University Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
August 8, 2018

Attendance:

Present: Alford, Bodnar, Chacon, Comer, DeLuca, Harbor, Humphrey (remote), Kirgis, Lindsay, Ratto-Parks, Schafer, Schwarze, Semanoff, Stark, Welch.

Absent: Atteberry, Barnes, Callaway, Chacon, Farnsworth, Manuel, White, Whittenburg.

Update on Methodology:

President Bodnar:

I am grateful to this group for your work over the past six months. One of the decisions we made that's different from the original charge is that we did not identify areas to no longer sustain (i.e. cut programs). The question is now--how can we maintain our programs as best we can with the quality demanded by our students and levels of faculty that align with student enrollment numbers? That changed the methodology slightly and I know that has caused some ambiguity. Adjusting to appropriate faculty sizes is much preferred to broad scale program elimination.

A next step is for the UPC to turn its attention to a longer range mechanism to assess programs and have budgeting and strategy line up with the assessment of our programs on a regular basis. That's what work should happen through the end of the semester. And then we will reconstitute it with a more institutional representation format. This is a primarily academically focused UPC for a reason, but through next semester, the reset of the planning assessment continuum and getting these processes built will be complete and we will get to a more regular operating mechanism. Then I will hand the chairing of the UPC back to the Provost. Provost Harbor will set up the mechanisms to assess our academic programs and link strategy, budgeting, and assessment.

Paul Kirgis:

I am going to explain the process used in the spring and a plan to tweak that process. The idea is that this body is primarily tasked with helping design the process. In April, the data subgroup will remember the tableau used when we were thinking in terms of cutting programs. We created a methodology for assessing programs and a number of iterations resulted in the tableau. We used a blind version to identify programs for further consideration. We handed that off to the administration team to do the assessment. And that was the moment in the process where we shifted focus from cutting programs to properly align faculty resources necessary to deliver these programs given our current student population.

We moved to stage 2 analysis which looked at departments rather than programs based on an internal and external benchmark. Another tableau shows that analysis. We tried to make judgment calls about the right staffing levels based on internal benchmarks. That ultimately appeared in the document last May.
We received a lot of feedback from that process. Themes emerged: 1) stopping the analysis in 2017 did not include attrition from 2017-18, 2) using a single year of 2013 as a benchmark was problematic because one year can have anomalies 3) looking at just tenure track faculty.

The data office went back and re-ran the numbers taking those critiques into account, as well as the concern that it might look too similar to across-the-board cuts. The new plan is to effectively flip the process that we used back in the spring. Now we want to start with the staffing analysis but updated in a couple of ways: 1) going through 2018, 2) using average of 2009-2013, 3) break out tenure track and non-tenure-track faculty.

We didn't feel the Delaware numbers were a good match. They were largely saying we were understaffed in all departments, although our ratios are way lower than the norms. That may be because the Delaware data is at least two years old. If we are taking a 5-year average, we should have confidence that we could deliver the curriculum in proportion to the students we had at that time period. So the staff numbers become stage 1. We will assign every department the number of faculty it had as of the average from 2009-13. We are looking at that proportionally (tenure track/non tenure track) so departments can see they are being compared apples to apples. That should likely result in more budget savings than we need to achieve (need to reduce by $5 million). The advantage of that gives us the opportunity to be strategic in adding additional faculty. That's when we will go back to the former Stage 1 analysis. Former Stage 1 is done by program, which is intentional. We want to be sure we can deliver the programs we are trying to deliver--the students take degrees, which is what we need to be thinking about when strategically thinking about reinvestment.

Now we have communities of excellence as well. We are in a position to assess programs qualitatively to see how they fit with the mission and communities of excellence. Hopefully we will have a pool of resources to build some programs beyond 09-13 average level. The main thing to consider then is former Stage 1 (through 2018) analysis and the demands of offering the curriculum of a program. If we are going to cut the faculty of a program below what is needed to deliver it, that effectively eliminates the program and we may not want to do that. The leadership team isn't going to know the on-the-ground needs of each program--deans and chairs have that information. We anticipate giving the data to deans & chairs and asking them for two types of feedback: 1) accuracy of the data 2) minimum faculty required to deliver the curriculum.

