

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Finance Committee

Campus Governance

3-14-2019

Finance minutes 03/14/2019

Finance Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/finance>

Recommended Citation

Finance Committee, "Finance minutes 03/14/2019" (2019). *Finance Committee*. 125.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/finance/125>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Finance Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

UMM FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES

3-14-2019

Members Present: Roger Rose, Jon Anderson, Michael Korth, Angela Anderson, Naomi Skulan, Justin Terhaar, Kerri Barnstuble, Bryan Herrmann

Others Present: Melissa Wrobleski, Jessica Broekemeier

Members Absent: Arne Kildegaard

Agenda:

i. Review, Changes & Approval of 2/28/2018 Minutes

It was noted that Jon asked the question in the first paragraph instead of Michael. The minutes were then approved by the committee. It was also noted that Isaac Hunt is no longer a member of the Finance Committee and won't be attending any more meetings.

ii. Final Discussion on the Budget Compact Meeting 3/15/19

Bryan said that Morris will be asking for the same amounts that we discussed during the semester. He noted that there are two sections where you can ask for money. The first is for significant concerns, where Morris will ask for the remaining shortfall for FY20 to be covered. The second section is for critical operating needs, which is where Morris will ask for help with covering the American-Indian tuition waiver. There will also be a discussion about the strategic vision and planning work being done, so they know what we are doing to work on covering this.

Roger asked what the process of this meeting will be (given time allotment, waiting in line with other units, etc.). Bryan said Morris will receive 1.5 hours in which they will go over 36 pages of documents Melissa has put together. There are 37 units that meet for the Budget Compact Meetings at different times. Chancellor Behr will present an overview of these materials on a PowerPoint. Jon asked who would be listening to this presentation. Bryan replied that they won't know for sure until they get there. He mentioned Julie Tonneson is always there, Brian Burnett is typically there, as well as someone from the VP of Research Office, and President's Office. The Provost's Office may also have someone be there. Roger asked if all of the representatives there make the decisions together or if some people have more say. Bryan

wasn't sure and stated that they present and find out the decisions made around May 20. Melissa said they may receive questions from the meeting later if they arise. Bryan noted there will be questions on the fee request changes and strategic vision. They will go through last year's cuts, show that Morris is using private scholarship dollars, go through 19's, and much more information.

Roger asked if there is any role for strategic communication in the community to this group in order for them to understand the information more. Bryan said the strategic vision piece will be used to look at multi-year projections. They will show that people in the community are approving the vision but there is no outside communication. They will have extra materials that aren't required in order to help justify these requests.

Jon asked who is responsible in deciding all of the student fees. Bryan replied that most fees are reviewed by ARFC (Activity Review Fee Committee). All fees have a justification for the increase/addition of the fee. The International Student Fee and Campus Fee are excluded from the ARFC reviewing. The Campus Fee is set by the recommendation of the Chancellor and is reviewed by the Regents. Keri asked if the Regents set the bar for campus fees. Bryan answered yes, we must stay within a certain percentage increase. Last year Morris increased the Health and Wellness fee and the Regents asked for the reasoning behind it. The Legislature also has a cap on the increase of Student Activity Fees. This can't go up more than 2% for fees that go directly to student groups unless there is a vote by the student body.

Bryan also reviewed how Morris is achieving the \$900,000 salary reduction. He noted that this includes positions not being filled, combined positions, replacement savings, salaries moved off of Fund 1000 budget strings, retirement, and restructured positions. There has been a total of \$876,000 decided on for salary reductions so far. Roger asked how much of this is recurring. Bryan said at this point these cuts are all recurring, but may change later on if needed.

iii. **Model for Retention**

Jon reminded the committee that the issue is thinking about additional, or alternative ways, to come up with projections on enrollment based on what we know about our students. He provided multiple examples for a possible model.

First, Jon reviewed a student senior seminar projection about meters put on pigs to determine X, Y, and Z directions. This model questioned if one could predict what the pig is doing based on the directions. With a model such as this, it could vary with two variables for students. The idea is if one knows a measurement (information on a student) they could predict what that student will do (leave, or stay at the University of Minnesota, Morris). And view this data on a Decision Tree. One would start by looking at students as a whole and review their attributes to break down characteristics as homogeneous as possible and put that on the X axis. Over time, you'd be able review how accurate predictions are based on the attributes chosen as to whether a student leaves or stays at school on a Confusion Matrix.

Jon also reviewed a student's thesis from St. Cloud State University that predicted retention at that school. They reviewed the most important factors that distinguished the retention at the school. In this example it appeared that T2 (term 2) grades and GPA's were ranked more important than high school performance. Jon said this is the idea he is thinking about. This was only a thesis and wasn't by the institution, but the student did use institutional data.

Jon compared how accurate the way student enrollment is currently predicted with using a possible model such as this. Overall, using a model to predict student enrollment provides less variable and has fewer outliers as well. Using a model would modestly improve current predictions. His argument was that people should have analytics for a lot of purposes and not just for student retention.

Roger asked what the next step would be if we chose to use a model to predict student enrollment. Jon said that is what the committee would have to decide. There would be discussion with the Institutional Effectiveness office on what factors would be drawn on, how and when to draw on, and how far

back to pull institutional data to build rules for the future. Bryan noted that the model that was created for the University of Minnesota, Morris years ago was predictions on students coming in and not students already here. That model wasn't used so it was stopped. Roger asked what the reasoning was to not continue this model. Keri noted that some of the recommendations on the model were already being done. Part of the reason was there was question as to how much this model actually added. Bryan also noted that timing is a challenge. With the SCSU model, it predicted student retention based on term 2 grades. This information wouldn't be available until after the semester, and the predictions are needed in the fall or beginning of spring semester. Jon said the model would be built to what our University would need.

There was discussion that doing a model would not be cheap. Bryan wondered if it would be worth the cost of creating such a model, or if it would be a better use of funds to work on retention of our current students. Roger noted that we could review the costs and benefits of using a model at the next meeting.

iv. Discussion of Strategic Vision Community Meeting

There was no discussion of this due to time restrictions. Roger said there will be data on the voting to discuss at the next Finance Committee meeting. The meeting was adjourned.