



Social Research Lab
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO
SOCIAL RESEARCH LAB

Cost-savings Options Feedback Summary 2019

January 23, 2019

Prepared
by

Social Research Lab at University of Northern Colorado
Josh Packard, Ph.D., Executive Director
www.unco.edu/srl

The Social Research Lab at UNC (SRL) prepared this report at the request of UNC President Andy Feinstein. All identifying information has been removed and identified data is stored securely at the SRL only. The SRL is dedicated to assisting individuals and organizations in all stages of data collection and analysis. Any questions about this report and/or inquiries about specific data should be directed to Executive Director Josh Packard at josh.packard@unco.edu or 970-351-3385.

Table of Contents

Summary.....	3
Option 1-Furloughs	4
Option 2-Computer Refresh Program.....	4
Option 3-High Deductible Health Plan.....	4
Option 4-Insurance	4
Option 5-Tuition Waiver	4
Option 6-Faculty Early Retirement	4
Option 7-Outsourcing	4
Option 8-Division Targets.....	5
Option 9-Faculty Workload	5
Option 10-Layoffs	5
Option 11-Contracted Services.....	5
Option 12-Travel.....	5
Option 13-Athletics.....	5
Option 14-Other	5
Findings.....	6
Option 1-Furloughs	7
Option 2-Computer Refresh Program.....	18
Option 3-High Deductible Health Plan.....	30
Option 4-Insurance	38
Option 5-Tuition Waiver	50
Option 6-Faculty Early Retirement	78
Option 7-Outsourcing	86
Option 8-Division Targets.....	91
Option 9-Faculty Workload	104
Option 10-Layoffs	118
Option 11-Contracted Services.....	131
Option 12-Travel.....	136
Option 13-Athletics.....	150
Option 14- Other	166

Overview

On January 14th, 2019 President Andy Feinstein held a cost savings forum at the University Center inviting all faculty and staff to participate and respond to President's Leadership Council (PLC) recommendations throughout the day or via survey over the ensuing 48 hours. Additionally, some people emailed the President's office directly and those messages were forwarded to the SRL to include in this feedback report. The Social Research Lab (SRL) was contracted to analyze all results independently of input from President Feinstein and/or PLC. The results of over 4,000 comments are below.

Please note, due to time limitations as well as scope of work, the SRL has indicated agreement and disagreement with PLC recommendations and identified major themes throughout the comments for each option, but we did not attempt to analyze the feasibility of any particular idea or set of ideas. We *strongly* recommend reading through the comments for each section below as there are some ideas that seem worth pursuing that have not been previously articulated, at least not publicly.

The findings below have been lightly edited for grammar, but not for content. The SRL has retained all raw data from the project. Please direct any questions to Dr. Josh Packard, Executive Director, SRL at josh.packard@unco.edu.

Summary

Option 1-Furloughs

PLC Recommendation: Do not implement for FY20; focus instead on identifying permanent cost-savings

Summary: 140 agreed with PLC, 69 disagreed with PLC, 85 provided mixed responses¹

Option 2-Computer Refresh Program

PLC Recommendation: Do not implement for FY20; minimal savings likely to be offset by increased costs

Summary: 120 agreed with PLC, 48 disagreed with PLC, 41 provided mixed responses

Option 3-High Deductible Health Plan

PLC Recommendation: Do not implement; would be a competitive disadvantage in recruiting faculty and staff; higher health insurance out-of-pocket costs would have greatest impact on lowest paid employees

Summary: 237 agreed with PLC, 5 disagreed with PLC, 26 provided mixed responses

Option 4-Insurance

PLC Recommendation: Part one- Reduce employer contribution/increase employee contribution to health insurance plan, keeping within competitive range. Part two- Do not reduce employer contribution to optional retirement plan.

Summary: Part one- 36 agreed with PLC, 151 disagreed with PLC, 25 provided mixed responses

Part two- 47 agreed with PLC, 35 disagreed with PLC, 9 provided mixed responses

Option 5-Tuition Waiver

PLC Recommendation: Continue all waivers for current users through a specified time period. Reduce undergraduate waivers for dependent children to 50%.

Summary: 47 agreed with PLC, 216 disagreed with PLC, 112 provided mixed responses

Option 6-Faculty Early Retirement

PLC Recommendation: Implement for FY20, earlier if possible.

Summary: 180 agreed with PLC, 15 disagreed and 36 provided mixed responses

Option 7-Outsourcing

PLC Recommendation: Because investigating and implementing outsourcing requires significant investment of time and effort, if UNC were to consider outsourcing, it should look first at areas likely to generate the most savings.

Further research following the PLC discussions indicates that State of Colorado requirements would make it very difficult for UNC to do significant outsourcing.

Summary: 74 agreed with PLC, 48 disagreed and 39 provided mixed responses

¹ In all cases where PLC recommends NOT to implement an option, there are invariably some confusing responses and data which cannot be credibly analyzed. For example, in Option-1 Furloughs, some survey respondents simply wrote “No.” or “Yes.” In these cases, it is unclear whether the affirmative or negative response is to the option itself or to PLC’s recommendation. We’ve used our best judgement to make sure we have as little missing data as possible, but these issues present themselves throughout the data. For this reason, we strongly recommend reading through the individual findings pages below.

Option 8-Division Targets

PLC Recommendation: Past participation in cost-savings work should be considered when setting division cost-savings goals.

Summary: 198 agreed with PLC, 9 disagreed and 56 provided mixed responses

Option 9-Faculty Workload

PLC Recommendation: Should be addressed at division/college level.

Summary: 99 agreed with PLC, 64 disagreed and 93 provided mixed responses

Option 10-Layoffs

PLC Recommendation: Allow at division/college level if needed and establish overarching parameters to guide these decisions.

Summary: 61 agreed with PLC, 86 disagreed and 113 provided mixed responses

Option 11-Contracted Services

PLC Recommendation: No university-level services recommended for elimination at this time. Consider at division/college level. Begin more rigorous review of software requests and renewals through existing Information Technology Committee.

Summary: 147 agreed with PLC, 9 disagreed and 29 provided mixed responses

Option 12-Travel

PLC Recommendation: Should be addressed at division level.

Summary: 59 agreed with PLC, 121 disagreed and 118 provided mixed responses

Option 13-Athletics

PLC Recommendations: Set a cost-savings goal for Athletics as part of the campus-wide process; focus on reducing costs rather than exploring a conference/division move at this time.

Summary: 125 agreed with PLC, 4 disagreed and 24 provided mixed responses.

Option 14-Other

Findings

Option 1-Furloughs

Our analysis of the comments found that 140 agreed with PLC that UNC not implement this initiative for FY20 but should focus instead on identifying permanent cost-savings. 69 disagreed with that and 85 had mixed responses including agreeing with contingencies.

Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Negative morale
- Only implement for high-earning employees
- Agency should be given to employees who are furloughed
- Low impact, high savings (those who disagreed)
- Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Negative morale

Respondents that agreed with the PLC recommendation believed that if mandatory furloughs were implemented, it will negatively impact morale.

A furlough is a pay cut. Negative impact on morale. If this happens, allow optional furlough taken when employees want. Non-sustainable cost savings.

Absolutely not! Significant NEGATIVE direct and indirect impact on all members of the university community.

Absolutely not. It's the faculty's job to teach, do research and service. And we do our jobs. It's the administration's job to keep the lights on and the budget balanced. Furlough the administrators one month a year instead. Way to make us pay for your failures. Typical.

Additionally as a classified employee, I would be looking at state laws to see if this would be legal. We are not formally unionized, but there is a group working toward that end. I'm sure they would be interested in any furloughs. Additionally, this would be a nightmare for hiring. "Come work for UNC! We can't pay you year-round!"

Do not do this; morale is already very low.

Do not implement, this is not a long-term cost savings option. If it is implemented then it should begin with the top-down so that the highest paid positions, those that can afford the days off, will be placed on furlough.

Faculty are already being paid an absurdly low salary in relation and asked to do more with less. People are leaving and morale is at an all time low. This is then a wrong-headed option if you truly want your faculty to stay, succeed, and create a nurturing environment for students.

Furloughs for classified staff are possible, but horrible for morale and provide only short-term savings. They are not sustainable.

I agree with the PLC's recommendations not to implement this option. Not only would more sustainable cost savings likely be more helpful, but this option would likely have a huge negative impact on employee morale.

I do not feel that punishing faculty/staff by reducing salary with furloughs is a good idea. In addition, the impact to the efficiency of running the University as a whole needs to be considered - furloughs for faculty would have an impact on student success. Our programs run year round, so there are no 'down times'. We work through weekends and holidays as it is to stay abreast of our responsibilities and to then not be paid over a period of time would be a slap in the face.

I have no issue with this but how much work is this for the payroll office and what about the morale it will have on employees? I don't know that this is the best option to use depending on when the furloughs would happen.

I think that while this could be a good idea for staff that has tasks that are specific to clocking in, for staff such as faculty that is often expected to do tasks outside of their normal job description or that may not be accounted into their working hours it will do a disservice to our school. If we continue to ask staff to work in excess amounts or to perform the same amount of work without providing them with the same level of pay, our school and students may be negatively impacted.

It is unclear how this would work based on the information provided but the plan would continually create more negative press for UNC, making it more difficult to recruit students.

It would be very bad for morale with very little pay off.

Just as I have seen with the Federal government shutdown, I think this would be bad for morale. We already feel that we do too much "for free".

Morale will bottom out if staff makes a sacrifice and administration does not.

NO, not good for faculty moral

Not a Fan, will start looking for other jobs if that is coming through

That measure is not sustainable and can cause more trouble in terms of morale than the savings it will provide.

The costs in doing in terms of moral would be devastating.

This does not seem to be an effective plan and would further erode morale among the employees that keep this university afloat.

This might solve a short-term problem, but is not a long-term solution. Employees will certainly experience individual financial strain from this and this effectively punishes employees for problems created by the institution. This will also impact already low employee morale. This will impact more than just employees' moods. Their work efficiency will decline in aggregate.

This seems awkward because even though it cuts the work time, the work we have to do doesn't stop. So what would end up happening is either (1) we do the work anyway and then resent not being compensated, or (2) we don't do the work and then things like student success, teaching, and scholarship are negatively impacted.

This would be devastating to morale.

This would create resentment in some employees and is not in the benefit of students who expect teaching and services to be available at all times.

This would deplete morale, which is quite low already; it also adds nothing to the issue of sustainable savings.

While I would not be opposed to this measure if it helps the University, it is not a sustainable way to reduce costs as this would be a one-time only cost savings. If this is done more than once, it will create insecurity between employees.

Why not cut out any bonuses for everyone-especially during these times? When administrators receive more in bonus than many staff do yearly, morale plummets.

Will cause low morale, how much would this really save us, anyway?

With no pay raises already implemented, this would be another blow to staff that are already struggling. Our campus already struggles with morale. It is also not a sustainable cost.

Only implement for high-earning employees

Respondents believed that if mandatory furloughs are implemented, they should only be required for higher earning employees.

Agree with PLC recommendation to not implement furloughs in FY20. If furloughs are implemented, the threshold salary should be higher (\$50,000) with perhaps more furlough days for those making \$75K or higher, including president and cabinet.

As a .90 FTE classified employee, I already take 26 furlough days per year. I feel .90 or less FTE employees should be exempt from this. The 26 days unpaid are already a hardship. Increase the threshold to \$45K and higher. Those making less should be exempt from this.

Consider changing the cut off from \$35,000 to \$50,000 or higher; set it to 2 days per year for 3 years; allow employees to take the days off when they best work for them.

Consider for exempt staff and tenured faculty

Consider the impact of this on employees that make less than executive level paychecks. May seem small to some, we all know cost savings measures are needed and there are hard decisions to be made...are executive level employees who make six figures considering take a few more furlough days considering their impact will be far less and it would demonstrate their commitment and tough decisions aren't just impacted the most vulnerable staff/faculty populations...

Even though it is a temp. savings I am fine with this option if needed. I would prefer the option begins with a higher salary range than 35K (maybe 50?) to impact fewer lower-paid employees.

For those who earn highest salary – two-day employee furloughs.

Furloughing low-paid, part-time staff will barely make an impact on budget, but a huge impact on employee's life, but furloughing high-paid full-time administration will make a bigger dent in the budget and less on the employee. Also keep in mind how close some are to retirement and if the furlough would make an impact on the rest of the employee's life in retirement.

I agree with the PLC's recommendation of not implementing this as written. However, I do think if the salary threshold was raised to "all faculty and staff earning \$60,000 or more", it should be implemented.

I am OK with this if the earning was raised higher. People earning less than \$45,000 should be exempt - and yes I would still have to take the furlough!

I am wondering about staff. UNC spends more on staff than faculty. What about staff accountable in my program, we have two part-time staff with unclear workloads ☹ increased efficiency/accountability. These people in my

department don't do their jobs (I don't think). They could do more. ☒ Do in short-term for richer people.

I think furloughs could be helpful short term, and I think only individuals making over \$50k (or maybe tiered?) have to take them.

I think that furloughs should be considered, but based on salary level. For example, under 30K - 0 furlough, 30-60K = 2 furlough days, 60-90K = 4 furlough days, 90K+ = 5 furlough days.

I think this should be for faculty and staff that earn salaries that are well over the poverty rate.

If implemented for all consider raising salary limit to 50,000.

If this is pursued as a viable option, I agree that it should not apply to low earning employees. Other than that, it should apply to everybody (top administration included). There also needs to be something in place to make sure there is still appropriate coverage. This is an ok immediate savings, but not viable to address the bigger problem

If we must, we must. However, there should be some salaries that are exempt because it would be too much to ask of them to have a two-day furlough.

Instead of asking faculty and staff to take a furlough to pay the price of administrators' mismanagement of the funds, deans and administrators should be asked to take a three to four day furlough - as an apology for getting UNC into this mess and as a statement of support to the poorly paid faculty and staff. It would serve to right a series of wrongs perpetrated by the administration; it would also demonstrate the support the administration has for the people that keep this leaking ship running - the faculty and staff that engage our wonderful students day in and day out. It would be a great statement to others in the community and a morale booster to faculty and staff in this highly depressing campus climate.

Is a tangible cost savings. Once we start making these changes, they will be permanent. Will the days be spread out? Can really affect a paycheck if days are in the same period. Can we look into making it \$60,000 and above? Could consider this to be permanent. Could units decide which days for the staff to take these days? Not around holidays. Close all UNC for the 2 days? Save on utilities. Can we spread the savings over the year in reduced paycheck. Implement a cap? – 3 years then taper off.

Look at furlough for 55K+ (raise minimum). Strategic furlough is better than a layoff.

Mandatory furloughs would be a financial burden for those living pay check to pay check, especially in single earner homes. I would recommend offering voluntary furloughs and if it becomes necessary to mandate furloughs, they should be for those making \$50,000 or more. Those are the employees who will be the least impacted.

Maybe for higher paid/tenured employees only. I'm in my 2nd year as contract renewable, hoping for a salary raise, and to convert to tenure. Until that happens, I have to work a side job (making an additional \$5K+ a year) to afford some of the niceties of our world - such as a manicure once a month, to buy fresh/healthy food instead of the cheap stuff, a gym membership, etc. I also like to donate to charities (MS Walk, AIDS Walk, students/colleagues/friends who need funding for emergencies through GoFundMe, etc.). It would be a shame to not be able to contribute in these ways because I was making less \$ in my salary because of a furlough.

Maybe this should depend on your salary. When you make less than minimum wage for the number of hours you put in this seems a bit unfair.

Not opposed to this option. Agree there should be a minimum salary for participation so we don't affect our lowest

paid employees.

Only for those making \$75,000 or more. Hardship is higher for those making less than \$75K. If this happens it should be one time situation and knowing which month this may happen will be vital for budgeting expenses.

Perhaps, instead of two-day across-the-board furloughs, we should consider longer furloughs for those with the highest salary levels. For example, a week-long furlough for a Vice President or Associate Provost would have a greater impact on UNC's budget than furloughing multiple low-wage workers while also creating less economic hardship for employees.

Raise threshold to \$45k or more. As an Admin Assistant III .90 FTE, I already take 26 days per year unpaid and am barely making ends meet. Giving up two more days would be that much more of a hardship. My salary is around \$39k.

Require furloughs b/w Christmas and New Year's Day for Sr./Exec. Staff and those that make 50K/annually.

This represents temporary cost-savings and would hit the hardest our lowest paid employees. Only staff members with a salary ABOVE a certain range (e.g. above 70k?) should be furloughed.

This seems reasonable. Something I find troubling about these suggestions is the lack of attention to cutting administrative expenses and trimming high-salaried administrators. If these furloughs are part of that kind of an effort, I would support them even more.

