Minutes
Wednesday, December 1, 2021
8:15-9:50am via Zoom


Absent: E. Cheu, J. Dudas, A. Miller, J.P. Roczniaik, R. Robbins, B. White


Presenters: Ravneet Chadha, Chief Data Officer, Associate Vice President; Rebecca Primeau
Barry Brummund, Co-chair SPBAC
Garth Perry, Vice President/Chief Budget Officer

Call to Order
Co-Chair Helm called the meeting to order at 8:18 a.m.

Approval of the Minutes of November 17th, 2021
The minutes of November 17, 2021 were approved with no amendments.

Presentation and Discussion: US News Rankings
(Presenters: Ravneet Chadha, Chief Data Officer, Associate Vice President; Rebecca Primeau, Senior Data Analyst; Trevor Kvaran, Data Scientist)
The report “US News & World Report 2022 Best Colleges” provided University of Arizona’s ranking amongst other universities across the United States of America. Guest presenters explained the report’s raw data comparatively from this year to previous years. The report stated the U of A ranked at 103 in national ranked schools, a drop in one ranking position from the previous year. Some notable items that occurred, the undergrad “Business College” ranking improved to number 30, undergrad “Engineering College” improved ranking to 52, the veterans support institution improved to 62, and the U of A is still a top 50 public institutions.

In the peer performance of best colleges in 2021 the University of Arizona tied with 5 other institutions at 97; in 2022 we dropped to 103 tying with 12 other institutions, meanwhile schools like Auburn University and UC Merced propelled past us in ranking.
The ranking methodology had key changes:
1. Standardized test scores such as SAT or ACT have decreased in importance from 10% to 7%. Schools penalized if less than 50% of new entrants submit any test scores.
2. Faculty salary re-introduces two-year average of base salary reporting.
3. Class sizes from fall 2020 data averaged lessened against 2019 scores to minimized impacts of pandemic year.

The U of A increased its ranking in positive areas, but also downranked or stayed stagnant in key regions that changed our overall rank.

**Increases in:**
1. Graduation/retention rates (4 year rolling average) have increased over the previous years.
2. Faculty who are full time increased from the previous years.
3. Academic student support financial resource category, students taking out student loans are decreasing.

**Decreases/Stagnant in:**
1. Decreases in classes with fewer students than 20 students decreased, whereas the increase of 20-49 percentage increase, which is a net negative, as it puts too much on faculty.
2. Student excellence had no real change.
3. Graduation rates at 6 years stayed stagnant maintaining at 59%.

Ideally the goal to lessen this gap of decreasing graduation rates would be to focus on lifting PAL students and recruiting a more prepared class.

Using this raw data and using a comparative look from the recent years to see where we are at in metric ranks, the peer assessment rank decreased, and this is a consistent trend dropping our rank over the last years. It is important to know that the U of A is maintaining peer assessment rating, the issue is other universities have exceeded us in jumping over our rank.

The possible reason and proposed solutions from our guest are to increase faculty resources, given those declined significantly, and comparatively our support went from 107 to 93 which could be the biggest component to other universities exceeding as other universities seem to invest in that component, and the University of Arizona has not. Additionally, class sizes increased, and faculty resources may have taken a decrease because of that. Additionally, it was expressed that social mobility fell, and other schools surpassed that comparatively to the University of Arizona, which contained a substantial drop, even though our raw data showed that we made no change, other schools had substantial improvement in that regards, giving them the ability to jump in rank. Using schools like “University of Oregon” and “University of Boulder” surpassed University of Arizona’s rank, and they also increased their faculty resources, through different strategies either through salary increase, or class size rank, both still had faculty resource rank, which in turn overall rank increased. Yet, this may help but if sustain improvement, a long-term growth would be to increase 6-year graduation rates and close the graduation gap for Pell grant recipients.

Key questions for this presentation made by members:
1. One member asked what is the ROY in increase our ranking? The general response was that increasing ranking is not just to increase the rank and look good, but that these are generally items we are seeking to improve regardless of ranking. That being said parents and students do look at a school ranking and it is important to maintain that, so we pull more future students.
2. Another member asked if the shift in the industry generally on shifting from testing, how does that affect the ranking? The answer is that the test scores portions have been lowered from 75% to 50% which is combine with SATs and ACTs. If we fall below 50% then the university is penalized. University of Arizona has had a decline, but the number is not close to being penalized and it is something worth paying attention to.

3. Additionally, a member stated that there maybe some critiques on how the data’s and ranks are measured, but ultimately they are important as parents and students do look at this, but the goal is to focus on things that move the needle and make sure we are paying attention to the items that align with our strategic alignment. Language like 6-year graduation rates is better to focus on making that a 4-year graduation rate, a goal the University of Arizona is working on. Additionally, the methodology of class sizes is under immense pressure as classes like engineering courses can not teach at lower class size can’t be paid efficiently and it is a goal we are unable to chase.

Presentation and Discussion: Planning Office – External Benchmarking Report #4
(Student Support)
(Presenter: Barry Brummund, Co-chair SPBAC)

Reviewing the “Higher Education Revenue Benchmarking” presentation. Brummund provided the presentation: https://arizona.app.box.com/file/869653899427. This is the third part in the revenue discussion, as requested via SPBAC looking at the combination of state appropriation plus net tuition revenue where we stand relative nearly the 79 universities throughout country. Using the same methodology from the prior discussions using all of the largest public universities in the country.

In the first presentation the discussion revolved around “Flows from federal and state governments to the University of Arizona. In the second discussion the focus was on students and families to the University of Arizona. This presentation will be focused on outer two flows directly to students. A reminder in that there has been an exploration on the topic of privatization of colleges, as state support has declined, net tuition has increased.