This has to happen in a short time frame. We should have the data this week. The plan is to give the deans and chairs the data and ask for feedback by end of the month (end of first week of faculty on contract - tentatively August 24). Then we have a whole bunch of other data at our disposal (APASP, etc). The administration will turn it around quickly in time for any required Faculty Senate review.

Questions/Feedback:

- August 24 sounds like on the quick side. Faculty will only come back a few days before that. What's the target date for the Faculty Senate curriculum deadline and can it be pushed back?
  - Maybe we can push that back to August 31 for preliminary feedback.
- If the deans are getting a dollar amount and need to reduce by that amount, can they use lecturers or adjuncts, etc and wind up reducing that way?
  - Yes, they could wind up with a different mix of faculty types, etc. It gives the departments a chance to be creative and go in different directions.
- This is a good plan but how can we handle interdisciplinary programs?
Neuroscience, for example, is interdisciplinary between CHS and CHPBS. This is a time the deans to get together around the table and figure it out.

- The Provost's expectation is that deans and chairs would provide that information in their feedback.

- How do you get from a staffing average to a particular faculty number?
  - You are actually calculating two sets: TT and non-TT. You have a student: faculty ratio and apply that to your 2018 SCH. It tells you both the TT and NTT faculty you "should have" and multiply by the average salary for those categories in the department. You multiply those out and that gives you the target budget for the faculty.
  - That's a very clear, reproducible calculation. We can give the Chairs/Deans that information and hope they will provide feedback.

- We are talking about in early September, chairs/deans will receive an instructional budget. We are converting headcount to dollars back to headcount (eventually).
  - For purposes of the attrition piece. Yes, because dollars don't teach classes. You need to know who the people are.

President Bodnar: As an institution, how do we best align our resources to meet the needs of our students? It's important that all of our shared governance leaders and administrators are aligned so we can move through this as a community. As we go back this fall to face these tough decisions, we need to get beyond the narrative of "UM Looming Cuts" and move forward. I keep hearing the uncertainty about UM in high school students' voices. And I heard that feedback loudly from current and prospective students. We need to be able to strategically enable successful programs to bring in more students. It needs to be an opportunity rather than additional workload with no more resources. This is as much about enabling growth as it is about cutting.

Additional questions/feedback:

- Instructional dollars also includes graduate students. Be sure that chairs and deans understand that.
- When we dial back to 2009-2013, how much have we added in that time frame?
  - We have almost exactly the same number of faculty we had in 2013.
- Earlier you said that demand and communities of excellence would be the criteria.
  - We feel the campus has had enough of processes and metrics. This group settled on (the original) Stage 2 to assess programs. We don't want to revisit that, we feel it's done. It's not just demand but a series of metrics. The additional thing is the communities of excellence, which I think the campus supports. Those are the two main items. And then APASP provides a huge amount of information.
  - It's not an equation. It can't be. It's a range of data. It's quantitative and qualitative. The President and Provost have to go through all of this input and make the management decisions we are employed to do.
- It's great to hear about programs being ready for investment, like Wildlife Biology. That's true but they are 100% dependent upon the rest of campus. It is dependent upon them finding seats for their students in classes like Chemistry and Biology. We can't just invest in a program and expect it to grow when other programs are still struggling.
  - It's the same for WRIT. We can't grow any bigger due to financial constraints but others rely on it. Like HHP majors or Wildlife Bio majors. And we work with those students'
interests and talents and skills. There are many adjustments happening in areas that we aren't thinking of.

  o Can't we utilize the expertise on campus to create a model to show the interconnectedness and consequences of decisions?

  • We need to be sure to communicate about what's coming next since people may not expect this right away when they return this fall.

Meeting adjourned.