University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

10-4-2016

Planning minutes 10/04/2016

Planning Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan

Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 10/04/2016" (2016). *Planning Committee*. 91.
https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/91

To:	Planning Committee	
	Participants:	Oscar Baldelomar, Melissa Bert, Brook Miller, Seung-Ho Joo, Sandy Kill, Jana Koehler, Tiernan Lenius, Mike Cihak, William Rasmussen, Bryan Herrmann (ex-officio), Gwen Rudney (ex-officio), Matt Senger (ex-officio), Alison Campbell (secretary)
From:	Engin Sungur, Chair	
	Present:	Oscar Baldelomar, Melissa Bert, Brook Miller, Seung-Ho Joo, Jana Koehler, Mike Cihak, Bryan Herrmann, Gwen Rudney, Matt Senger, William Rasmussen, Alison Campbell (secretary)
Subject:	*Meeting Agenda*	
	Date:	October 4 (Tuesday)
	Time:	3:00-4:00
	Place:	Prairie Lounge

Committee Website	http://committees.morris.umn.edu/planning-committee
Committee Moodle Site	https://ay15.moodle.umn.edu/course/view.php?id=7767

THE AGENDA

1. Approval of September 13, 20, and 27 Minutes *(5 min.)*.
   ***Action: Approval of the minutes* – next time**
2. 2018 Budget – Bryan Herrmann - Nancy Helsper as guest
   Discussion about Arne Kildegaard's email
   - Arne Kildegaard's email is referencing data in the Data Book
   - At the time we were merging CERP and the campus together we had a big spike in instructional staff
     ○ If you exclude the CERP staff then it effects the numbers
     ○ Topic on cutting 40 positions – at the time (2005) we had a low faculty to student ratio and all the changes came from changes to the CERP program.
   - IPEDS lumps different things together
   - The issue was not on number of facility/staff directly related but the instructions - how much funding each of them were receiving
     ○ Rapid recovery with all other fields except instruction, research, public service and academic support
     ○ TC encourages us to cut programs
     ○ Not sure we see a recovery rate in the IPEDS data
   - When did we start having a retention rate problem?
     ○ Last 3 years have been 3 to 5 points below – average in past has been 83%
     ○ Best retention rate was FY13 – 87% - had a smaller class 413, year before was 465- 79% retention rate
     ○ Number of instruction has increased over time
   - UMM Student Credit Hours and FTE Faculty graph
     ○ Engin says we are not planning we are reacting
     ○ It's hard to match the number of students and faculty – it's hard to adjust in September

- o Would like to see a student to staff ratio – just because students are low we should not reduce faculty
  - Arne said Operation and Maintenance of Plant: +36% - but it's not just salary expenditures in there it's infrastructure expenditures – computing services moved but the numbers in the data book stayed the same (We go by IPEDS regulations)
  - Reallocation for the past several years were all staff and one faculty
  - Everyone is acutely aware of their area and protective
- Should the Planning Committee respond to Arne's email – we don't need to but this is good for us to discuss – give suggestions to help
  - o Finance Committee ultimately makes the final recommendations but we can have a conversation
- Soft Money comment –
  - o Planning issues to consider around initiative - we have been able to fund with grants – what are the appropriate planning processes to follow?
  - o Fantasy to do comparative analysis – could say something like "when we account for the soft money….these are the various expenditures on the parts of our mission and some explanation to why" – rather than a figure pointing
    - Compare our institution to other institutions
    - We rarely talk about ways to bring money into our campus (revenue/resources generation)
  - o Does not show up in IPEDS – IPEDS are a comparison but it's hard to compare them with each other because we are a part of the University
  - o One grant we are looking at – looks at a set of 10 or 11 functions in terms of expenses (core expenses) which can help compare
- Engin looked at strategic plan – look back and see what needs to be edited – look at online teaching and our plans for the future – enhancement – we need the survey to give us the answers
  - o Other system universities have stronger online programs which bring in more students - Crookston is 50% online and 50% in class
    - Is our program any different from 10 years ago – Crookston invests in a different way
    - Tuition is our best way to generate revenue – every 10 students is $100,000
- Gwen said we need to move forward and take care of things now - make agendas that people are interested in and follow them
  - o We have the survey done now – lets send it out
  - o Would like to discuss: Advanced support for teacher education has an impact on enrollment – 30 more students in her program as they had years ago solves the tuition problem
  - o While people are doing our survey what should we focus on? – we need some structure
  - o Talk about goals for metrics from Melissa
  - o Look at revenue generation
  - o Asked if Brook envisions the planning committee working with him for the on-campus focus groups related to the system-wide strategic planning effort.
3. Discussion on UMM Strategic Planning Survey Progress
- Keeping bottom two boxes separate for data purposes (past and future)

