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Call to Order
Chair Steve Bieber called the meeting to order at 12:11 p.m.

Roll Call and Approval of Minutes
Committee members present included: University President Laurie Nichols, Provost Kate Miller, Vice President for Administration Bill Mai, Dean of the College of Law Klint Alexander, Dean of the Outreach School Susan Frye, Dr. Frederic Sterbenz, Dr. Robert Sprague, Dr. Donal O'Toole, Dr. R. McGregor Cawley, Committee Chair Steve Bieber, Ms. Molly Marcusse, Mr. Kevin Colman, Ms. Rachel Stevens, and Mr. Joel Defebaugh.

Dr. Cawley moved to approve the minutes from September 9, 2016 and September 12, 2016 as distributed. Mr. Coleman seconded. All committee members were in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Public Session
Committee Chair Bieber explained that the committee would meet again on September 30, 2016 for their regular meeting from 12:00 – 2:00 p.m. and then would have a working meeting from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. to begin their work on recommendations to University President Nichols for the Budget Reduction Plan. He added that he was meeting with the Huron Consulting Group on Thursday, September 29, 2016 to work to schedule a time for the consulting group to present to the FCAC. The committee discussed how the Huron Consulting Group would present their recommendations to the campus community. It was noted that some of their recommendations would be made available to the public. The committee decided that since they had delayed their timeline to match that of the Huron Consulting Group it was highly suggested setting up a meeting before a final recommendation is presented by University President Nichols.

Report on Budget Reduction Target – Student Affairs – Vice President Sara Axelson
Vice President for Student Affairs Sara Axelson thanked the committee for allowing her to present her target reduction plan. She noted that based on the division reductions, student affairs would be smaller overall, but it would be manageable. Vice President Axelson explained that Student Affairs supported student inside and outside of the classroom, including their residential experience. She noted that their services assisted with building the pipeline for higher education through departments like Student Financial Aid, Dean of Students Office, Student Health, Half Acre Gymnasium, numerous tutoring services across campus, Resident Life and Dining Services, and Office of the Registrar to name a few. Vice President Axelson noted that the Student Affairs division also focused on the health, safety, and wellness of the student body, including programs focused on alcohol awareness and the SAFE Project. She noted that the functions of the Alumni Association were also housed within the Student Affairs division. Vice President Axelson explained that the departments within the division of Student Affairs fell into all three fiscal categories, Section I, Section II, and Section III monies.

Vice President Axelson stated that her division was thankful that the FCAC had reduced the Student Affairs Division Target based on the financial transfer that occurred between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. She added that based on their reductions, the division of Student Affairs needed to be cautious with student fees and work to accommodate the budget overall with the fewest impacts to students. Vice President Axelson noted that UW needed to grow, and any
actions taken by the division of Student Affairs needed to not leave enrollment unbalanced. She added that the services provided by the different departments needed funding, and it had been their goal to review and offset some funding while reallocating other funds.

Vice President Axelson noted that there had been positions lost in the division of Student Affairs strictly through attrition, adding that this would affect a few more positions in the future. She explained that the next budget reduction saving measure would be to offset Section I funds with Section II funds. Vice President Axelson noted that the University Counseling Center would be one area where Section I funds could be offset to Section II funds. She explained that this allowed for $300,000 in savings. Vice President Axelson stated that there would need to be reductions made to support budgets to numerous departments excluding Admissions. She explained that the areas where support budgets would be cut would be low impact areas that would not affect the University and division core missions. Vice President Axelson noted that it had been important to grasp how significant of a reduction $550,000 was and to also note that it was only a piece of the greater reductions happening campus wide. She added that this reduction accounted for 20% of the Student Affairs division budget. Vice President Axelson explained that there would be an impact when implementing a reduction of this size and there were critical positions in the division that were empty and those duties were being reallocated temporarily. She added that there would be a different service level moving forward, including slower processes in the Office of the Registrar, among other departments simply based on the workforce. Vice President Axelson noted that the largest areas of concern were the Office of Admissions and the Office of the Registrar. She explained that there had been an effort for these two departments to assist each other and provide more efforts across departments for overall success.

Vice President Axelson explained that departments such as Campus Police, Dean of Students Office, and any other departments focused on student safety would not decline. She added that efforts toward student recruitment and student living would also need to remain a priority as UW looked to grow its enrollment and student population. Vice President Axelson explained that each department had conducted ongoing reviews of their services to assess their effectiveness and how they could operate more efficiently. She added that this process included a look at student fees and an evaluation of how they were charged and utilized. Vice President Axelson noted that through this analysis process the division of Student Affairs had utilized the recently created list of peer institutions. She explained that through analysis the division of Student Affairs was able to see how other universities operated, including how many staff they retained within each department, and she noted that they would work to implement some of these ideas if they could benefit UW. Vice President Axelson concluded her remarks by stating the division of Student Affairs would stay true to its core mission as well as the UW core mission moving forward, adding that this would include an increased fundraising campaign through the UW Foundation.

