**UFS Minutes**

**Meeting: 5 February 2020**

**Bogomolny Room, Student Center**

Attn Members: Stephanie Gibson(UFS Pres/CAS), David Lingelbach(UFS VP/MSB), Stephen “Mike” Kiel(UFS Sec/Libraries), Frank VanVliet(MSB), JC Weiss(MSB), Kristin Eyssell(CAS), Mike Frederick(CAS), Jeffrey Ross(CPA), Tina DiFranco(CPA), Jessica Sowa(CPA), Tim Sellers(LAW), Michael Hayes(LAW), Irv Brown(Adjunct), Carol Molinari(CUSF), Julie Simon(CUSF), Kurt Schmoke(President), Darlene Smith(Provost), Beth Amyot(CFO)

Attn Guest: Sharon Glazer(CAS), Sally Farley(CAS), Chris Spencer(CAS), Greg Walsh(CAS), Nicole Marano(SSSS), Katie Kauffman(SSSS), Karyn Schulz(SSSS), Ray McCree(SSSS), Pavan Purswani(SSSS), Hyejeong Yoo(SSSS), Christine Marconi(SSSS), Llatetra Esters(SSSS), Constance Harriss(CELTT), Leah Dahlheimer(CIC), Daniel Bowley(CIC), Lana Farley(CIC), Sarah Holliday(CIC), Matthew Johnson(CIC), Alan Weisman(CPA), Roger Hartley(CPA), Amrita Shenoy(CPA), Latrina Bowman(CPA), Nikita Anderson(CPA), Megan Manley(CPA), Ferzana Havewala(CPA), Al Gourrier(CPA), Laura Wilson-Gentry(CAP), Nusta Carranza Ko(CPA), Sarah Federman(CPA), Tylis Cooper(CPA), Sascha Sheehan(CPA), Aaron Wachhaus(CPA), Dawnsha Mushonga(CPA), MariglynnEdlins(CPA), Ben Wright(CPA), Carol Descak(EMM), Dan Mills(EMM), Karen Karmiol(Provost Office), Janet Whelan(Provost Office), Sally Reed(OHR), Mary Beth Waak(UBO), Bill Boyd(UBO), Wabei Chitambala(UBO), Barb Aughenbaugh(UBO), Seyed Mohammedi(UBO), Kathea Smith(MSB), William Raab(MSB), Danielle Giles(MSB), Mailyn Oblak(MSB), Ryan Steffy(Records), Mark Jacque(Records), Mason Paris(OTS), David Patschke(OTS), Ron Weich(LAW), Jason Kunz(UBPD), Keith Merryman(UBPD)

**Consent Agenda**

*Logistical Items*

* Approval of January 2020 minutes (1 document)
* Approval of and amendments to February agenda (1 document)

Action items

* Someone called for active duty, med leave for students, pregnancy process
  + **[Action 20-11]** - The vote was unanimous to refer these questions to the Academic Policy Committee

*Information Items*

* CUSF report (1 document)
* MSB internal credit transfer (graduate catalog) (1 document)
* Group to work on indirect cost allocation (1 document)
* Gen Ed courses offered per term (2016-19) (1 document)
* Transfer Recruiting territories (1 document)
* Parking issues (1 document)
* Admissions funnel (1 document)
* Code of conduct statement (1 document)
* Answers to questions previously posed by UFS (1 document)

Strategic discussion Items

* **Worklife Committee – General report, Anti-Bullying policy/procedure** (1 document)
  + The committee has worked with counsel to approve the policy incorporating previous problems. The policy borrows a lot of language from the state policy and outlines reporting procedures. It will be posted publicly for comment after this meeting.
    - The word “unwelcome” might be problematic, perhaps that should be reexamined
* **Deficit reduction plan** 
  + Administrative Restructuring **[Document 20-K]**

