**UFS Agenda**

**Meeting: 4 December 2019**

**12th Floor Law School**

Attn Member: Stephanie Gibson(UFS President/CAS), David Lingelbach(UFS VP/MSB), Stephen “Mike” Kiel(UFS Secretary/Libraries), Kurt Schmoke(UB President), Darlene Smith(Provost), Beth Amyot(CFO), Tina Difranco(CPA), Jeffrey Ross(CPA), Kris Eyssell(CAS), Mike Frederick(CAS), Tim Sellers(LAW), Michael Hayes(LAW), Frank vanVliet(MSB), JC Weiss(MSB), Julie Simon(CUSF)

Attn Guest: Sharon Glazer(CAS), Candace Caraco(Provost Office), Bill Schnirel(SSSS), Zach Luhman(SSSS), Marilyn Oblak(MSB), Danielle Giles(MSB), Kathea Smith(MSB), Mark Jacque(Records), Alex Davis(OTS), Karen Karmiol(Provost Office), Alan Weisman(CPA), Amrita Shenoy(CPA), John Chapin(RLB), Jeffrey Huston(RLB), Salley Farley(CAS), Phil Korb(MSB), Mary Beth Waak(A&F), Bill Boyd(A&F), Barbara Aughenbaugh(A&F), Nicole Marano(SSSS)

**Consent Agenda**

*Logistical Items*

* Approval of November 6 and 20 2019 minutes (2 documents)
* Approval of and amendments to December agenda (1 document)
* University Committee membership (1 document)

We still could use more faculty representation on these committees.
Senators should send any additional names to Stephanie or David

*Information Items*

* CUSF report (1 document)
* CELTT update (1 document)
* AAUP guidelines on program elimination, college/school policies on curriculum (1 document)
* Financial Clearance (A&F) (1 document)
* Salary Task Force charge (1 document)
* Admissions funnel data (1 document)

A special update that on giving Tuesday UB had an increase of 65% in terms of dollars raised compared to last year. While the law school raised the most, CPA had the most “bows on poe,” and SSSS was the most improved.

Action items

* Policy: Emeritx Policy (1 document) - The APC has reexamined the policy to add exceptions proposed by specific units. Some senators felt there should be an examination of the set of privileges in the document. It was agreed there should be a separate document about this, similar to the bylaws appended to an organization’s constitution. The Senate tasks the APC with separating the privileges into a separate document before a final vote on the policy. **[Action 20-05] Passed unanimously.**
* Curriculum: Substantive change in English BA (2 documents) This proposal streamlines the English BA, it must be voted on by the Senate since a change greater than ⅓ of the program needs approval. **[ACTION 20-06] Approved unanimously**
* Elect CUSF representative (Carol Molinari) **[ACTION 20-07] Passed unanimously**
* Faculty Grievance policy to UFS WL Committee (OAG requested review of policy, it has no way of addressing grievances against your supervisor) The attorney general has identified an obvious problem in our current policy in that there is no course of action for when the subject of the grievance is an immediate supervisor. The Senate tasks the work-life committee with addressing this. **[ACTION 20-08] Passed unanimously**

Strategic discussion Items

* **Financial plan and step one (voluntary separations) of managing the structural deficit**
	+ Leadership is appearing before the BOR on the 12th, to answer the question “What else are you doing to manage the deficit?” President Schmoke shared some of his strategies and observations. These strategies are outlined in a document in Sakai **[Document 20-I]**:
		- As some background Over the next 4 years we are assuming the size of the university will be closer to 4000 students, certainly not 6000. This is similar to the size UB was in 2002. UB can be a great place at this level with the right mix of students, which the President feels will be more heavily graduate and professional
		- The University will streamline business processes, as well as review administration up and down. There will likely be more specifics about program changes and voluntary separations soon.