Members of the committee asked how the Office of the Registrar planned to handle an increase in transfer students while being down positions that assisted with the evaluation of transcripts. Vice President Axelson explained that the Registrar Lane Buchanan was revisiting how evaluations were being done and was utilizing members of the Admissions staff to assist with this process as well. She added that resources could be maximized and those processes were already taking place. The committee discussed the transaction to digital transcripts and when UW would begin that
A member of the FCAC asked how the division of Student Affairs was working to remain compliant with Title IX regulations as positions were lost. Vice President Axelson explained that positions had been reallocated to provide additional support for these high concern areas on a temporary basis and would be properly addressed as soon as possible. She added that this compliance had been watched very closely to make sure no matters of compliance were broken. A member of the committee asked how students were being addressed through the residence halls and how reducing front desk operations would affect the students. Vice President Axelson explained that the Resident Coordinators were handling additional support for the halls even though there was not one resident coordinator per hall as in previous years. She added that each floor retained two Resident Assistants, stating that these individuals were critical to the functionality of the halls. Vice President Axelson stated that even with the reduction in staffing, safety in the halls was still within compliance and would be monitored closely to ensure the best experience possible for students.

Members of the committee discussed the mandatory fees that students were charged that were then allocated to the division of Student Affairs. It was noted that early indications showed that UW charged fewer student fees then their peer institutions. Vice President Axelson explained that many of the fees that were allocated to Student Affairs went towards Campus Recreation, Student Government, and Residence Life and Dining Services to name a few. She added that the fees charged for Residence Life and Dining Services were only charged to students who live in the residence halls. Members of the committee suggested that the division of Student Affairs work with Rob Godby and the Revenue Enhancement Committee to assist in the conversations being had regarding student fees. Members of the committee asked if the Huron Consulting Group could provide recommendations to the division of Student Affairs that could result in immediate savings. Vice President Axelson noted that the Huron Consulting Group had been asking the right questions that would allow Student Affairs to implement a fresh framework. A member of the committee asked how Student Affairs would work to make Multicultural Affairs a priority even through the budget reduction. Vice President Axelson explained that Student Affairs would work to realign aspects of its budget to make these services a priority.

Listening Session Reports – Robert Sprague, Rachel Stevens, Joel Defebaugh
Committee Chair Bieber explained that there had been numerous listening sessions across campus and he wanted the members of the FCAC that had conducted those sessions to report on the suggestions and information they had received.

Faculty Listen Sessions – Dr. Robert Sprague
Dr. Robert Sprague distributed a document to the members of the committee detailing the faculty listening session, please see Attachment A. He explained that he would provide the highlights that had been presented during these listening sessions. Dr. Sprague explained that members of the faculty felt that the budget reductions had started to exacerbate the fact that people were not valued by the institution, adding that there had been numerous building improvements but the faculty and staff had not seen a modest raise in a number of years. He explained that members of the faculty stated that they felt the increased course load sent a message that research was no longer valued
It was added that faculty felt there had not been adequate exceptions to the workload policy. Dr. Sprague also noted that the faculty felt there was uncertainty among the students on campus regarding the budget reductions. He concluded his remarks by explained that many faculty members felt that morale was incredibly low, but many were afraid to give their opinion at the risk of being targeted.

Dr. Warrie Means of the Animal Science Department, assisted in conducting these listen sessions. He provided recommendations that had been complied following these sessions. Dr. Means stated that there had not been any thematic trends that presented themselves during these meetings to provide concise recommendations. He added that the largest take away from these sessions was that there were a lot of misconceptions that had been circulated across campus, adding that increasing the amount of communication would allow for some of these misconceptions to be cleared up.

A member of the committee noted that one possible way to increase the communication and cut down on misconceptions would be to use the Faculty Listserv in a more positive way. It was added that this forum could allow for faculty and those in the leadership to address misconceptions. A member of the committee noted that Provost Miller and President Nichols could work with members of the faculty to provide information to the listserv to clear up the misconceptions. Dr. Means stated that this was a great idea and would be happy to assist in the facilitation of this effort.

University President Nichols noted that she would be happy to respond to a list of questions that would be disseminated to the Faculty Listserv as often as needed. Members of the committee noted that in addition to more information and open lines of communication there was a problem across campus of people not believing and trusting the information they were provided. It was added that this had become an issues because many people across campus were hearing multiple messages from many different avenues. A member of the committee stated that if the messages were coming straight from the president or provost it would provide some additional believability and trust to the messages being sent.

Staff Listen Sessions – Ms. Rachel Stevens

Ms. Stevens explained that many similar comments had been made during the staff listening sessions. She added that there were five main points that presented themselves during the sessions, including misinformation on campus, concerns about UW Athletics, new staff workload based on losses of positions, the strategic planning process, and the program elimination process. Ms. Stevens explained that many misconceptions had occurred because people had heard multiple different versions of the same story and struggled with which information to believe. She added that a large concern had been placed on the workload for staff members. Ms. Stevens explained that many staff had taken on new responsibilities after staff in their department had departed. She added that many of these staff members felt as though they had no time line for how long their doubled workload would last. Many staff members had been told they would be taking additional duties and had been reclassified but were also told there were not the funds to compensate the difference in salaries. Ms. Stevens noted many staff members wanted a specific timeline for these changes. She also noted that many staff members across campus were curious as to how the Strategic Planning Leadership Council would work with the FCAC moving forward to allow information obtained by the FCAC to be shared.
Student Listen Sessions – Mr. Joel Defebaugh
Mr. Defebaugh explained that the student listening session would take place the week of September 26, 2016. He stated he would provide some remarks based on his experience as a student at UW. Mr. Defebaugh stated that often times students were not aware of items that did not affect them personally. He added that the largest concern he had heard focused on the amount of student fees and a lacking transparency about these fees and how they are calculated. Mr. Defebaugh noted that Student Government would work to make these breakdowns clearer in the future. He concluded his remarks by stating that he would report more following the listening sessions. Mr. Defebaugh also noted that if there were any services that could be provided by Student Government to the different divisions on campus, they would be more than happy to have those conversations.

