

## CLAS Finance Committee Meeting Minutes

Friday, January 28, 3:00 - 4:00 p.m.

Present: John Palmer (Chair), Galia Hatav, Thomas Knight, Daniel Talham, Matthieu Felt, Jorge Valdes Kroff, Tarek Saab, Uma Sethuram, Chris McCarty, Fahad Qazi (student rep), Catherine Tucker (Secretary)

### 1. Call to order and approval of minutes from previous meeting.

- Meeting called to order: 3:03 pm

### 2. Updated recommendations from Working Groups 1 and 4.

- Main step: Eliminate unsustainable or problematic practices – “low hanging fruit.”
  - Then see what more must be done to reach target of \$14 million total OPS
  - Insofar as we apply a given principle, algorithm, or metric, we should recall that it is just a first pass. During the second pass, we need to pay attention to key details (e.g., student safety, equipment concerns, infrastructure constraints)
  - Reminder: New initiatives that will require more funding will need to be covered by the Provost (e.g., AI initiative, Civics requirement, which will require more courses and TAs), thus we should not consider projected growth due to new requirements in our recommendations to cut or increase OPS.
- Group 4 Evaluation and Recommendation: Thomas and Jorge
  - Specific recommendations offered for 4 of their 5 departments, retaining budget at or below 2021-22 allocations
  - For one department (Religion) a number of TA's were assigned to substantially fewer students than other departments, leading to a reduction in the budget. Here an issue is that both the number of GA's and the numbers of undergrads is low. Religion generates few majors (now 14 majors), lowest SCH and lowest SCH/faculty in the College. Question: Does a substantial reduction make a grad program not viable?
    - McCarty reminds us that all recommendations are advisory to the dean, who will make final decisions. For challenges such as this, groups can include some narrative regarding considerations. The Dean is aiming for balancing undergrad needs, grad program, faculty research needs, and budgetary constraints.
- Group 1 Evaluation and Recommendation: Tarek and Matt
  - Presents a ppt with possible recommendations. After cuts of unsustainable practices, still above what would be needed to reach targeted savings. Then options (metric) such as a set % reduction or a scaling of SCH.
  - However, some departments need consideration of particular situation. For example, Chemistry's program would be in danger if severe cuts are made.

- Certain workload profiles are not appropriate for Chemistry because some labs with highly specialized equipment have a very low feasible enrollment per TA.

### 3. Preliminary discussion of how to craft Stage-2 reductions (General Discussion)

- Important to emphasize undergrad education (delivering undergrad credits)
- We need to focus on OPS needs
- Evaluations/recommendations can raise questions and include commentary
  - We can point to full suite of relevant dimensions, including grad programs, faculty research needs, and special departmental circumstances
  - Sustainability of a graduate program might be called into question but is beyond the purview of this committee
- We need to recall that these preliminary recommendations will be most useful when considered as a whole (i.e., one group may be able to recommend much larger cuts than others, we need to understand how close our initial recommendations get to the goal of reaching the \$14 million target – a cut of \$4.5 million).
- McCarty wonders whether UF could charge a fee for the few classes that carry exceptionally high costs. Certain other universities do this.
- Goal: Aim for all groups to complete recommendations by Friday, Feb 4. Each working group should forward them to John Palmer. These will be posted for all groups to review and consider whether reassessment might be needed before the next meeting on Feb. 11.
- Palmer will do an initial synthesis of recommendations for Feb. 11.

### 4. Meeting adjourned: 4:02 pm