

UBAC Committee Meeting
February 23, 2018, 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM, Trinkle 107B

In attendance:

Rob Barr, Brooke Di Lauro, Jane Huffman, Mike Lapke, Pam Lowery, Will Mackintosh, Paul Messplay, Nina Mikhalevsky, Lynne Richardson, Abbie Tomba

After approving the minutes from 11/7, 11/28, and 2/9, the committee discussed feedback on our fall budget report.

In response to our Fall Budget Report, Nina let the committee know that the President is aware of the priorities.

We next addressed the question of whether we need a standing committee in the new governance structure. Nina filled us in on the history of the committee. She was the first co-chair of UBAC with Rick Hurley back when there wasn't University faculty governance which meant that a lot of decisions regarding resource allocation were made exclusively by the President. The committee was created to provide faculty with a means of regularly asking questions and providing advice to senior-level administrators on resource reallocation. When we moved to the 3 separate colleges, UBAC remained a standing committee, but the work got distributed among other regular standing committees. Will pointed out that our charge specifically mentions our work during times of "financial exigency" and Lynne suggested that if we determined that a standing committee was no longer necessary, we could still create an ad hoc committee or task force under such circumstances. Jane reiterated that our polling of Colleges in the fall was an experiment with the committee's relevance – rather than just listening to VP reports, can we serve as a liaison between faculty and administration? Nina recommended that the work go back to UFC (which provides channels of communication around budgetary issues) or that it could be included in Faculty Affairs.

Nina then responded to concerns brought up by COE faculty that there was inequity in the distribution of faculty research grants. Using "back-of-the-envelope calculations," Nina informed us that this was not the case—COE gets \$1621 per faculty member, CAS gets \$1010, and COB gets \$1141. She added that COB is only one with numerical targets for research due to AACSB accreditation.

At our request, Nina continued with a detailed description of Department Budgeting Process explains that she takes it year by year, Department by Department, ORG by ORG. The Board of Visitors wants to see that we're not only adding new things but taking away old things as well which means that it's always a matter of prioritization or "robbing Peter to pay Paul". She suggested that perhaps the UFC should get a basic primer from Paul Messplay about how the budget works and the history of cuts.

The Provost further explained that we are going to need to plan our 2023/4 budget based on 0% enrollment growth for 4-5 years (due to plummeting birth rates) and a retention level of 90%. Four particular items of concern are that: 1) 11% of our students are registered with Office of Disability Resources (twice national average), 2) changing student demographics will require more support, 3) Virginia exports more students than it imports, and 4) the transfer student population is growing which will put pressure on the adult student population.

Nina reassured us that the news was not all negative. For example, we will cap the first year class (so faculty won't be stretched as thin) but grow the adult / non-traditional student population. This will entail focusing more on the modality of courses (online, blended; evening, weekend) to meet needs of legitimate need of students and to strengthen recruitment. Surprisingly, we lose the most students to community colleges, which tells us a lot about student needs. Our best plan to respond to those needs is to continue to articulate our vision and mission in a way that captures and supports distinctive and innovative programs that really define us. We need to emphasize that we are a high quality, public liberal arts university and that we place a premium on high impact learning (research, community engagement, sports, theater, etc.). To that end, we need to recruit and

retain very high quality faculty who are genuinely engaged in teaching and working with students so that we can provide the small classes and on-one-one attention which we advertise but which we are slowly drifting away from. Some ideas include: a disability studies minor, expanding and supporting undergrad research, and moving money from the Teaching Center to support faculty members in creating on-line courses to meet GenEds for the BLS program. Finally, she emphasized that the President is focused on vigorous fundraising.

Nina then updated us on the status of market adjustment raises, explaining that we don't yet know how much money we'll have (around \$120,000) and acknowledging that there are a lot of problems with compression. The model used addressed both compression and equity issues and bringing salaries up to market value. The plan is to do what will make the biggest difference to the largest number of faculty. She added that last year's classified wage study revealed that we really have to do something about staff salaries too. Money is equally short here—if we move the classified sub-bands to the minimum level, it would cost \$270,000 and that doesn't include AP which would take \$426,000 to get to midline.

In other business, the Committee learned that the University increased its reserves from 6% to 8.5%, but the President would like it at 10% of total operating budget. It was also suggested that Departments meet with Jeff Rountree to determine which ones aren't using their funds.

Given Nina's suggestion that we should look more closely at how we're all spending our Foundation funds, we decided to invite Jeff Roundtree to our next meeting. We will also talk about making a formal recommendation regarding our viability as committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Brooke Di Lauro