University Budget

B. Ambach joined the meeting as a guest to give an overview of the university’s budget process; he distributed a document that provides the detail. The process typically begins in October or November but it is dependent upon the state. Fifty percent of the university’s funding from the state is based on students’ course completion. UC’s budget structure is now a performance based model. A major component in the budget assumption is tuition and fees. The state froze tuition for the current year and capped it at 2% for next year. A 2% increase could potentially generate $8M in revenue. They also have to take into consideration the possibility of a flat enrollment. Budget requests are submitted to the President from his direct reports and then reviewed by the Executive Committee. In the next few weeks, his office will begin working with governance committees to start conversations about building the budget for the next cycle. The President’s direct reports will begin to prepare their budget for next year including strategic initiatives to be given consideration in the annual budget process. Another way to get items on the list for consideration is through the 3rd Century Initiative. They will set baseline assumptions, go through the appropriate constituent group and then seek the approval from the Board of Trustees in the spring. He invited questions.

T. Guerin asked about institutional funding for the Diversity Conference. B. Ambach replied these types of requests (smaller in nature) should be brought up through the appropriate channels (deans, vps, himself, etc.) for resolution. The list of strategic initiatives is for larger items.

B. Marshall shared that the Council has been addressing another issue relative to some of the university’s programs (Gen-I, E3, etc.) that have proven successful and need to be institutionalized. How do they make it into the budget process for permanent funding? B. Ambach recommended this be brought up through the appropriate channels (dean, vp/provost, president).

W. Harris asked who defines the performance that is being measured in the Performance Based Budgeting model which then determines what gets funded. B. Ambach replied it is based on the operating and revenue budget from the current enrollment. Also, taken into consideration are gifts, endowments, and scholarships.

W. Harris said he does not see institutional initiatives going forward to address retention initiatives and asked how to put emphasis on this as a priority. Who can the Council
have a conversation with to create more focus on retention? B. Ambach replied resources have been committed to hire additional advisers and the First Year Experience. He encouraged the conversation to be at the college level with C. Miller, D. Merchant and B. Davenport. If this is to be a strategic institutional priority, then it needs to come up through the budget process as he described earlier. R. Hays stated that C. Miller realizes this is a priority and with the recent sale of the President’s house, the goal for that money is to identify cohorts to receive scholarships to ensure their retention through graduation (this is just one example). K. Simonson asked how scholarships are funded and the percentage of general funds for scholarships. B. Ambach stated that C. Miller should address that question.

K. Simonson asked about the progress of addressing the structural deficit. B. Ambach stated progress is being made and anticipates the $150M amount should be paid off in 2018. Once this deficit is gone, this money can be freed up for other uses.

K. Simonson asked about Athletics impact on the budget and the use of general funds for that department. B. Ambach stated that Athletics is the front door for a good portion of undergraduate recruiting. The conference we are in now is not in a position to wean it from the use of general funds. The goal is to expand the football program and increase some of the Olympic sports in the hopes to get into another conference that will move Athletics to a point where they are off general funds and become revenue generating.

K. Simonson asked about the special fees that most of the colleges charge students. B. Ambach acknowledged the administration is aware and this needs to be scrutinized carefully. These fees are reviewed and approved by the Provost and President before implementation.

B. Ondja’a asked about implications to students due to the Affordable Health Care Plan. B. Ambach replied the university’s current policy is to require all students have health insurance at a certain level. Given the new rules of the external mandate for health coverage, he is uncertain if the university needs to maintain a separate requirement. This needs to be reviewed.

B. Marshall thanked B. Ambach for his time and information. B. Ambach welcomes any additional feedback.

Developing a University-Wide Strategy for Pipeline Initiatives
B. Marshall asked for input on the current status of pipeline initiatives for diverse talent in UC’s student population. She noted data collected from the units has been posted to the Council’s Blackboard site which provides some of these initiatives. She asked specifically when we build this structure, how should it look/function? Once we establish this piece, then we can have the conversations with the appropriate areas sharing the Council’s strategies and make recommendations.
W. Harris suggested looking at how the university communicates with youth in Cincinnati. There are opportunities that exist at UC but it is not being communicated with this audience.

R. Hays called attention to the effort initiated by C. Gooden where Council members were given names of potential students to contact and encourage their interest in the university. B. Marshall reported K. Dewberry is the new Admissions staff member taking C. Gooden’s position. She meets with her on 11/8 and will bring this to her attention. It was also suggested that the Council invite a rep from Enrollment Management to hold a brainstorming session on recruitment strategies to develop a more systematic approach, but the desired outcome needs to be identified.

