

CLAS Finance Committee Meeting Minutes

Friday, February 25, 2022, 3:00 - 4:00 p.m.

Present: John Palmer (Chair), Daniel Talham, Galia Hatav, Thomas Knight, Jorge Vales Kroff, José Ponciano, Mattieu Felt, Fahad Qazi, Tarek Saab, Uma Sethuram (Dean's Office), Catherine Tucker (Secretary)

1. Call to order and approval of minutes of the previous meeting.

3 pm meeting called to order
Minutes approved unanimously as posted.

2. Remaining issues from the Stage-1 review of units OPS by the five Working Groups.

Palmer asks if there are any questions regarding the Stage 1 reviews; none at this point.
Therefore the discussion moves to Stage 2.

3. Method for implementing further reductions (Stage-2) to reach the \$14.5M target total.

Summary of points raised:

- Stage 1 review only reduced overall OPS by \$80,000.
- Therefore we must still cut over \$3M to reach the target
- We should aim to recognize overall needs and recommend realignment
- Perhaps we should start by capping all departments at a maximum of current OPS, however, this then discards all the work done in Stage 1.
- The FIRST QUESTION to consider is whether it is appropriate to begin Phase-2 calculations of the further reductions required to reach that target (1) from the base OPS for each unit suggested by the Working Groups even though a number of these represent increases to the unit's base OPS, or (2) from the base OPS suggested by the Working Groups in cases where they do not exceed current year OPS budgets but from current year OPS budgets in those cases where the suggestions do exceed that amount?
- Basically, where do we start from? Consideration (1) or (2)? If we artificially cap everything starting at current year OPS. Therefore it seems to make sense to start from the Stage 1 recommendations, which were the result of a deep dive into the information available for each department.
- It makes sense to begin from the prior year base OPS. At least one department seemed to have excessive unwarranted increases.
- There are differences across departments. One department requested an increase because of a new major and AI commitments
- Cuts present a catch-22 – how can departments grow if they have cuts?
- It might be useful to run one or two parallel “experiments” with the data. We should consult with the College on which criteria are most important.
- The College will make its own decision, but we can provide recommendations that could guide their decision toward a minimally damaging result.
- Our decision making process can be documented and left for subsequent Finance Committees to use as are reference and source of information.
- The initial proposal was to apply a multiplier applied at % of recommended (or current) OPS * SCH/1000 to reach the target. It seems desirable to develop something more refined, perhaps including more criteria.

- It would be desirable to have a table to determine cuts but we first need to identify relevant criteria. Possibilities: SCH/1000, # majors, # of degrees awarded in a given time interval, department size, or time to degree relative to some norm. All of these have challenges.
- Clarification: SCH from UFO is NOT included in the SCH in the spreadsheets we are using as references for our analyses. SCH numbers should include BOTH UG and Grad credits. (Uma will check and confirm)
- Uma likes the proposal that the committee pay attention to what the College wants. She thinks that the College wants to see increasing SCH.
- The committee can offer guidance on particular insights regarding department details that emerged through our analyses.
- One consideration: Is there some measure of effectiveness that we could include? Effectiveness could be assessed with aspects like placement of graduate students (perhaps also undergrads), diversity/inclusion measures. It is pointed out that this information can be very difficult to get, and this committee does not have the time. We can recommend that such effectiveness criteria be included, perhaps the college has not this year, in the future.
- Efficiency of delivering graduate degrees is a possible criterion. Also % of incoming students who finish grad degrees.
- If we are going to use time to degree, or number of degrees, we should consider comparison with respect to peer institutions.

4. Items to include in the committee's final report.

- For our report to the dean, we should:
 - Create a general overview explaining how the committee went about its work and concerns that emerged regarding the risks and consequences of the severe cuts.
 - Provide our stage 1 assessments and reports.
 - Present a decision tree, presenting options. This might include some spreadsheets
 - Identify a relevant criteria or set of criteria in association with a multiplier to reach the target number
 - We might combine several criteria in a given manner
 - Dean Richardson has already proposed SCH/1000 as a criterion
 - Another approach is a proportionally equal reduction (%) across all departments.
- Goal: draft a report by March 18 for discussion. Palmer volunteers to draft.
 - To include:
 - Preface and considerations,
 - Reports from working groups
 - A proposed decision tree incorporating factors /criteria discussed, and several paths to the cuts to meet the target of \$14.5M OPS.
 - The committee expresses its appreciation to John Palmer for his effort and high level of commitment in leading the committee and drafting the report.

5. AOB.

- Tucker and Kroff note that they have conflicts on March 18, the day of the next scheduled meeting.

6. Meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.