

December 3, 2019 URPC Campus Budget Meeting Feedback

Round 1

Question 1: What is your initial reaction to the presented balanced budget plan approach?

- Similar strategy to the past – not strategic – the numbers don't reflect the impact
- As this is essentially an across the board cut, this plan does not address the baseline funding requirements for areas nor the implications of deeper cuts. This plan does not consider impacts of areas with established fixed costs such as maintenance and utilities costs.
- Impossible timeline for any true values-based decision making
- Proposal is almost an across the board approach
- Concerned about the illusion of input and timeline does allow for substantive engagement.
- Why was the Academic Support not changed or matching the summary page?
- How do the FIMS codes match up to the divisions?
- How are the proposed distributions going to be implemented?
- Cuts are based on historical model instead of a strategic model based on outcomes
- Important to be strategic. Example: Older campus needs money for maintenance
- This is the time to look at our whole budget model. New ways of considering budget based on students FTES. Need to look at other models
- We need to be sensitive to cuts that have the biggest impact. For example, when one dept. makes a decision to cut a class to save money it affects students from another department that needs the course in order to graduate
- Confused about the connection to the guiding principles and rationale. Believe performance and effectiveness metrics should be included (eg. Student success or alignment with university mission and goals.)
- Assess the effectiveness of areas. Look at the # of transactions to # of staffing or staff ratio over time. Look at how work has shifted from centralized departments to ASCs. # of funds and accounts being managed have dramatically increased.
- Hard to say what is behind FIRMS codes
- Students need to get classes and concerned we won't be able to offer as much.
- FIRMS codes are fine for guiding but don't necessarily represent our values.
- Fixed costs vs. scaled budget.
- How do we be strategic?
- Need time to enact smartly.
- Are there other ways to find \$?
- What can we stop doing?
- Identify the scalable portions of the budget.
- Valuable to have input but perhaps not representative of whole campus.
- Abstract – nebulous – doesn't feel real.
- Are we using all resources efficiently?
- How do we do less while preserving personnel?
- Work will be pushed down.
- Everyone said instruction is high, yet it stayed proportionally same
 - Is the committee heavy in faculty?

- Doesn't feel right.
- Would be interesting to see distribution of who provided feedback in forum and other venues.
- We are so unique to other CSUs – hard to rely on campus comparison data – location, distance from 'home,' remote.
- Services should be higher to *retain* students.
- If AA gave up a %, would help services dramatically.
- But comes back to guiding principles.
- Instruction and student services are complementary.
- Reduction ~50 employee attrition over next two years.
- Cut of this magnitude is bad – tinkering is minimal impactation
 - Even with attrition, harm to institution will be significant.
- If enrollment continues to decline, *need to strategically invest in what will attract and retain students.*
- If we cut the things that harm recruitment/retention, *spiral effect.*
- Enrollment Management taking a \$374K cut potentially harms recruitment/retention.
- Fair way, but is it too simple?
- Instruction should be explained more than the 4.4% seems to.
- Some FIRMS Codes – may be too simple.
 - Look at salaries by FIRMS Codes?
- Doesn't seem like the model may be strategic.
- Does the model anticipate the AMP?
- Does the model contemplate narrow-focused funding such as GI2025?
- AMP -> GI2025 -> Strategic Plan alignment would be helpful.
- Too broad of a brush.
- Parsing down institutional support would be helpful.
- Was there an operational analysis of the fixed versus scalable costs? Scalable approach would be recession proof.
- The reduction based on FIRMS codes is 4.4% across the board but the overall impact to Academic Affairs is more than 4.4%, meaning Academic Affairs is taking a higher cut.
- Are there going to be consistent protocols across the Divisions when implementing the reductions?
- Concern is not only about people keeping their jobs but how can we promote their retention, productivity, and morale.
- Would advocate for Student Services and Instruction so feel the plan is right on.

Question 2: How can the plan be refined to better reflect our campus priorities?