This will have a disproportionate impact on people who are in the lowest salary brackets. It does not seem fair to place a greater burden for cost savings on those who are least compensated and, in many cases, have the toughest jobs on campus. If you choose this, it should start with the president and cabinet and athletics first and not affect people who will have a hard time covering their monthly expenses with a salary reduction.

Voluntary? Proportional? Everyone making over 60K take a furlough. 1 day/year.

We already get paid crap and now you want to do this? We learned that there are a lot of individuals that are paid under parity and there are a lot of others that are paid well over parity. Take it from the ones that are paid over their parity levels - leave the rest of us alone please as it's already hard enough to live on what we make currently.

Yes- but start with the highest paid employees. Some people are already living paycheck to paycheck.

Agency should be given to employees who are furloughed

Respondents stated that if mandatory furloughs are to be implemented, there should be able to choose which days to take off.

Although this is not sustainable, it would give us a boost of income very quickly - which we could use. Just do not do it around the holidays.

Although this would not result in much cost savings, perhaps your offer it as an option if an employee chooses to take 2 days without pay. Some may want a vacation.

Assuming we plan for income to exceed output within a few years, I would support this on a short term basis. Make this voluntary (leave without pay).

Furlough as an option not mandatory. Look at holiday closings of some campus bldgs.. Go to 4 day weeks.

Furloughs would give time to develop vision and help make cuts in line with vision. Not on Fridays – let employees pick days. Furloughs in winter break between holidays. Can't be used to balance health insurance cuts.

However, should in the future it be reconsidered, my only suggestion is that this be implemented the same across the campus and that employees get to choose the month/day of their furloughs.

I agree that we should not implement this. It's a non-sustainable, long-term effort to save money. I do believe that we should allow faculty/staff to take voluntary furlough days if they wish though, particularly over the summer or around the holidays, but there should be NO pressure to do so, nor should it be looked upon negatively if you choose not to take furlough days.

I am for this as long as it does not pass two days.

I realize this is not a permanent solution. However, several other options have phase-in periods that could be helped by this type of savings. Also, you could make it optional, which would be a nice benefit. The savings is not predictable, but would help.

I think this would be okay if you had to do it as long as it falls on the week of Thanksgiving, allowing us to spend more time with family.

I would be more in favor of voluntary furlough days first.

I would be open to this option as long as it was required for ALL UNC employees, and if employees could choose when to take the furloughs.

I wouldn't mind a two day furlough. The 2019 holiday calendar includes time off for a Monday - Wednesday from 12/23 - 12/25. Adding in 12/26 and 12/27 would make the time off around the Christmas holiday a whole week. A lot of University Staff would take the time off anyway so the loss to the University in productivity would be small. Having a whole week off during the holiday season would be welcome for me and likely many other people, even if losing the two days worth of pay would not be ideal. The savings offered by this one time move could also help preserve several jobs.

If considered – ensure that days are spread out over different months to decrease negative impact – give people the option when they take it.

If it is an option to pull from our vacation bank, that would be wonderful. Some of us have a lot of vacation built up because the work needs to get done regardless.

If this happens – employee chooses 2 days. Shut down certain buildings ☒ essential employees.

If this happens, I would like to be able to give up two vacation days instead. Also, please let us decide when to take the days.

If this option is chosen, the employee should be allowed to decide the day. Guidance from the top would be helpful, but the departments know their work load better than anyone else. Don't decide for us.

If we could choose which days and not be told.

Implement furloughs as part o holidays. Wed before Thanksgiving or the week of Christmas. How many people are

on campus to justify staying open?

Instead, close the university for the 2 days between Christmas & New Year's. Generate Utilities savings. If employees are allowed to use paid vacation days, it still generates savings long-term (at least when the employees leaves and cashes out vacation days). Also, this could be a permanent change & not just a temporary saving.

Let employees pick the two days out of the year they want to take off without pay, if possible. That way people can plan in advance.

Mandatory is a strong word, but what about closing campus - entirely - during intersession, spring break, holiday breaks, etc.? For example, the two days in the Xmas - NYE week in 2018 could have been entirely shut down, with wages saved, energy saved, etc.

Offer voluntary furloughs to faculty, staff, upper-level administrators. Summer schedules and holiday schedules could be flexible.

Should still be considered for the short-term fix i.e. when enrollment is down. Allow employee to choose when – set parameters. Allow staff to utilize vacation banks in place of/during furloughs.

This is a reasonable request, if there is sufficient notice provided or if employees have a little choice as to what days will count as furlough days.

This is not necessarily a bad idea, particularly if you allow those making the least (under the 35K) to be exempt. And, if you look at the draft holiday calendar, 12/26/19 and 12/27/19 would be good days as employees would get the entire week off for Christmas.

This seems like the toughest across the board option. I hope to see this implemented only as a voluntary furlough for those interested in working without Fridays over the summer, this doesn't work for me as summer is my busiest time. This is my third least preferred option.

This would be highly desirable especially during the holidays where we always seem to have three workdays off and two on. By planning the furloughs at this time people could have the entire holiday week without using vacation which would raise morale and with the university nearly closed during this time it would provide additional savings.

This would help immediately but not long term. I don't think it should be discounted. However, it is only one time savings unless you implement year after year. Also, this would be better if the employee could take the days as wanted and it wasn't mandated when they had to take this.

Two to five days per year would be manageable as long as employees and units had flexibility on when to schedule furlough days and time to prepare for the absences and payroll deductions. This could be part of an interim solution until longer term savings are realized from program pruning.

Very few people across campus work on the two days between Christmas and New Years, consider this for permanent two-day furloughs.

What about voluntary furlough – ex: staff member choice – between Christmas and New Year, during summer. Not affecting FTE. Provides flexibility to staff. Widespread support @ spring budget talks. Only available to exempt and faculty.

Low impact, high savings (those who disagreed)

Respondents that did not agree with the PLC recommendation made statements regarding how mandatory furloughs will have low impact on employees and have high savings for the institution.

Could be an option--small cut to employees that could mean major savings for university.

Even if it is a one-time fix I could see it being helpful if it would help provide more time to plan strategically.

Even though this is a one-time cost savings, it seems like a feasible way to gain a jump on the debt.

For me, this would actual be preferable to an increase in what I'll need to pay in health insurance or the money I'll lose with an employer contribution change to retirement.

I know the PLC recommended not to do this because it is not sustainable. However, consider doing this for a few years just to give us a pot of money while we have more talks about sustainable ways to save money. Having a few days of furloughs may long outweigh the extra costs employees would pay for increased tuition waiver costs and healthcare costs.

I realize furloughs are not a long-term solution, however to help get us on the right track, 2 days is not terrible. I think we need to do something to fix the situation. I personally would rather have a job in the future, even if it means I have receive 2 less days of pay.

I realize these are not permanent savings, but I, and many others in my department, would be willing to take a 2 day furlough if it would save someone's job for a year or permanently. And if we had the choice to take these furloughs when it would work best for us as far as our schedules (kids day off of school) or when our finances are better (not around Christmas) then it would be greatly appreciated.

I think this is a viable option for immediate cost savings. There are many things on the list that will take a few years to reap the benefits of--this could be a temporary cost savings until those other things kick in.

I think this would be a good compromise for minimal impact on all employees.

Is ok - might save a few \$\$ in the short term...

One idea that came up in a budget meeting last spring was voluntary staff furloughs. Some staff members on campus may want to take time off in the summer when they have less work and would gladly take the time instead of the money. Moreover, this could be a long-term idea, allowing faculty to take, say, a week every 3 years or whatever. One potential problem, though, is that this would create inequities between exempt and classified staff. I still think it's worth pursuing because, while how much savings permanent voluntary furloughs would create each year would move around quite a bit, it would save.

Support for: Equitable way to generate a portion of the cost-savings needed to address our deficit.

This does not sound unreasonable. Two days is not going to cost the employees a ton of money and some could probably use the short break.

This doesn't seem to have too much of a negative impact on individual employees but does have a reasonable cost-savings contribution.

This seems to be an acceptable and fair cost saving measure.

Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Respondents left suggestions to implement non-mandatory furloughs to employees as well as having the option to choose which days to take furloughs if required.

Academic year contracts, 10 or 11 month contracts, four day a week contracts

As a 12-month faculty member, I would be ok with this financially as long as I had enough notice to prepare. I am less happy with it if it effects vacation accrual and benefits.

Consider 4 day 10 hour work weeks for staff.

Each college can decide what works best.

For quick cost savings have people use them during slow periods OR better yet, make people start using more of their vacation instead of carrying it over. The liability would be decreased dramatically if UNC employees were REQUIRED to use a certain amount of their vacation during a certain period.

How about a 1% salary cut instead.

How much lobbying effort for increased state funding is currently being done? Though legislative changes would not help for the current budget year, over the long run it could be tremendous. State level funding since ~2000 has dropped approx. 4 fold - this is unconscionable in a modern society that has the ability to support education at a high level. With the tremendous growth in extractive industries over the last 5-10 years in Colorado, revenues to higher ed. should and could be increased, and with the current administration in office, with a stated interest in supporting education, we need to make a major push to increase state funding for higher ed generally - and get rid of the impediment to social progress in the state, known as TABOR - a misnomer if ever there was one.

I agree with the task force that this does NOTHING to generate long-term cost savings. It would make more sense to layoff "bloat" at the administrative level (like Dan Weaver, Ann Bentz not being replaced, etc.)

I don't agree with placing the burden on the back of employees for financial mis-management of the upper administration. Non-sustainable/one 1x savings. Consider 10 month contracts in lieu of furlough – more sustainable.

I don't believe furloughs are sustaining or advisable at this time - the exception would be if employees could use vacation time to offset the furlough, which seems it would be self-defeating.

I think is feasible if employees are given six months of notice.

I think this is a good idea if it is for everyone (faculty/staff/admin).

I think this may be a good idea depending on again which departments will show the least amount of impact.

I worry about the impact of this recommendation on our lowest paid staff members and believe the PLC had good insight that this is simply a temporary funding fix and not sustainable and that's why they didn't recommend it. If it were determined to be necessary; however, I would suggest UNITS determine when it could be and stagger it between staff so student service isn't interrupted.

If this is what it takes to help with the budget, there should be furloughs for all on the UNC campus. Faculty, Staff, Board of Trustees, administration - everyone - should pay.

If this were to be done/considered. Have the 2 days the week of Christmas (so their is a perceived benefit to staff where it would not seem like such a blow). Then buildings could be shut down and more savings to occur in HVAC savings.

If we ever must do this, we need to try to mitigate the regressive aspect. Two days off for someone making \$36,000 is a lot harder than for an employee making \$100,000. Maybe the number of days off could be tiered. For example, the person making \$100,000 would have four days off. Also, the minimum should be raised.

I'm ok with that. Do it for this year and drop to Division II athletics to make up the sustainable cost-savings.

Instead of a furlough – could we strategically offer reduced contracts for people who are invested in “time”?

Instead of implementing a mandatory two-day employee furlough, the University should consider exercising voluntary furloughs. Employees that would like to take 2 or more days off without pay would be able to do so without having their benefits impacted. There might be employees that would like to participate in voluntary furloughs.

Instead offer possibility of reduced position (1. FTE to .85 FTE, etc.) to willing employees where appropriate.

It would be arrogantly inappropriate to punish the employees for years of financial mismanagement by the senior administration (which was blessed by the Board of Trustees). Before furloughs, and if I was in President Feinstein's place, I would impose a (minimum) 3% base pay cut for all AVPs and a (minimum) 5% base pay cut for all VPs. Their mistakes created this situation, and while this may not realize the savings that a one-time 2-day furlough might see, it would recognize where the failures BEGAN. While the BOT is unpaid, they should nonetheless be admonished for allowing such unrealistic goals to have been set in the first place.

Mandatory ALL employees

Might be a good option short-term, perhaps in the summer.

Not against this option but would want to be sure timing of this would be considered around the financial needs of people. It would hurt around Christmas or January (post holiday). Maybe a day in the Spring and one late Summer?

Only if during days when classes are in session.

Only if it's during the holiday time frame when most people take off anyway.

Perhaps offer this as a voluntary action since some employees may be able to afford this while for others it would be a hardship and not doable.

Seems like a fine idea but if it were a week there would be more cost savings (seriously).

Should NOT be required for lowest paid employees.

Should not consider furloughs for classified staff or others at the lowest pay scale.

Take the money from this from upper administration and deans

Terrible idea. Maybe make executives take a pay cut before you do that.

The one-time savings of this just makes it seem impractical and a bit short-sighted. But I suppose you could implement an optional furlough, in case anyone does want two unpaid days off.....

The only way I could agree with this option is if everyone gives up two days of pay. That means faculty too!!!!

There should be tiers. For those with higher salaries they should take more furlough days than those with lower salaries. Not preferred as it is a 1 time cost savings and not sustainable.

This creates a lot of risk for employees that is hard to plan for and unsustainable. Rather than cutting healthcare contributions and other things, what about a 1% pay cut across the board as a way to “reset” the budget. It would be less painful than several of these options.

This doesn't link to any of the options, but it's an idea. My alma mater has a program where community members can audit classes for way less money than tuition. My dad has taken probably 25 classes this way, giving the University 2500 dollars or so. After the last day of the add period, the University opens seats in classes with remaining spots not filled by students to the community. Community members pay \$100 bucks to take the class. In most cases, this costs the university NOTHING, because professors aren't doing any extra work grading (the community members don't turn stuff in) and professors don't teach the class any differently because there are a few extra bodies in the room. I don't know what it would take to administer this program, and the university I know about is in a much larger city, so I don't know if we have the population to sustain this, but it's worth thinking about something like this. At my alma mater, it's a cash cow!!

This is not ideal but ultimately wouldn't be a bad option if it preserves some of the other benefits of employment (e.g., dependent tuition waiver, affordable health insurance, etc.)

This is only a correction and I don't believe it could affect everyone. Only if it affects every single person on campus should this be implemented. Everyone should feel the crunch not just staff.

This option is not ideal, as it is a one-time savings, but I'd rather go without pay for 2 days than some of the other options being implemented. At least this would be a one time thing versus reduced employer health insurance contributions, which would lower our take home pay indefinitely.

This option is only viable if the upper 1% of the University administrators also participate. I would like to know if the 230K in exempt savings includes all employees, Pres, Provost, all VPs and AVPs.

This option may be helpful to obtain an initial cost savings that would allow time for the other options to be implemented. I prefer this rather than health care changes.

This option needs to be reserved for absolutely dire emergencies and it appears we are not there yet. It is an unprecedented pay cut. Though it does appear that as implemented by the state of California it was not a complete disaster in terms of faculty recruiting or student success.

This seems appropriate considering the small amount of work that is accomplished directly between Christmas Day and the New Year's Eve.

This should be implemented although I believe that the salary exemption amount should be increased to \$40,000. This item contributes a large enough amount of savings to be implemented in the current year and futures year until permanent savings are identified in the budget that contribute an equal amount of savings or more.

Would be ok in lieu of having to make layoffs

yes. not a huge deal, would be manageable for most. Having budgeting seminars or workshops on how to manage the decreased income would be good.

Option 2-Computer Refresh Program

Our analysis of the comments for this option found that 120 agreed with PLC that it should not be implemented for FY20, but to focus on identifying permanent cost-savings. 48 disagreed with PLC and 41 said maybe.

Specific comments are sorted according to response below.

Yes- Agree with PLC

"Bad business practice. The cost will have to be rolled into future years.

"No real cost saving benefits and everyone would have seriously outdated computers by year 6 and 7.

"This is a good idea immediately"

Agree with PLC

Agree with PLC not to recommend - we already have too many computer issues with a 5 year refresh repairs. Extending the refresh would just increase that cost.

Agree with PLC recommendation, but not because of the decreased number of available second hand computers, which I imagine would impact few people. Small soapbox...I find it interesting that this was considered, especially with the very small projected savings. There are obviously other areas that could reduce costs, like moving toward sustainable energy consumption. We have so many roofs on campus and virtually no solar panels...same for wind-energy. If so much of our utilities cost is tied to the consumption of gas, why not move away from consuming gas.

Agree with PLC recommendation: Do Not Implement

Agree with PLC recommendation: Do Not Implement

Agree with PLC take-aways and recommendations

agree with PLC; suggest however, UNC look at other IHEs that use a systematic university-wide computer refresh and as implement over time (not simply as a cost savings option)

Agree, but depending on the type of job the computer refresh pertains to. Many jobs may not need updated equipment versed some may need it to perform their job duties. It should not be a blanked order across all areas, but more of a guide.

Agree.

Agreed

Agreed that this is a great idea.

Agreed, the cost savings is minimal and there would likely be additional costs for repair.

Agreed.