How are schools identified to solicit student recruitment? R. Hays stated he has a list and will share it.

K. Simonson stated the university does not have a strategic enrollment plan. This plan should include the pipeline initiatives and address the individual college plans. This should be an institutional priority just as the increase to international student recruitment.

B. Marshall reported that over the past summer a Five Year Enrollment Management Plan was submitted to the Provost. The Provost is reviewing it, but she offered to inquire about getting a copy to share with the Council in draft form. All agreed this is a good idea.

J. Blizzard shared his positive experience with the President’s tours to high schools, but suggested integrating current UC students into these visits. Students will relate better if their peers are present. Also, he recommended that UC needs to have a broader impact with CPS schools. If the university claims to be part of the community we need to increase our relationship with CPS. He believes personal engagement will drive retention. It’s important to have the student experience to keep them involved and build a sense of community.

W. Harris recommended looking at four key areas (substations): 1) pre-college programs, 2) orientation, 3) academic support services (coaching, mentoring, etc.), and 4) next phase: graduation, placement, graduate school. This will require collaboration at UC; many of these initiatives are happening but they are not aligned together. It was also noted to include alumni relations in this strategy.

M. Hughes stated that alums continue to report about their negative UC experience and they continue to not feel welcome. Therefore, they do not want to help or come back. D. Reed-Francois shared an experience from another institution that paired a student-athlete with an alum that shared a common career path. This was a very successful partnership.
It was suggested that a workshop be held for those interested in submitting proposals for the Diversity Incentive Grants. This will provide interested parties with the knowledge of how to write a successful grant.

T. Guerin asked how does the Council get connected to the right people and what is the communication pipeline to reach those who have negative experiences. How can the Council influence the appropriate people to integrate diversity priority items into their budget? K. Simonson said a conversation on diversity initiative priorities is needed. The council needs to demand this takes place.

L. Smith stated a more strategic approach is needed with Student Affairs (SA). This unit does a large amount of work, but they are rarely engaged in conversation on the front end. SA has a large amount of alums and this would be a good source to utilize.

B. Marshall thanked all for their feedback and asked all to continue strategizing on this topic. She asked for written comments to outline the end product when it works in all five areas in the pipeline. Looking ahead several years, imagine UC is being praised. What made it successful? Send ideas to her by 11/15. Information collected will be used to continue the conversation. Keep in mind a similar approach is needed for faculty and staff and eventually include alumni and community.

CDO Report
B. Marshall reported that for the second year in a row, UC was award the Higher Education Excellence in Diversity Award. She thanked all for their work as it contributed to the recognition and selection.

She reported three proposals were submitted for the climate assessment survey, and she is prepared to make the award. She thanked M. Rastogi for her work in the review process. L. Newman suggested doing the survey in-house. B. Marshall noted that the first survey was conducted in-house and it has already been decided that using an external entity is preferable allowing employees to feel more at ease in their responses. The Plan indicates that the survey is to be conducted every two years, and it is the hope that it can be done internally on the next cycle.

B. Marshall thanked all who participated in either the Michael Eric Dyson or Tim Wise events. Those events were designed as initial conversations relative to our climate on campus. There are more conversations that need to take place and she is shaping that structure now and welcomed suggestions. She encourages Council members to be participants and even perhaps serve as facilitators. A few ideas included: hold small group conversations, have panelists who are internal experts, open format structure but could also be for particular areas (colleges, units, etc). People need to start feeling comfortable talking to each other. A structure for the conversation needs to be developed with topic points and make it a charge to each college/unit diversity committee to hold this dialogue. B. Marshall stated A&S needs to hold their own conversation to address a more welcoming and inclusive climate. L. Newman volunteered to work on an A&S conversation. Outside of that, the conversations can be
broad but addresses the issue of how we interact with each other. Just Community and civility are the foundation points. She welcomed feedback.

B. Marshall reported her office co-sponsored a hearing impaired community event.

B. Marshall shared that she receives a large number of requests to attend events, serve on panels, speaker, etc. and she cannot accommodate all requests. She asked if any Council members are interested in serving as a proxy to call upon for these requests, please let her know.

Shout outs
B. Marshall acknowledged the great work being done by R. Hays for the university. He is a mastermind ensuring all the details are in alignment and handling communications.

R. Hays suggested an agenda item for the next meeting include budget for the Diversity Conference, identifying what we want to accomplish, be clear on the scope, Council members need to be invested. Consider holding the “conversations” now and build up to something at the Conference.

11/27/13: Minutes approved by B. Marshall