- Establish baseline metrics indicating and prioritizing services that we perform to establish those which can be cut.
- Will there be a mechanism to buffer reductions that impact areas of fixed cost?
- Establish data driven connections to campus services and the enrollment decline and growth.
- Change reduction distribution from year 1 and 2 to allow for synergies, department level solutions

- The collective group said (in poll) to make decisions on priorities. Not sure what/how campus sets priorities
- If students are our priority does it make sense to make deeper cuts to academic affairs?
- If institutional support is too high and cuts are made the other FIRMS codes should be raised
- Guiding principles suggest strategic reductions but percentage reductions are across the board.
- Each area should have input on how they make the reductions
- Self-support needs to be actually self-support
- Look at consolidating courses, reduce assigned time, look at department chairs and program leader overlap
- Understand priorities of Division Leads.
- Including more student input.
- Divisions do budget proposal – start at department level.
- Deeper dive on information.
- Process evaluation is key.
- “Soften the blow” – help campus through changes.
- Difficult conversation to get to methodology.
- Deeper dive on information.
- Evaluate bottlenecks

Round 2

Question 3: What are three things we need to preserve as we strive to maintain a “students first” focus?

- Maintain academic integrity and faculty student interactions.
- Make strategic reductions with informed decision making
- Determine what of the workload/workforce needs to be preserved combined with valuing and investing in faculty and staff
- We need to preserve classes that serve the current student population. Taking into account whether HSU is a commuter, transfer or first-time full-time institution
- Keep investing in student focused services such as CAPS, Learning Center, Library etc.
- Evaluate which services are most needed and effective
- Think about what we can start in addition to what we can preserve
- Don’t sell out social justice for the budget
- Consultative rather than just informative input to be counted
- Classes, grad courses that are needed, follow through with guidelines, tutoring/counseling student services
- Student Faculty Ratio (SFR)
- Meet student demand, program preservation/innovation uniqueness, Strong community connections
- Maintain advocacy for student experiences at HSU in the community
- Preserve brand and reputation. There is tension/conflict between divisions and colleges. Strong in CNRS, need to invest there. Need to work collectively between all three colleges to strategically invest. Then, we will attract more students.

- Recruitment strategy needs to be true to brand to fit student needs and expectations.
- We need an analysis of what is most important to support students. What do students want to see? Sacrifice in strategic way rather than across the board. (Eg landscaping, building hours, maintain comfort of buildings, restrict courses to daytime and close all buildings at 5)
- Don't take a business approach – we aren't a for-profit. If we are considering students first, then the CSU should support student first presidential candidates that advocate for free college.
- Offer programs that students need to get careers. Relevant majors, and highlight connection to workforce.
- Need strong leadership, a process to get input, and tough decisions.
- Quality Education
 - Sticking to our mission.
 - Maintaining things students come here for.
 - Unique campus.
- Don't get in the way of graduating on time.
- Students' ability to get access to faculty.
- Support services for students; *healthcare,* food, basic needs, etc.
- Classes - *Major courses + GE.
- Retention.
- Enrollment support.
- Outreach – relationships w/community colleges.
- Student input.
- Co-curricular programming.
- Advising.
- Student jobs/internships – “keep them here.”
- Basic needs.
- Different funding strategies not HM500.
- Three things to preserve:
 - Student access to classes.
 - Student wellbeing, and basic needs and support services (focus on transfers).
 - Providing what students are looking for.
- Important to remember all divisions and areas support students. Sometimes that gets lost. Every position is here to support students.
- Strategically cut to reflect the enrollment decrease to not impact students.
- Focus on what we don't need any more because of declining enrollment. Start from the ground up: department level, what are the student's needs in those departments?
- It is a balance between market driven student analysis and the understanding of what we are trying to create in our students at HSU.
- We need to decide what we need to keep and what to get rid of. We tend to push things down when cuts are implemented at the higher level. (Top down, bottom up)
- Evaluate what has to be done and build up from there. There are things that have to happen.
- Invest upfront to make more efficient processes. Example: payroll

Question 4: What does meaningful communication/engagement look like to you as divisions work through a period of diminishing resources?

