University Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
April 20, 2018

Attendance:

Present: Alford, Atteberry, Bodnar, Callaway, Comer, DeLuca, Fitzgerald, Humphrey, Kirgis, Lindsay, Manuel, Ratto-Parks, Schafer, Schwarze, Semanoff, White, Whittenburg.

Absent: Barnes, Chacon, Farnsworth, Stark

Discussion of Feedback Received:

- Reports are coming in of students worried about being able to come to UM for their degree. We know they will be able to finish their majors. It would be great to put out a press release or a banner on the website and make it a positive message for students.
  - As dean, I sent out a message that the current degrees will be available and we may also have additional degrees that would be desirable. Let's make it more positive than just being able to finish your degree.
- FAQ document should be created.
- People are confused about how to direct their feedback. There's the Faculty Senate feedback form, the President's office feedback form, and listening sessions. We need to think hard about how feedback gets digested. Faculty Senate wants to collect feedback and we want to make sure we get the feedback directed that way.
  - There's a perception that online feedback does not get reviewed carefully.
- Chuck Harris in SSRL is going to help us analyze the feedback. We will look at the email feedback and enter the ones that aren't already in the survey. We can sort by faculty and provide all that faculty feedback to ECOS.
- The Faculty Senate meeting also raised questions about CBA processes. ECOS has met a number of times and we have met with the union frequently to make sure we are following all the procedures. Mainly we are concerned with how this process can honor the role of faculty review in curricular matters. We've broken up the recommendations in terms of reorganization, discontinuances and curricular affairs. We are thinking that for the regular reorganization stuff, that's a matter for deans and AOs to consider. We will gather feedback and try to organize it for you to help inform your decisions that the faculty have to live with. In terms of curricular and discontinuance we are going to ask the curriculum subcommittees to look at these proposals as they normally would. Based on the document we have at the moment, there will be a lot of issues they can't weigh in on without further detail. There will likely be requests for more information. In addition, we will gather feedback from faculty at large and they will probably be able to identify issues of initial concern. We will ask that you follow the regular next steps in the case of discontinuance. The one thing this process bypasses for now, is that the forms ask for endorsements for affected programs. They may not have been contacted before the initial reviews came out. There are grave concerns about how this will play out. These are also initial recommendations and we recognize that they will change. In that case, we expect that we can review those changes in the normal fashion as well.
• We are a little concerned about what you are going to present to BOR in May. Some of this needs to go through standard Faculty Senate processes, ASCRC, Grad Council, etc. We need to make sure we do an appropriate teach-out.
  o The President will have them vote on the mission.
  o There is a difference between an informal plan and then formal BOR paperwork.
• There is some pushback on the reorganization. This is a big deal when you start merging cultures and departments and the day-to-day life of the faculty. There are a lot of details to work out. Where people work, unit standards, etc. It would be nice to see dollar data savings for these consolidations. Or maybe it's not about dollars and it's about stimulating interdisciplinary work—which might be an extreme action.
  o It may help having staff coverage and support for units.
  o Unit Standards--just because they operate under the same division doesn't mean the units can't have different unit standards.
  o There's a sense that is not ground up, it hasn't been discussions among the faculty.
    o That's what we are doing. The whole point is to put out a plan and then we need to hear from faculty. We purposely didn't put the level of detail to say that there will be a division head with a certain power over the chairs. We need to hear from the faculty and what they would like to see. This is the message we need to continually convey.
• I'd like to return to the question of the level of specificity of the plan you expecting to deliver to the BOR. There's a big difference between saying we are moving to 10 divisions and saying exactly what those divisions will be. Is it possible to say we are going to reorganize the college from 23 to 10 divisions and not have the exact answers in two weeks?
  o I do not believe I know the best way to go from 23 to 10. There's a proposal to go down to 10. The college is closest to it. Aligning to fewer divisions is helpful. There are budgetary savings and I do think there are significant student benefits. I don't plan to specifically organize the CHS in my BOR presentation.
  o The original plan was to go to 12 divisions. Lots of good comments have come back already. The motivating factor is first to serve students. We cannot properly serve students through 23 departments. A plan can emerge that ultimately most of us can embrace and we are having meetings next week so that everyone can be heard.
  o The question I've gotten most is about timing. Is this happening in August or over the next academic year? With such a massive reorganization, what is the timeline?
    • It will play out over an academic year. Faculty will be gone over the summer. When people come back in the fall we can begin to plan and move in a direction.
    • Let's realize this is a huge staff issue. We really have to get it right with the staff.
      • We know there are people hurting for staff around campus. If there's a staff member lost and they have the skills to move to a different department, I encourage us to look at those opportunities to retain staff.
  o Our faculty want to move as fast as possible. There are recommendations made that have been fully embraced and people want to get after that. We may accelerate our timeline but that's a point of conversation and knowing we have a year to get it right, then the sooner we can communicate that in a collaborative way, the better.
  o We need to think about H&S and how we can facilitate this reorganization. Can we provide support to help accomplish it? Mediators or facilitators for this planning process?
  o I want to talk to the BOR about consolidation at a high level. On the reorganization level, there is a sense of urgency to move forward. But I've never had the intent for this to happen over a month. This is a proposal. Let's have a feedback period and then execute it over time.
- Be clear about what kinds of things are moving forward quickly and what will take time. There is major anxiety about this.
- It might be helpful to build a schedule of implementation plans for working through over the summer. We need to know what's realistic.
- I don't see the savings. We don't have a thorough analysis for budget savings. We don't have time for a thorough analysis. There will effectively be departments within divisions. So in three years, we could really wind up having to pay more stipends and have further costs.
  o CHS is woefully understaffed and we have to find a way to address that. We had to start the conversation.
  o This is really not a cost savings but it is way to better serve students.
  o It's a platform for revenue growth.
- How do the proposed FTE reductions map onto the communities of excellence? The artistic expression and communication area is getting hit far harder than all of the others. I'm not advocating for across-the-board cuts.
  o The reductions came from the mismatch between faculty resources and students. The idea is to match the faculty resources with the student demand, across all of the communities of excellence.

Meeting adjourned.