Minutes CACBSP: July 15, 2016, Chancellor’s Conference Room

Committee Members in Attendance: Connie Creech, Mike Farmer, Sarah Lippert, Adam Lutzker (for Amelia Biehl), Cathy Miller (Chair), Mehrdad Simkani, Matt Wolverton, Matt Wyneken (for Sharman Siebenthal-Adams), Tess Barker (designee of ex-officio)

Approval of May and June Minutes: Approved with correction to the spelling of Cathy Miller’s name.

Discussion of Agenda: As a governing faculty committee the CACBSP committee chair will consult with the Chancellor’s office to develop the agenda and will disseminate the agenda.

Discussion of Faculty Council committee rep: Mike Farmer will finish his term in August. A new rep can be selected at that time.

Discussion of Minutes: Discussion of best practices in minute taking and the importance of having a faculty perspective and complete information included in minutes for governing faculty committees. Motion was made to elect a faculty secretary. Motion was seconded. Volunteers were sought. Lippert volunteered to be nominated. Majority vote approved Lippert as secretary for the 2016-17 year (Lippert and Creech did not vote as they become eligible to vote in September; Farmer abstained as he is leaving the committee).

Discussion of Minutes Dissemination: Secretary will send draft of the minutes to the Committee Chair. The Chair will review and send to the committee. Minutes that have been approved by the committee will be sent by the Chair to Faculty Council (to be posted on Blackboard), and to the Chancellor’s office to be posted on the Chancellor’s website (as per the Chancellor’s wishes in order to ensure transparency).

Discussion of Review of the New Program Special Revenue Agreements:

Relevant documents: Tess Barker provided copies of all programs approved for special revenue agreements since 2012, as requested by the committee at the June meeting. However, these documents are not what the committee needs to review the programs. The committee wants to investigate how the programs are spending the revenues, especially the additional 20% the program receives in the first years as incentive to create new programs. The documents received were the “initial” program requests, not the program reviews showing action after program approval.

The committee has the following questions for these newly created and future requests:

- How do we find out if the estimation of resources needed for programs is an accurate reflection of the program’s actual need?
- How do we investigate if funds are being used appropriately? Some programs have funds transferred to the department, but the department doesn’t receive approval or support to use the funds.
- What is the proper format and information to be included in these proposals? (Can this be within our purview? Do we need to assess if the process is working? Might forms need to be updated, for example?)
Can we get feedback from the programs to find out how things are going, both through the program/department and possibly the offices of the Deans?

Should CACBSB set up a process to apply for, track, and report use of funds?

Should we request from SHPS (from Emily Helm) information on its process for development of new programs and payback of funds plan, as its process may be a model for other units?

How do faculty obtain assistance with needs assessment reports, especially at the undergraduate level, when applying for new programs? There seems to be very little guidance available to faculty on this process.

Is there something regarding budgetary investment that should be happening to prepare for 2019’s accreditation? (Sarah, I don’t understand this point.)

Could we ask for programs with revenue to submit their program reviews (since they have to be written anyway at the 2 and 6-year mark for graduate programs, and at least the 6-year mark for undergraduate programs) so that we can assess if budgetary planning for the new program was consistent with the revenue plan expectations? Areas of budgetary stress for programs could be communicated at that time.

Action Items from Special Revenue Discussion (based on discussion consensus rather than vote):

- Revisit the proposal for revenue process to see if it is efficient and clear.
- Obtain copies of program reviews for approved special revenue agreements. If budget information is missing then ask for this information and begin to communicate to programs that they should include a budgetary report on use of revenue funds in their program reviews in the future, if not already included.
- Begin communicating with programs and Deans’ offices to close the loop on if revenue programs are benefiting the programs as intended.

Discussion of the Budget Model for the University:

- We will spend time discussing the budget model and whether and how it can be modified to encourage and support the current mission objectives of the University.
- We have a campus goal to focus on student retention and other factors that impact both new and existing programs. What are the metrics we could use to assess these goals?
- The Deans will work on metrics for their programs’ retention efforts and agree to meet periodically with the Committee’s Chair to discuss the metrics.
- The budget model creates an incentive for new rather than existing programs or student retention efforts. The budget model appears to prioritize fiscal rather than curricular needs.
- How does a budget based on enrolment (at least in CAS) cause faculty post request to be used to generate money for the college, rather than keeping commitments to students and faculty for existing programs, such as those that lose faculty? Is there a way to create a more fair faculty post request process?
- Currently the budget model makes it fiscally undesirable if not impossible for CAS to honor worthy faculty post requests based on non-budgetary priorities. With the current budget model the only way for small programs to get faculty posts is for the faculty posts to be provided by Academic Affairs (the Provost’s office). Should some faculty posts come from the college or school, while some are granted for solely academic goals from the Provost’s office?
In terms of the way in which existing programs are supported, how do we make sure that commitments to students and units are maintained, especially if they don’t have a lot of enrolment? Retention of students is partially dependent on retention of faculty. When a program loses a faculty member who is central to the vitality of a program, students are abandoned and enrolment falls. Is it wise that existing faculty posts be eliminated when faculty retire (or are otherwise lost)?