Also, I understand why IM&T gets new bids and contracts for computers every few years, but the time spent on the process likely negate any actual savings.

As much as computers are used for most positions on a daily basis, extending the life of a computer when this is your primary work tool is not a good idea.

As someone who relies on my computer to work for 8 hours each day, I don't think this will benefit the university. Technology changes so fast and with constant software updates, we need to ensure that we have the hardware to support changes and allow us to efficiently complete our jobs.

As someone who teaches technology and software, this would be tricky. A five-year old computer can struggle to handle high-end programs such as the Adobe Creative Suite.

As the PLC stated, I don't think this generates enough to be worth it. We have a lot of student staff members who use the "retired" computers, too.

Based on the spreadsheet posted on the President's website - this is not an option considered. I agree with the comment that the savings would be offset in increased cost of TSC work, time management of employees, etc.

Do not do this. To be competitive we have to keep pace with new technologies. For example, streaming is not even available campus-wide. Older computers may not be compatible with some technologies like this.

Do not implement (agree w/ PLC). Have better options for folks who do not use an institutional computer regularly to have a low-cost option. So the standard model, the Mac model and the "budget" model that should maybe only be for light users (adjuncts, TAs, student employees, less than 1/2 time staff etc.).

Do not implement.

Doesn't save enough money to be helpful

Doesn't seem worth doing.

For UR, this could have a negative effect on the work we do. We need the newest and fastest technological tools as possible in order to perform the work we're tasked to do.

Given that beyond a period of time, computers fail and need extensive repair, extending the refresh period does not seem cost effective. It is probably possible to find that "sweet spot" for different technology to which the refresh period can extend, and beyond which repair becomes costly.

Having asked IT about this, the average length of a MAC is around 7 years, so there would be cost savings there, plus they feel the PCs are cheap enough to buy on a regular basis. Sounds like a no sum game.

High repair costs very minimal savings. Waste of time to have inefficient computers/maint.

I agree that this does not make sense to implement.

I agree we should not implement. This is a short sighted option, as cost in IT support and lost productivity would ultimately increase cost.

I agree with PLC recommendations. Savings would be minimal.

I agree with PLC.

I agree with the decision to not implement

I agree with the PLC. If this was being considered as an option, though, think it would be advantageous to consider funding for maintenance as an option as that may create more cost savings.

I agree with the PLC's assessment of this strategy. Savings seems small and it would have an impact on services out of proportion to the savings.

I agree with the PLC's recommendation of not implementing this. I think 5 years is already a stretch for computer refreshes when technology is always changing.

I agree with the recommendation to no implement. It cost a lot to fix computers in their fifth year anyway.

I agree with the recommendation to not implement, due to minimal savings.

I agree with this recommendation. As a 20 years + member of the IMT department, I am aware of how many members of the UNC community have multiple computers & other peripherals that are potential contributors to frivolous and/or over spending.

I agree. For the amount of work this is, it's just not worth the rather miniscule savings.

I disagree with this option. Current technology is key to performing our job duties in a timely and productive fashion. 5-years is already too long for a refresh.

I do not mind that, but as far as I know we are already on a 6 year rotation, and, will it really save us money to wait longer for computer updates? It may end up being even more expensive given such quick technological advances and costs of more significant upgrades.

I don't see that this will result in major savings. Will help if the existing computers are capable of handling the newer software.

I don't understand how this can really save money, especially if computers can be reimaged or reset in lieu of getting a whole new machine. I just don't think it's effective.

I have heard from people in IT that this would actually end up costing the university more than it would save, so it does not seem to be a good option.

I have not had a computer that consistently works for three years. IT and I have spent large amounts of wasted times on this laptop. I am sure if you calculated my salary plus theirs plus the fact that I am writing a book that having such an old laptop does not save money. I literally use my son's laptop since I am worried I will lose my book. The book has a contract deadline that the laptop has made me really worried about. I have had to spend days at a time working in a lab with students. I like chatting with them but I am sure you can imagine how hard it is to get work done.

I would suggest not implementing this.

Implementation does not seem greatly beneficial. I believe IT and departments should be directed to use mindful discretion and help the university save funds by addressing situations on a case by case basis with cost savings in mind.

In order to remain attractive to prospective students, faculty, and staff, technology must be functional. The expected offset (or lack thereof) does not justify this option.

In today's technological environment, a 5-year computer refresh is bordering on too long as it is this is like a sea captain selling the planks off the bottom of his ship in order to raise funds for the journey.

Instead of pushing computers back, take advantage of them. Start time sheets, work order reviews done online to save paper and ink prices.

It isn't clear how this option would really impact the overall \$10 million deficit and it would very negatively impact employee functioning.

It sounds like the discussion has cost more money than the measure would save

It sounds like the discussion has cost more money than the measure would save

It was not recommended by PLC so am assuming it won't be an option.

Limited savings.

Little savings. Not useful.

Many programs are online so this doesn't make any sense. If you need your computer to do your job, you need one that works efficiently. Five years is already a long time to wait for new technology

May end up costing more in IT support and wasted employee time.

Minimal savings

Minimal savings

minimal savings

Minimal savings with huge impact to productivity with old equipment

More money will likely be lost due to repairs in the long run.

My department worked with outdated computers for quite a few years. I can say that getting the computer refresh significantly increased the level of service that we were able to give to students.

My research is contingent on having software to be successful and to get external funding. Computer refresh may impact that ability.

No - this isn't a practical concept. There wouldn't be enough of a financial gain for the potential problems.

More practical management of purchases of software programs for campus use might be something to evaluate and implement for a small cost savings.

No not a good option

No real \$\$ will be gained here.

No, the cost would offset the benefit.

Nope, no significant impact on the deficit.

Not a cost saver, a 5 year refresh rate is already too long.

Not a good option. Maybe look at having/enforcing rules about the kinds of computers people get.

Not a great saver

Not a high yield for extending time period, technology should be top notch where needed for students and faculty/staff.

Not a huge cost savings and repairs on older computers would be higher.

Not a huge fan of this one. These are pretty important.

Not enough payoff - possibility of even more debt if computers don't last

Not enough savings

Not enough savings to implement this option.

not much savings

Not really cost effective.

Not significant and could cost more in long run.

Not very cost effective. no

Not worth it

Not worth it.

not worthwhile

Old technology makes us a joke.

Our technology and refresh program is already embarrassingly bad at UNC, making it worse is unconscionable

Pointless, not enough savings.

Savings appear to be minimal so agree with PLC recommendation to not implement changes.

Savings too minimal.

Seems like the savings will be minimal and the necessary measures are already in place.

Small and there is no way to know how much money this will save. This doesn't seem like a good recommendation to implement for campus.

Such minimal cost savings. Some computer equipment is already old. Would possibly affect student experience too. Makes it harder, more expensive to catch up.

The computer refresh program shouldn't be extended. A lot of the work that staff needs to complete needs to be done on a computer. Computers need to be maintained and updated consistently in order for employees to complete their tasks in a timely manner. Additionally, there are several departments that rely on mostly student employees and graduate assistants as staff. These employees also need access to computers that work properly in order to do their work. Finally, the cost savings in extending the refresh program is not a substantial amount to offset the deficit.

The cost savings from this measure is not worth the potential aggravation met from failing technology.

The payoff on this is minimal.

The refresh program is already too long, and would not save a substantial amount of money.

The savings are not significant and computers are needed to do out work. In my department we employ several Gas and student employees and they need computers for their tasks.

The savings for this seem to be relatively minimal. Would there be a potential for greater savings in reducing the frequency of computer updates in the student labs?

The savings here are just trash, and it seems like it would be more costly than anything.

The savings of this option seem negligible and it would perhaps end up costing more in the end with IMT time in servicing old computers needing repair. I'm not sure it is a reasonable, sustainable solution.

There is virtually no real cost savings and as the assessment pointed out, will just lead to potentially more costs down the line and potentially less productivity in the short run.

This could be an option, but I am not sure how much savings this would actually provide?!?

This does not seem like it would create enough savings to justify the additional work/trouble it would cause.

This doesn't seem like a viable option at all. There is not that much savings. Extend the refresh as long as it doesn't impact productivity.

This seems like a drop in the bucket savings-wise, but would have a significant impact on my productivity.

I'm strongly against it.

This seems like a reasonable recommendation.

This seems like it would cost more in the long run. If you have to play catch up to update computers the replacement/catch up would/may cost more than just continue to replace on the scheduled maintenance.

This will only cost more money because the outdated computers will break and cause more downtime for employees.

This would likely be offset by increased maintenance costs due to replacement parts and IT hours spend on the older computers.

This would potentially cost more than it saves. 5 year old machines are already outdated and frequently crash - 7 years does not reflect the current speed of technology changes

UNC is already behind the times in technology. Prioritize needs. Partner with computer and technology companies for grants and discounts.

We agree with the recommendation to not pursue this course of action because the consequences of out of date computers to research, communication, and online teaching is too high for the estimated cost savings.

We already have shitty base computers, so by all means lets wait another year to get a new shitty computer. Thanks...

Neutral – I think we can manage with older computers – I defer to IT's knowledge.

No- Disagree with PLC

Most of the computers are still running and IT can maintain them. They are a bit slower but some people don't necessarily need a new one. I think it should be a case by case basis and discontinue buying expensive Macbook Pros.

Sure, this seems reasonable to a point of course. I imagine that some faculty actually don't need the top-of-the-line laptops that they have for their work obligations. Perhaps it also would help if the faculty were made aware of the cost discrepancies between Macs and PCs when asked to choose their new machines when refreshing.

"Meaning - less new computers/hardware and less new software systems? YES! I have used the same personal Mac Laptop in my home office since 2013...that's seven years...I think I have another good year or two more I can get out of it. I've updated as needed when Mac tells me I need to, at no additional cost to me.

"Should be OK as long as there could be exceptions for a problem computer.

Dandy. It seems like computers get refreshed whether they need to be or not. If we moved to refresh when needed instead of refresh when it is time, we could save significant resources.

I am fine with using my computer longer.

I am in favor of this idea because it does not have a human cost associated with it.

I am in, Computers do not need to be refreshed as often as they did in the past. most gains are in the device being lighter or better battery life. Not really in performance or functionality

I am okay with working with the technology that may be a little outdated for an additional year.

I am willing to work using an older computer. This would have little impact on my job.

I believe everyone has a new or two year old computer. should be fine.

I believe this is a valid way to cost savings.

I could see this being a viable option

I do not know what this means. If it means getting a new computer later, that could be a good idea in some departments and not others.

I feel extending the computer refresh program is reasonable and would not impact employees, so my recommendation is to extend the refresh program. I realize that the impact on savings would be small, but it is still a savings and even small savings add up.

I think this is a good idea. The impact financially would not be huge, but it is relatively low-hanging fruit, and there are very few people on campus whose work requires the very latest computer. Most computers that get refreshed are re-used elsewhere anyway.

I think this is a good option that won't negatively affect too many people.

I think this should be implemented. There is so much wasted technology that is sitting in closets not being used.

I think this would be a good compromise for minimal impact on all employees, as long as options are available in emergency situation so this won't impact work.

I think this would be fine. Anytime I have been up for a refresh, my existing computer was working at least as well as my new one. I think the fact that I'm still using a desktop may contribute to this. Laptops do not seem to me to last as well.

I would be interested in IT's take on this.

I would support this option, but it does not seem to be that great of a yield for savings.

If our computers are still functional we should keep them for a bit longer than is currently scheduled.

If people can do their jobs on the computers they have I don't see this to be problematic. Getting new computers for the sake of getting new computers seems unnecessary.

If this saves money, do it.

In most cases, this would not cause severe problems in workflow or productivity of faculty or staff.

Just because the savings is minimal doesn't mean it shouldn't be considered! It all adds up!!"

Make this refresh longer with only updates to software being refreshed.

Moving from five to, say, six or seven years would not affect me at all.

No harm in this - my computer was replaced in August, and I was working with a 9-year-old machine (which, really, was just fine, but IMT insisted upon replacing it), but I'm not sure that this would realize an overly-significant savings.

Okay with this. We have spent a great deal on constant refresh and should go to an 'emergency only' mode for a lot of our technology. We are not 'behind' other similar sized Universities.

Only refreshing when damaged would help. Keeping up with updates and security should help with longevity of computer.

Seems a reasonable cost-saving.

Seems reasonable, making sure if there is a need they are not impacting an individuals/offices ability to serve students.

Sounds good to me. Should look into other technology too. For example, we pay to have a site license for Refworks and there is a free citation manager called Zotero: <https://www.zotero.org/>

Sure, but from what I read from the Presidential leadership document, this will generate very limited savings.

That'd be fine. Most modern computers are workable for 5-8 years as long as they are maintained.

This is a good idea. We don't need new computers so often.

This is easily one of the better ideas. I would also suggest taking Apple computers off the board for employees that don't really need them when a PC would work just fine.

This makes a lot of sense. Even better, refresh computers only when they die. But of course this is a sensible solution only if employees are instructed to save everything on networked drives.

This seems like a logical step to take...one that doesn't negatively affect productivity excessively, but can result in some real cost savings.

This seems reasonable. A slow-moving computer is still useful.

This seems reasonable. It's never been clear to me why updates are needed as often as they are. I have a laptop that is over 5 years old, and it works fine.

This should work absolutely fine. I do not see an issue in making this change.

Though cost savings are limited, could extend computer refresh to 6 or 7 years with an option for employees to receive refurbished (rather than new) computers at the current 5 year timeframe, as needed.

Very viable

Yes, I believe this could be an area we could save money.

Yes. This makes sense and it would be a long term savings

Maybe

This is an option that only works for some, not all employees have computers. Some computers are more costly i.e. Mac products. Perhaps if doing a refresh pc's might be more cost effective.

Easy to implement with the caveat that if one's computer becomes unusable, it would be replaced.

Acceptable if IT support is strong

As a blanket policy, this doesn't make sense. I think a laptop that is taken back and forth to home and to conferences experiences a lot more wear than a desktop that is only used at work. It would be nice if IT could think about a more nuanced approach to deciding when a computer is ready for replacement.

As long as the computer is still meeting the needs of the employee, this seems like a reasonable thing to do. The last time my computer was refreshed, I really needed a new computer because mine was having a whole lot of problems that IT couldn't fix - I was wasting a tremendous amount of time because my computer would freeze up and/or crash. I think I am coming up on a scheduled refresh fairly soon, but my current computer still meets my needs, so I don't think I will need a new one right away. However, I think that a uniform extension could be problematic if the employee has a computer that is really giving them problems and needs to be replaced in a shorter period of time.

As long as the refresh would be available for those machine that truly no longer function as needed by the faculty, this is a great plan. Maybe refresh on a case-by-case basis?

By one year.

Consider extending this for people who are not having problems with their computers.

Cost savings are minimal but may be implemented on a short term basis to pull out of deficit

Do this in a non cost environment! Extra credit or some other form of compensation. RCL, ASRM

Doing refreshes as needed seems like a good option.

Don't care as long as i can do my job.

Good short-term option, but not sustainable.

Halt for a year

I do think that the time between computers could be extended, in most departments, without significant issue, although if the saving do not mitigate the cost, it may not be worth it. Perhaps offering some kind of bonus or incentive for employees who wish to extend time between computers could be another way?

I think many departments spend additional money on technology currently, because computers seem too outdated at a 5 year turn around. I wonder if there is a way to research this in more depth, because it seems possible that having a shorter refresh timeline might also save on costs, if departments are spending more on tech to supplement.

I think the refresh program should be extended to 7-10 years and should be a case by case basis.

I think this is a fine option as long as there is room to request a new computer if it breaks or becomes unserviceable before the refresh.

I think this is fine if it added a short time to the 5-year plan, maybe 6 years? Technology is important to keeping our programs relevant to students.

I think this option is fair. However, if an employee is has continued difficulty that a refresh would resolve, the refresh should take place.

If technology is still usable then this might work, but it also doesn't seem like a big savings.

If the job is not being impacted significantly without a refresh, this would be a good option.

If the professionals really believe this will save money, sure. But I suspect old computers cost quite a bit of \$ to maintain. Instead, how about allowing people to keep using their UNC computer beyond the existing schedule and then providing them a replacement when the old one is no longer viable?

Maybe

Not ideal, but preferable to layoffs, reduction of benefits, or cutting travel funds.

Opt-in approach for this one. I know of some faculty that would be OK with another year or two.

Our computers are something we use on an everyday basis and I feel it is important to stay with new technologies, however, maybe we can look at extending it out for some areas.

Perhaps make computer refresh voluntary at 5-years and mandatory at 7 years. Don't contact people until 7 years. If the computer is working well, likely the user wouldn't contact, but if a computer is problematic, it should be replaced.