Public Comment
Mr. David Keto asked how realistic it would be for different divisions on campus to move their Section I funded programs to Section II monies, as many of these were considered line items. He also noted he would be curious to see if there would be student push back on any of the reductions made to the division of Student Affairs. Mr. Keto added that he had seen a trend where crisis services were reduced only to have a new need for these programs.

Members of the FCAC stated that there should be a town hall meeting scheduled in the coming month to release the Budget Reduction Plan and begin the vetting process. It was added that this forum would allow the correct information to be distributed before any misinformation could arise. The committee further discussed the format of the town hall meeting and how the committee would move forward with the listening sessions about the Budget Reduction Plan. It was decided that the members of the committee would create a firm plan for the release of the Budget Reduction Plan during their working meeting on Friday, September 30, 2016.

Adjournment
Dr. Cawley moved that the committee adjourn the meeting. Mr. Defebaugh seconded. The committee adjourned at 1:34 p.m.
Faculty Listening Session Subcommittee  
Financial Crisis Advisory Committee (FCAC)  
September 2016

A subcommittee of the FCAC was formed by Steve Bieber, FCAC Chair to provide faculty with an opportunity to relay their concerns, impacts, and recommendations to the FCAC. Robert Sprague (Department of Management & Marketing, College of Business), FCAC Committee Member representing the UW Faculty Senate Executive Committee, chaired the sessions. Warrie Means (Department of Animal Science, College of Agriculture & Natural Resources) was asked to record and summarize the listening sessions with a report to be given to the FCAC. The following notice was sent to faculty.

A special subcommittee of the Financial Crisis Advisory Committee invites UW faculty and APs to attend a listening session. At each session faculty and APs will have an opportunity to
- express concerns related to current and future budget reductions,
- identify impacts of current and future budget reductions, and
- give recommendations for alleviating concerns and impacts.

Sessions will be held:
Wednesday, Sept. 7, 9:00 – 10:30 a.m., Coe 506
Thursday, Sept. 8, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m., Berry Center Auditorium
Friday, Sept. 9, 1:30 – 3:00 p.m., Classroom Bldg Room 133

Staff and students will have other similar opportunities through Staff Senate and ASUW.

Thank you in advance for your thoughtful participation. Faculty input is extremely important.

Participants were given a brief background of the need for input, the current UW budget situation, and informed that all comments would be without attribution. Electronic and handwritten notes were taken at each session. Some answers to specific questions and points of clarification were given by Sprague & Means when deemed appropriate. Comments from the three sessions held during the week of September 5, 2016 are combined and organized into the three categories of concerns, impacts, and recommendations. A separate category of questions was added, as well as a section of identified misconceptions. Attendance at each of the listening sessions was as follows: session #1: 12 faculty/academic professionals, 2 administrators; session #2: 12 faculty, one trustee; session #3: 6 faculty, 2 administrators (administrators left early).
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SUMMARY REPORT
Following are recurring themes in each of the categories.

Concerns related to current and future budget reductions

- There is concern that we may be losing sight or emphasis on the “Land Grant Mission”. Concern that programs, which are considered core to the mission, may be cut or deemphasized in times of tight budgets. There was also concern that institutions, in general, are moving towards more of a corporate culture with more emphasis on short-term goals versus long-term planning. It is difficult, or impossible, to predict where the future money and future jobs will be in Wyoming. It is necessary, therefore, to provide a broad-based education to our students.
- There is a common concern that the University of Wyoming is moving towards becoming more of a “teaching college”, in contrast to a research intensive PhD granting institution with a good reputation for research productivity, especially considering our size.
- Some UW employees are genuinely worried about losing their jobs, or perhaps other repercussions, if they speak up and communicate their candid thoughts. This seems to be more of an issue with staff, and untenured/non-extended term faculty/academic professionals.
- There is concern that people are “not valued”, or at least as much as they should/could be. Contributing factors include: repeated communication indicating the need to reduce the UW work force by 400 people, recent and, perhaps likely recurring retirement/separation incentives, marginal raises in two of the last eight years, seemingly little emphasis on retention, and implementation of the blanket workload policy. Some feel pressure to leave the UW workforce because it would be good for the institution.
- There is concern that the Athletics budget will not be proportionately cut and Academics, which many feel is the core of the institution, is bearing the greatest share of cuts.
- There is concern that no one is thinking about what effects the UW related changes will have on the local community and economy. There is a great deal of interconnectedness, spousal jobs in the community for example.
- Implementation of the blanket workload policy is of concern to many. This stems from an abrupt change in appointments, a perceived de-emphasis on research (especially those hired as research intensive faculty), a perceived de-value of Extension and service activities, no credit given for mentoring undergraduates in research/creative intensive activities, the uncertainty of the workload appointment changing year-by-year, in some cases the inadequate protection of non-tenured research intensive faculty, and non-uniform implementation of the policy.
- There is concern that budget cuts and attrition are having disproportionate impacts on varied units, with some units being affected to a much greater extent. There are specific units on campus that are on the edge of being dysfunctional.
- There is a general concern regarding poor attitudes and moral due to the budget situation, which has, in some cases, pitted groups and individuals against each other.
Impacts of current and future budget reductions