It’s clear that higher education has been under a lot of change and that is particularly true in Maryland. UB has faced increased competition, particularly online, for our traditional market of students. The University has also made decisions that increased competition, for example increasing freshman admissions standards made us compete with more institutions as have changes to our MBA program. We have to take steps now to ensure that we aren’t just reacting but planning for the future. The SPBC has done a good job helping us create a strategic plan through 2023, we have to work to achieve these goals. One that has been elusive is number 4, organizing for long term financial stability. My proposal has several major points related to this:

* + We must assume and budget for an annual enrollment of 4000 with a mix of 60% graduate and 40% undergraduate students
    - Enrollment management will be asked to prioritize as follows: Transfers with AAs, then transfers with 60 credits, then less, then finally the first time full time. We are not debating freshmen here, nor the focus of our mission. In addition, we’ll enhance EMM by making sure we have stability in that area of the university
  + In addition as far as revenu:
    - We’ll increase revenue from philanthropy, this has been occurring already largely in the area of scholarships
    - We’ll seek an enhancement in state appropriations, some of this may be coming this year through appropriations in the governor's budget and we’ll continue to monetize real estate
  + While revenue is the most important, but there's no way to balance our budget in the coming years without some spending reductions
    - We will move to 3 schools rather than 4, law and two others. One model might be a school of business and technology and a school of “public engagement”
      * What is that? It was called the “New school of social research” in New York. We have a similar mix of those programs that could be anchored in humanities, communication, international affairs
      * The SPBC will be asked to think about this model and offer other possibilities or recommendations
      * RCM would be used for all three schools starting in 2021
    - Other savings will come from:
      * A reduction in open positions. Presently there are about 70 vacant positions, and some will definitely be eliminated after a review
      * Voluntary separation agreements
      * Moving to a student faculty ratio of 15:1
      * Implementation of shared services with USM school for some administrative functions
  + Clearly there is a lot of work to be done
    - Combined there would be a 4-5 million dollar impact on our deficit if we pursue all of these initiatives
    - Moving in this direction would highlight the best of our programs, and promote interdisciplinary activity
    - The memo outlining these steps will go to the state legislature and the chancellor
    - There have to be some final decisions by the end of March, so please send in feedback after this meeting in addition to what you may share today

Discussion:

***Restructuring Specifics and Concerns***

* “Public Engagement” suggests service learning and engaged learning, so if we go that route we must make those changes or it will be empty marketing rather than doing something. However, we have to make sure these changes are marketed to the larger community.
  + There will need to be some redirection for sure, we have asked if we could use some donor money for marketing and the donor has agreed. We will also have to be smart using social media and all of our options more effectively.
* Many liked a recent poor people’s campaign class because it was so embedded in the community, if you want it to work you must harness the power of Baltimore
  + I hope we will highlight that more and be **for** Baltimore
* We need to make sure where things get split comes from ground up
* One thing I don’t see room for in that model is science? Is there a role for that?
  + We’ll look at that, there will be a room for all programs
* One of the barriers between schools is a difference in course loads. How would we deal with that?
  + We have to figure that out between March 31st
* This should result in 4-5 million savings, yes? I don’t see the high volume programs fitting well, could there be different divisions within the school of public engagement?
  + Essentially yes, but we’ll discuss what goes where, for example, some have said let’s put health and human services with business
* Where does CAS exactly fit in this? History and jurisprudence don’t seem to fit. I worry you’ll eliminate some draws for students. I think we can’t eliminate faculty and the connection they have for students.
* It feels like we are operating in a position of fear, that needs to stop or we will scare students away. We don’t seem to understand what the faculty and students need. Why is this necessary?
  + The simple answer is that we built a structure that assumed a larger student body
  + The best marketing is word of mouth, this has to be the plan moving forward
  + We keep fighting each other I feel like the administration is not listening
* There could be serious downside risks in proceeding this way. It seems like top down, what is the risk if the restructure fails… what would we do? It could contribute to enrollment decline.