- Decisions need to be explained with sincere and clear rationale – be up front and honest
- Empower decision making at all levels and the ability to promote actions and change that will create efficiencies and innovation
- Transparency
- Campus held trainings for better a understanding of HSU’s budget and how decisions are made
- Identify performance indicators to measure our efforts
- Open forums held so far is a good start. Forums should be held more consistently for proactive conversations and input on the framework
- Assessment and communication with those resources that will potentially be diminished
- Where the money comes from? Provide context and terms
- What divisions are inside of each proposed FIRMS code?
- Knowing where the money is being spent
- Strategically incorporate data
- Include all employees at the ground level in discussions
- Have a values discussion on what areas bring to the institution (ROI)
- Discussion gets buy-in, helps morale
- Less top down. Need strong leadership with vision.
- Preserve special instruction branding at HSU, hands on learning.
- Leverage successes like HSI Learning Communities
- Want to have open meetings with all departments under a Lead rather than 1 on 1.
- Have Division Leads LISTEN and act on input!
- Where do you draw the line on input?
- Time to digest information. Then provide written feedback.
- Transparency!!!
- Trickle down and trickle up!
- Direct communication to students on their preferred mediums – text, snapchat, email, etc.
- Need to feel a buy-in from top level as well as bottom – admin equity.
- Communicate a plan to reallocate against funding reductions when new \$ comes in.
- People change management training
 - ADKAR -> Awareness, Desire, Knowledge, Ability, Retention.
 - People-centered change.
- Regular and frequent communication meetings like this. Open and transparent.
- Each Division begins with goals.
- A lack of information creates concerns with folks creating own narratives and meanings.
- Keep positive with good things we are doing.
- There is a lot of bureaucracy here. If people like you/your leadership, you are more likely to keep your money. If you don’t have the correct alignment, you may be impacted.
- The live poll and simulation tool are useful tools for communication. There is almost an illusion of participation on campus. For example the live poll, if people knew it would have happened maybe more would have attended and participated.

- More collaboration - Current structure is very siloed and there is a lot of overlap in work done throughout the university. Incorporate collaboration to find efficiencies.
- Collaborate on process improvement– Invite campus stakeholders (across departments/areas/divisions) to come together to talk through current processes, find efficiencies, and better understand impacts that may arise when a change is implemented. (Even the smallest of changes can be very impactful to areas.) Examples: Accounts Payable and travel
- Bring the conversation back to the human place.
- *Not finding these questions as the ones that need to be answered. There was a lot of flexibility with previous reductions and negotiation that occurred. Doesn't have the necessary context of the reductions. These reductions would be catastrophic. Need to understand what will happen if they don't meet these target.*

Round 3

Question 5: What's one thing the University could do that would improve morale during this time of immense change?

- Highest paid employees take a 10% cut. No threshold discussed.
- Engage campus in a visioning process – community engagement – build trust
- Make an emphasis on budget planning rather than budget reduction
- Sincere evaluation of what workload could be reduced
- Mechanisms and processes to consult with staff prior to making decision impacting them
- Empower staff and students in goal setting
- Knowing what the decisions are and how it will impact the various programs and departments
- What is the rationale behind the decisions?
- What can I/we do to contribute?
- Layout how the feedback was incorporated into decision making
- Establish what the priorities are
- Have talking points to share with students/stakeholders. Such as, Enrollment Mgmt. success stories and others circulating around campus
- Break the silos
- Everyone to adopt student perspective interdisciplinary programs
- Do more assessment and evidence/data driven decision making
- Dare to be different, change is good, explore different ways to approach cuts
- Examine processes where inefficiencies are clear
- Curriculum reform
- More professional development
- Use relevant data to make decisions
 - Ties strong leadership to gathered evidence toward the goal
- No to updated hiring strategy. In response to the Staff Vacancies announcement below temporary and critical is an oxymoron.

- If a vacant critical staff position is not filled via internal recruitment or reassignment, then the **critical** staff position will be openly recruited as a **temporary** hire.
- Increase transparency and participation about what is valued
- People don't know what is really going on and fill in the gaps in information with their own story. We need another form of communication.
- Language/jargon confuses conversations (eg FIRMS code)
- Be more straight forward, be direct and don't drag out the process
- Need to know more, and know earlier, when creating the course schedules. The sooner the better! We are talking about people's jobs.
- Focus on the positive.
- Professional development.
- Relationship building/social opportunities.
- More options for meaningful collaboration.
- Honest approach to why cuts were made.
- Process improvement.
- IRPs.
- Things that decrease morale:
 - Faculty workload for large classes – WTUs in half.
 - Staff workload up as number of staff down.
 - Across board cuts for 15 years.
- Things that boost morale:
 - Stop blaming people – treat each other well. It's no one's fault (we are killing each other).
 - IRP and reclass to reflect new and more complex responsibilities of those who are still here.
 - Simplify processes – less bureaucracy and more transparency:
 - Any process that complicates the work we need to do.
 - Eliminate chargebacks.
- Improving access to employees to health/wellness facilities, classes, and services (would demonstrate how we value our employees).
- Faculty club for informal interactions.
- Besides money, how do we make the culture better?
 - Expanding the fee waiver program beyond 6 WTUs/semester.
 - Celebrate even the small successes
 - Not in a bureaucratic way – more natural ways, e.g., employee of the month.
- Minimize impact to students
 - Psychological impact
 - Class offerings
- Transparency – meetings/forums
 - Engage constituents on any budget reductions.
- Thank-Yous to different areas
 - Acknowledge contributions of departments and individuals.
- Lack of information leads to negatives and feelings of worry.

