**UFS Minutes**

**Meeting: 5 December 2018**

**Bogomolny Room – Student Center**

Lunch served at 11:30

Members: Greg Walsh(CAS), Michael Hayes(Law), JC Weiss(MSB), Irv Brown(Adjunct Council), Ben Wright(CPA), Kathryn(CAS), Jessica Sowa(CPA), Beth Amyot(CFO), Stephanie Gibson(CAS/President), Kurt Schmoke(UB President), Darlene Smith(Provost), Haitham Alkhateeb(CUSF), Julie Simon(CUSF),Angela Vellario(Law), Jeffrey Ross(CPA), Rajesh Mirani(MSB), Amir Pezeshkan(MSB), Tim Sellers(Law/VP), Mike Kiel(Libraries/Secretary)

Guests: Catherine Andersen(Provost), Aaron Wachhaus(APC), Carol Descak(EMM), Karen Karmiol(Provost), Carey Miller(Provost), Candace Carcao(Provost), Dave Riggin(OTS), Nicole Marano(SSSS), Kathea Smith(MSB), Murray Dalziel(MSB), Roger Hartley(CPA), Ron Castanzo(CAS), Fiona Glade(Provost), Ann Cotton(Schaefer Center), Sharon Glazer(CAS), Betsy Nix(CAS), Teri Onegoke(Comptroller), Zach Luhman(SSSS), Neb Sertsu(CPCO), Catherine Leidemer(EMM), Karyn Schultz(DAS), Bill Schnirel(SSSS), Suzanne Tabor(OGPA), Anita Harewood(OGPA), Mark Jacque(Records), John Chapin(RLB), Bill Boyd(AF), Megan Manley(CPA), Al Gourrier(CPA), Mikhail Pevzner(MSB), Phil Korb(MSB), Steve Isberg(MSB), Danielle Giles(MSB), Tina DiFranco(CPA), Marilyn Oblak(MSB), Barb Aughenbaugh(AF), Marybeth Woak(AF), Vicki Schultz(Law), Ron Weich(Law), Terese Tonus(CAS)

Action items

1. Academic Policy Committee charges:
   1. Active duty military - policy for when they have to leave mid-session
   2. Grade grievance - is in the Student Affairs section of the policy guide but some of the provisions need reexamination (timelines for students too generous (60 days) and too onerous for faculty (14 days))
   3. Other academic grievance - similar issues to (b). For (b) and (c) APC would suggest edits and then pull in Student Success and Support Services to do further edits, involve SGA, and come back to UFS
   4. 2nd master's policy for CAS and CPA - align with MSB's?
   5. Adjunct II status needs guidelines on keeping the status

ACTION – The senate approved a charge to the committee to examine these matters unanimously

Strategic discussion Items

***Plan to address our $4.6M structural deficit***

*One possible guideline for discussion:*

1. *Concept*
2. *Strategy*
3. *Implementation*

The President explained that the document shared represented his best thinking as to how to respond to goal 4 of the University’s strategic plan (Organize for long term financial stability). Because the state requires a budget be in by middle of February, I have tasked the strategic budgeting and planning committee with making some more detailed recommendations. At the time of the meeting 38 responses had been received through the portal. The University community was strongly encouraged by the President to submit further feedback.

A lengthy discussion and question and answer session is summarized below. This made up the majority of the meeting:

Q: A comment first that most of the ideas in the plan don’t seem crazy, but we need to see more detail. Some specific questions:

* It’s unclear how the money saving is realized in the students to faculty ratio, where does this calculation come from?
* Will monetizing real estate be part of an overall examination of space usage? Specifically I’ve heard some concerns about the location of the special collections and archives.

A: The deans are talking about how to reach the cost savings related to student ratios. This will be more about aligning courses and faculty electives and could include reexamining adjuncts or decreasing faculty lines that are no longer needed, which courses should be included or not included including independent studies is still under discussion by the deans. We’ll update the faculty as a specific methodology is agreed upon. The President hopes to have some more specific answers in January. With regard to the question about the archives, monetizing real estate is the primary goal at this time.

Q: I’m concerned that this plan is cutting in instructional areas that can hurt the ability to offer programs our programs effectively. I’d also like to be assured that support for faculty resources and research will be intact.

A: Instructional needs are being examined by program, decisions about faculty lines and lecturers are being made in consultation with the deans. In terms of research, the office of higher research will remain, and should maintain its core functions. The President noted that we need to make tough choices. If we can’t grow a program I don’t think we can afford to continue it. If the dean’s don’t make some hard decisions then I’ll have to.

Q: The change to sabbaticals makes me distraught. It’s a hard pill to swallow.   
A: To be clear sabbaticals are not being eliminated. The proposal is to temporarily suspend single semester sabbaticals, and to focus on those that last a full year.

Q: Regarding low enrolled programs, some students are worried about their future and are therefore considering transferring. This can cause a further financial problem, there needs to be some insurance to the students.   
A: There is a meeting with the SGA at 4 today to discuss their concerns, and we’re developing 2 year programs or course schedules to help students progress on time.