Perhaps some programs/faculty- because of what/how they teach- specifically need more updated materials, but I think that's a minority."

Possible, if the computers are still functioning and effective for employee use.

Technology is already stretched at the university, but this is a better option that some of the others.

This could be targeted, but shouldn't be across the board. I am sure there are also security reasons to refresh computers.

This could be useful on department/division level. Perhaps an audit on the number of computers and their use. I know that I need a computer that runs well and fast, but maybe not everyone.

This is definitely something that can be implemented with minimal impact. However, I think if an employee can give a good argument why they need an upgrade before their refresh, they should be able to make a case instead of just being told absolutely not, because they aren't eligible for an upgrade.

This is possible with the caveat that "lemons" can be replaced.

This may be okay, but computers are absolutely needed and so would need some kind of back-up access plan where highly functional computers were available 24/7/365 even if not personal computers. With so much online correspondence with students, as well as need to keep Canvas pages fresh and updated, this seems an old-world solution to a new-world problem. Again, in specific instances this might work for individuals and departments/programs where digital student interface is not high.

this may work for computers that are not regularly used, but for faculty and staff computers 5 years is already pushing the functionality.

This one is a semi-viable measure, since often technology gets too old after 5 years, but maybe this can be done on a voluntary basis.

This option is feasible though won't save an enormous amount of money.

This seems reasonable as long as there is flexibility within the program.

Try it out in one of the most costly colleges (in terms of cost per credit hour) - PVA or Business - to see how it works out. If after a year the ramifications are not too negative, roll it out to all colleges.

Other Suggestions

Look into providing online services for personal computers, lowering the need for facility based computers.

Lost productivity. Do we evaluate type of device needed based on role. I.e. Is a Chrome Book or Ipad sufficient?

Need to consider limiting options available to one model and one operating system.

The only option I see that would really help here is to centralize all computer purchasing and try to develop a more simplified system for all staff. This would require departments to give up their budgets where they have them and a more universal approach.

Purchase less Macs. Take away the option unless you truly have a business need (marketing, coms, etc). Literally twice as expensive to buy a Mac over a Dell/HP/PC with worse performance.

What I could support is everyone having a much cheaper PC instead of a Mac. So many people feel like they ""NEED"" a Mac, but they don't. Macs are 2-3x more expensive than a PC. Only in extreme cases should Macs be furnished."

Option 3-High Deductible Health Plan

Our analysis of the comments found that 237 agreed with PLC that UNC should not implement this initiative because it would be a competitive disadvantage in recruiting faculty and staff and higher health insurance out-of-pocket costs would have the greatest impact on the lowest paid employees. 5 disagreed with that and 26 had mixed responses including agreeing with contingencies.

Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Negative impact on low-earning employees
- Negative impact on recruitment
- Negative impact on employee retention
- Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Negative impact on low-earning employees

Respondents that agreed with the PLC recommendation about the health care savings plan believed that it would negatively impact low earning employees the most.

Again, cuts to insurance coverage would be fairly detrimental to the people like me who are on the low end of the pay scale. Any increases in cost of health care for my family would be hard felt.

Again, I believe this hurts our lowest paid employees the most and would be difficult for retaining and attracting highly qualified candidates in an already competitive employment market.

Again, this would impact lowest paid employees the most.

Agree with PLC recommendation because of disproportionate impact on lower wage employees.

Agree with PLC recommendations, would also disproportionately impact lower salary earners.

Agree with PLC. Competitive disadvantage in recruiting and retaining faculty and staff, and hurts the lowest paid employees most who already are making low wages.

Any changes to the health plan is going to negatively impact my family. I am living paycheck to paycheck at the moment. How are other employees who are not faculty going to support their families?

Anything that effectively reduces salaries even more should be avoided. Please keep in mind that the base costs of health plans are the same for all faculty and staff, but faculty in different colleges and staff in different roles have very different salaries, and faculty/staff with the lowest salaries also tend to have the lowest parity averages. Hence, this would also likely hurt our most poorly compensated faculty/staff the most.

As noted in the table, this will hurt the lowest paid faculty and staff. I have been here for 6 years and make about 58,000/year. My husband and family are also on my plan. There are some faculty who earn much, much more than I do and definitely administrators who do. I don't understand how doing this for everyone, the lowest and highest paid, could be seen as ethical.

Discriminates against lower salaried employees.

Do not implement. We have a difficult time as is recruiting faculty to our unit, this would increase the challenge. The greatest impact would be on the people making the least amount of money. Also, if you have high deductible plans, it deters people from seeking medical care when they need it. This ends up costing more in lost time and extended leave for medical issues that could have been taken care of earlier.

Given the PLC's conclusion that this option would be most detrimental to the lowest paid employees, a possible compromise might be to retain current deductibles for employees earning less than a particular salary but raise deductibles for employees earning higher salaries.

Horrible idea with costs of health care that are already increasing year over year. This directly impacts lower paid employees who now have to pay more out of their own pockets.

I feel like this would end up impacting some employees/families more than others (specifically I think it would impact me/my family more than some), which doesn't feel as equitable.

I think this is a horrible option for faculty and staff retention. Increasing health care, especially for employees and faculty on low salaries only compresses the salary itself. I've spoken to multiple junior faculty that can barely pay rent, own their own home, or live without roommates - let alone if their healthcare is increased.

I won't let it implement the higher insurance and out of pocket costs will cause a big impact on lowest paid employees.

Impact on lowest paid employees.

Impacts lowest paid employees. Would impact retention of faculty and staff.

Some employees will leave as they do not have the extra money.

Terrible. Just terrible, especially for those of us living paycheck to paycheck.

The cost of this would be significant and detrimental, especially to those in the lower salary categories. One of the advantages of UNC is its generous health benefits, which help to balance the much lower salaries.

The insurance premium difference between the high-deductible plan and the base plan is not enough to convince people to switch anyways. Compared to the classified employees who's high deductible plan is much less, the salaries for the lowest paid exempt employees do not make enough to cover major medical expenses under the high-deductible option.

This is a detriment not only to impeding the recruitment and retention of new faculty and staff, but with the already lower parity rate at UNC for so many, this would be devastating to much of the faculty and staff. I see that this will also hurt morale in ways that would be felt campus wide.

This is my least preferred option. I think it unfairly costs our lowest paid staff. I don't have children and my wife and I both work at UNC but this would be a significant extra cost per month for us.

This seems debilitating for some of our lowest paid staff members.

This would be a pay cut to lower-paid employees like myself. I already lose a giant chunk of my paycheck to my health insurance as it is.

This would impact folks making lower incomes. Not a good solution for our campus.

This would strongly affect starting professionals with lower incomes, single individuals with no other income or source for medical care.

This, again, would disproportionately affect lowest-paid employees which seems to be a trend among these recommendations. Why are none of the recommendations addressing administrative bloat and high salaries? Why are none of people who led us into this economic crisis being asked to shoulder the burden of getting us back on track?

We are already underpaid at UNC. This would disproportionately affect the lowest-paid workers and is a horrific model.

Negative impact on recruitment

Respondents that agreed with the PLC recommendation about the health care savings plan believed that it would negatively impact future employee recruitment.

Again reducing the benefits you are offering employees will impact recruitment...

Again, staff are already struggling to make ends meet with no raises. It is already hard to get qualified staff willing to commute or live in Greeley. If we hit any compensation plans, including health plans, we will lose staff and have a difficult time finding sufficient replacements.

As mentioned by the task force this is a big recruiting tool in the context of very low salaries.

Disadvantageous in recruiting faculty and staff.

Do not go to a high-deductible plan. Given our low savings, one of the reasons that UNC is still potentially attractive is our high quality and relatively affordable health care plan. It provides peace of mind to many of us that medical expenses are not going to pile up and that we can take care of potential medical issues without having to pay a lot out of pocket.

Do not implement unless other permanent cost savings cannot be found that would contribute this significant of savings. While this item does save a significant amount, the implementation of making the UNC contribution equal to HDHP single premium would be a significant burden for this class of employees with families. Reducing UNC HOM contribution to 50% is a more reasonable burden for this class of employee to take on. Implementation would probably affect recruiting if we would be significantly different from the neighboring university offerings.

Given our low salary, having a good health care plan is important in terms of recruiting and maintaining faculty and staff, and in terms of supporting them and helping their quality of life.

Health insurance and benefits remain one of our only recruiting tools, our salaries are not competitive for staff and workloads are often significantly more demanding in many areas

Health insurance reduction is a pay cut – we already have trouble recruiting and retaining faculty and staff. Where are the conversations happening around graduate TAs?

I agree with the PLC. I fear this is an inequitable option for employees across the campus and will make UNC less competitive in recruitment.

I am not in favor of this idea because there is a very human cost to this. This is a pay cut disguised as a change in the health plan. Additionally, UNC does not have the kind of competitive salary needed to attract talented people. Reducing benefits would further undercut this already difficult hurdle.

I am very much opposed to this due to the impact it would have on me personally. I already pay over 9% of my base salary towards my medical/dental insurance, and my wages are BELOW 80% of CUPA. To make my out of pocket expenses for healthcare MORE than they already are on top of the low salary I earn and high amount I already contribute for insurance would be a tough pill to swallow. We already have a hard time recruiting and retaining faculty, this would make it even more difficult.

I don't think this is a great option due to recruiting faculty/staff.

I thought this was already an option that employees could participate in. I believe good/reasonable health insurance is a big consideration for recruiting and retaining employees, especially when we are not competitive salary wise.

Implementing this measure will effectively result in lowering the monthly pay check which, given that we are already around 80% or below of many peer institutions, will result in difficulties recruiting new faculty and will make many of the best current faculty consider leaving, this is one of the options that can quickly significantly decrease the quality of UNC educational experience.

Increasing the cost of employee out of pocket expenses for medical needs is going to make UNC even less financially attractive as an employer than it already is. Our already low salaries make recruiting new faculty and staff difficult. Reducing benefits is just going to add another reason for current and potential employees to seek employment elsewhere.

Leave benefits alone. It is already very, very hard to hire new faculty with our ridiculously low salaries. Our competitors hire assistant profs for more than our associate prof average. Bennies are the only way to even try to persuade people to accept a job here.

No, it would put us at a competitive disadvantage and is a poor way to conduct business.

Not recommended as we would not be competitive for attracting and keeping employees.

Please do not implement this option, the hardship does not justify this cost savings and would have detrimental impacts on recruiting and retention of talent across UNC. I've heard several employees state they would leave UNC if this went through.

Reducing benefits while reducing employee take-home pay will have a negative effect on recruitment and retention. UNC already struggles to hire and keep qualified staff, this would

Such plans are unpopular and perceived as not competitive with other educational institutions.

This would be a major disincentive to potential new hires.

This would greatly harm the ability of UNC to be competitive in hiring. We are already substantially below the average salaries of our peer institutions in most areas - benefits are one of the few selling points we have.

This would have a huge impact on faculty and staff and impact recruitment/retention.

Very bad policy and detrimental to all future hiring.

Well, if you want to lose your good current faculty, and then not be able to recruit anybody worthwhile, then by all means go this direction....

will cost employees more in the run long, will lose incentive to come to UNC

would be detrimental to staff retention and recruitment; viewed as a salary cut.

Negative impact on employee retention

Respondents that agreed with the PLC recommendation about the health care savings plan believed that it would negatively impact current employee retention.

Agree with PLC. No to HDHP. This will drive people to leave UNC.

Bad idea. Will lead to losing more good people

Because of our below parity salaries the only reason a lot of us work here is because we had better benefits than other nearby institutions. If you make our benefit package similar to nearby institutions WITHOUT fixing our salaries most of us will leave. By doing so you will be forced to hire new individuals at higher salaries based on these changes. I'd suggest finding other ways of saving money instead of taking it from our tables in this fashion.

Coming from medical background – insurance is already costly for employees out of pocket. This could cause staff to look for employment with better insurance.

DO NOT IMPLEMENT. If this was implemented, I would need to find a job else-where.

Do not touch the health care plan. It is one of the few perks of working at UNC. It would be horrible for campus morale, and it will lead faculty to leave in droves.

Given that health insurance is federally required, this would be a direct cut to salaries due to having to pay higher insurance premiums. Would no longer be able to afford to work at UNC and would have to leave

Great employees will look elsewhere.

I agree with the PLC that this should not be implemented. As a faculty member earning well below national averages, the current insurance plan is one of the only things that makes supporting my family with this job a possibility. If this were implemented, we would not be able to even think about having a second child as out of pocket costs to cover the high deductible would make this impossible. If it were implemented, I would be forced to find employment elsewhere, which I do not want. I love my faculty position here at UNC and want to raise my family here.

I am already using the high deductible for my daughter and I. This is already not ideal, and to make it worse, would encourage me to look for a new job.

I would leave.

If an HMO plan would not be available, this would be an effective pay cut and would prevent me from staying at UNC (as a hypothetical exempt/faculty). "

IF THIS HAPPENS I WILL LEAVE. I cannot stress this enough - our salary is already crap, but the benefits aren't. This is a truly awful idea that should not have been considered, let alone presented.

If you do that it will be the beginning of the end of UNC. As faculty with a family and the provider of insurance I would be forced to leave UNC and seek a job with a stable employer, like burger king or taco bell.

If you want to retain employees, you will need to have competitive benefits.

In the United States today, this seems like a completely unworkable proposal. I for one would begin the search for a new position.

Many people would leave. Too costly.

No don't do this! This is a bad idea. I believe UNC will end up losing employees than keeping them if this is adopted.

NO! Please no. Our salaries are already WAY below the national average for universities our size. It will be impossible to plan financially for the year because no one can know how much of a deduction will happen to their pay. This is a deal breaker for me. If this is implemented, I will be forced to leave UNC.

NO. People would leave the university.

NO. The 14 people who opted into this are very reflective of how the university population would feel about this. I believe people would leave as a result of this change.

Not an option. I would have to find another job.

Not interested, health care and insurance is already expensive enough. Honestly will probably go somewhere else if this is the case.

Please do not do this. Faculty and staff are already underpaid. The current benefits package is sometimes the only thing that keeps people here.

Please don't do this. This hits people with children disproportionately. We recently had a child born with special needs, and this coupled with the already low, low UNC salary would force us to find a different community.

The family health insurance plan currently offered through UNC is one of the main reasons I chose to accept a position at UNC. Based on my current salary, supporting my family will be challenging if we move to a high-deductible health plan. I will strongly consider leaving UNC if

This does not appeal to me as an employee and would make me want to look elsewhere for employment outside of UNC to get medical coverage.

This is a bad idea and I agree would put UNC at a competitive disadvantage. This is the kind of thing that would push me to start seriously looking elsewhere for employment.

This is another hit to your already low payment of employees. You will likely lose good employees.

This places a huge burden on staff/faculty. Makes UNC less competitive and less attractive as a place to work. It's essentially a pay cut and tax on families. This makes one want to find a new job.

This sounds incredibly risky for an institution that would like to retain employees into their 30s and beyond - and even those who want to (or, already) have families.

This will result in 2 likely outcomes. 1. People like me will leave our pool and join our spouse's plan, thereby

weakening the UNC insurance pool. and 2. People like me seeking employment elsewhere. Let's be clear. This is the equivalent of a huge pay cut.

This would be a mistake. One of the reasons my colleagues and I have decided to stay at UNC rather than seek positions elsewhere is that, despite the slow salary, the benefits are worthwhile, particularly our health plan.

This would be detrimental to myself and my family. The insurance benefit is, in my opinion, the most attractive benefit we have to offer employees. Changing this would result in a significant financial hardship for myself and my family, and possibly mean that I have no choice but to look for employment elsewhere.

This would be essentially a pay cut for employees, which will lead to higher turn over as there are less incentives to work for the University

This would be extremely difficult for me and my family. It would cause me to consider whether staying at the university would be feasible.

Under HMO single, I would have to look for another job.

We will lose our better faculty.

With our low salaries this is terrible for morale and retention of employees.

Would force me to look for a position elsewhere.

You may lose good faculty and staff that do not have better options through their spouse/partner.

Additional suggestions, comments and questions

The few respondents that left suggestions indicated that it would be beneficial to have more options for health care plans in the future.

"If we do this, we need to structure the plan so that the cost varies more from the copay based plan. The classified employees have a HDHP option that only costs \$18.92/ month and the copay plan costs \$140.56. That is an annual savings for almost \$1,460 to encourage employees to use the HDHP. I believe the HDHP can be a really good option for healthy employees and employees who know they will meet their annual out of pocket maximum early in the year, but the plan has to be structured appropriately to do this.

"This is not a good idea as this would affect a huge amount of people. Could you look at other options or other health insurance companies to possibly save money? It seems like the option listed may be with one company and I wonder if there are competitors out there that could offer a better rate? Most families need a better plan than the HDHP.