- There are unintended consequences of our budget situation. Attrition is not strategic and some units are more affected than others. The “ban” on hiring temporary lecturers has caused classes to be cancelled, summer courses may not be offered, program rigor is affected in some cases, and there was a great deal of uncertainty at the start of Fall semester (which in some cases remains). In some units hiring temporary lecturers made departments money which was used to support programs in many ways. This is no longer a viable option. There are a number of faculty, often the most productive, who are looking to leave; or at least searching for other/better jobs. This may be good for the budget, but these people will be hard to replace. Service and Extension outputs may decrease. Some departments have 40-50% fewer faculty because they are unable to rehire those lost to attrition. Since discipline expertise is often only one-deep, fewer classes are being taught, undergraduate numbers have decreased.
- There are impacts to students. Class offerings are diminished and time-to-graduate will likely be affected in some programs. Only one degree analyst for all of A&S is causing a backlog.
- Impacts of the budget crisis on small departments are often disproportionate.
- Due to across-the-board mandates (“ban” on hiring temporary lecturers, blanket workload policy), department heads/chairs can’t run departments in what they consider the most effective way any longer.
- Program reviews and proposed eliminations have students concerned about graduating and degree viability.

Recommendations for alleviating concerns and impacts

- Administration needs to continue to make it clear that people are free to voice their opinions/concerns. We may want to have specific listening sessions for untenured/non-extended term folks.
- We need to keep sight of our mission, grow programs where appropriate, and remain focused on quality. It is recognized that a strong strategic plan is important to good decision making.
- Utilities should not be off the table. The campus has expertise that could decrease costs.
- Athletics – Thoughts range from deleting athletics all together, taking a one-year hiatus, dropping down a division to recognizing the importance of athletics to the state constituency and to the students who benefit from participating in athletic programs.
- There is significant inconsistency in how programs, for instance the workload policy and temporary lecture “ban”, are implemented across colleges and even departments within a college. Administration should work towards improving consistency of implementation.
- Perhaps a group of faculty consultants could work with low enrollment programs to improve them instead of targeting them for elimination.
- Faculty need to demonstrate to constituents, governing bodies, and our peers what it is we do.
- Fundraising should be strengthened with a focus toward improving the academic mission.
• Administration should work towards reducing uncertainty. Contributing factors include: yearly changes in workload policy, appointments changes of non-tenured faculty, outsourcing budget decisions, and the perception that program eliminations will lead to layoffs.

• UW should make a case for “rainy day fund” monies. Tuition should be increased more than currently planned, some would say with assurances that it will go towards academics.

• The burden on staff should be decreased whenever possible

• People should be valued.

• The administration should remain diligent at communicating with the UW community on a regular basis. Efforts to correct misinformation and dispel rumors should be reinforced.
Comments are grouped into CONCERNS, IMPACTS, RECOMMENDATIONS, and QUESTIONS, with a MISCONCEPTIONS section added at the end. In general, comments are listed in the order received, except where obvious groupings were apparent. Care was taken not to paraphrase the original comments.

**CONCERNS related to current and future budget reductions**

- Everything seems to be top down directed.
  - How much influence will the faculty actually have in the budget decisions?
- People are actually worried about their jobs if they say something.
- The interconnectedness that UW has with the Laramie community hasn’t been discussed
  - Spouses at UW
  - Spouses working in the Laramie community
  - While faculty themselves may not be worried about losing their jobs, there is the interconnectedness
- The message that is out there is that it is in the University’s best interest to lose people
  - “If I leave, it would help the University”
  - Therefore, the message is that we do not want to retain people
  - The provost is actually in support of retaining faculty, but that is not the message
  - The people who can leave, will leave
- Results of retirement incentive were heavier on staff
  - e.g., Library: 1 faculty; 4 staff retirements
  - We want to retain people, but we are encouraging them to leave with retirement incentives
- There are perceptions of the Board of Trustees & Legislators that
  - Faculty are just here to teach
  - Losing faculty is no big deal because they can be “easily replaced”. “So what if we lose faculty, they can be easily replaced”
    - This is very demoralizing
- It is important that we support our mission and not just become a teaching institution.
- Regarding staff
  - Workloads have increased
  - Concerned that we are going to lose these people
    - Physical plant, Information Technology, office staff
  - Is there anything that can be done to ease their burden?
- The current Outreach funding model is broken; There is too much $ going to Outreach when the departments need to pay for the instruction
- The 3-2 teaching load model is based on being “right-sized” already. But some departments are already down several faculty.
- Broad brush strokes that impact every program in the same way may be detrimental in some instances. There are department differences with different needs.
- If academic program reviews are being done; why isn’t there a review process for athletics?
- ATHLETICS
  - The importance of Division I Football is overstated.
○ Heard a portion of Athletics’ budget is being used to buy tickets to meet Division I requirements. This doesn’t seem right, a false way of maintaining Division I status.
○ The only school that has made Division I to Division II change… missed point of thought here?
○ It is difficult to travel to Laramie for games, especially in winter months.
○ I think that the central motivation behind picking on Athletics stems from our depressing budget situation, which naturally puts people in a “self-destruction” mode.

