Dr. Sims introduced Provost Moser. Provost Moser then gave an overview of the intended presentation today and of topics he would touch upon.

Allyson Easterwood presented a PowerPoint presentation entitled “USM Briefing on Financial Position FY18.” She clarified that she will be ‘looking backwards” in this presentation. Provost Moser assured the group that he would be looking forward in his presentation.

1. Budget (from Allyson Easterwood’s presentation).
   a. Current economic status of the university

   Tropics to cover: Reserves, FY 18 E&G Fund, FY 18 Unrestricted Net Assets, Key Financial Indicators.

   Reserves are funds set aside for non-recurring, non-operating expenses. On financial statement the are “unrestricted new positions.”

   IHL has new financial sustainability benchmarks that we must comply with. Reserves support our campus environment and we need to do this to be competitive.

   She shared a snapshot of FY18 Education and General Budget, with explanations. We ended FY18 with 8.4 million dollar surplus.

   She shared Unrestricted Net Assets in areas across the institution, including Auxiliary, Designated, Plant, R&R. (The latter two are for capital development). The 8.4 million E&G surplus went into Designated.

   Key Financial Indicators:

   Days of Cash on Hand. The IHL minimum is 90 days. We are now at 95 days (after a low of 87 in FY17).

   Reserve Adequacy. IHL benchmark is 1.5. We are at 2.89. (Lower is better). This is based on long-term debt, and most our ours is from the dorms ad new housing. We should be in line with this policy in five years.

   Debt Coverage. This is our ability to cover our debt. We meet IHL benchmarks in this area.

   Overall: We found a way to get through the year with financial improvements. Our FY18 actions made a positive impact. We need to stay the course, tighten our belts, be fiscally conservative, generate income (through enrollment, retention, controlling discount rate).

   We came in under budget in scholarships. Our goal is 20% and last year we came in at 40%. That we are still growing enrollment seems to indicate that this is working.

   b. Performance based budgeting
Provost Moser spoke to this topic. 30 states are involved in this. State metrics are tied to a variety of indicators but they are not basing budgeting on these factors. At this point there is no intention to bring in formula based funding (from the IHL) in the coming two years.

HelioCampus is assisting us in gathering data and trying to implement performance based budgeting. We are aware that we need to tend to the unique demographics of USM. Weights of metrics should be based on the mission of the institution.

Where are we now? We are not going to be an RCM school. Funding will be tied to factors we all agree upon.

Weights in the Resource Allocation Model are still being worked. The ingredients in the model reflect what the IHL expects for us. In 1-2 years, the next steps would be to address hiring, equity/compression adjustments, carrying forward returns, and one-time program/research development and seed funding. All of these would be tied to performance, as defined in the model.

Putting our savings (our carry forward) would go in to a central pot.

We are not moving towards weighing credit hours.

Questions from the Directors:

-What metrics are being used this week in hiring requests? It is more qualitative in this review. We are interested now in building revenue bottom line. We are looking at capacity issues. Directors get nervous when the criteria is qualitative. Moser assured (and listed) several quantitative points that would also be included.

-What are High Impact Practices? Actions that lead to retention. Examples are student engagement in research, Faculty Development Institute, student living-learning communities, service learning, and others.

-What is impacting how the weights are changing in the different models we have seen? We can't seem to find an institution to refer to, so we keep shifting. The next step is modeling.

Moser then discussed Platinum Analytics and course enrollment caps. (Dr. Amy Miller shared a handout about Class Scheduling Guidelines). The handout is meant to share broad guidelines. It covers general principles for scheduling at USM. It address course enrollment minimums and course capacity limits. Pedagogy should be the main concern. Demand matters as well. Both should be based in the discipline and be discussed at the local level. Another factor is facilities. Online courses are driven by demand and pedagogy. The Department Of Education maintains a standard about regular and substantive (i.e., academically meaningful) interactive in the online format.

The Provost’s office is not interested in dictating minimum class enrollments. However, we are not yet in a place of consistency across the institution. Once we are, then pushing these kinds of decisions down to the local level will make sense.

Putting student progression to degree/completion at the center of decision making is still wanted. The Provost wonders if class scheduling comes from this place of or if it is coming
from a center of faculty interest. Dr. Miller added that the SGII grants are intended to be tied to the new schedule and to Platinum Analytics data. At the same time, unproductive research reassignment is not a reason to not teach courses that students need to complete.

A question was asked about research productivity. Research can be correlated to plan/goal setting. Sometimes adjustments need to be made as research profiles/agendas change. There is an awareness that some units graduate more students, some produce more research, and others generate many SCHs. This is about benchmarking disciplines against their peers and their disciplines.

The formally will be at the School level, the aggregate performance across the school will matter. This creates some flexibility for Directors.

We need to make more decisions about what we deem as our peer institutions, and even drill this down to the level of the discipline. This can yield better comparison data.

c. School level resources

2. Resource Allocation Formula (See above)
   a. KPI Metrics
   b. SCH Weights, High Impact Practices, Research Weights

3. Data
   a. Platinum Analytics (See above)
      i. Provide directors guidelines for setting class caps based on discipline specific pedagogy, course level, face-to-face, and online formats.
   b. Digital Measures (Doug Masterson will speak to this at a later meeting).

4. Academic Master Plan

Provost Moser thinks it is still early for this topic. As Directors we are curious about our School in this process. We will address this at our last Expanded CoD meeting.

5. Status of Reorganization Proposal #8

The Provost is “afraid” to move this proposal forward. (This Proposal defines the roles and responsibilities of personnel in new schools). We prefer that we move through this coming “bridge” year and respond later after gaining more information from the CoD. Specifically, he wants to know more about Faculty Leads, Associate Directors, and thinks we will after more time in this current year. The CoD is interested in this as we are working on our School documents.

6. Communication Processes
   a. Academic Schedule Proposal

   A draft for 19-20 was shared. New features: 1. There is Reading Day on the Monday after Thanksgiving, and graduation is on Saturday. 2. Spring graduations are changed with Graduate graduations at a day earlier. The Coast graduation will be combined.

   Graduations will also be ticketed via a lottery.
b. Athletic Counselors added to courses

As per NCAA requirements, athletic student advisers have access to view the work of student athletes in online courses. This is an updated practice that reduces the risk of the institution.

On a related note: Directors can be granted administrative access to all online courses in their schools. This can assist Directors in evaluating faculty. Directors can contact Amy Miller or the Office of Online Learning.

Another related note: An online summit for directors? Is this possible? Something that merges Quality Matters, best practices, external standards would be helpful. What is the status of our online instruction? We are “uneven” in the deliver of online courses at the present.

7. Streamlining Administrative Processes (no discussion)
8. Deadline Expectations

This is in relation to deadlines for School Policy and Procedure documents. We were advised to work on what we can.

There are sticking points to reorg proposal #4. Maureen Ryan is charged with “harmonizing” documents. She will assist in identifying areas that we need to revisit. Directors take points (in School Policy and Procedure documents) that do not “fit” to Maureen Ryan (through a Dean).

9. Q &A

No additional Q&A.

Provost Moser shared his appreciation for the work of the Directors and to the participants.