A slightly higher deductible/co-pay (say, up to 20%) would be a manageable option for most people, and would probably encourage more use of FSAs, so that the co-pay/deductible would be pre-tax.

As a classified staff member, this wouldn't affect me, but if it did, I would want to make sure it wasn't the only option. It works great if you don't get sick much, but for someone who is sick often, or has kids who are accident prone, it would be very hard to come up with that much money. This is an okay option, but needs to be watched.

As long as there are also options for lower deductible health plans. There are people on this campus who would have to forgo important medical care if their deductible was higher.

As one of the 14 who chose the high-deductible plan, I definitely don't recommend it. I only chose it due to personal financial planning and because I weighed the risk against the savings. Since I'm fairly young and healthy, I felt this was a good way to save money each month. Not a good base plan at all as it's essentially only preventative. Maybe do a better job promoting this plan during open enrollment - like have you used your health benefits for anything other than preventative care in the last year? Do you want to save X dollars? Think about the HDHP! Or something.

As someone with a long term health issue requiring treatment I understand just how valuable a low deductible health plan can be. The HMO plan should remain as an available option. Maybe policy changes could be made that lead more people to choose the HDHP plan since the cost to the University is less. This may include employee education on Health Insurance on how HDHP plans work and that healthy employees who need little medical care could benefit from it with additional cost savings. Potentially UNC could make some contribution to the HSA for employees if they select the HDHP plan as an incentive to change plans. There does seem to be a large potential in cost savings to the University in reducing the amount contributed and some amount of this should be implemented, but the HMO should remain available. Most employees would probably prefer to pay more for their health insurance than lose their job.

Before dismissing this proposal, alternative providers and plans should be checked. The out-of-pocket premium for a family HDHP was \$19/mo with a \$2,000 deductible (2017). This aligns with what classified employees pay.

Even with differences in employer contribution, UNC's current premium and deductible is obscene and should be re-bid, then this option considered further.

Implement with highest paid employees

Maybe instead of having the employee pay 15% more, you could have them pay 5-7% more and split the difference. Ideas."

Maybe we need to leave CHEIBA to get better premium rates? "

Oppose. What I suggest is increase the class taught, in return the university pays for our medical insurance.

This should be offered as an option, not an across the board cost savings effort.

We are ok/can deal with a 1-2% reduction in employer contribution. Right-size to other CO institutions. Do not go to a high-deductible plan.

Were I an exempt employee or faculty member, this would only be acceptable if the HMO plan were still an option, as a HDHP is useless for some people. It would be incumbent on the employee to select the best plan for them. HR would need to have a campaign to reach everyone affected, email and a letter would NOT be sufficient.

Option 4-Insurance

Our analysis of the comments found the following:

Part one- 36 agreed with PLC that UNC should reduce employer contribution/increase employee contribution to health insurance plan, keeping within competitive range. 151 disagreed with that and 25 had mixed responses including agreeing with contingencies.

Part two- 47 agreed with PLC that UNC should not reduce employer contribution to the optional retirement plan. 35 disagreed with PLC and 9 provided mixed responses.

Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Negative impact on retention
- Negative impact on recruitment
- Perception that the increase would be a pay-cut
- Lose competitive edge over peer universities
- Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Negative impact on retention

Respondent's that did not agree with the PLC recommendation stated that they believe it will negatively impact retention of current employees.

Again - some employees will leave as they do not have extra money.

Again reducing the benefits you are offering employees will impact recruitment...

Again, for the very little pay the university community receives, asking for more out of pocket is unjust, and is risky as people will leave the university.

Any salary reductions make us less competitive in hiring and retaining staff. This matters much more to staff and faculty who make less. Maybe parameters for contributions based on salary. With guidelines, maybe a good place to save money.

As with Option 3, this would be a mistake. The benefits are one of the few reasons for exceptional faculty to remain at UNC.

Bad idea and will lead to more departures.

Because of our below parity salaries the only reason a lot of us work here is because we had better benefits than other nearby institutions. If you make our benefit package similar to nearby institutions WITHOUT fixing our salaries most of us will leave. By doing so you will be forced to hire new individuals at higher salaries based on these changes. I'd suggest finding other ways of saving money instead of taking it from our tables in this fashion.

Effectively a pay cut, you might as well call it by its name. Will harm morale, and likely lead to resignations by those employees whose services are most valuable and most in demand elsewhere.

Faculty and exempt staff already pay a lot out of pocket already for a good plan. You may lose good faculty and staff that do not have better options through their spouse/partner. This could be a retention factor for exempt staff and faculty. Essentially it is a pay cut as it would reduce their take home pay.

Great employees will leave UNC and look elsewhere.

Health insurance is one of main the reasons I stay at UNC (& retirement & tuition waiver). \$1152 is 60% of my monthly take-home pay. So that would be asking me to live on 11.4 paychecks a year instead of 12. I am salaried at almost \$40K. I am a professional. I have a degree from CSU. Almost \$1000 is taken out of my check for insurance and retirement, and that goes up every year; my check to live on is \$2000 ONCE A MONTH. I have a child. I can barely make it as it is. I live paycheck to paycheck. We don't even get a yearly 3% raise to help off-set COL which is insulting.

An apartment is \$1500++. Could you live off of \$500/month with a child? And take away \$100 of that?! So, \$400/month? The answer is NO. And don't compare us to CSU where employees are paid a lot more AND get raises. Sliding scale. i.e. <\$50K - no change. \$1152 isn't as a big deal to someone who brings home six figures as it is for someone like me. I love my job and UNC, but I can't really afford to work here anymore.

Higher impact on lower paid employees. Tiered to salary? Strong benefits create important incentive to recruit and retain faculty members that is important to student success. Do not change UNC contributions.

I already pay too much for how much I am paid. After ten years my take home pay has not changed. This is because despite getting P & T the increase in my contributions has outpaced my pay increases. Meanwhile my costs insurance has doubled on everything else, taxes doubled, auto home insurance doubled, electric same. How am I supposed to pay my bills? Here is something I don't think your brain trust has considered. All of us have an easy exit from here if we own our homes and been here 7+ years. Lots of home equity. You are making very easy for me to leave, but somehow I think that is our plan, attrition.

I disagree with the PLC's recommendation to pursue this option, as I believe it would significantly affect faculty recruitment and retention. When I moved to UNC from a very similar university, one of the primary drawbacks to actually accepting UNC's offer was that the health insurance costs for employees were already substantially higher (and salaries lower) than at my previous, otherwise similar (on paper) university.

I think this is a horrible option for faculty and staff retention. Increasing health care, especially for employees and faculty on low salaries only compresses the salary itself. I've spoken to multiple junior faculty that can barely pay rent, own their own home, or live without roommates let alone if their healthcare is increased.

I think we need to remain comparable if not better than our neighbors at CSU. If not, this might be someone that would cause staff/faculty to leave.

I understand why the PLC provided comparisons to CU and CSU but I would like to stress that the difference is our lower pay and the fact that we haven't received raises in several years. This should be considered a pay cut for employees. Our benefits were one reason I chose UNC. This will negatively impact our ability to recruit new faculty and will greatly impact current employees. Please also note that co-pays have increased over the last few years which has been difficult for my family.

If you do this, I will have no choice but to either leave, or frankly, I will not work as hard as I do now. The health care plan and the ORP are the only benefits that really matter here and if they are changed/reduced, it will be a paycut. I already make 15% less than my peers. A healthy retirement and the ability to get sick help mitigate the low pay here.

If you want to retain employees, you will need to have competitive benefits.

In the ten years that I have worked at UNC I can count on three fingers the number of times I have received a raise that was equal to or greater than the rising cost of living in Northern Colorado. One of those times was tenure and promotion. In other words, I have sustained a functional pay decrease for seven of the past ten years in order to

keep working here. Option three and option four would essentially be yet another, larger, functional pay decrease. I understand the necessity of cuts but the reality is, as much as I love my job, my students, and my peers at a certain point I am going to be literally unable to afford to live in Northern Colorado and continue working here. These two options would mean I have to start seriously looking for other employment. I fear I'm not the only one and continued pay cuts for faculty would result in a serious talent drain and an inability to recruit qualified replacements.

Increasing the cost of employee health plans is going to make UNC even less financially attractive as an employer than it already is. Our already low salaries make recruiting new faculty and staff difficult. Reducing benefits is just going to add another reason for current and potential employees to seek employment elsewhere. Some people won't be able to "afford" to work here.

Leave benefits alone. It is already very, very hard to hire new faculty with our ridiculously low salaries. Our competitors hire assistant profs for more than our associate prof average. Bennies are the only way to even try to persuade people to accept a job here.

No. Faculty underpaid with no raises in years. Do not decrease benefits or faculty will leave

Not a good idea. Why implement cuts when there is no clear vision as to where we are heading. We will lose our better faculty.

not in support of the reduction to employer contribution. Again, I am already under paid for my type of position, doing that would move me even lower, which again will make me look elsewhere

Once again, employees are bearing the brunt of these cuts. If you make cuts here, it better not be much. There aren't that many reasons for people to stay at UNC (it certainly isn't the money). If you keep taking (and much has been taken in my 10 years here), people will leave. Maybe that is what you want?

One of the reasons that people stay at UNC is because we do have very good benefits. Since our pay is so much lower than other institutions, I would be very careful with taking away benefits people have become accustomed to in lieu of higher pay. I suspect that quite a few people would view this as the last straw. I know many of my colleagues, especially the younger and very promising faculty, would head out the door if they lost benefits in addition to have not having had a raise for some time.

Please do not do this. Faculty and staff are already underpaid. The current benefits package is sometimes the only thing that keeps people here.

Reducing employer contribution and increasing employee contribution to health insurance plan does not seem like a great option if they would like to keep employee retention. Also seems to have less incentive to stay on as staff.

Reducing funding to the ORP would definitely result in greater difficulty in recruiting and retaining faculty. Optics would also be bad for this as you can not cut funding for PERA beneficiaries -- this would likely result in negative employee actions, further making UNC look like an unstable place to work and study.

Same comment as above but I am much more strongly against this. Again, given our low salaries and heavy workload, having a relatively generous health and retirement plan option is absolutely essential. Perhaps if all faculty were at parity with peer institutions I could see this being a reasonable option, but I am fairly sure that if these changes were implemented I would move into the private sector. UNC could make the decision to support faculty and staff, who in turn support our students, but instead seems to be penalizing faculty and staff for

budgetary problems not of their making. I am all for finding creative ways of recruiting students and helping them graduate, and would even be open to larger classes or a university-wide differentiated workload. But one size fits all cuts that hurt almost all faculty and staff seems like a poor solution. Also: would these changes also reduce benefits for administrators?

Same comments as on option 3, but I want to emphasize how much of an impact this option will have on my family and other families just like mine. Again, as a faculty member earning well below national averages, adjusting employer contributions to health insurance plans will have a huge impact on me and my family. I support my family on my career at UNC, and an adjustment of only a few hundred dollars a month may mean the difference between us making it and not making it financially each month. This very well could mean that I would have to find employment elsewhere. Again, not because I would want to, but because I could not afford to have that additional amount taken out of my check each month. I love my faculty position here at UNC and want to raise my family here in Greeley.

This is a bad idea and I agree would put UNC at a competitive disadvantage. This is the kind of thing that would push me to start seriously looking elsewhere for employment.

This is a straight up pay cut and I would be hesitant to implement this. It could cause significant retention and recruitment problems in areas where we already struggle. If we deviate much further than comparable or nearby universities, potential employees will go elsewhere.

This is another hit to your already low payment of employees. You will likely lose good employees.

This is effectively a permanent pay cut for all exempt employees. Given that UNC recently publicly worked at increasing compensation to reach "90% of the average salaries at institutions in our identified peer group," we are already admitting that we are below average for compensation. To further reduce take-home pay for health benefits that are already fairly high cost for employees would not position us well to attract and keep exempt employees. Also, as far as cost savings, there may be quite a few employees who leave for their spouse/partner's coverage or Obamacare options at the next open enrollment. This may further impact the rates for those who do need to stay on the exempt health coverage options and be less sustainable than we think.

This is essentially a pay cut for faculty. I don't believe UNC salaries are currently competitive with CSU or CU. This will make it more difficult to attract/retain excellent faculty.

This will lead to consistent turn around in the positions. So if you want to always be training new staff, then take away money from the working class.

This would also have a huge impact on faculty/staff and on the ability to recruit and retain staff.

This would be a major disincentive to potential new hires.

This would greatly impact employee morale, retention, and recruitment during a time when UNC employees are already paid the lowest when compared to sister institutions. Additionally, our overall lifetime earnings and retirement are impacted by consistent pay freezes. The lower salaries and lack of raises are palatable when considering the fringe. How does the university intend to retain and recruit highly qualified staff and faculty - non-competitive salaries in combination with reduced benefits will have a strong negative impact.

When you set a standard precedent for something like retirement contributions it stands out when you talk about taking them away. You're talking about getting rid of most benefits of working at a university. Without those benefits, it really isn't worth working here. Our salaries are far lower than other university's in the area. I'm positive

a lot of dedicated employees will leave because of the lack of benefits. They could go work at another school who isn't taking away these benefits. Pretty soon the whole staff will be 22-25 year-olds who are on their parent's insurance because they are the only ones who can afford to work here.

With our low salaries this is terrible for morale and retention of employees.

You will lose employees over this if implemented

Negative impact on recruitment

Respondents that did not agree with the PLC recommendation stated that they believe it will negatively impact recruitment of future employees.

\$100-\$200 pay cut for many employees is HUGE. Recruiting concern. Compare insurance rates vs salary. Increased cost of living in Greeley and Front Range. Minimal à NO raises. If this is implemented, there needs to be a salary floor.

A major mistake to make the jobs less attractive as we are having difficulty finding good candidates as it is.

Again this is a huge benefit and to chip away at this, would be detrimental to future employees.

Again, I don't agree with [unidentifiable – renslising?] employees for financial mismanagement of upper admin and the trustees. Hiring staff will get more difficult when job market is so tight.

Health insurance and benefits remain one of our only recruiting tools, our salaries are not competitive for staff and work loads are often significantly more demanding in many areas

I am not in favor of this idea because there is a very human cost to this. This is a pay cut disguised as a change in the health plan. Additionally, UNC does not have the kind of competitive salary needed to attract talented people. Reducing benefits would further undercut this already difficult hurdle.

I could, perhaps, handle a 1% cut to my health insurance contributions, though it would lower my already crap salary. But if you mess with our retirement I, again, will seek employment elsewhere. I also worry you're not considering long-term issues here. How on earth are we going to hire people to this institution with a non-competitive salary, shit benefits, and a high cost of living? Yeah, we may save \$10,000,000 now, but we are setting ourselves up for long-term failure if some of this trash is implemented.

I do not support this - we need those benefits in recruiting new employees once we start hiring again

Recruitment of good faculty would suffer

Reducing salary or benefits has the same impact on my bottom dollar. Comparing benefits to other universities does not take into account our smaller salary range. X some position salaries are only comparable to private sector salaries. This also makes it hard to recruit qualified employees.

This is essentially a reduction in pay. We already are not competitive when it comes to employee wages, we don't need to reduce the benefits of employees further. This will make us less marketable to future employees and will decrease the quality of life for current employees.

This would greatly harm the ability of UNC to be competitive in hiring. We are already substantially below the average salaries of our peer institutions in most areas - benefits are one of the few selling points we have. This

AGAIN would disproportionately harm UNC's lowest paid employees. Why are we expecting our lowest-paid employees to shoulder this burden? Where are the cuts to salaries of our high salary administrators? Where are the administrative layoffs?

Perception that the increase would be a pay-cut

Respondent's that did not agree with the PLC recommendation perceived that employer reduction to current health care plans is a pay cut.

5% is a large pay cut.

again, this is a pay cut -- not strategic and more harmful to some, particularly those that were left out of the Wacker raises.

Again...this reflects a reduction of pay for faculty and staff.

Another pay cut to faculty members that are teaching at a university that already pays ridiculously bad

Any comparison to other organizations needs to be comprehensive. Many salaries at UNC are considerably less than our peers and significantly less than private sector positions. As an example, my position in facilities is transferable to the private sector as well as other institutions. My salary is roughly 25% lower than the same position at CSU and CU and 50% lower than private sector positions in Northern Colorado. Wages in my industry have seen significant growth over the last 5 years and are forecasted to keep going up. I am very aware that under the best circumstances I won't be seeing a raise here for a few years and worst case will take-home less than I already do. The impact of a 5% reduction in benefits would be the same as a two-day furlough every year.