Q: Regarding expenses, these are one time permanent cuts? Is the 4.5 after 2 years us breaking even if there is no change in our revenue?   
A: Beth – What my team and I are doing is, as you suggested, taking high level summaries to say “How much revenue will we have?” For example, tuition assumptions and enrollments. There is still the structural 1.5 million in an ideal world we’d have 7 million in revenue or reductions. What the plan does do is stabilize the gap.   
Q: From what we have here, it’s hard to see what the net-net is in students and the overall trend in headcount. What ARE the efforts and timing that is going to drive these enrollment numbers?   
A: In this plan, even though we are talking about increasing students… the assumption made is that we are flattening out as 5000 students. For next year the projection is 4800, because of the pipeline of returning students.   
Q: Could you address how we are handling outreach and marketing?

A: In addition to some recent hires we shared some of that in the November meeting. We’d be glad to show more of the specific ads. Admissions has also developed tactical and funneling goals.

Q: I truly want to learn about what are we not doing in terms of retention. It seems to me that a lot of people might not come back for financial issues which we have limited ability to affect.

A: We have to have an informed community, and do more as a community. For example we need to do more about financial literacy to help our population stay on track. All the students need to understand their financial obligation. We need to have metrics as part of this each dean has provided a retention plan, modeling a 2% increase.  
Q : I worry that we wont weight our urban mission too much, and I worry about a push to accommodate students in the name of retention.  
A: We will never do that, we must do what is academically right.

Q: A major part of retention is advising, please explain the part to the plan that relates to aligning advising  
A: We are examining advising ratios and discussing loads using national guidelines and considering different models. No firm decisions have been made.  
Other comments: A problem is that no one manages a student’s experience across the entire University, there need to be clearer handoffs. A ticket tracking method would be helpful.   
The law school does more mentoring that previously. Maybe that could be a solution, we could even use law students to mentor undergraduates.

Q: As regards recruiting new students, what are our specific plans?  
A: This depends on the specific student population. We’ve had a lot of emphasis on the freshmen in terms of the pathway model, and we have a distinctive freshman strategy now. For transfers we are reengaging to forge strong partnerships with community colleges.

Q: With all due respect we can’t continue to attract students if we make the cuts you are making, I talk to students and I think there might be a problem with us being out of touch with who we are. Students ask me what are my fees going toward? The plan seems to gloss over the real issue with where are we going. Who are we serving and why would a student come here? Who are we? We have excelled serving a first generation blue collar scrappy population rather than trying to reinvent the wheel to keep up with the joneses. Major changes should start with thinking about students first.

A: For a long time people who have been here had an idea of serving older students. At a time there was a change in vision and the President is trying to move the University back to that vision articulated, but we also can’t simply go back to that. Our programs are our market strength; this is why he has been telling the dean’s we have to slim down. If we don’t make some major changes, we won’t be around to serve anyone.

Additional Comments:

* Adding a lower division doesn’t strike me as having changed our mission. We grew from 4500 to 6000 much of that in sophomore transfers, I’m concerned that 5k is a size at which we can’t be successful.
* A complimentary narrative, stability has been from new programs that took off. If we focused so much time on freshman stuff, we’d put lots of eggs in a basket that is not necessarily a good bet.
* What do we offer that other places don’t? We should intertwine opportunities to have a smooth transition between undergrad and graduate education more deliberately.

A number of faculty shared some concerns about data being used for decision making:

* The colleges have been looking at changing divisional structures to save small amounts of money, but I’m concerned that we are not considering the costs of the chaos that can be created by organizational changes. I’m also concerned that we are spending a lot of time discussing unknowns as we lack data that we trust.
* The problem is in the labeling of the data and it’s packaging.
* People have different kinds of data in mind. We should express what data we would like to see.

The UFS President reminded senators that following every meeting we solicit questions for the next meeting. Please forward specific requests so they can be aggregated.

Q: Overall I think what faculty are saying is that we need to hear more detail. To return to one of the earlier questions can you describe what kinds of changes are happening in administrative reorganization?

A: The President will be giving up positions in his office, including some that are funded in the budget but are unfilled.

Q: I’m very distressed, because there is little in the plan that the President hasn’t said in the last few months. I don’t see any further specifics. These are ideas, not a plan. I worry that there will be chaos from restructuring as was mentioned earlier. I’m concerned about asking the SPBC to restructure, the units themselves should do this. I’d like to understand some of the terms in here like shared revenue model. I’m really worried that this isn’t going to work and I feel a little bit desperate, as I don’t feel that our feedback actually changes anything. We can’t fix this by building the plane as we fly it. I’d like to recommend that we just have a day of strategizing about these plans. We need more numbers and specifics.

A: Having a choice between a constitution and code of federal regulations, the President noted he chose the former and committed to coming with more specifics in January. We’ll respond in categories to all the feedback we’ve had online.

Following the discussion of the President’s plan the remainder of the meeting was an update from the CFO:

* We must complete the tuition and fee plans and submit them to the system by March 15th. We can’t increase tuition more than 2% in state, but have more flexibility for out of state enrollments. The expense reductions have a similar time table,
* UFS should possibly consider enrollment in Feb and then expenses in March.
* We are doing modeling for the next two years based on a variety of scenarios, though the best estimate is that enrollments will decrease
* There will be data next week showing counts of positions and trends over time, in conjunction with enrollment over time. Financial aide will also be ready next week.
* No one officially asked, but there is interest in showing reductions over the past few years by area.
* We hope to have the FY18 data posted in January in the financial review model

**Important Upcoming Dates**

* Fall Commencement: December 17, 2018
* Spring Commencement: May 23, 2019
* UFS 2018-19 meeting dates:
  + December 5

**2019**

* + January 16
  + February 6
  + March 6
  + April 3
  + May 1
  + Possible second May date if necessary