Public college funding sources have listed that the University of Arizona is second most dependent to outside tuition and international students’ tuition.

State appropriations + net tuition and fee revenue is a combination of funds that largely give most of the unrestricted activities at the University of Arizona. In fiscal year in 2008 to FY 20 our rank has dropped from rank 20 to rank 22. What is seen is FY 20 had a relative well-funded, but the funding source shifted dramatically to net tuition from its state funding. Looking at trends the combination of net tuition and state revenue has risen for all the other universities including the University of Arizona. Relatively per students were not having the same support for students, but in dollars the absolute dollars, student has increased in our total dollar amount. We have offset the decline by recruiting out of state and international students give us more tuition revenue. We are down in 7 credits student support.

Now looking at the outer flows of funding relationships. Federal grants overtime change in PAL awards, was off set and other institutions as PAL grants increased. Looking at the amount from 2007-08 there was a decline in per student credit hours, but again off set due to the dollar amount using current dates of 2019-2020. Our students per credit hour receive less than other institution in PAL grants. In addition, local and state support is low to students compared to other institutions.
Comparatively the top 5 states that do grant students with local funding, in looking at the programs there is a mix of state-based merit based on scholarships to high performing high school students. Some states have need based on their family’s financial need. There is not one pattern on why they report high, but each of those higher ranked states do have student support programs in some capacity.

In combination of federal, state, and local government directly to students have decreased and is much less compared to the other institutions. Some key notes the University of Arizona is a large institution ranking the 19th largest institution in the nation. We are middle in funding of state funding, but the direct support to students is far from the top institutions that do have the state support like Florida and Illinois. Which helps explain why the University of Arizona is doing well, but the students are struggling in cost of living.

Questions in chat:
1. How did Georgia rank in this data? A: they did not report their dollars.
2. Revenue impact from state funds to medical schools and research funds? A: Looking into the disaggregated numbers for institutions that have a medical college, no substantial difference on land grab side, but medical schools are substantially different, from a revenue perspective revenue to state supported that have medical schools are higher than those that don’t.

A comment from members stating the comparison of the first presentation to this presentation exemplify the lack of support from local and state government and explains the issues on how the students can be affected on different levels.

Presentation and Discussion: AIB – SCH assignment (Course Owner vs. Course Instructor)
(Presenter: Garth Perry, Vice President/Chief Budget Officer)

Updates on AIB: The guest presenters’ main point of focus was on simplifying and having one metric on the topic of which side do student credit hours follow, the instructor or the course owner? Two perspectives have occurred from this, one from the management perspective from the department head, they are managing the curriculum, how the degrees are given on a system level, who teaches that course, how we pay for it, etc. The second perspective from the instructor concerns about their freedoms, how do you double up instructors. It comes with their domain expertise, when asked to construct a new education topic and come with a new way to teach students and how to double up the course.

The data presented in two tables if you went from one way vs the other way how would it impact student credit hours. There is not much impact at the college level, but the impact may affect the department head on a local level management wise, before bringing this to senate there needs to be a discussion on these main questions:
1. How do we think about this?
2. How do we address student needs?
3. How do we double up on new integrated courses?
4. How are all faculty enabled to create/teach new courses?

Further clarification the current environment in RCM the student credit hours being assigned based on “instructor funding”. In the other delivery platforms online, summer, winter are being assigned on course owner. The goal is morphing these different processes in one uniform model.
One member asked how does this attempt to incentivize new and interdisciplinary teaching benefit the revenue flows to the vice provost office or student success? If we can give more information on what this system is designed to do and maybe show how this is going to promote interdisciplinary from the movement of funds out of already strapped academic units into places SCH has never gone before? The presenter answered by expressing that this policy affects different departments who are recruiting people from other units that are not RCU will not flow into other units. Those dollars will flow back to the college who hosted that course and will not flow out to administration units. The provost office is working to have all academic curriculum should belong to academic calendar, currently it is not like this and they are working to fix this and the temporary fix is some departments use MOU’s but it is an efficient solution.

A member expressed a question as they are unsure how and why some units who have nothing to do with the curriculum or degrees can teach in classes? Also why not hire an instructor for their expertise? The presenters explained that if a teacher is requested to teach a class the home department is owner of said course. As for hiring the instructors felt the department should hire the appropriate people to teach a class whereas a revenue perspective an administering, a department can hire who can teach that course, but with the limited resources in mind.

Finally, some members expressed that the committee originally had concerns of SCH flow to course owners would disincentivize to teach outside their college since the unit would not revenue for their labors. so, deans would be reluctant to pay salaries for an instructor not bringing in revenue. The data shows that students are taking the courses outside their departments at the same rate before the implementation of RCM. In response one member said they would like to see more data on this and more oversight on logistics for what instructors must teach.

Faculty Center team will collect questions for Garth Perry as many questions regarding this discussion are pending answers and the meeting needed to be adjourned.

**Updates**

Leadship express updates in chat: 1.) Folk had no updates. 2.) From GPSC regarding a new grant called Promising Practice Grants that is available to all students. We would love if this information could be shared with students and faculty. 3.) MarCom Update - excellent impact from Michael Worobey work on origins of COVID 19, RCR to do a Washington Post interview on Omicrom variant and social activity very positive for last two weeks. 25mm impressions in key markets as we close the last media flight for the year, added Las Vegas, Denver and Chicago to the market mix (markets are zip codes within the market, not the total market)

**Adjourned**

Meeting adjourned 9:51am.