coherence.** The implementation plan will be mindful of the impact of one decision on other areas and will present a package of ideas that are integrated.



Attachment One: Suggested principles for the development of any implementation plan prepared by the Planning and Priorities Committee and submitted to PCIP on January 31, 2014 for PCIP's consideration in the development of its response to the TransformUS task force reports (in no order of priority)

- That as the TransformUS program prioritization was undertaken to address budgetary concerns, that any program phase-out have a clear budgetary consequence, with the exception of those programs where the unit has already indicated its intention to phase-out the program;
- That further analysis of the real costs associated with any program phase-out is undertaken in advance of making any recommendation with respect to the program;
- That decisions regarding programs be evidence-informed, in terms of the budgetary consequences as well as the operating consequences;
- That PCIP begin by reviewing those programs placed in quintile 5, and that the consequences of not proceeding with the recommendation to phase-out a program be made clear;
- That in reviewing the programs placed in quintiles 3 and 4, that PCIP look to those programs which may yield the greatest degree of increased revenue or increased savings, as the case may be;
- That PCIP look as much to quintile 4 as to quintile 1 for reinvestment of funds, as many of the programs in quintile 1 are already well resourced, whereas investment in programs in quintile 4 has the potential to have a greater impact on improving program quality;
- That the future potential of programs be considered relative to any recommendation, particularly for those programs undergoing renewal at the time of task force review;
- That the direct and indirect consequences of phasing-out a program and the overall effect upon the unit be considered in terms of research and teaching;
- That the direct and indirect consequences of phasing-out a program on other units across campus be considered;
- That the university's strategic directions and long-range planning be considered relative to any program changes;
- That central resources be provided to units to assist with enacting the recommendations in the implementation plan;
- That PCIP begin by examining duplication of services, with the goal of reducing duplication through restructuring or other means;
- That the effectiveness of any support service be assessed by its contributions either directly or indirectly to the university's mandate of teaching and research; if the unit is not directly or indirectly contributing to this purpose, then its activities should be directed to another agency;
- That any change to a support service be considered relative to the potential implications of the change relative to the university's programs and students, so that these interrelationships can be thoroughly examined and explored prior to enacting any change;
- That administrative services be streamlined to reduce expenditures over time;
- That administrative structures be simplified;
- That outcomes be pursued which enhance quality; and that any action which reduces quality be balanced against the savings realized to have a minimal effect upon quality while maximizing the savings attained;
- That the potential of shared services be explored as a cost-saving measure;
- That recognition be given to the fact that the university campus extends beyond its physical boundaries, and that any changes with respect to the means by which the university presently delivers distance education take into account the importance of distributed education as a university goal;



- That the savings afforded by taking advantage of information and communications technologies be realized;
- That if a support service is essential in the long term (e.g. student housing), then a valid assumption is to proceed with the service;
- That any further analysis be conducted in a forward-looking manner;
- That as the contributions and connections of small programs may not be readily identifiable, that any recommendation to phase-out a small program that did not rank highly be carefully considered in terms of its contributions to research, teaching, and the success of other programs elsewhere, prior to any action being taken;
- That PCIP refer to the university's foundational documents as it creates the implementation plan.



Attachment Two: Principles Guiding the Operating Budget Adjustments Project *As of September, 2012*

Background: In May 2012, the Board of Governors at the University of Saskatchewan asked university administration to produce a sustainable balanced budget, reducing operating expenditures by \$44.5 million annually and balancing the budget by 2015/16 while at the same time supporting the strategic priorities of the university as described in Promise and Potential, the University's Third Integrated Plan, and in the Strategic Directions. This is the second time in four years that the university has been asked to address a significant budgetary challenge. In 2008/09, following the global economic downturn, the university achieved \$10 million (or 3%) in permanent reductions through mildly targeted cuts which protected the three new graduate schools, the College of Graduate Studies and Research, and University Advancement. The current challenge represents just over 8% of the university's projected operating revenues by 2016 and is expected to require highly selective actions on the part of the university, including the possibility of closing academic programs, departments and colleges, to be achieved.

Based on previous experience and guided by institutional goals and plans, the process that will be followed will be deliberate, principled, multi-pronged and strategic. The University will utilize all of its considerable resources (people and financial) to address this challenge and to ensure that it addresses the current fiscal realities and shepherds its financial, capital and human resources in an effective, humane, and respectful manner.

Aligned with the vision of the university to 'hold an honourable place among the best', as described in Promise and Potential, and guided by the Strategic Directions, the operating budget adjustments process 2012-2016 will be based on the following principles:

Alignment: The budget adjustment process will ensure that decisions are aligned with the university's vision and its teaching, research and service missions, as expressed in the Strategic Directions, the Foundational Documents and integrated plan.

1. Be aligned with the university's vision as expressed in the Strategic Directions, Foundational Documents and integrated plan.