Anything that effectively reduces faculty salaries even more should be avoided. Please keep in mind that the base costs of health plans are the same for all faculty and staff, but faculty in different colleges and staff in different roles have very different salaries, and faculty/staff with the lowest salaries also tend to have the lowest parity averages. Hence, this would also likely hurt our most poorly compensated faculty/staff the most. If costs must come here, I would recommend moving to a model where all faculty are expected to contribute roughly the same percentage of their monthly salary in health care premiums, rather than the same raw amount.

Basically a pay cut, not recommended.

Be very careful not to overreach on this. Remember, this is also the equivalent of a pay cut.

Both of these are, essentially, pay cuts. If we are going to do them, let's call them what they are.

CU and CSU not a good comparison. Many people's take-home has already been decreasing. High growth à increased cost of living in Greeley. This is perceived as a large pay out – not sustainable.

Cutting benefits would cut salary even more.

Do not support. No raises and increased health payments is a SALARY CUT. Salaries are already too low.

For me and my situation I don't have a problem with this. An increase of \$1,200 over the course of a year isn't a big deal - but it is effectively a pay cut. This would have a disproportionate impact on lower earning employees. Maybe have a tiered system?

I am extremely opposed to this, as it is essentially a PAY CUT to employees. Again, as it stands right now I contribute

close to 10% of my pay to medical/dental insurance premiums (and that is just for me and one child) I already removed my husband from my plan because it was too expensive when the family plans changed a few years back. I noticed that the president's council is suggesting to change the insurance contributions to keep within the competitive range - but if that is done you need to look at the entire faculty compensation package as a whole. Our salaries are LOW compared to other programs that may have slightly higher faculty contribution to insurance. Then there are neighboring institutions such as CU Boulder that pay higher salary AND contribute more to health insurance! As for retirement - because we do not contribute to social security OR PERA, my 'retirement' contributions are not 'optional' for me. TIAA CREF is what I will have to fall back on for retirement.

I do not support the health contribution option. You are asking employees to work more, but be paid less, and still no plan for raises in the near future.

I would recommend not reducing employer contributions. This would basically be a pay cut and since we don't even get cost of living raises, a cut in pay would not be fair and would again put the most vulnerable employees at risk.

I'd be okay with optional retirement plans. Not interested in reduced employer contributions. That would be basically a pay cut and I already work more hours than I should for less pay than I should receive.

Insurance cost generally go up every year – we already usually pay more every year. Essentially a decrease in salary. Would hurt families living paycheck to paycheck if health costs go up. As a smaller/financial institution we can't afford to have benefits 10% higher than other institutions. Agree with not reducing retirement.

No different than a pay cut. NOPE.

No, it will make UNC not as competitive and attribute to a pay cut for employees

Okay, but recognize this is a pay cut.

Pay cut for employees. Effect lower paid employees - \$35k vs \$80k. Why not do a variable pay cut à in salary.

Please don't do this. This will essentially be a pay cut on a salary that is significantly lower than that of my peers at other institutions already.

Reducing employer contributions to health care plans and increasing employee contributions is the equivalent of a pay cut for employees.

Results in a pay cut and no raises and will continue to accumulate.

Same as above. This would lead to further pay cuts.

Same comment as Option 3. You're taxing faculty and exempt staff and making UNC less attractive to study at. It's a pay cut especially to families.

This is a pay cut seen through a different lens. It will make us less competitive, especially with most of us are already making the lowest salary in our band.

This is a pay cut.

This is a salary reduction.

This is a substantial pay cut in the face of frozen wages which are already quite low. Also, we are facing the lack of the end-of-year premium holiday and premiums are likely to go up anyway so this seems particularly unfair.

This is in essence a pay cut, so it is hard to see how this moves the university forward in terms of faculty compensation.

This option would result in a pay cut for faculty and staff. Pay is already lower than other institutions in the area. Benefits is one thing that off sets the low pay. Please consider not increasing employee contributions to health insurance.

This seems reasonable, although for all practical purposes it is just a pay cut, and adversely

This would be a pay cut if you do this. If you do, do not increase employee contribution by more than 5 %. That is a significant hit to those with families already. Going beyond 5 %, though it will save the university a fair amount of money, could be crippling to many.

This would hurt. With this and other ideas, it is a pay cut without the Cost of Living increases.

This would make it two years in a row that I would take a "pay cut". I already make less than private sector and benefits are a huge reason I stay.

Understand that 5% is a large pay cut, possibility of premium holiday add'l pay cut, with no planned future compensation. CU and CSU offer pay higher salaries (to compensate for lower healthcare contribution).

Unfortunate as it results in a pay-cut for exempt staff and faculty. Understand it is likely a necessary move though.

Very inequitable compared to peer Colorado institutions. Feels like a pay cut. Saves money – but big impact to morale. Big employee impact for minimal savings.

We are already so lowly paid – this is a serious pay cut. 5% decrease and no premium every day is losing \$2000. We agree, don't touch retirement.

Without a raise in pay, this option is actually a pay cut for anyone on University health plans.

Lose competitive edge over peer universities

Respondent's that did not agree with the PLC recommendation stated that they believe it will harm UNC's competitive edge over peer institutions.

Again, the health insurance and retirement plans are good benefits and since we don't get raises anymore this is an incentive to stay with UNC.

Already reduction in overall compensation. Takes us further away from a competitive salary/benefits range. Comparison with CSU-Pueblo is not particularly relevant due to significant cost of living rates. Base cost of health insurance is the same for all, this has disproportionate impact on lowest paid employees. Do not recommend.

Decreasing employer contributions (without opting for HDHPs) is an acceptable cost saving option if reduced by 5%. More than that, it becomes less competitive and in my position, while my family could absorb a reduction between, say 5 and 7% without issue, a 10% reduction would have a significant impact. This would only have a bigger impact on other employees. Retirement plan contributions are currently competitive and should be kept competitive.

I realize in general that healthcare is expensive. However, plans offered to UNC employees are already expensive in my opinion. To pay more as an employee (depending on the increase) seems noncompetitive as mentioned in the PLC recommendations from #3. I know of employees at other organizations that pay less and get better coverage. Is it possible to "shop around" to see what other insurance companies could do?

If drop the 11.5%, does the employee have to cover it? Or can it just not be contributed? How are lower paid employees (living paycheck to paycheck) supposed to afford this?? What is a competitive range? Hard to cut benefits when pay isn't competitive!!! (1-13)

NOPE. I can be comfortable with lower pay than other universities and their employees if it comes with great benefits like we currently offer.

PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE do not implement this option. The amount of premiums we already pay for a family is such a large expense, especially for those employees on the lower end of pay. Increasing even 5% would add almost another \$100 to month premiums for families. Increasing the cost of benefits is taking money out of the pockets of many who are already struggling and aren't being paid a competitive salary. In addition, costs in this area for families is already so high (daycare, particularly) that this option is really a disservice to the faculty and staff at UNC who just say an increase this year.

Salaries are not competitive to other a like Colorado schools or schools in our "range."

Same answer as above, this affects UNC's employees future. Reducing this benefit would greatly impact how competitive our compensation package is. It sets lower paid employees back, hurting any financial stability an employee might try to achieve.

That might make the university be not as competitive as the other larger universities in the this region.

This is not acceptable, especially considering our low salaries compared to our peer institutions.

This would be very painful. Our health insurance premiums are already quite high (at least for adults without children). My husband and I pay about \$560/month. When I started my position here, I compared to premiums paid by faculty at CU and other local schools, and their payments were under \$200/month for a couple. I also worry about retirement savings since we do not have social security and make very low salaries for the area we live in.

UNC wages are lower than other universities and colleges of Colorado. Not comparing oranges to oranges - Lower employer contributions at other institutions are offset by higher wages at other institutions. Good benefit packages is what makes UNC appealing and competitive as an employer in that it offsets lower compared wages. Would significantly affect morale. DO NOT AGREE WITH PLC RECOMMENDATION

What is the actual increase percentage? What is actual impact to salary reduction? Will this be offset by a cost of living raise?

Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Respondent's stated that a tiered system based off of salary or a lower employee reduction than 5% is more feasible of an option.

A slight adjustment may be necessary here for cost savings, but comparisons to other institutions and what they do for their employees would be essential to make sure we remain competitive in the market.

A small increase in the cost of health care is reasonable and affects all employees. Consider not imposing this increased cost on to the lowest paid employees, if legal to do so.

agree with PLC; urge PLC and HR to consider reducing the percentage - if more than 1% over a period of X years (adjust to percent reduction) to allow employees to slowly take on the higher percentage and not take a large reduction in income all at once

allow to reduce retirement contribution and have contribution matrix based on income and age and increase health insurance contribution. I support reasonable decreases in UNC contribution as a way to save \$. The current structure is unsustainable.

As long as the reduction is not too severe, this seems like a relatively painless way to capture funds over the long haul. I would suggest, if it can be managed, that such a step be scaled by income ranges, especially as regards the health premiums. A \$100 per month increase to some faculty and staff would have little impact, but for some of our lower-paid staff in particular, that amount could be a significant hit.

Consider a proportion schedule: <50k – keep that same %, 50-100k – increase by 2.5%, >100k – increased by 5%.

effects faculty and staff with families. Perhaps a more equitable and transparent solutions would be to just reduce everyone's pay by 1%.

Have you considered differentiating this for different salary levels? Less of an employer contributions for those making 75,000 and then 100,000, etc.?

Health insurance – reduce to 50% FY20 60% Fy21 55% FY 22 50%

How about leaving us a little bit of a benefit to working for UNC and the State of Colorado? We shouldn't have to bear the burden of UNC's cost savings when the administration over the past 20 years has led us to this point. How about lowering the compensation of Assistant VPs, VPs, Provost and the President? They are making the most money of anyone at UNC and would be able to bear the cutbacks more easily than those living paycheck to paycheck.

I am ok with shifting more of the health insurance burden to faculty as long as we keep a good plan like we have now. I do not think those of us with single coverage should have to share some of the burden for the cost of family plans. I should not be penalized because others made different life choices than I did.

I believe you will do this but there should be some tiering based on time served in retirement contributions.

I think it depends on the employee's circumstances - are they married with dependents, how much is their salary? Perhaps a ratio of % of salary could be a determinant for what the employee pays...those making less have a higher contribution from employee; those making more have a lower contribution from employer... also consider factors such as family/number of dependents.

I think maybe reducing in both these areas as they are huge cost savings and a lot of companies are doing it. Huge hit to the employee though. You could do an employee match or do a 1% decrease in UNC contribution and let the employee choose how much to contribute or have them increase the .5% if they choose

I understand this may be the best way forward. My plea is to consider making health care premiums a portion of a faculty member or administrator's salary. If an Associate Professor in the Business School is already paid twice what I am for doing the same job, I believe he or she should not bristle at paying more for insurance. In my mind, this is sharing the load and acknowledging that a \$1500 increase is less painful if you make \$125,000 a year than if you make \$58,000 or less. Reducing the retirement match seems reasonable, though again an increase in insurance premiums without any chance of a raise in the near future is a pay cut. The retirement match is in the same ballpark for me. So, dropping it to, say, 9.5% seems more appropriate than a severe cut.

I would like the institution to consider developing an approach to its healthcare subsidy that is based on a fixed percentage of base salary. The math is not too difficult. For example, UNC's contribution could be 6% of base salary (with more data the actual number could be derived).

I would like to know the suggested % amount of increase for the health insurance. I understand we need to make personnel cuts and I would prefer to see these cuts made in fringe benefits rather than pay cuts or layoffs. I would also suggest that instead of a one-time huge leap that you take an extra year to tier the increase (perhaps 2.5% and 2.5% the next year) to give people some time to adjust personal budgets a little better.

If phased appropriately, and perhaps tiered based on salary/wage (more for those with higher salaries), reducing contribution to health insurance could be a real way to save some money.

If there is going to be a move on health insurance, it needs to be done slowly so that people who are not getting raises can handle the pay cut. ORP should not be touched.

If this must be done, then it should be done in a tiered system. Those who make less should not have as much of a reduction as those who pay more. One hundred dollars a month may have a very significant impact on some while much less on others.

If this were to take place (the health insurance) I think we need other options presented to us for insurance. We already pay a great deal for insurance, and taking MORE money out of our paycheck just feels really unfair when we don't have a GOOD alternate option. For those of us who are healthy, and visit the doctor once, maybe twice a year, it would be nice to have an option that was beneficial to us. I pay (just my portion) of insurance is close to \$8000 per year, for 3 or 4 doctor visits between my husband and I? It's already expensive, so other options would be much more welcome than just jacking up the price on what's already an expensive (although, I realize, good) insurance.

Maybe give tiered option. Previous employers I have worked for offer the ability for individuals to choose what savings plan best works for them. Some don't match contributions until the employee puts in at least 5%. Employees have the option to select the percentage they contribute and that in turn triggers the employers "match" for each tier available. For example: 0-5% employee contribution = no match by UNC, 5-10% employee contribution = 50% match by UNC, 10% - 15% contribution by employee = 100% match by UNC.

Needs to include a salary minimum to help the lower paid staff.

ORP – how about 1% rather than 5%.

ORP – reduce to 10% FY 20 11! FY21 10.5% FY22 10%

Pro rated schedule 50k -100k – 100 .5% decrease.

The health insurance is really important for a lot of people so it could be reduced by doing salary based. If they have a high salary, the employer would contribute less to a health benefit plan etc.

This most significantly impacts faculty. Use a tiered system where all individuals with a base salary over 100K would have a significant percent deduction (e.g., 5%). Institutional comparisons (e.g., CSU & CU) are not appropriate because salary comparisons are not aligned.

UNC should reduce the contribution to the optional retirement plan as it would have a lower impact on the immediate incomes of people who live paycheck to paycheck due to low wages.

Under HMO single, my budget is already extremely tight with cost of living as a single person so an increase in 420/year more for the premium I would affect my monthly budget. This option seems understandable for UNC, but please consider altering 2% not a full 5%.

Use a tiered system. Don't reduce contribution for lower paid employees.

We believe that increasing employee contributions to health insurance plans is likely to have a significant financial impact on many employees. We agree with the recommendation to not reduce employer contributions to optional retirement plans. If this is the only option available to balance the budget, please continue to engage faculty and staff in the investigation of the options that are available and may or may not yet have been identified between now and the time when this would be implemented.

While painful, this is less of an impact than option #3, so long as it's only 5% difference, not more. Again – it's more equitable to just cut salaries by 1% across the board.

Yes, this makes sense, but look at reduction scale based on salary.

Option 5-Tuition Waiver

Our analysis of the comments found that 47 agreed with PLC that UNC should continue all waivers for current users through a specified time period and reduce undergraduate waivers for dependent children to 50%. 216 disagreed with that and 112 had mixed responses such as agreeing with contingencies.

Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Negative influence on morale
- Grandfather in current students
- Negative for retention/recruitment
- Marginal savings
- Mobility for employees
- Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Negative influence on morale

Respondents that disagreed with the PLC recommendation for the tuition waiver believe that it will be harmful to employee morale.

Few faculty with children live in a radius close enough to the school to qualify to have their dependents live at home. Dependents that do attend UNC and live on campus contribute to fees and room and board costs. Families with college dependents outside of Greeley will likely opt options such as community college, or schools like metro. The savings is minimal, but the impact on morale would be huge. This will hit our most vulnerable of faculty and staff - our lower earning employees, and often single parent employees who count on this to provide an education for their children.

Believe it goes against university mission. Costs far out-weigh short-term savings. Bad for morale. Tuition benefits off-set the lower UNC salaries.

By removing this you will lose a lot more than you save. You will lose UNC employee children who are raised to love UNC and have such amazing school spirit when they finally attend, you will decrease the learning UNC employees gain from taking classes, and you will greatly decrease morale.

Decrease of tuition, small savings with a huge decrease in morale. Many classified staff rely on these benefits. Dependents may pay room and board (possible decrease in revenue). Proposal- prorated benefits based on salary <50,000 keep at 100% 50-100,000 75% benefit >100,000 50% benefit.

DO NOT ALTER TUITION WAIVER. People relying on this. Change # years before benefit kick in (tiered to Salary?). If employee does not use- give to kids. Children will not necessarily come to UNC without waiver- cost savings likely lower. Use UNC peers to evaluate cost savings, not CSU and CU (they make a lot more!) Morale impacted. Important for employee professional development.

Eliminating waivers for employees is unlikely to increase revenue. Those who currently take courses are unlikely to continue if they have to pay. The calculation of 50% drop of employee/dependent enrollment would save \$80k is microscopic relative to the overall budget. Is it worth the hit to morale and reputation?

For what it's worth, it seems to me that this is one area with the least potential for savings, but with the greatest leverage for UNC leadership to make clear that they heard from members of the community and made adjustments as a result. I think it could go a long way to increase morale if that was taken off the table in the midst of other cost-saving measures that will be implemented.