- Professional Development/Trainings
 - Invest in and develop staff/MPPs/Faculty.
 - Better leverage than what is already on campus.
- Helping students helps morale – negative impact on students hurts faculty morale.
- Remember why we are here – the heart of the mission.
- HSU T-shirts/Fridays.
- Highlighting/honoring departments/staff weekly
 - Include in Humboldt Now.
- Addressing the inequity (real or perceived) between units on campus:
 - Sharing resources vs. some areas not.
 - An understanding of what cannot be reduced further.
 - What is the strategy to increase when budget rebounds?
- Continue highlighting what is going great on campus.
- What would benefit students that will benefit the entire campus? Keep the college experience alive.
- Communicate campus wide
- Upfront communication that includes what is happening and why – context is helpful
- More strategic leadership – Take deeper cuts in some areas while investing in other areas instead of whittling away in all areas.
- The union contracts will be going up for negotiation. The IRP/Reclasses are delayed and always taking the maximum amount of time allowed in those contracts. What can we do to expedite these processes?
- Round table discussions like this event and also department and division level.
- Professional development events similar to one recently held by the Enrollment Management division – everyone was strongly encouraging to attend, offices were closed to allow attendance, and information was brought back to departments for those that were unable to be there.
- A structured communication plan – campus wide communication AND communication from your VP/AVP/Director to add relevance/importance to the information being shared.

Question 6: What innovations/changes could we (or you individually) make to support institutional change?

- Evaluate what workload can be reduced with an emphasis on the people working in those positions.
- Change management training
- Analysis of processes
- Data informed decision making or assessment
- Identifying the indicators for assessment
- Being realistic about budget
- Talk about good stuff also, acknowledging it is difficult
- Stop scapegoating. We are all in this together. We are here for and because of the students
- Build trust and respect

- Include students. Inclusive of all stakeholders (i.e. announcements, reaching out)
- Be more collaborative. Stop divisional bickering. We are all together
- Take down silos. Collaborate more.
- Eliminate overlap, reduce steps in processes, share best practices, mentor. Focus on process improvement.
- Invest in paperless processes. Reduce time/signatures
- More opportunities to work together outside the org chart. (Professional development, campus conversations)
- Go to a 4 day a week schedule and save money by shutting down buildings on Fridays.
- Transparency and unified approach.
- Process improvement -> (example with no follow through/transparecny after lots of time put in - Department Chair proposal)
- Get rid of chargebacks!
- Outside perspective
 - Difficult to get buy in and support from employees on campus.
 - Embrace change.
- Proactive and look forward with course offerings, career goals for students.
- Incremental change – ripple effect
 - Identify effects/consequences.
- People-centered change vs. technical change.
- Look at more centralized programming.
- Collaboration between areas to leverage program funding to reach more students.
- Centralized paperwork for students.
- Online timesheets.
- Realigning programs to lead to careers and graduation paths.
- Extended Ed to continue to innovate with certificates.
- Pilot different programs due to nimbleness
- As enrollment declines, the assumption can be made that fewer classes are happening. If current department classroom allocations were disregarded and classes could be held in different buildings or at different times, that would allow for facility consolidation or even elimination instead of program elimination. If a classroom, floor of a building, or even a whole building was closed, it could result in savings – less cleaning, less utilities, etc.
- Flexibility on what work can be done based on the position’s role.
- As vacancies arise, evaluating classifications and pay for the individuals that are still here. This would allow for professional growth and a boost in morale as remaining employees feel more valued. (Higher salaries but decreased benefit costs due to less employees.)