University Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
April 16, 2018

Attendance:

Present: Alford, Barnes, Bodnar, Callaway, Chacon, Comer, DeLuca, Farnsworth, Fitzgerald, Harbor, Humphrey, Kirgis, Lindsay, Manuel, Ratto-Parks, Schafer, Schroeder, Schwarze, Semanoff, Stark, White, Whittenburg.

Absent: Atteberry, Chacon

President Bodnar draft recommendations discussion:

• Remember, these are preliminary recommendations. This is the time for feedback, for input. One reason we hurried to get our recommendations out there is because we scheduled two weeks for consultation and feedback and insight.
• In terms of the presentation, I will spend time sharing our strategy for distinction. It's not just about recommendations programmatically but what we want to define us as a University going forward. We need to stay focused on why this place matters so much and to advocate for the importance of this institution.

Stewardship. This notion has been at the front of my mind as we go through a process for reevaluating our future. Our job is to make sure we are allocating our resources to best serve our students. This is why you are all here. Let's consider these in the context of a student paying $20,000/year to improve their life.

Reimagined UM. Let's think of what we, as a public, flagship, research University can do. Not just in terms of the number of programs we have. We talk a lot of what programs we have, keep, or eliminate. It's not just about the number of programs, but how they are delivered most effectively.

Current Structural Budget Imbalance. These costs have to be absorbed into the base. Our structural imbalance is really around $10 million. If we stay on this course, we significantly hurt a critical institution for the state.

Process. Defining our North Star and drafting a framework through which we will forge a path. Refreshed Mission Statement.

Strategies for Distinction:
  1. Innovative UM Core
  2. UM Communities of Excellence
  3. Holistic Student Experience focused on Support and Success
  4. An Appreciation of People and Place
The UM Core and the Communities of Excellence. How should the President communicate this on the UPC's behalf?

- Remember to emphasize the Core
- "MT Ways" are not on these slides. Maybe some image of MT
- Emphasize that diversity is really important
  - This will be a key point about people and place, but we should also talk about it in the core.
  - When you talk about it, talk about the "different" ways of living and knowing, etc. It is not a single way of knowing, but multiple ways of knowing.
  - What we expanded on, related to communicating and living, had a lot to do with intercultural competence, awareness. Ways of Living requires working with and negotiating with others of different backgrounds. Ways of knowing includes traditional knowledge, etc.
- There is concern about what the UM Core will mean to Gen Ed—how will this be executed. The President is asking the Provost's office and, Faculty Senate to look at the Gen Ed curriculum and adjust as necessary to achieve these objectives.
  - If there's a new strategic direction provided by the President, then I think a charge to Faculty Senate is made to make sure our Gen Ed curriculum is consistent with the vision of the University's future.
- The sub-point under Business & Entrepreneurship. Change "demands" to "opportunities" or "meeting workforce needs"
- "Science and Technology" area is really broad. Could we make it "Data Science" and Applied Computing or something?
  - We think of natural science, data sciences, and applied computing.
  - We have had strong arguments in both directions. Let's just leave it at this point, obtain feedback, and revisit after that.
- Holistic student support and success. The UPC did not spend much time on this, but it's a huge driver of recent organizational restructure.
- An appreciation for Place and People
  - The imperative as we move forward to have systems to better utilize the beautiful place and engaged community here but to also value and learn from the cultural diversity we have here. This is an area that needs to be improved.
- There are academic program recommendations and there are also administrative restructuring recommendations.
  - Project Simplification
  - This is important to emphasize so people realize it's not just the academic side of the house.
- They will present by college the programs that are being discontinued or reorganized.
  - There will be reductions in faculty in programs that are continued.
  - One option is to eliminate programs. Another is that we know the program is important to maintain, but given the student demand, adjust the resource investment. Align with student enrollment and demand. We hope to achieve a good deal of that through attrition and natural departures. When the input comes back, we need to articulate a clear plan that says how we will see a reduction of faculty. It will be strategic, targeted, and compassionate. Where necessary, we will have a targeted strategic curtailment plan.
  - The time for feedback starts tomorrow. Remember, we have two weeks for official feedback. There will be things on this that I'm sure we get wrong. They are preliminary and that's why we are collecting feedback. It's also important for Jon Harbor to have time to have a chance to talk with the President about this in person.
- How specific will you be in terms of budget?
We are meeting with the union after this. The intent is to talk about programmatic changes. I want to be as transparent as soon as humanly possible. But we also need to follow the appropriate steps. We have estimates now but we have to follow the appropriate steps and also allow time to get the feedback. Things may change as a result of feedback.

