PBA SWOT Analysis

Strengths:

- Budget transparency. The discussions and results are available to all interested parties.
- Better communication among units on campus regarding priorities and needs.
  - Units are more informed of needs across the university and may compare other’s needs against their own.
  - Some collaboration has been encouraged through the PBA process.
- Priorities of the President are made public through budget allocations.
- Open/transparency
- Good attempt to tie planning and budgeting and assessment together
- Very well known process on campus
- Facilitates PBA conversations at lower levels in the organization
- Transparency of budget process, facilitates “buy in” of campus community
- PBA is now part of UVU culture
- This year presentations were more precise, an outcome of discussions taking place at department levels
- Better directive given on separating one-time requests from base needs, as well as making sure to point out immediate needs and their recommendations/solutions to meet those needs

Weaknesses:

- As noted in several places and in several ways in the NWCCU report, there needs to be a closer tie between the university’s mission, objectives, and core themes to the PBA process.
  - Real substance related to the university’s mission should be part of every unit’s PBA presentation. Adding rhetoric to PBA proposals is not enough.
  - It should be noted that everything done in every unit across campus cannot reasonably relate directly to the overall university’s main objectives.
- The process has focused too much on budget needs. It seems that the culture has created a system where you only receive one chance to make financial needs known and request funding. As a result, everything is brought to the table.
- Sometimes the financial requests are petty. Two competing explanations have been heard.
  - Some feel that this behavior has been driven by the units attempting to make budget requests all inclusive to show the total financial need in the unit.
  - Others have expressed that this is a process designed for the President to micromanage units across campus. This viewpoint was reinforced by the past president’s practice of seldom granting budget enhancements that were not specifically requested and his denial of very small line items in PBA requests.
- Assessment or accountability of a unit should not be limited to 30 minutes once a year in a public meeting. The PBA process seems to encourage this behavior.
  - Assessment needs to be viewed as a continuous process.
Results of regular academic program reviews and accreditation reviews, even though not occurring annually, should become a part of the PBA reporting (rather than creating another review process).

Regular, or at least periodic, reviews of non-academic departments and units likewise should become a part of the PBA reporting.

Some failures should be accepted. If all proposals are expected to be successful only the most conservative ideas will survive the budgeting process. This behavior will hold back the university’s progress.

- Presenters seem to believe that there is a lot at risk related to the PBA presentations. Presenters and their supervisors should know where they stand (are they doing a good job or is their performance lacking) before the PBA presentation.
- The PBA process sometimes appears to be about the person presenting when it should be about the program or department they are representing.
- PBA meetings are long and, due to the many conflicting schedules of would-be participants, cannot be scheduled at a time when everyone can attend.
- Tends to be “ask” oriented; pBa instead of PBA; assessment takes a back seat
- Conversations are too long with too much detail presented
- Conversations are too much for one week
- The conversations are not really conversational and usually mostly attended by the division that is presenting
- The reason for the conversations is a little vague
- Presentations can easily become place of giving the “laundry list” and focus more on operational needs rather than development of strategies to move institution forward based on core themes of Student Success, Inclusive, Engaged and Serious
- Can become more a presentation to the President Holland and Linda, rather discussion with all of the campus (attendees)
- Since it is now a part of UVU culture, has lost its appeal to the campus as a whole, only “top management” at presentations unless it is their division presenting
- While the condensing of requests to templates needs to be flexible for each division, the list of requests need to have some continuity to bring them all together
- The summary of allocations may be hard to understand for the campus at large. Need to direct them better to the detail and refer them back to original templates that are updated with outcomes.

Opportunities:

- There is a great opportunity to increase the collaboration among units on campus beyond where the PBA process has already taken it.
  - Sharing PBA ideas and outlines prior to the formal presentations would allow units to work together.
  - Asking units to identify which of their priorities involve collaboration would show administrative interest in units working together.
- An opportunity exists to push the PBA process deeper into the university system.
All colleges, schools, divisions, departments, and other units should be encouraged to develop an open process for budgeting. Some have but this culture can be spread to more units across campus.

The PBA can become a true grass-roots budgeting process with involvement from all levels.

- Since the PBA process is open and public, could the process be used to generate publicity?
  - Many great programs and accomplishments are highlighted.
  - Budget priorities often reflect the great service provided to the local community.

- Use the recent NWCCU report comments as reason to tweak the PBA process
- Use the new NWCCU standards as a rationale for revising PBA
- While presentations are posted to PBA website for view and review of requests. Need to find ways to publicize to campus at large of overall direction during the process. Possibly using UVU Need to know announcements after the post conversations wrap up to inform them of next step in process.
- Increase opportunity for more of campus to participate by changing format of scheduling. Set aside on afternoon the week of November, rather than squeeze it all into one week.

Threats:

- The emphasis on new and colorful programs may threaten the viability of good solid programs that are the backbone of the university.
- Non-budget related achievements are downplayed due to the emphasis on resources.
  - The PBA process in the past has placed too much emphasis on budget related programs and achievements.
  - Many quality initiatives are the result of prioritizing resources and taking advantage of opportunities that do not require new resources.
  - Fund raising, grant writing, and other activities to bring new resources to the university need to be encouraged and rewarded.
- Micromanagement of all units on campus by the President is a threat.
  - Trust needs to be placed in lower-level administrators to make good financial decisions.
  - Accountability assures that resources are wisely used.
- The current process places too much emphasis on short-term needs and results and does not place enough emphasis on long-term planning and progress.
  - The few months between receiving new budget money and reporting on its use is not enough time to accomplish most of the programs and projects being funded.
  - Building a reputable academic program may take ten years but this long term and incremental achievement is barely noted in the current PBA process.
- With lots of new leaders at the top of the organization, are they in support of PBA?
- Complacency of the campus at large.