

President Jackson,

Thank you for allowing the URPC an opportunity to discuss your draft of the Memo in Response to the “URPC’s Balanced Budget Proposal for 2019-2022”, and offering us the charge of generating a response. Our response is organized hereafter as clarifying questions around the “Guiding Principles” that the URPC included in our budget recommendation, with the intention of suggesting revisions for the final Memo. We hope it serves to assist in creating the best possible messaging to the campus community around a challenging set of circumstances and decisions.

**Students First:** *We will always prioritize the needs of students and their education first. We will support students’ academic success and provide courses and services that facilitate their education and graduation.*

Educating students is the mission of this university and the proposed reduction to instruction will significantly impact the brand and academic experience that HSU is actively marketing to prospective students, families, donors, and community members. How do we effectively maintain our brand in light of the potential for decreasing course availability, the loss of instructional and academic support programs, degradation of facilities, and absence of financial support programs?

Alternatively, would you consider leveraging one time bridge funding to hold Advancement and Enrollment Management harmless over the next two cycles while so many new initiatives are underway rather than completely eliminating reductions to those areas? This would buy time to develop resource planning without causing additional harm to Academic Affairs and Administrative Affairs, and would head off questions regarding divisional equity. If this is not possible, explaining why this tact was not taken would be important.

**Preserve and Value Personnel:** *The education of students is intimately linked to the morale and security of staff and faculty. As such, every effort will be made to avoid concerted personnel dismissals. We will instead focus on preserving jobs for existing employees and engaging in thoughtful, evidence-driven approaches to filling positions as vacancies arise, and leveraging reassignment of personnel in line with student needs and growth.*

The human impact of this communication will be considerable. As such, engaging stakeholders in the decision-making process as thoroughly as possible will be necessary, not only to maintaining morale, but to preserving community trust in institutions and processes. Having universal representation (Division, Senate, AS) at the table while this decision-making process is underway will prove essential, as is reflecting any input collected in decisions that are made.

As reductions get larger, the likelihood of substantive staffing changes is inevitable. Contingent faculty and their living circumstances will be affected immediately in this round, with further impacts on other community populations sure to follow. Sensitivity to this will be vital, and engaging employees in jarring processes including reassignment should be enacted with care. Common movement with a centrally held aim has proven to ease such transitions in past rounds, while top-down action has resulted in avoidable disruption.

**Fiscal Stability and Revenue Enhancement:** *The budget must be balanced on an annual basis, and be sustainable into future years, through co-equal consideration of contemporary needs and ongoing institutional health.*

How is the projected remaining \$6.6 million in tuition-based revenue deficit (\$10.4 million less \$3.8 million) to be addressed in the AY following '20-'21? And what is the timeline for identifying these reductions?

On the chart at the bottom of the memo, please clarify what is provided for informational purposes only and what will be implemented going forward.

The memo points to the potential use of bridge funding; clarification of how and in what contexts this would be enacted would be helpful.

**Mission, Vision, and Context:** *We will continue to work toward realizing the articulated vision of the University.*

What are the expectations for a long term budget allocation model by October 2020? One potential issue with an October 2020 model development deadline is that while we can research, data gather, and develop the initial framework in parallel with the strategic planning process to be positioned to move quickly, the actual model should be developed following the strategic plan/academic master plan to ensure the model supports and aligns with the guiding plans of the University. For example, if there is a heavy focus on grad programs, we would want to ensure our model contemplates and adequately supports the build out of such programs. Similarly, if we were wanting to grow in the sciences, different model decisions might be made as far as how metrics and weighting are applied. Otherwise our model may not align with our University's direction and we will have trouble achieving our identified goals. So, acknowledging how much is in flux, is there a target completion date for the AMP, and, if so, we could have preliminary model work (phase 1) in parallel, then model development (phase 2) once the AMP is complete.

The last paragraph of the memo draft speaks to considerable new investment. It would be helpful to the campus community to operationalize what is meant in regards to these

proposed investments. How are these types of investments going to be incorporated into the planning process?

**Transparency, Communication, and Shared Governance:** *We need input in order to make informed decisions about resource allocations such that they reflect the values, needs, and avowed intentions of the University community. In order to provide meaningful input, the Campus community must be informed about the issues being considered. Reciprocal participation by all stakeholders is thus advised and requested.*

Clarification of the context of the authorship of this document and the means through which decisions were made in relation to the memo will be important to the campus community. To that end it will be helpful to clearly define the following concepts:

Who is this drafted memo from? How were Divisional leaders asked to participate? An outline of the decision-making process might be helpful, especially in regards to the points at which the memo diverges from the URPC's proposal.

What information (data, contextual concepts) was used to come up with the redistribution of reductions (in comparison with the URPC's proposal)?

What is the authors' view of URPC and its role? The URPC has traditionally been the venue for shared governance at HSU, and outlining expectations for how we will be engaged in the process could be helpful to the campus community.

How will shared governance be incorporated into decisions throughout the next cycles? Particularly, how will shared governance address the new programs and activities referenced in the last paragraph of the memo?

Thank you for considering these questions. We would like to invite you to the next URPC meeting on March 27th via Zoom to discuss them. Barring that, we look forward to reading the final draft of the memo and working collaboratively to address the challenges ahead, and hope that this text will be helpful in the drafting process.

Sincerely,

James F. Woglom