- Add citation for what we mean by "new or related goal"
  - We don't want to end up with a brand new goal
  - Do you think it would gather different information?
  - We want to capture if they have a new or revised one
  - If we had an example we could see what wordage works
    - Engin will design a test survey and send it out to the committee during the time we are not meeting
- Will the people know that their responses will be available to the public? – we should make sure that is in the intro.
- Bryan will show this survey at the VC meeting tomorrow

4. UMM Data Flow Planning: UMM Progress Cards/Metrics – didn't get to
   Any progress?
   Information & Discussion.

Appendix A.
Engin and Dennis,

Please feel free to share that note with the respective committees that you chair.

Sincerely,
Arne

Hi everyone,

A quick follow up on some of the numbers I threw out at the budget summit last Thursday. I did not mean to blindside anyone, and I wasn't even planning to raise the matter until I saw the compounding cuts ($450K from faculty reductions; 10% SE&E reductions amounting about to perhaps $100K in academic divisions; $150-$500 additional cuts to non-bargaining unit employees) targeted at the academic side of campus.

The figures I cited were these:

1. From 2007-2010, according to the graphs on p. 18-19 of the latest Institutional Data Book (2014-15), the campus lost about 40 positions, net. Instruction/Research, and Academic Affairs, taken together, lost 46 position. Other areas, on net, grew by 6 positions.

Why use these dates (2007-2010)? It's not cherry picking. That's as far back as the databook I was looking at goes. I stop at 2010 because that's where the annual IPEDS data becomes available, in a table on p.9. From FY 2010 through FY 2014, here's what the growth rates of certain categories of spending were:

1. Instruction; Research; Public Services; and Academic Support: +7.8%
2. Student Services: +28%
3. Operation and Maintenance of Plant: +36%
4. Scholarships and Fellowships: +15.1%
5. Non-mandatory transfers: *up from zero to $4.2m*. (I don't know what this is; cost pools?)

I understand that some of this is soft money, and that's a thing the people involved should be

proud of and not apologetic for. But if you look at the data in the table on p. 5 ("Total Expenditures from O&M," FY 10 through 14) you get similar results:

1. Support services: +17%
2. Academic Services & Academic Divisions: +5.4%

So, I'm struck by this. After taking more than 100% of the overall campus staffing reductions during the financial meltdown (2007-2010), the academic side of campus subsequently grew much more slowly than the rest of the campus.

And now, in spite of continuing evidence that faculty salaries are below the peer group, and that this is a major contributor to campus morale and engagement challenges, we are looking at another cut of up to half a million dollars, to go along with reduced size of the faculty and reduced SE&E.

I hope this is a useful way to frame the discussion that follows.

Sincerely,
-Arne

Appendix B. Revolving UMM Strategic Plan Input Survey: Stage I.

Revolving UMM Strategic Plan Input Survey: Stage I.
Planning Committee 2016-17

We'd like to provide the new Chancellor with a holistic overall vision of the status of the goals identified in the 2006 Strategic Plan as it expires in 2016. Your office/committee [NAME OFFICE OR COMMITTEE] are identified in the 2006 Strategic Plan as responsible for leading UMM's pursuit of these goals.

Receiving Unit/Committee:	
Title of Strategic Planning Component:	
Integrated Statement on the Strategic Planning Goal:[1]	**Goal 1[2].** *{Statement from 2006 Strategic Plan}*
Status of Goal	*Please check all that apply* ☐ Achieved ☐ In Progress ☐ No Longer Relevant ☐ Achieved But in Need of Maintenance ☐ Other o Please explain
Brief Comment on This Goal.	
Recommendation for a related goal.	

---

[2] *[Statement from the 2013 Review & Progress Update]*
[Statement from the UMM Strategic Priorities for the FY 16]