- People are concerned about the fairness of what is happening across campus
  ○ eg. Athletics, engineering
  ○ Concerned about what is happening in other units across campus in relation to their own unit
  ○ There is also a dose of self interest in protecting one’s own program
  ○ We are having a “crisis of collegiality”

- There is a significant lack of knowledge among faculty in relation to our budgets.
- It would be impulse, human nature, to sit back and listen if junior faculty.
- Are working to try to save us $
  ○ But, we are not hearing that we value our faculty
  ○ Not hearing anything about retention

- Some departments are really threatened because of a mistake dean Lutz made in early announcement of units that are on the chopping block
- Currently operating a Veterinary diagnostic Laboratory without a toxicologist
  ○ If lose one more faculty, the unit will become a broken department

- People in this institution are not valued
  ○ >$1 billion spent on buildings in the last 10 years
  ○ Had, maybe, 2 raises during that period
  ○ There seems to be “deep sorrow” that more people didn’t retire
  ○ This is a “scattering” approach

- **Program Fees**
  ○ A&S departments were told to look at program fees for all courses in the college/department
  ○ $10/student credit hour
  ○ There is a lot of confusion around program/course fees, in A&S especially
  ○ Board of Trustees must approve tuition increases
  ○ Board of Trustees must approve fee increases
  ○ Will create a “new reality” with increased fees
  ○ This concept sounds just really terrible, even though I am an economist.
    * Does financial aid pay for this?
  ○ Concerned that program fees will impact student curriculum decisions; i.e. students will choose courses/programs with lower fees.

- **Rumors are causing problems**
  ○ Rather than policy, we set things up on conversations, which sets us up for rumors
  ○ We are outsourcing many budget cutting ideas to an outside company (Huron)
    * This is a great recipe for paranoia and fear

- Even with our budget reductions, we are still the best state funded university in the nation
• I understand the hesitancy to not make vertical cuts, but this has unequal consequences for smaller units due to the larger effect of attrition
• Part of the problem is that we don’t have a strategic plan
• UW has to be “all things” because we are the only one (institution) in the state
  o Comparators are not valid
  o We are forced to be inefficient to serve the state
• Are community colleges going to diversify their programs when UW is deleting programs?
• STEM program barriers
  o Already have a math barrier – with students not being prepared in math
  o Now we are creating more barriers
    ▪ Increasing fees for STEM programs/courses
    ▪ Student/Faculty ratios are increasing
    ▪ Working independently with undergraduates doesn’t count as teaching credit in workload policy
• Can’t share innovation
  o Can’t support our university
    ▪ These are not unrelated phenomenon
• There is a confluence of things occurring
  o Corporatization of education – Concern about the corporate, short-term investment paradigm
    ▪ Short-term versus long-term goals
    ▪ External reviews will be about short-term investment; not long-term vision
    ▪ The problem is we don’t know where the
      • Money in the state is going to be
      • Jobs in the state is going to be
  o We not only need to be led by what future job opportunities, but also by what we think we MUST be doing.
  o “To let the Board of Trusteeisom line of the last quarter determine all your future investments will be a disaster”
• We can’t completely commit to what we are seeing now. We need to diversify; not only the state, but UW as well.
• When we have a budget crisis we start counting things
• There are certain expectations of what a land grant university should be, what we should offer, certain disciplines we are expected to have.
  o Had people calling thinking something was wrong with the web site because we had so few faculty
  o I hope “they” are thinking about that
  o Really hope they (administration) are aware there are things that are on the edge of collapse
• Workload policy
  o I have been sold on the land grant mission, the Extension-Research-Teaching mission and the interrelationship of the three, by my colleagues.
    ▪ But now that model seems at risk
    ▪ I have a 3-way split appointment and was teaching 1 class per year
• Now am teaching a 1-1 load – there is a 1-1 requirement of the workload policy
  • I will do this at the expense of other endeavors (Extension & research)
    ○ There are some unintended consequences of the blanket workload policy
    ○ It is predicted that our unit will get smaller as a result
    ○ Not all departments are protecting untenured faculty
      • Percentage research load changed, but actual research expectations for tenure and promotion are the same
    ○ Outreach/Extension, research, teaching is time consuming
    ○ What do faculty do?
      • There have been some attempts to explain this in the past
      • Some attempts have been pretty lame & non-productive
      • Some were better
        • Follow faculty around for a day
        • Storytelling does seem to help
        • Personal contacts are helpful
    ○ Teaching is hugely important to me
      • The 15 credit minimum is irritating
      • Need more flexibility
    ○ The grant exemption part has fuzzy language
• Are we going to go through this temporary lecture routine again next fall; or starting in January?
  ○ Late hires
  ○ Confusion about what is allowed
• In the 1950s UW really was a teaching institution
  ○ Asked meekly if one could have a patent.
  ○ Then, UW turned into a pretty good research institution
• The idea that we are being turned into a teaching college is widespread
  ○ One thing working against President Nichols is that when we take a close look at SDSU; it does appear more like a teaching college than UW, with less research.
• Students who work in research labs learn non-academic skills
  ○ Work ethic
  ○ $ management
  ○ Responsibility
  ○ Time management
  ○ Communication skills
  ○ Attend conferences
• My concerns about current and future budget reductions are in regards to the general attitude at the university right now. I am a fairly new hire – have been here for 3 years – and have been extremely alarmed by 1) the new teaching expectations and 2) the flexible job descriptions. 1) I already have a fairly high teaching load in my department, so it is not difficult for me to adapt, however I feel that other parts of our mission, namely research and Extension are being neglected. 2) It is insane to expect pre-tenure folks to adapt to continually changing expectations that they may or may not have control of regarding these flexible job descriptions. Upper administration seems to be completely ignorant to the idea that this would be stressful for pre-tenure folks. I know of many who were hired in the last couple years who are furious about these changes in job descriptions and concerned
about how it will affect the T & P process, not just here but when packets get sent out for external review.

