The University of Michigan - Flint  
Chancellor's Advisory Committee for Budget & Strategic Planning  
February 10, 2012  
Minutes  


Absent: Sharman Siebenthal-Adams  

Guest: Fawn Skarsten  

The minutes of the CAC/BSP meeting of February 3, 2012 were reviewed. Susan Gano-Phillips motioned they be accepted, seconded by Clement Chen.  

Items of Discussion  

➢ Governor’s Proposed Budget  

Chancellor Person initiated a short discussion on Governor Snyder’s proposed budget. UM-Flint has been allocated a 3.2% increase with a performance funding increase of $568,500. The percentage increase is not the same for all public universities, with Wayne State receiving the low of 0.9% and Grand Valley State University receiving the high of 7.6%.  

The performance funding metrics will be (1) growth in the number of undergraduate degree completions, the number of undergraduate completions in critical areas (defined as STEM and for community college ~ health related fields), the number of undergraduate Pell Grant recipients and compliance with tuition restraint.  

Our MSB Capital Outlay project is still pending.  

➢ Enrollment Management  

S. Turner introduced Fawn Skarsten to lead the conversation relative to the necessity in looking at enrollment management. (Fawn provided material she developed at the request of Dean Trela/CAS as it related to target estimates.
Four years of undergraduate data were reviewed with regard to course prefixes as opposed to departments. Based on the data collected and after a discussion with Dean Trela, CAS will project a 2% decline for fall 2013.

S. Gano-Phillips expressed her difficulty in arriving at projections ~ taking into consideration teaching schedules, sabbaticals, reassigned time, class capacity. It was noted that there are some projected large negative numbers in CAS and the provost will be working with DJ Trela and the chairs of the various departments.

D. Barthelmes stated this past fall (2012) presented some unique challenges, particularly with regard to the change in admission standards (which resulted in the freshman class being down 95 students). The manner in which financial aid is disbursed also presents challenges in that many prospective students have already made a college decision by the time we make a financial aid offer.

Enrollment management is a complicated process which requires a careful examination of data ~ particularly with regard to targets for transfer students and incoming freshmen, the primary feeder for Gen-Net courses. A discussion ensued relative to what other data could be collected to assist in projecting enrollment. Are we doing a good job at tracking high school trends for counties contiguous with Genesee County? How do we target these students to “get them on our radar?” How do we compare with our competitors and who are our competitors?

S. Gano-Phillips inquired about retention numbers and the various factors that affect the ability to retain our students. L. Knecht stated that if we are really going to focus on retention, the faculty/student relationships are crucial.

The question was raised as to whether we are collecting data on “why” our students transfer elsewhere. It was noted that many of the students who leave do so for financial and/or academic reasons. L. Knecht inquired as to whether it was possible to develop a survey of students who are leaving.

S. Gano-Phillips inquired as to how to engage faculty in retention without giving them “one more thing to do.” G. Voland indicated his belief that faculty need to take “ownership” of retention issues and that this is not just an “administrative” challenge.

Other

A brief discussion commenced regarding the upcoming retreat to be held March 9th at Ross House.