Observation from a CAS XC member that the college simply cannot fund faculty posts that don’t generate the highest revenue.

Do we have baseline retention data to help us understand these matters? Retention measurement has to take into consideration that students change their majors often in the first 2 years, and so retention rewards based on a 2-year measurement may not be appropriate, especially if it would push students to being pressured not to switch majors.

The current budget model and GE program (since 2010) creates an incentive for the Schools to develop courses typically held in CAS. Does the University agree that CAS should be the foundation for GE offerings? If we truly want to support the core traditions of the liberal arts on this campus, we need to address how the budget model and the GE program could be adjusted to preserve the survival of liberal-arts education on this campus.

Curriculum duplication remains a concern.

**Action Items:**
- The CACBSP will look for ways to assess intersections of the budgetary model with student and faculty retention and will seek to find data on these matters.
- The CACBSP will continue to address issues related to the current budget model.

**Discussion of Information Available to the CACBSP:**
- What documentation is provided to this committee on the annual budget?
- What changes and time trends are available to us?
- Can we have access to the budgetary info presented to the Regents?
- Can we see several years of information, rather than just the current year?
- Might a designate for the finance ex-officio be able to join us when he is unavailable, especially since the new person only works 3 days a week on our campus and will therefore rarely be able to attend our meetings?

**Action Items:**
- Invite a designate from finance to attend meetings periodically.
- Investigate which documents regarding the campus’ budget, and those of the schools/colleges, might be available to the committee.

**Discussion on the Issue of Retention:**
- Do compensation and teaching loads for faculty impact our relationships with students?
- DEEP: About 130 students from DEEP joined us. What recruiting are we doing specifically for students from DEEP?

**Discussion on the Issue of Retention:**

**Discussion on the Issue of Space:**
- Space is fundamentally a budgetary matter, as it deals with resources, and it is part of this committee’s charge to address space.

- Discussion of faculty representation in space plans:
  - Currently the plans for the newly acquired buildings are in their early stages (architect is being secured).
  - There are no faculty members on the non-elected committee that has been assembled to plan the use of the new buildings.
  - There is currently no governing faculty committee besides ours that is transparently elected to represent faculty concerns on space.
  - Discussion of the facilities committee and whether it was a faculty committee on space (Administrative Services Advisory Committee was thought by some to be a faculty committee that deals with space needs, but it was determined that this is facilities, not space).
  - Planning of space on this campus has historically been lacking in transparency. There is no point of contact for faculty or programs to take their space concerns to a governing faculty committee.
  - There used to be an ad hoc committee on space many years ago, which had some faculty, but it doesn’t exist any more.
  - The problem for faculty and programs is that by the time decisions have been made about which buildings to purchase or renovate, an initiative and resources are already so committed that needs for space cannot be fairly and comprehensively assessed.
  - It was mentioned that in the fall semester there was a campus-wide initiative for all programs/academic units to have 5-15-year plans for specific space needs. However, it is not evident that this initiative occurred in CAS or all of the Schools. The main call for input on space in CAS was very last-minute and primarily focused on brief proposals for the capital outlay plan.
  - Errors in use of space and planning for pedagogical needs has historically been lacking. Buildings have been designed without faculty input into classroom needs. Building design can have a grave impact on if students can even find the faculty.
  - What are we doing to make sure that students have access to faculty (how does space dictate access)?
  - Do we have common spaces for students in all disciplines, rather than just the ones that lend themselves to such spaces (i.e. arts, science labs, sports groups)?
  - Data might be available to show that when students have places to bond with one another in their departments (with students in like areas of study) they are more likely to be retained.
  - What happens between precipitating events (like purchase of a new building) to ensure that faculty have access to input on space on a regular basis?
  - Could this committee be given updates on space plans on a regular basis?
  - Update on current space plans: Academic spaces in Merit Building cannot be housed above the 8th floor due to safety issues. Administrative offices may be housed on 9 and 10. They are working on how to separate the current 2 buildings and addressing utilities. An architect is required to be hired by Ann Arbor, and we are at the stage of securing an architect, who would then presumably consult with faculty groups. After decisions are made to put administrative offices in Merit, new conversations about how to use the UPAV would presumably happen.
**Action Items:** Consensus through discussion that the committee needs to be more involved with space conversations, especially since space decisions are budget decisions, and are part of our charge. Can we get an update on the plans for Capital Outlay and phase 2 of Murchie Science renovations?

**Suggestions for Upcoming Agendas:**
- Review and discuss the Strategic Enrolment Management Plan report. It is accessible at a link provided through an email from Sue Fabbro. The report was written by the SEM committee.

**Other Business:**
- The committee thanks Karen Riptoe for her service in helping the committee with administrative duties.

**Next Meeting:** Friday August 12th, 2-4pm, in the Chancellor’s conference room

**Fall meetings:**
- 1-2:30 on the 2nd and 4th Thursdays of the month, starting on September 8th. Some adjustments will be needed for holidays and certain days when the Chancellor has a conflict.
- Back up time if Thursdays don’t work would be Friday 2-3:30, but we’ll try for Thursdays first.

**Minutes taken by CACBSP 2016-17 Committee Secretary Sarah Lippert**

**Minutes approved September 22, 2016**