- I am concerned about the fact that mentoring undergraduates in research is not counting towards teaching. I feel that we are failing our students. I am taking on these activities even though I basically get no “credit” for doing it.

**IMPACTS of current and future budget reductions**

- There is now only one degree analyst for all of Arts & Sciences.
  - This greatly affects our ability to service our student’s academic needs.
  - There is no way for the Office of the Registrar to have one degree analyst for A&S and not have it impact students.
- We are already bleeding; we will be gushing next year!
- Unintended consequences
  - Our department was already at a 2-3 teaching load
  - Department relied heavily on highly qualified, self-monitoring adjuncts to deliver a quality undergraduate program
  - Now, we will be cutting classes by 1/3 to 1/2
  - Our previously generated outreach $ will go away. This will become a huge revenue loss.
  - Foresee summer classes going away. These were an integral part of our program; important to students.
  - **THERE ARE IMPACTS TO STUDENTS** — no longer offering summer classes will impact our students
- Already affecting students by not offering on-line degree program; on-line courses
- Some departments may be forced to teach degree programs with 75% Outreach classes; versus in a class with a professor
- Students may not graduate this fall because courses they need won’t be offered
- Due to across-the-board mandates, department chairs/heads can’t run departments in what they consider the most effective way anymore
  - Although, recognize there are department heads that may need to change the way they operate
- There are a lot of faculty that are looking to leave. This may be good for the budget, but long term it will be bad for the institution & our students.
- All these bad rumors are floating around and student’s perceptions have changed.
- A lot of talk about program elimination. Students in these programs are concerned.
  - Will I be able to graduate?
  - Will my degree be as valuable?
  - Should I transfer to another institution that values my program more?
  - Program elimination may be at the core of these student’s concerns.
  - Many students couldn’t believe that UW would consider cutting a foundational social science. Even though “they” have backed off of this “target of elimination”, students remain concerned.
- Impacts of budget reduction on small departments may be disproportionate
  - Especially departments affected by attrition
  - Unintentional impacts
- Faculty are searching for better jobs
  - Tired of no raises
  - Don’t feel valued – since were target for elimination
  - Department is on the verge of collapse
- Being the best state supported university doesn’t help us when state budgets decrease
- There is an extremely high correlation between decreased faculty numbers and the major count in some programs
  - Faculty numbers went from 12 to 6, and soon to 4
  - We are now offering 32 fewer classes
  - Undergraduate majors went from 100 to 50
    - If you lose faculty, you will lose majors.
    - Temporary lecturers were a cheap labor source
- Program elimination without a strategic plan will lead to unintended consequences
- We are getting a lot of calls because the temporary lecturers we did finally hire we not in the system, haven’t been hired yet. They couldn’t use the course system, banner, etc.
- In relation to the workload policy: “It is demoralizing to be told that what you were doing wasn’t good enough. That you weren’t working hard enough.”
- We have been treated differently by the state in regards to our funding model. Because a greater portion of our budget has come from state $. Not sure what is meant here. Perhaps just a comment.
- You get a lot of “bang for your buck” at UW – Because people who work here could be paid more elsewhere, but they like it here, like the flexibility to do research
- A colleague departed. I am the only person left in the department with expertise to teach the classes I teach. Many units are at the point of dysfunctionality.

**RECOMMENDATIONS for alleviating concerns and impacts**
- Administration needs to make it clear that people are free to speak. This is an “old fashioned” traditional college value.
- If you want to know about impacts talk to the department heads/chairs
- Identify growth areas in the University
  - Places where if given resources, the program could grow and increase students
  - eg. Psychology Ph.D. program – accepts 6 of ~200 applicants to program
- There are some positives that can come out of this budget exercise
  - Reallocate of resources based on needs/performance/growth areas
  - Reexamine where our growth areas are
- UW is a “University”; there are certain things that you must have
  - “I can’t picture a university that doesn’t have some of these programs.”
- We need to go back and look at our mission: We are to be a “liberal arts core education with science, with thinking skills, with writing skills.
- I am all for departments becoming more entrepreneurial
  - We need to find other ways to grow essential units
- There is a need for us to move away from the current state-heavy funding model, but that takes time.
- There is a gap between the Legislature and the University that needs to be overcome.
• The high state support model is the best model for our state.

• ATHLETICS
  o We need to be cognizant of the long-term outcome of the students
    ▪ Anything that helps a student become a more rounded citizen, such as
      athletics or ROTC, is good
    ▪ There are advantages to students, e.g. teamwork, work ethic…
    ▪ I’m not ready to throw out athletics altogether
    ▪ How do you measure success of athlete students 10 years down the road?
  o Don’t overstate the importance of Division I Football

• Historically, as a campus, we could always rely on the “water cooler talk” for
  communicating campus issues. We are still using that, but we really need better
  information.
  o Message to faculty: “If you choose not to be active, to participate, the buck is on
    you.
  o The new budget system may help.

• Our department started having a faculty lunch. Perhaps this could be more widespread. It
  does help with communication among faculty.

• Research shows that money doesn’t really matter all that much to people until moral gets
  low, then it becomes more important.
  o We need to figure out ways without money to make people feel more appreciated.
  o It comes back to the transparency of Dr. Nichols saying “we appreciate the
    people”
  o Behind all of this is the people “we value the people”

• There have been some gaffs made. Administration needs to craft some language that
  acknowledges they made mistakes.