***Savings Questions***

* The total savings from doing everything would be 4-5 millions dollars in our structural deficit by your estimation?
  + That’s correct
* What is the structural deficit per annum before and after these changes?
  + To reiterate it is 9 million dollars right now and you’d lower it by 4-5 million with these changes
  + This is an untenable situation, with tuition declines, other costs are flat. We have to stabilize tuition revenue.
* What are the cost breakdowns that lead to that? It can not be just positions
  + One is an administrative staffing in terms of those offices which would be combined in a new structure. That would net about 600k dollars.
  + We’re not presenting a whole budget now because some of the decisions and outcomes affect exactly where dollars will fall, for example it is hard to say more with the number of early retirements and other things still unknown.
* Given that we see a lot of repetition here from a year ago. It would be helpful if we could see some scenarios with numbers attached to them. For example, what is the cost savings with various levels of position eliminations?
  + Eliminating all open positions would be 2.6million, but we aren’t likely to do this. Exact savings will depend on the positions that are or are not eliminated.
* I feel like we aren’t getting clear answers and it’s concerning that we have asked multiple times. These changes will be less than our 9 million deficit of course, what will happen **after** that. I am concerned that we aren’t doing what needs to be done if we don’t have more details than this.
  + A healthy organization needs to match revenue and expenses, the problem to be addressed for us is primarily on the revenue side. We have to achieve progress there to stabilize our budget. We don’t have the level of specificity yet to give what you are asking for.
* The public engagement school seems like it would require associate deans so how much money would it save?
  + I don’t understand **why** we don’t have more detail and why it took so long to get to this point? I feel like Lucy and the football with Charlie Brown
  + Five years ago there were 4 schools with an enrollment of 6500 students, with an average of 1600 students each. Now we are at 4000 overall. With 3 schools you’d have similar but smaller schools at 1500
    - We would need a job analysis of people managing on the equivalent positions, it’ll be a very costly process
    - This would be an opportunity to gain clarity about roles and responsibilities
* Academically we clear 8 million, if we are in the hole 9 million, then there must be an 18 million hole somewhere. Where does that come from?
  + Colleges are generating a margin but it might not be the **right** margin
  + It seems like we make a lot so where exactly are the costs? I don’t see how merging schools will address these issues.
* If I understand, you’re saying these changes cut the deficit in half. This then is the minimum. We’ve gone over the same ground and someone needs to make a decision, we might all yell at you but I’m glad you’re going to make decisions
  + This doesn’t close the gap in one year, so we have to dip into reserves. It’s hard to see what you’d need to do without some of the pieces falling into place. I hope not to do RIFs. I know this **helps** us.