Discussion

* + - Could the senate get a sense of the magnitude of these proposals? How would these initiatives affect the 9 million dollar deficit next year?
			* Most of UB’s money is in facilities and people, this is where the costs are. It’s why the voluntary separation is appealing, our estimate is that the result will be a 7 figure number, even including potential replacements.
			* The other amount which is firm is the lease, this is a help for the next 5 years, it could be more should there be a renewal. This is approximately 1 million dollars.
			* Buildings and consolidation can be helpful, but it’s not always a quick process.
			* A structural deficit requires structural solutions. Furloughs and such won’t work, we tried that previously based on an assumption that we would turn around enrollment more quickly.
		- What about sequencing? Which of the options would we prioritize? The Provost has indicated some movement on examining programs. Is this a ranked list?
			* It is not a ranked list, and it doesn’t indicate dollar amounts. The fiscal impact of some options would be harder to estimate at this moment. The options are to be pursued in parallel as the voluntary separation proceeds.
		- Voluntary separation is a proven model, but what scares people is the involuntary. Couldn’t we expand the parameters to maximize our chances?
			* It’s been suggested that we lower the time requirement to 16 years, however a model with 20 is something that has been previously approved by the BOR
		- When will we know about **involuntary** separations should that be necessary?
			* UB would be well served to do that as soon as possible, even should it be phased. It would be during the spring semester.
		- If we get rid of programs aren’t we potentially hurting enrollments and making our problem more acute?
			* Contribution to university revenues tends to be correlated with the size of programs
			* The university must to be careful to differentiate between focusing on any and all students and students, and programs, that yield a positive margin. If we want to have programs that don’t have a positive margin. We should do so intentionally.
			* Over the past few years we have lost a bunch of students and 30 thousand credit hours. UB has not done much if any adjustment of courses or programs, one way to deal with the budget gap is to align instructional costs with headcounts
		- Following up on timing, the University will look at some sooner rather than later. One would be elimination of programs or courses. That would mean starting in January through March, there would be difficult decisions. One consequence of not doing so could be some of the other options on the list.
			* As discussed several years ago during program prioritization there must be a phased in process. One must teach out for example if a program is eliminated. So one would need to look carefully at how we’d do so
			* The President expects in January there would be a more robust discussion: factors to be examined would be high demand, contribution margin, and feeders to grad programs. Online education would be another factor, but these are a starting point. We could reach consensus should we all look at this the same way
		- What would the option reduce costs across colleges look like?
			* To keep the 4 school model, we would need to find some efficiency elsewhere in things like marketing, advising, and business services. We can’t really act in a decentralized way as a small University.
		- And what about the process for numbers 4 and 5 in the document, which relate to staff and position reviews thereof?
			* We’ll be talking to everyone about that shortly, the staff senate is also being given this information.
			* There will likely be differences for various departments. So it is likely to be a more internal and individual process because they are different
		- This could result in a loss of good young faculty we need to keep programs and the University going. If we strip out some of our younger people it will not set us up for success. We should be attempting to protect our untenured faculty members.
			* We should be very concerned about how we communicate any decisions that are made. What do we tell someone on the market?
				+ We have to be honest about the financial threat. We have not received a financial lifeline from the BOR like some other institutions.
				+ In the next few months, there will be unavoidable anxiety. The best we can do is have an organized process with appropriate timelines. We’ve been hurt by continued uncertainty year over year.
			* We can only fix our problem long term by increasing student enrollments.
		- UB and other universities think about adjuncts, as a more flexible source of faculty, but we also need to keep in the back of our mind that if we eliminated them, especially long serving ones, it could be very detrimental to our instruction
		- Are we still committed to RCM? If so, how can centralising services work with this?
			* We can’t go at the same speed, but we are committed to it, and the law school has already started.
			* The Deans argue that it can proceed, but it can’t go at the same pace till we resolve our fiscal problems.
			* There is an effort underway to determine how to allocate indirect revenues and costs,
			* Some things are centralized in RCM no matter what. OTS is a good example. If we were in RCM now, we’d be able to look at centralizing services in a different way.
		- There might be some flexibility from the regents if we have a plan. The board is looking not for a cost cutting plan, but an overall plan. Who will we be and how will we get there?
			* There is a regent now for each university. They really want to meet with us and Gary Atman is our regent.
		- I know little about the new chancellor. What are his values and aims?
			* He is a pediatrician, a good one, and a strong listener. Smart and strategic of course, but also humble and purposeful. A huge believer in the city, which makes sense as he was the president of UMB.
			* He emphasizes that the regents should value all of the schools. That should benefit us.
			* He had a low income background and he remembers his roots. Knows the system and is a great leader. Very little ego, and civic involvement without par.
* **Curriculum** Question for discussion: We have financial data, what other data should be considered when making curriculum decisions? (2 documents attached)
	+ Visibility that faculty work in the classroom gives to the university
	+ Impacts on UB’s ability to offer effective general education
	+ AAUP guidelines on ending programs note that one item to be considered it whether courses continue to be offered in the absence of a program
	+ We are struggling with values and aligning with them. I’m not sure the University community could state and agreed set of values.
	+ Let’s be careful of knockoff consequences. For example, it might look very strange to an outside observer to eliminate programs core to our existing reputation, or to eliminate entire areas of study that are closely associated with the concept of a four year university
		- To put that another way, whatever we do It needs to be clear afterwards that there’s a “going concern” here at UB
	+ Are we running this institution purely as a business? Surely there are some things that we should have even if they are in red?
		- There will surely be some courses and programs that we decide as an institution to subsidize or cover, however currently about 20% of the programs generate 80% of the contributions. Not many organizations can survive in this way.
	+ Are we looking at minimum class sizes?
		- Good question. We are still recruiting for everything till decisions are made, but programs should look at how many electives are offering and streamline. It’s concerning and inefficient to have electives with 8 students. It would be more effective to have planned multiyear schedules.
		- Doesn’t UB already have extended schedules?
			* Not for every program
		- To clarify about canceling classes and electives, program directors have had some encouragement to cancel courses already. This is creating angst in how people can progress through programs.
			* The Provost’s office has not had direct communication on this topic. We have encouraged schools to offer fewer sections, but core classes must continue to be offered to allow students to progress.
			* UB does have to be committed to our continuing students, usually we’d have more enrollments registered now than we do. We’re about 200 off. Encouraging people to register for the spring is something faculty can do to address low enrolled courses.
	+ The faculty own the curriculum and we have a well established process for program elimination. This should **not** be a top down process.
		- The President would like to make recommendations not dictates
		- In preparation for an upcoming dean’s council meeting data are being generated for this meeting
			* Primary questions for the meeting will be: What is our timeline? Is the data we have generated appropriate and relevant?
			* For now everyone should look at the spreadsheets previously distributed. CM1 and CM2 are defined on the UB intranet: CM1 - revenue by major minus instructional costs 2 - includes college level costs, such as the dean’s office
			* Following the meeting an email to all faculty will summarize the discussion and process. This should ensure transparency and that everyone works from the same information
	+ If college structures are going to remain, there should be **strong** decision making at that level.

Important Upcoming Dates

* UFS 2019-20 meeting dates (Bogomolny Room unless otherwise noted)
	+ December 4 – Law School, 12th floor

*2020*

* + January 15
	+ February 5
	+ March 4
	+ April 1
	+ May 6
	+ May 20, second May meeting if necessary
* December 16, 2019 – commencement
* May 21, 2020 – commencement (10:30 & 2:00)