• There is a lack of involvement of senior faculty and junior faculty. If a junior faculty,
  now might not be a good time to be visible. Need to try to reverse this.

• There is a burden on faculty, even junior faculty, to say something, to become engaged.

• May want to have specific listening sessions for untenured/non-extended term folks.
  Need to provide them with a safe environment.

• Perhaps have a web page to dispel rumors.
  o e.g. “Yes, we still have class in Fall 2016.

• If there will be “exigency” hires the highest priorities should be given to departments on
  the verge of collapse
  o There has been a lot of faculty exit already
    ▪ Partially due to modest raises past 2 of 8 years
    ▪ Faculty are moving to places they feel more appreciated
  o Some units are wobbling on the cusp of not being viable

• It seems that the institution will either do another retirement incentive, or do vertical cuts
  o We should look at raising tuition more
    ▪ Told by Rob Godby that our tuition is the lowest of doctoral granting
      institutions; 173rd/173 institutions

• Need to make sure that the Program/Course Fees message is clear and similar to all
  colleges

• We keep hearing that we are the best state supported university – that’s a bad thing
  o We are regularly bullied by politics
- We have less flexibility
  - Why don’t we make a recommendation to increase tuition; rely less on the block grant?
    - Program fees may be more easily sold to the trustees
- We need to be more concerned about quality
  - University of Texas – Austin was so committed to their top-tier PhD programs
    that they raised tuition 7% per year (~25% total) to support that
  - Would like a similar concern for “quality” at UW
  - If we fall in the rankings, how long will it take us to build the quality back up?
  - I’m not as impressed with some departments as I once was
- Rainy day fund
  - Why don’t we ask for $ from this pool
  - Why is tapping into the rainy day fund so taboo?
  - Understand that UW will not ask for any more appropriations this round
    - But, “a failed argument is better than no argument”
- We are beholden to the state because they support us
  - Our appointments have service appointments
  - Maybe it is time to decrease our state service?
- Maybe we need to have a faculty bake sale at the next football game
  - This is a pathetic statement
  - But, bake sales & car washes make good optics
- The reason that we have so much state support is because of the carbon economy
  - Are the people of Wyoming actually willing to pay taxes to support the university?
  - When the Governor or the legislators say they represent the people – are they really?
  - Are we willing to publicly state that we need income taxes?
- Program reviews
  - Looking at # of graduates undermines quality
  - Quality needs to be evaluated; need more metrics
  - Perhaps tuition increases may be good; yielding higher quality students
- Program counts are not a good metric
  - UW – 190 programs
  - CSU 140 programs
  - In Geography/Geology (not sure here which department) have 3 different undergraduate degree programs
    - Create options for students, but with the same number of faculty
    - Eliminating programs may not save much $.
- Proliferation of majors was, to some degree, in response elimination of concentrations
- In Geology, 2 of 3 degree programs are on the chopping block
  - In 2011 we revitalized an old program that was slated for elimination upon recommendation from the Dean, with provost concurring
    - Make a degree program a track within another
- UW Campus electricity costs are very high
  - Not sure why utility costs are “off the table”
  - We should work to decrease our peak power usage
• There may be one-time money available to decrease peak power
  • Battery arrays, solar arrays
• We work on energy & climate change
  • We are a university and we do research
  • This is not a conversation that people wanted to have
• There seems to be massive amounts of excess heat generated/wasted in Ross Hall
• Electricity and energy are Wyoming issues
  • There is a discussion of increasing the wind tax (generates $4.5M/yr)
  • Several $100M generated by wind power
  • Wyoming is the only state that taxes wind, maybe it shouldn’t be increased
• The idea of a group of faculty that act as consultants to improve low enrollment programs, versus eliminating programs
• President Nichols is talking about not making (involuntary) lay-offs; but she is talking about eliminating programs. This seems to be inconsistent.
• We need to demonstrate to our constituents and our peers what we do
• Most important thing of all is to find the excitement. We need to remember what excites us.
  • Teaching/learning (the assorted ways that people learn) can yield brilliant insights
• Would hope that someone is communicating to the Board of Trustees that the future of the state lies in post-secondary education.
  • An investment in higher education would be a much stronger approach
• One way to help convince faculty to stay is to reduce as much uncertainty as possible regarding the workload policy.
• Can the President alleviate the fears of program eliminations translating to layoffs?
• My recommendations are as follows
  • Encourage President Nichols to begin a major fundraising campaign to strengthen our endowment, so UW is less dependent on the state’s boom-and-bust economy and the Legislature’s budget. This should be a large-scale, highly public, statewide endeavor, and it should include the visible support of the Governor, legislators, well-known alumni, state celebrities, and everyone we can imagine might be helpful. If we don’t already have active alumni associations in every town and county, this would be the time to establish them and put them to work as our ground game. The crisis is not just “UW’s problem” and it won’t be solved without the help of the state’s entire constituency.
  • Look carefully at ancillary or distant programs (UW Casper, Ag Research stations) to see if they can be eliminated or consolidated. Drastic, but might preserve core functions.
  • Wyoming’s community colleges have developed a great deal over the past two decades. How can UW reduce its costs by eliminating duplication with their work? Let’s look at how much $ is spent at UW on remedial programs. What if we raised admission standards, or otherwise encouraged students to do their remedial work at a community college, before enrolling here?
  • Establish a task force to make recommendations about UW’s athletic programs. Leaving this “off the table” while cutting academic and student programs is, simply, irresponsible to the people of the state. Athletics is not part of our constitutionally obligatory mission. Core academics and an affordably university-level education are in our mandate. The committee should include not just “the usual suspects,” but a broad range of Wyoming citizens, including an equal number of men and women, diverse ethnicities, people with and without university degrees, businesspeople, economists who can
analyze the numbers effectively, and so on... in other words, let's see what is really going on, instead of just repeating familiar phrases about athletics. A gilded front porch attached to a shed is no bargain. If the people of Wyoming truly want Division I athletics (and I don't think there is really good evidence for that), how can it be achieved without eating into UW's budget for its actual mission?