***General Questions and Comments***

* We’ve been internally focused for quite a while, and not taken advantage of opportunities. How will this allow us to shift our focus to be more external?
  + If we reach a consensus internally, we won’t be debating forever our structure or admissions priorities. Having an agreed to plan will free us up to be more externally focused
* If I think back to when there were furloughs, it seems like we’ve been in crisis mode for several years and I hope we engage or do the work to help people process this after all is said and done
* Much of the fix being discussed is on the academic side. What discussion has been had on the administrative side? Has there been a discussion of a serious involvement of an external examination? In order to stabilize, we have to draw more people. That means investment, what would balance these cuts?
  + One example is investing in more scholarships, especially for students with AA’s. Our faculty have been very engaged in ensuring their programs are strong and attractive.
  + I’m worried we aren’t investing in the strongest programs that we already have and maximizing and eliminating duplication.
    - We should look more carefully through courses and programs
    - Deans have been asked to work with faculty on these sort of assessments
    - The prospect of an RCM model would address some of these points, decision making would then be vested more at the college.
* What would we outsource in terms of shared services?
  + There is a USM workgroup exploring the sharing of things like human resources or technology services
* We’ve heard repeatedly that we have an 8000 structure. What exactly has been done in this respect administratively? We’ve heard repeatedly that an RCM model will not be effective in a small school, and that the deficit would make it hard to do RCM.
  + Regarding the administrative or institutional side, I think we need to look at salaries
  + We should assess what we need to deliver in order to support students. These decisions are contingent on our future state, and these evaluations have to be occurring right now.
  + We can't afford the structure we have, we must calibrate to our size
  + If the structural gap can be reduced then RCM could be helpful, it would be a powerful incentive. The next phase, developing CM3-5, will be helpful in understanding more effectively our expenses.
  + Tina - When would you realize the cost savings? What does centralizing services mean? Does it include things like marketing in the law school?
    - We’ll have to figure that out RE the law school based on the final overall RCM calculations
* Thank you for saying something now, these are difficult decisions. However, I have a problem with the timing. This is a **very** fast timetable. We really need a job analysis. There are many inefficiencies and we are creating our own problems
* This feels like the same as what we’ve seen before, though I’m glad for what added detail there is. The timing seems impossible, it seemed like last time we wound up with plans and ideas people couldn’t believe in and this seems like pie in the sky thinking. The program prioritization being done now seems rushed, as we haven't had enough time to assess changes made previously.
* Clearly we need to do something, but I think these suggestions create more chaos. There would be costs to realigning, and it seems like it’s not a workable idea to go to 3 schools in a short time frame.
* In the budget scholarships that come from UB seem to be deducted from profitability of our programs. Why is this?
  + The impact on program profitability depends on the type of the scholarship and whether it is funded directly by UB, or funded by the UB Foundation or other third parties.
  + Scholarships and need-based grants that are funded by UB are, in effect, a discount from the listed tuition price. Students are expected to pay the discounted amount. Therefore, these scholarships are an offset to tuition revenue available to the University.
  + Scholarships and grants that are funded by the UB Foundation or other third parties are not deducted from tuition revenue for UB. The student is charged the standard tuition and the University applies funding received from Foundation or third party toward the student’s tuition bill, with the result being that UB receives the tuition revenue.
* We should consider an internal website to submit ideas. We’ve had lots of models presented previously that we have not followed through. If this is the final decision, maybe people will have ideas to refine them.
* Over the past few months members of the community have asked for action, I think that we’ve had a lot of sharing and input in the past couple of years. Many have commented that there’s more flesh here on old bones and you want more. I think we should acknowledge moving forward that there hasn’t been many new ideas generated. There are a finite number of options to realign the University, but we keep coming back to the same areas.
* Word will get into the public soon about these changes, I hope we have a robust upbeat message for the media and the general assembly.
  + I agree, we are working particularly with our donors and the mayor
  + How does MHEC fit in? We have to notify them of any potential changes
  + Given the quick deadline, how will we communicate internally?
    - Leadership is also going to the staff senate and SGA

***Morale***

* We are in a crisis and this will be difficult, but a plan without details launches a grenade into us as a faculty and staff. How can we maintain morale and protect our community?
  + I think what was presented is a picture of what our challenges are. If we don’t do something different and make tough decisions now the university won’t be successful, and there will be some winners and losers. I hope we can approach it in an objective and civil manner. We have to get rid of programs that don't perform well.
* Morale, there are people leaving who have been here because orale is in the toilet. What can be done to increase our morale?
  + I think if we have an agreement on priorities it will be helpful
  + We have to go through this, if we do it I think it would improve morale.
* Let’s make a morale committee, if you’re interested notify the UFS President

***SPBC changes and charge***

* There aren’t enough faculty on SPBC to give a ground up perspective, we should change the membership composition
  + All the deans on it and increase faculty involvement
  + SPBC is a large committee already, members should have an institutional perspective.
  + The group meets weekly for two hours, initially next Wednesday from 10-12. One more member from each school and the library can be submitted as soon as possible
* The charge should be narrow and clear. For example: We’re going to three schools, how do we do it? Deliverables should be delineated.
* We are almost a year out from the report generated last year, we should revisit that report before any more discussion
  + A good idea, as this work must be done soon, hopefully by March 31

Important Upcoming Dates

* UFS 2019-20 meeting dates (all in Bogomolny Room)
  + February 5
  + March 4
  + April 1
  + May 6
  + May 20, second May meeting if necessary
* May 21, 2020 – commencement (10:30 & 2:00)