Comprehensiveness: The budget adjustment process will take a holistic view of the university and all of its resources, including the opportunity to collaborate internally as well as with other post-secondary institutions within the province and beyond.

2. Take a holistic view of the university and all of its resources, including the opportunity to collaborate internally and with external partners.

Sustainability: The budget adjustment process will look for budgetary savings and new revenues which result in a balanced operating budget by 2016 and which lay the groundwork for the university's future success by demonstrating responsible, prudent and sustainable stewardship of resources.

3. Look for long-term, sustainable, operating budget leading to a more efficient, innovative and responsive university.

Transparency: The process to be followed and the criteria upon which decisions will be made will be clearly stated and readily available to the general university community. There will be opportunities for the university community to influence the criteria and the process, particularly for academic programs and decisions which require the approval of the University Council and Senate. It is understood that the principle of transparency must be balanced against the obligations of the university enunciated within its collective agreements and the



rights of individuals for due process. This is particularly important in the context of job loss which is anticipated as part of this process.

4. Be transparent with respect to process and criteria, integrative and consultative.

Respectfulness: The process will be especially respectful of all groups and individuals involved, particularly those who are directly affected by change.

5. Treat individuals with respect and dignity.

Evidence-informed: Recommendations of the Steering Committee to the Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning (PCIP) and to the Council committees (where appropriate) will be based on evidence which is properly assembled and with criteria widely understood.

6. Base decision-making on defined criteria.

Opportunity: Opportunities to differentiate the University of Saskatchewan by sharpening focus and acting on strategic advantages to achieve research, teaching and service goals will be supported and encouraged.

7. Look for opportunities to differentiate ourselves by sharpening our focus and acting on our strategic advantages to achieve our research, teaching and service goals.

Accountability: The process to be followed will be informed and guided by the recommendations of institutional leadership, leading practice and evidence appropriately assembled. A high degree of importance will be placed on ensuring that the leaders of academic and administrative units undertake actions which are strategically correct for the university, rather than working to achieve the narrow outcomes for individual colleges, schools or administrative units. The process will support the university's pursuit of a culture of high performance at all levels.

8. Be informed and guided by the recommendations of institutional leadership, leading practice, and evidence.

Consultation: The operating budget adjustment process will follow a broadly consultative approach to ensure that the general campus community is aware of the anticipated changes and the consequences of these changes (within limitations of collective agreements) and will utilize existing governance mechanisms, established policies and processes, including the principle of subsidiarity. Consultations and approvals will be required with Council and Council committees where academic programs, departments, and units are affected.

9. Take action consistent with existing governance mechanisms, established policies and processes, including the principle of subsidiarity.

Timeliness: Decisions will be made in a timely fashion to ensure that the campus community is not engaged in an extended process which unnecessarily and negatively affects institutional morale.

10. Decisions will be made in a timely fashion.

The committee also sets out the following principles to inform our deliberations:

Confidentiality: Information or documentation on the specific actions to be undertaken will not be shared beyond the quadrant teams and Operating Budget Adjustments Steering Committee without the consent of the Provost and Vice-President Academic and/or the Vice President Finance and Resources. It is important to understand that the quadrant and steering committee members should not be adding to rumours that will



circulate within the campus community about this project/process and that all communications must be circulated through official channels only.

Conflict of Interest: Any real or perceived conflict of interest shall be identified and disclosed as soon as a committee member becomes aware of it so that it can be appropriately considered by the quadrant team or steering committee. In general, the university's conflict of interest policy will be followed.

Role of Quadrant team members, quadrant team leads, and steering committee members: The work of these groups is deliberative and they will act as deliberative bodies for the purposes of this project. While individual members will bring a broadly based perspective, they are not explicitly representatives of groups in the sense of a constituent assembly. Rather, their role is to exercise independent judgment keeping in mind the best interests of the university.

Finite Role of Steering Committee and Quadrant Teams/Leads: The work of the steering committee and quadrant teams/leads is important but transitory: appointees and incumbents have no obligation beyond their appointment except to maintain confidentiality to protect the individual and collective discussions of the committee and quadrant teams.



Attachment Three:

Criteria used by the Task Forces to assess templates (from Task Force reports)	
Academic Program Task Force	Support Services Task Force
History, development and expectations of the program (5%)	Importance to the University of Saskatchewan (26%)
Internal demand (10%)	Internal demand (17%)
External demand (11%)	External demand (10%)
Size, scope and productivity of the program (12%)	Quality (16%)
Quality of program inputs and processes (6%)	Cost effectiveness (21%)
Quality of program outcomes (18%)	Opportunity analysis (10%)
Revenue and other resources generated by the program (10%)	
Costs and other expenses associated with the program (8%)	
Impact, justification and overall essentiality of the program (14%)	
Opportunity analysis (6%)	