- Encourage faculty and administrator retirement. The first round of retirement incentives naturally picked up more staff than faculty. Faculty are usually engaged in long-term research projects and mentoring grad students; it takes time to wind things down. Several improvements can be made to encourage senior faculty to opt for retirement sooner rather than later. These include: the option of partial retirement for a fixed number of years; creative ways to maintain links with UW, departments, students (such as office space, occasional teaching, perks like parking and athletic/cultural events ticket reductions); a longer timeframe for making the decision; and of course the financial incentive is certainly an important element.

- Let's not move towards outsourcing the work of our staff, especially not for physical plant, grounds, food services, etc. We can predict that outsourcing will result in local people taking these jobs (again) but at a reduced wage and with fewer benefits. It is not responsible of us to harm our community in this way. Perhaps you will hear more about this from the staff "listening sessions", but I suspect people would prefer furloughs or a reduced salary for a reduced work week (some universities/colleges do run on a four-day week, with M/W and T/Th classes!), to being fired and "outsourced.

- We will have to raise tuition and program fees. Look at Outreach, especially. I don't think UW should be shy about stating frankly the need for this. But it will only be acceptable if it is clear that we are cutting non-essentials costs, and that increased student payments will go to core academic functions.

- Unless you hear a very solid argument for eliminating entire colleges or departments, I hope you will try to find a way to put the cart back behind the horse, by delaying such irrevocable changes until after we have a strategic plan. Of course we all realize it is absurd to make drastic changes in our academic offerings without having a clear destination in mind, but we are, it seems, in danger of doing that if we can't find a way to stretch out the timeframe we're working with.

- ....which brings up the idea of making a large, dramatic gesture that would indeed buy us the needed time to plan our future path: what if we suspended athletics for a year? Or suspended classes for a semester? Or delayed construction of the High Altitude Fitness Center? Or paused the Engineering Building? Or...?? that is, what if we made a strong public statement that "this is a crisis"---not very visible if we are just bleading faculty and staff and eliminating individual classes...these changes are too small, too hidden, for the public to understand how serious UW's position is. A large dramatic gesture, though, could be very helpful in promoting a major endowment push...which returns to my #1 suggestion.

- We keep getting asked to make recommendations but it is very hard for someone like me to connect the dots and really make decisions about how to save money given my limited knowledge of the financial workings of this university. I am writing this email to represent myself, however I think we are being put in an impossible position in which if we fail to offer feedback or solutions, we appear disinterested and disengaged, but we do not have all the information to make effective decisions. We, committed, motivated, anxious pre-tenure folks, are trying to do our jobs in the face of indefinite raise freezes and plummeting morale. My recommendation is that the upper administration, especially this new provost and president, really think carefully about how to communicate with their faculty—not simply in terms of how we all need to pull our weight—but in
ways that make us feel valued and respected. Not a week passes without an email announcement of another respected colleague of mine leaving for another university. Attention (and $) dedicated to retention of good people should be a priority.

QUESTIONS

• How much impact are the faculty actually having?
• Thinking in the broader terms of faculty governance; how much influence will the faculty have?
• Is there anything that can be done to ease the increasing burden on staff?
• What is the timeline?
  o When will we hear about “consolidations” may occur?
• Do legislators really understand the institution and the risks of making cuts without a plan?
  o The intellectual poverty that can be created?
• What does the community & state think about athletics?
• What does the community & state think about academics?
• Why doesn’t our UW budget “normally” include raises?
  o Public School system does, but UW doesn’t
• Why don’t we look at raising tuition more?
• Why is tapping into the rainy day fund so taboo?
• $19.3M + $15M ≠ $41M. Please explain this inconsistency.
  o Bottom line is that we need to eliminate $24M from recurring section I budget
  o Some other moneys were reallocated – this was non-recurring funds
• Was the goal of the workload adjustment policy to save $ from part-time lecturers?
• What will work force reduction of 400 UW employees do?
  o To UW?
  o How will it affect the Laramie community?
  o The local economy?
• Foundation has not been mentioned yet. How much in alignment is the academic side of the house with the Foundation?
• How much does the legislature hear about impacts to students?
• Does financial aid pay for program fees?
• Will the University value research activity in the future?
  o If yes, HOW will it be demonstrated that it is valued with regards to support from the administration, Academic Affairs, the State?
  o This is important since many faculty came to UW to do research as well as to teach.
• How much influence will the faculty actually have in the budget decisions?
MISCONCEPTIONS – There are many misconceptions about very important aspects of our current budget situation. The UW community, and outside UW, should be made aware that

- The FCAC charge included only 3 items that were “off limits”
  1. UW police
  2. Outreach
  3. Utilities
     o In other words… Athletics is not “off the table”

- The Program Review process is independent of the Budget Reduction process
  o Administration realizes that there may be minimal savings from elimination of low student number programs
  o Administration believes that we can redirect our effort to make other programs stronger