I feel this is the most important benefit we as employees get. We get very few benefits and as an exempt employee,

our paychecks have decreased in the last 4 years with not even a cost of living consideration, making it impossible to fund one's own education. It would be very discouraging if the university does not recognize the importance of learning and how this one employee perk can improve the life of employees who make this university what it is. Employees need to feel valued and appreciated and I don't feel the cost savings associated with cutting this benefit outweighs the benefits that allow employees to: Develop valuable skills; help their professional development and knowledge; gives employees an opportunity to engage in the community, socialize, gives them the feeling that they are a part of something and gives them a sense of dignity; facilitate active citizenship, benefiting society; adult learners benefit and enhance the learning process for other students through their different backgrounds, life experiences, and different learning motivations; being in a classroom gives employees valuable insight into what other students on campus are experiencing and they develop empathy and understanding which can benefit students they work with in their jobs; broadens employee horizons, rekindles imagination and creativity, and creates openness; learning allows employees to reach our full potential. If cuts to tuition waivers must be made, I argue they should be made for dependents. Dependents have the opportunity to receive grants and scholarships that employees do not have access to for various reasons. I disagree with the recommendation that undergraduate waivers for employees should be eliminated. I have had conversations with many different staff members and morale at UNC is low. Cutting the employee tuition grant will not help, but will further alienate those employees who feel this benefit is crucial for their success.

I have worked in higher education for over 20 years with almost nine of those at UNC. Additionally, my husband and I are UNC Alumni. As a staff with 2 children closing in on college attendance, my employment at UNC has been our family's "college savings plan" since my employment almost 9 years ago. Alteration of the dependent tuition waiver will mean us considering the many other collegiate options available. The financial aid packages presented to them will undoubtedly be the main deciding factor, like it will be for many UNC employees. That's my personal story, but there is more! What a loss for UNC and the community to lose bright local high-school graduates (of UNC employees) to other institutions. This non-expenditure is an investment in: the local community, the hard working UNC faculty/staff (many of us who could work elsewhere for higher wages), and the overall morale of the UNC community.

I hope current employees would be grandfathered in under the dependent tuition waiver reduction to 50%. I had 3 offers to decide among when I moved to UNC, and the free tuition for my son was pushed as a tangible benefit that would make up for the significantly lower salary range. We stopped contributing to the college fund because of this benefit. While not explicitly stated in my offer letter, it does state, "This position includes a salary of \$X.XX and applicable benefits." One of those "applicable benefits" was free tuition for my kid. I now have a high school aged child who is planning to attend UNC, but not for 3 more years. If I have to make up several years of contributions in only 3 years, it will have impact on whether I choose to do that on my lower salary here or if I leave so I can contribute at a faster rate? What a morale booster! Our primary product is an Undergraduate degree and so should be protected, at least for those to whom it was promised.

I think this should be one of the last resorts to mess with. I think the cost to moral, staff retention and recruitment will be too great.

I'm not sure we are thinking clearly about this one. I agree that few people come here for the tuition waiver, but my sense is that the waiver occasionally convinces a faculty member and his/her dependent children to choose UNC over some other institution, which means it is only a net gain for us financially (we get fees, room and board, etc that would otherwise go to another institution). Meanwhile, it's huge for morale. And perhaps most importantly, it's in keeping with our self-understanding as an institution that serves a large number of low SES, first generation students. The tuition waiver makes college possible for staff. That is who we are and jeopardizing that does not seem worth a possible, small financial gain.

Kills moral and little savings. Use a tiered system. 50% = free. 75k = 10%. 100k = 50%.

Please do not change this. I predict that if you announce that this is off the table for cost-savings cuts, you would be applauded across campus and morale will actually rise. People are holding their breath on this one. Amidst these difficult decisions, please consider the impact that this has for all of us who took lower paying jobs in a high housing market because we counted on this benefit. This will impact those who earn mid-range salaries the most. We don't qualify for Pell and we don't earn enough to pay out-of-pocket for our children's tuition. I have high school aged children who have been counting on this. I dread telling them that it's not available. Please apply this to incoming employees only so they know in advance. Will this really raise revenue? My children will go elsewhere based on scholarships and other incentives. This also targets specific people for pay cuts, rather than impacting everyone equally.

Please do not do this! I came here and accepted lower pay because of this benefit. If we are paid more, or could be considered, UNC will lose housing income, scholarship (Weld County) and more because my kids will be offered scholarships and more because my kids will be offered scholarships and go to other institutions, this will impact morale. NO ONE wants this change.

Saves little money and guarantees a lot of ill will, especially among staff. Also makes recruiting faculty/staff more difficult.

The overall cost savings is minimal and would significantly decrease moral among employees.

Think this would have an effect on staff morale.

This also seems like a drop in the bucket and will SIGNIFICANTLY affect faculty/staff goodwill. I'm curious to know how this was calculated. Do we really lose money on it? If those dependents are filling up classes that has the space then this costs us very little but is viewed as a very desirable perk. Do some dependents pay for housing or meal plans? Were those revenues calculated into the overall costs of the program?

This decision lacks foresight and real numbers. Why would faculty and staff stay at UNC with our low pay without this benefit for themselves and their families? The comparisons to CU and CSU miss all the differences in the ways those institutions compensate their employees- so UNC would likely lose a ton of staff and faculty. This is bad for morale. A staff/faculty dependent is a benefit to the university and even at the 50% rate you would lose many students who would get financial offers or a more prestigious offer elsewhere. You lose "butts in seats" that are otherwise empty, you lose housing revenue, you lose parking passes, bookstore fees, and all other additional income brought in by dependents. This seems antithetical to our mission and education culture and overly punitive right to the heart of what makes UNC.

This is by far one of the worst things UNC could do to its employees, particularly for the minimal savings and the very high cost to moral, employee retention, and employee hiring. The other institutions listed that provide 50%, also provide a much higher salary. We use the tuition waiver to higher good people as it offsets the low salary that can be offered. Employees are often on the long term plan to use the tuition waiver, particularly for dependents. Many have dependents that are not even teenagers yet and plan to stay at UNC for the benefit. If the benefit is the same as other institutions, they will leave for the better salary. Just the thought of this possibly happening has damaged moral across the institution and if it does happen, will destroy what little moral is left. Please reconsider this option as the cost is far, far too high for the institution.

This should not be done. Many individuals have planned for this as part of their benefits and as compensation for lower salaries. It will have a significant impact on morale for only a little cost saving. The cost saving assumes that dependents will still attend UNC and in my case, I would suggest my children go elsewhere if the university chooses to do this. For those of us who have been here many years and have children reaching college age, this is unethical

and goes against what we were promised.

This would be a very large dissatisfier for me and I feel it would be EXTREMELY bad for faculty morale. Colorado is an extremely expensive state to live in. I have been teaching at UNC for 3 years and have never received a raise, nor will I be getting one next year. In addition, we are already being paid quite a bit lower than CUPA and the Faculty Compensation plan that was approved to improve salary equity has been put on hold for the past 3 years. I am a single parent and have 4 children. I make only \$1500 over the federal criteria for the free lunch program. As a PhD prepared professional this is incredibly disappointing to me. One of the main benefits that both drew me to UNC and has kept me here is the dependent tuition waiver. Furthermore, it would make recruitment of high quality, new faculty even more challenging. It is significant enough of a benefit to me that if the tuition waiver is modified, I will probably begin to seek other job options. Please don't change the waiver!

What is UNC's mission, if not to support their bears, student AND staff? We speak about a bear family but how can we leave those family members high and dry and not offer them the chance to educate themselves, to better themselves, for the betterment of the entire community? And if this benefit is taken away from employees, what's stopping me from applying to work for another university, literally any other Colorado university, who will understand the value of an education and offer me the chance to better myself? One of the reasons I work at UNC is because I had the opportunity to pursue a master's while I gave back to the institution I love. I bleed blue and gold but with this on the chopping block I am at other options to gain a higher education and it breaks my heart. Taking this benefit away from your employees and their dependents would only say to us how little you value our growth as people and the time and effort we put into this institution to make it the special place it is.

Grandfather in current students

Respondents that did not agree or were unsure of the PLC recommendation for the tuition waiver made comments urging for current employees and dependents to be grandfathered into the current tuition waiver policy.

I hope current employees would be grandfathered in under the dependent tuition waiver reduction to 50%. I had 3 offers to decide among when I moved to UNC, and the free tuition for my son was pushed as a tangible benefit that would make up for the significantly lower salary range. We stopped contributing to the college fund because of this benefit. While not explicitly stated in my offer letter, it does state, "This position includes a salary of \$X.XX and applicable benefits." One of those "applicable benefits" was free tuition for my kid. I now have a high school aged child who is planning to attend UNC, but not for 3 more years. If I have to make up several years of contributions in only 3 years, it will have impact on whether I choose to do that on my lower salary here or if I leave so I can contribute at a faster rate? What a morale booster! Our primary product is an Undergraduate degree and so should be protected, at least for those to whom it was promised.

"Absolutely not for families who are already working with this. Please grandfather current students. I would not have come to work here without this.

"Grandfather in all faculty/dependents/spouses currently utilizing this benefit through the durations of their programs (for those enrolled in degree/certificate programs). Many may have chosen to work at UNC for lower wages knowing this benefit was also an option. Cutting the benefit would potentially cause students to disenroll/transfer and then would take away revenue from other areas such as fees/room/board etc.

"This makes sense but I suggest grandfathering in people based upon years of service. For instance if an employee has been here 10 years they keep 100%, 5 years 75%. I say this because a number of folks have made career choices based upon this single item. They chose very low salary knowing they would access this benefit for children.

Again, UNC doesn't pay very well to begin with, but the benefits are (were?) attractive. Many people work here for

less money because of the benefits - health, retirement, tuition waiver. So you're not going to give us what we deserve NOR yearly raises AND you're decreasing benefits? If an employee wants to further their education AT YOUR INSTITUTION of higher education, UNC should ENCOURAGE that, not make it less attractive or prohibitive. People stay at UNC for the dependent waiver. At least grandfather that in.

agree with PLC; if there is a grandfathering effect of some sort to allow dependent children at BOTH the UG and G level to continue OR opt into programs based on the length of time an employee has been at UNC, with the dependent child having no less than 4-years to complete a program

Amend to continue to cover current employees at current policies (Grandfather in). Then for new employees to make changes.

At the least, current employees should be "grandfathered" in to existing waiver program.

Consideration needs to be given to those employees who were hired with this benefit. Anyone who is currently utilizing this benefit should be "grandfathered" in. For new hires, other options should be considered if a reduction in this benefit is necessary. It is an important recruiting tool for new faculty and staff. In addition, has the data been gathered to determine how many faculty and staff are receiving the dependent tuition waiver, but are paying for room and board, meal plans, etc., for their dependents attending UNC?

Could be make or break for faculty/staff with multiple dependents. Has to be grandfathered in. Wouldn't be the first time in history employees have been without this benefit. Eliminates a channel for employee professional development. How would this affect overall enrollment? Would they go somewhere else? If this decision is made, it needs to happen NOW so people can plan.

Existing employees with waiver should grandfather in (hired with expectation should be honored). Benefit for low salary (HUGE ISSUE). Faculty/staff retention. Trickle-down effect decrease revenue for campus housing and student engagement.

for those of us that have been here for over 15 years and have planned on using the dependant benefit the next few years. I am hoping that there will be a phase implementation of the reduction of this Benefit or a grandfather clause. We have stuck with this University through many years of no raises, and very low raises counting on this benefit to help cover the cost of college for your kids

For those with dependents, they should receive 50% tuition assistance which compares to CU and CSU. The tuition grant should be grandfathered in; current employees should still get this benefit, but new employees should not be offered dependent or spouse tuition waivers."

Grandfather in for current employees. Assets to UNC and community!

I also think that if the waiver is changed, employees who have dependent children who are not old enough to attend college yet, who have multiple years of service need to be grandfathered in as they have likely not been saving the necessary amount of money for their children, assuming they will go to UNC nearly cost free."

I am not in favor of this option. When I accepted my 1st FT position, I was excited for the opportunity to continue my education. After 2 years of working FT, I decided to pursue a PhD for many reasons. As a Student Affairs professional, I recognize the importance of maintaining a knowledge-base of student development & grow in my understanding of emerging issues in HESA & students as a whole. Secondly, I knew I would also be investing in my future as a SA professional & administrator. I am in my 3rd year as a PhD student, & am proud of UNC for supporting me in my personal/professional goals. The waiver allows me to pursue my goals while also being able to pay my

bills. Should the tuition waiver be taken away, I wouldn't be able to continue my degree. Loans are not the answer for me. I believe not only should currently enrolled students continue to obtain the waiver, current employees should also. If you take the waiver, I understand if incoming employees don't receive the waiver.

I really don't see what cost savings this will create. Those courses are already being taught. Also, this was an incentive for employment here when I was hired. Are you going to grandfather this in? I would really like to see numbers on what this would save.

I support the recommendation to modify the tuition waiver, as long as current employees are grandfathered in to the current tuition waiver for a certain number of years. When comparing our tuition waiver program with CSU and CU, it is important to also compare faculty and staff salaries at CSU and CU which in many cases are substantially higher for positions with similar responsibilities. The risk to modifying the tuition waiver is the unknown impact of decreased enrollment and/or revenue, due to students who would live at home versus on campus and/or take classes at Aims instead of UNC if the tuition waiver did not exist.

I would support it only if the current dependents are allowed to finish their degrees with the waivers.

If leadership makes the decision to reduce or eliminate this part of our overall compensation package, we think this new policy should be applied to new employees only, keeping the benefit for those who are already here. (Similar to options to join PERA that was changed solely for incoming employees.)

If you do make this change, please consider making this change for new employees, not existing employees. Some of us have worked years knowing this was a benefit we could tap into in the future. Not fair to make changes to us at this point!

Ok if people are grandfathered in. Current employees may be tolerating this low pay because of the benefit. Do these people taking free classes really take seats from paying students?

Only for future employees"

Please consider taking an approach that would honor the commitment to the tuition waiver as is currently for employees who were hired with this benefit. New employees would be offered the 50% rate suggested. This is a benefit that many faculty and staff count on currently and hope to count on when their children grow. There will be lost revenue in housing etc. if this is put into place.

Probably okay if you allow those in school to complete their degree's but don't allow any new students in this program.

Questioning what ideas are out there for continuing current waivers for a specified amount of time, can the current ones be grandfathered in or can they be tapered down, so 100% to 75% to 50% instead of just cutting off immediately."

Re-avive a FAFSA. Restrictions of tuition waiver (duration, # of family waivers, etc.) Betrayal of promise made to current employees upon offer-letter. All existing employees- dependents should be grandfathered in. I stopped contributing to my child's college savings knowing we had this benefit. Now I have only 3 years to make this up. Leave waivers for staff.

This continues to be an option with small payout in a short term. Should grandfather to the present employees and begin with the most recent hire to phase out over 18 years. Start with Grad programs to see net value first. Leave Undergrad alone as long as possible.

This is a hot button topic. Perhaps grandfather folks in who have been here 10+ years; or have it tiered by salary: e.g., less than \$50K = 100% tuition waiver

This is a slap in the face to your employees who have been working with you, at low comparative employment wages, with the plan of sending students to you. This feels underhanded and dishonest. You can stop offering it to new and future employees, however, it is not okay to take what you have already contracted with current employees.

this is good depending on how much grandfathering we are giving to old employees.

This seems like a move that would have a high impact on only a few people for not much cost savings. Therefore, it probably isn't worth it. If implemented, it should only be for new hires, in case someone is depending on it.

Tiered system, eg. <\$50k salary- 100% waiver 50k-100k- 50% >100k- 0%. Grandfather all current employees- give them what was promised. Potential hit in recruitment- faculty and young professionals.

Negative for retention/recruitment

Respondents who did not agree with the PLC recommendation on the tuition waiver made comments that it would hurt retention of faculty and the recruitment of new faculty as well as hurt the retention and recruitment of employee dependents as potential UNC students.

"Because salaries are so low, it was not an easy decision to take this job at UNC, but knowing that I would have a great benefits package and the opportunity to send my kids to school tuition-free sealed the deal. Losing part of the tuition benefit and seeing a substantial pay cut from benefit contributions will make it very difficult to justify working at such a discounted salary. There are such negligible cost savings to the university to eliminate a life-changing benefit for our lowest earning employees. I was told by a PLC member that some programs on campus have a disproportionately high number of students on the waiver, to the point that without the waiver the program could either be cut or would become profitable. To this, I would recommend reducing or eliminating the waiver for that specific program.

"I came to UNC because of the dependent tuition waiver and may have to leave if this is implemented.