The goal of the Senate review is to understand curriculum impact. The personnel and budget aspects that come next will involve the UFA, which is the party to manage contract and personnel negotiations.

The deans also have a role here. When you look at some of the data on our programs, identify high-cost and low-enrollment programs, but deans may have additional information that would allow the program to continue. Programs with a lot less students should not have as many faculty as those with many more; that's not fair to our students. We have to recognize that our resources should be aligned with student enrollment and needs. That's what we are trying to achieve.

Programmatic curtailment does not allow for creative restructuring that is strategic. If it's presented in terms of CBA/budget figures, it's very simple.

Is there flexibility for restructuring or is there not flexibility of restructuring? Are we aiming for a number related to a school/college? Using the terms "retrenchment" or "curtailment" results in very specific steps.

I use the term "reduction." In certain areas, there will be attrition. This is the first path or possibility. You can look at a program and say the cost is too high and it should be eliminated. But depending on how it could be designed, you could still have the grad program, serve the undergrad/gen ed program, but it could be done with two fewer people. So that can meet student needs and then reduce the cost. Then you look to see if there will be attrition or departures, then great. If not, a curtailment plan or committee takes place. We want to maintain as many offerings as we can.

There is a history of the gut punch coming after the semester.

The President is trying to provide the most specific information to the campus as soon as possible. When it comes to specifics about personnel and people, that's a matter for the Union.

There's still some confusion about the timeline. If you need two less faculty, over what time?

Maximum 3 years. Some through attrition over the next several months. But if there is curtailment, and there likely will be in certain areas, that happens over a period of time.

If you put names of specific programs up but then feedback results in changes, then that program may be harmed.

It's a delicate balance because I want input. But we have to manage perceptions and be respectful.

I have tried to emphasize in our College that the faculty are a big part of the reimagining or reorganizing. As the dean, I have put suggestions forward, but I plan to include all the faculty. Collectively we will be so much more thoughtful and creative than me alone.

The only way to have this discussion is to start the discussion. We have to start with something and that's where we are.

Remind people what they have already seen of this process since January. They have seen the data subgroup respond to APASP criticisms and create something better. They have seen the Mission/Identity subgroup respond to feedback.

I think we should be excited about opportunities and planting flags. This is a vision of where we are going and it's only a preliminary conversations.

Will this be moving forward with current teaching load?

The Deans and Department Chairs need to consider this. The new Provost will also have ideas. This has gone back and forth.
We will have fewer faculty here. The deans and provost need to lead in determining how we deliver an innovative quality education.

- Structural imbalance slide. Can you elaborate how we get from the 3.5 to $10 million hole? The campus needs to see this.
  - Things have been covered by various funds other than general funds and over time those things will need to be absorbed into the base. We need to account for things like having a recruitment/retention budget. You're not accounting for things appropriately if you say you don't spend money on recruitment, for example.
  - There is also natural inflation and if we do nothing, our structural deficit is $14M in a few years. So the majority of this plan is revenue growth. Primarily through retention and persistence. It's hard for me to think about how much time we've spent on the reductions. How much have we focused on retention over the last two years? This is a cultural thing that we need own. When we have these cuts we turn on each other. We are on the same team and we are all focused on students. I need all your help to say, “All of our efforts need to be focused on persistence and success“. If we increase retention significantly, all of our lives are very different. This is going to be a hard process for our campus and for me. If we enable this to consume our efforts and lose sight of the retention and student success side, then we will continue to lose.
  - All we really need to know is that we have a serious financial challenge.
  - Maybe because it is an academic affairs conversation, we simply say
    - Maybe showing it visually, getting everybody on the same page, keeping it very simple. This could be a moment of transparency but also asking people to tackle this problem together.
    - The Budget Committee may need to handle this. The intent of this presentation is to talk about the strategies moving forward, not the why we need to do it. We don't want to lose sight of the real discussion.

- Public Comment:
  - Professor Duwell from Philosophy Department. When you mention you should spend time on retention, there has been empty talk about this for years. Please have the experts tell us what best practices are on retention. What are 10 things we can do to improve retention?
  - With respect to the numbers tomorrow, people want some serious information. I would list departments you are thinking of doing something with. Uncertainty is mental murder. Even if it's subject to revisions. Others will breathe a collective sigh of relief. Actually it would be good for morale to just pull the Band-Aid with the caveat that we will engage in discussion.

Meeting adjourned.