"I can see eliminating or greatly reducing graduate tuition waivers. There is a lot of competition for grad school spots in many areas of study. All of those spots should probably go to paying students. If you do that, though, you absolutely shouldn't make ANY cuts to undergraduate waivers. Again, there aren't that many benefits to staying at UNC BEYOND THIS ONE. If you cut this, my job search will begin. I have 3 kids and that is one of the main reasons I have not pursued other opportunities that I have had. I certainly don't stay for the pay, bonuses and raises.

"Personal reasons this is a terrible idea: People like me are here at entry level positions at lower pay than they'd take elsewhere because of the opportunity to work on a degree while getting experience. Ideally, I'd pursue a masters while I'm here and work in different areas over the next 20 years until I retire. There isn't much to keep me here and loyal to UNC if you were to take away my tuition benefit or the benefit for my children.

"Reducing the undergraduate dependent tuition benefit to 50% would make UNC more uncompetitive when we go to hire faculty and staff. This increases the financial burden on the lower paid, potential employees where we already have a difficult time competing based on salary. This could be looked at as a revenue generator by many of the UNC community.

"Should retain undergraduate waivers for dependent children at current levels and retain graduate waivers for

employees also at current levels. Given that UNC's salaries are already considerably lower than salaries at other institutions, eliminating or reducing these waivers could result in difficulty recruiting and retaining faculty to UNC. Consider eliminating graduate and undergraduate waivers for spouses and domestic partners."

"This institution already has a history of devaluing higher education despite its purpose. We required higher degrees, but don't pay accordingly. We need to support our objective of being an institution of higher learning. Employees should be able to better themselves by taking advantage of our academic units. Perhaps this can be reduced, but should not be eliminated. People who work here are a valuable asset in the recruitment and retention process. If we know just how good the education is, we will be your best supporter.

This is not a good option. You are saying that CU and CSU employees get 30% and 50% tuition waivers for their kids. We don't get paid the same amount as CSU and CU. We are underpaid compared to other schools. If we made the same amount as the other schools then I could understand why, but we don't. I have worked here for over 10 years. When I was hired, this was a huge benefit because of my large family. Had I known this was going to be taken away, I would have gone somewhere else along time ago and would have made more money. And now that my oldest daughter is graduating HS, you are taking away the benefit.

4 years for current users (as many as possible). Transfer benefit to you or dependent (like CU) Enough time to complete degrees in progress. Compared to peers this may impact ability to recruit talent. Are we going to lose classified employees?

ABSOLUTELY NOT. This benefit is a significant recruitment and retention strategy for faculty and staff. Projected savings is NOT VALID....assumption is made folks will send dependent/self to UNC. More than likely, will seek education elsewhere. This is a LOSE/LOSE proposition with NO financial gain.

Adjustment for the graduate tuition should be reviewed, but surely as a whole this does not put too much of a financial impact on the University and is a huge retention piece for faculty and staff.

Also, UNC has a hard time recruiting good employees. If you take away this benefit, you will lose employees and it makes it hard to recruit and be competitive in the workplace because of the pay schedule."

Because of our below parity salaries the only reason a lot of us work here is because we had better benefits than other nearby institutions. If you make our benefit package similar to nearby institutions WITHOUT fixing our salaries most of us will leave. By doing so you will be forced to hire new individuals at higher salaries based on these changes. I'd suggest finding other ways of saving money instead of taking it from our tables in this fashion.

Concern in our group about losing the benefit. Also how does the proposed change impact enrollment generally? Does losing the waiver impact GA/TAs? Concern about losing employees with a reduction in the waiver.

Disadvantageous in recruiting faculty and staff. My wife, for example, is earning her master's at UNC. Her presence boosts enrollment, and benefits District 6, as well. Without this benefit, she might have enrolled elsewhere. Further, this is a benefit in recruiting faculty and staff.

Don't touch it Good recruitment unless you pay new staff more \$

Eliminating or modifying tuition waivers may be a dealbreaker for me. This is one of the only substantial benefits I saw to working at UNC. I will be looking elsewhere for employment if this is eliminated or substantially modified. I cannot imagine it will save the university much money in the overall budget.

Eliminating waivers for staff will have them looking for jobs at CSU and CU. Reducing dependents and eliminating

spouse would be ok, but keep staff waivers. UNC would be at a disadvantage.

Faculty would send their dependents elsewhere and perhaps even follow their children

For dependents - again consider nearby institutions. If CSU/CU offer full tuition waivers and we offer 50%, that's a significant incentive for people to leave.

For faculty who are here, I think this would be problematic. For some, they calculated this benefit into their decision to come here. For example, my colleague took a tremendous pay cut to come, but thought in the long run he could recoup some of those costs with this benefit. The graduate benefit seems reasonable to reduce or cut. Again, we might be able to attract a strong faculty member if we could provide some kind of benefit to a spouse.

How does this effect the grad school enrollment? Competitive disadvantage for recruitment of staff. As someone looking to pursue a master's degree, who is currently employed and already received a bachelor's degree from UNC, unless my master's degree is even reduced, cost-wise, it wouldn't make sense for me to stay. More likely to move to another university that offers competitive tuition waivers. 50% tuition waiver for graduate programs? At least!!!

However, again, in combination with low salaries, this will impact the retention and recruitment of highly qualified faculty and staff.

I absolutely do not agree with this option or the PLCs recommendation to implement it. As faculty members earning well below the national average, it is obvious that we are not here for the money. Most of us are here because we love teaching, research, and the UNC community. Employee and dependent tuition waivers is one of the perks that makes surviving on such a small salary worthwhile. As a faculty member raising my family in Greeley as part of the UNC community, my family and I have been counting on this as a viable option to put our kids through college. If this were reduced, even to 50%, it would make a huge difference on whether I would seek employment elsewhere, or if I were to stay, send my children here. Simply put, if we have to pay tuition either way, then another college is just as viable an option as UNC. So, in the end this may not be a viable revenue generating idea for UNC. Please do not implement this option.

I am completely against eliminating graduate waiver. UNC benefits from having well-educated, grad educated staff. Staff commit to UNC during their program and stay here. This essentially closes some grad programs. Employees won't pay for a grad degree here – They'll work somewhere else or not pursue this type of proposal and development.

I am in support of reducing, but not eliminating tuition benefits--I think it would be impossible to recruit many faculty and staff here if they were not receiving some sort of tuition support. Also, I think it would be much more equitable if it were the same benefits that could be used by the employee themselves, or their dependents. Because currently, people who have dependents using this benefit for their undergraduate degrees are getting compensated more than someone without dependents. Would it be possible to do 12 credits undergraduate or 6 credits graduate for the employee or dependents? (Not sure what breakdown would be appropriate, but

I am writing in concern to the tuition waiver and the reason why is It is a great recruiting tool. I'm sure you're aware the HVAC, Plumbing and electrical employees are hard to come by especially at the lower wages that we offer. I hired one of my best employees 3 years ago and he was interviewing at CSU at the same time but I convinced him to come to UNC because he has 2 young boys and he wanted the free tuition to educate his boys. Now he is re-thinking his decision. I have another HVAC tech, again one of the best, his son is starting in the fall. Trust me these guys could get into CSU easily because they can't find good techs either. If we offer the same benefits as CSU I have absolutely no bargaining tool. It was so bad in the last year I had to replace two Pipe Trades II positions for Pipe Trades I positions and now we are shorthanded because we are in training mode.

I believe you will lose faculty and staff if implemented. This is really an investment in faculty and staff. Allowing employees to continuing their education is a benefit and not taken lightly. Considering keeping 100 undergraduate waivers for dependent children, eliminate graduate waivers for dependents but keep for employees of UNC, keep undergraduate waivers for employees but eliminate undergraduate waivers for spouses and domestic partners. This would be a compromise.

I do not like this idea. My daughter is in college here at UNC. One of the main reasons I have stayed at UNC the last 10 years is for the tuition waiver. Granted I love working here, but the jobs do not pay much. I would have gone to CSU for a job because there are more opportunities to advance. They offer 50% dependent tuition. If UNC goes to 50% dependent tuition -- what is the draw? Professors and staff are already paid at the lower end of the pay scale compared to CU or CSU. I hope the dependent tuition is kept the same.

I feel like this would be more of a detriment to the university as it would cause employee retention to fall as well as make it harder for hiring new employees.

I feel the most strongly about this option because I am for sure going to get my master's degree. I just graduated from UNC and am now working for UNC, and the main incentive was the tuition waivers. It would be super difficult for me to continue with my master's if the waiver is taken away and I feel as though I am stuck because I just started here yesterday and already feel like I need to work at a different college in order to have access to a tuition waiver. UNC promotes education, so I feel like taking away this benefit for employees would be going against the goals of UNC. My ultimate goal is to get my master's in higher education and build my career in higher education. PLEASE do not take away the tuition waivers!

I feel the same way about this as the computer refresh idea. I doubt it will really help because then the children of faculty will simply go elsewhere.

I find this unfortunate as this is a real boost for morale, a strong recruitment tool, and does not save significant dollars. I graduated from UNC, am a proud supporter and chose to return to UNC over another employer, partly because of this benefit. My daughter received her BA and MA under this benefit. Because tuition was free, we paid \$10,000 for her to stay in the dorms. If the benefit was only 50%, we would not have done that. She would have had her choice of schools and if she came to UNC, she would have had to stay at home and UNC would not have received that revenue. Comparing us to CU and CSU doesn't justify as they are larger schools, pay more, and would have a larger benefit to cover if they did 100%. As we are trying to find our niche as a university for students, lets make this a niche for employees and keep the full benefit for employees and dependents.

I know there are some employees who continue working here because of this benefit, if it gets cut, they are already considering looking elsewhere."

I think you should at least match what CSU is doing otherwise you might lose employees to them. It's a huge incentive for working here to be able to complete my degree. I agree with the 50% coverage for dependents. I take more than the 9 credit hours a year so the school is already making money off me.

I think you're going to lose a lot of employees if this is implemented.

I understand -- should keep dependent waiver for children as it is a great recruiting/retention tool.

I was hired less than two years ago and the dependent tuition waiver was one of the reasons I accepted a position at UNC (despite receiving offers that included higher salaries from different universities). To be honest, I feel a bit misled that, within two years of being hired, there is a possibility that the dependent tuition waiver will be

eliminated. While I love my job here at UNC, I will strongly consider leaving UNC if this decision is made.

I'll speak from my experience in this option. When I was offered a position at UNC, I was also offered positions at CSU and Metro. Both CSU and Metro, where higher paying, higher level positions, but they only offered tuition waivers to the employee. I had a junior in HS at that time, so when I factored in the tuition waiver, that compensated for the higher pay, granted it was only for the 4 years, but I also considered the student loan's length, interest etc. So I believe this is a good recruitment tool for offsetting the lower salaries at UNC.

I've worked at the University for a number of years. I consider the tuition grant part of my compensation. To take that away just as my children are about to take advantage of that benefit will create a financial hardship for us. Consequently, I may have to look for a higher paying job elsewhere to pay for my children's education.

If we are going to compare UNC to CU and CSU for tuition waiver amounts, it would be best to also consider the average pay scale for job duties too. I took a 20,000 annual pay cut to work for UNC because I was excited to offer my kids 100% tuition coverage while I work here. I have 5 kids. I consider that part of the pay/benefit to working at UNC. If that is taken away, I have to consider looking for work that will cover the cost of tuition. If we compare against CU and CSU, their pay is higher from the start so therefore the comparison is not "apples to apples". If tuition waivers are cut or modified, salaries will need to be reviewed to ensure they are competitive with the market.

If you take away the waiver you are going to lose employees

If you want to retain employees, you will need to have competitive benefits.

In my office, we have 5 employees utilizing this benefit. Two others have stayed on with us even after receiving their degree. I personally would be devastated by this as I have two children, one close to college age, who were planning on going to UNC. It is one of the biggest reasons I have stayed. I would need to leave if this benefit were taken away.

Institutional and Departmental reasons this is a terrible idea: We will never attract good, qualified people to important positions if they are not able to work on degrees or have this benefit for their children. There are too many other opportunities out there that have more to offer. This would severely limit who we are able to attract and hire.

It has been really difficult to keep my teams attitude positive because the State of Colorado hasn't been giving much for raises for the last 18 years, this would be the last straw for some of them.

Leave benefits alone. It is already very, very hard to hire new faculty with our ridiculously low salaries. Our competitors hire assistant profs for more than our associate prof average. Bennies are the only way to even try to persuade people to accept a job here.

Many employees earn their graduate degrees from UNC to remain current and increase their knowledge within their positions. After earning their degree from UNC, their job performance improves, ability to perform tasks associated with their jobs are enhanced and they are more competitive compared to national performance standards. The university will benefit long-term by continuing to invest in their employees rather than spending time and money to recruit new hires nationwide. In addition, several individuals were hired with the understanding that they would be able to earn a graduate degree through the University at minimal cost and this agreement was part of their new employee package.

Many employees took pay cuts when they came to UNC and/or have been willing to work for less money for many years because of this benefit. Taking this benefit away is pulling the rug out from under them and will result in many

employees leaving.

Many of us come here because of this benefit.

Many UNC employees took their jobs based on the waiver system.

NO! This is the number one reason I came here is so that my son can get his education here, as well as myself. This would not be okay and I feel you'll lose a lot of people who feel the same.

No. I don't think that dependents are costing the university that much money as it is, and the waiver is the only way that some students are able to attend school at all. If you do reduce it, it should be on a sliding scale where the employees who make the most have to pay more tuition than the employees who make the least.

Not a good idea. Why implement cuts when there is no clear vision as to where we are heading. We will lose our better faculty.

One of our last recruiting tools when hiring staff. Other benefits have declined over the years and are not always attractive to potential new staff

PLEASE do not cut our employee tuition waiver. Many of us have started programs as a way to continue our education. Many individuals came to this institution because of this benefit. Cutting will hurt our ability to retain faculty/staff. The assumption is that this won't even save money. The only way it would generate money is if employees pay for classes and stay in programs. Employees aren't going to stay in programs and pay tuition when you are already cutting our benefits through insurance or through no cost of living pay raises. This would be DEVASTATING too many of us. Of all the proposed changes this one hurts the most. It feels like UNC doesn't care enough about it's own employees education. If you must cut these programs, a grandfathering process for folks already enrolled needs to be defined. The degree a person is taking should be factored in for how many years the grandfathering gives you. If PhD program at least 5 years. 3 years for masters or undergrad.

Possibly small modifications, but this is a large reason why I chose to both work and attend UNC. If this is eliminated completely, I will look for employment elsewhere.

Rather than keep/cut- look @ incentives-earn waivers: years of service, volunteer/comm work, etc. Tuition is a tool to recruit staff- keep but change incentives.

Recruiting tool- one of the biggest/only we have left. How many students would it impact and academic programs? Can programs have a chance to respond? Sm. (%) savings. Getting rid of tuition assistance and reducing professional development is too many negatives for employees.

recruiting tool, UNC and Greeley are not as sought after as our sister schools in the area, as the cost of living increases and is comparable to the adjacent communities we need competitive benefits, our salaries are not

Recruitment of good faculty would suffer

Some time ago UNC stopped the tuition waiver because they thought they were losing money. The difference is they grandfathered the existing employees children no matter what their age. Anyone new didn't get the waiver, what they discovered was employees kids were not attending UNC like before so they lost out on the C.O.F. ,fees, housing ect.. So they re-instated the program to regain some of this money. I believe that is not a money saver for this reason and I am concerned about our quality of service we might incur by not having this hiring leverage.

The cost of this benefit is difficult to estimate. Many dependents will not attend UNC if this benefit is reduced. This is a big factor in attracting faculty to the institution when salaries are not equivalent.

The savings for this option seem very small. Eliminating all waivers for employees and 50% for undergraduate dependent children will only save \$240K. This doesn't seem to be a worthy amount of savings for the fallout of taking away this benefit. As well as the turnover that will occur and the staff that will move to a different college.

The tuition waiver is one of the benefits to attract employees. Removing this benefit will make our offer less competitive.

This benefit is enormously important to me. As an officer with a bachelor's degree I could make \$14,000 to \$22,000 more a year by working for Lakewood or Arvada. However, I chose UNC because of the work/life balance offered. I wanted to work full time but also pursue graduate studies. UNC allows me, indeed encourages me, to do this. If the tuition benefit was reduced or removed it would eliminate one of my primary reasons for working here. Additionally, the dependent tuition waiver serves as a recruiting tool. It is my opinion that option 5 would hamper recruitment."

This benefit is the reason I took my current position over other positions that require my degree. I would reconsider my employment at UNC if this benefit is revoked.

This implementation would negatively affect current staff at UNC. Many employees may have accepted positions with UNC with the expectation that they or their dependents could utilize the tuition waiver. Additionally, this could negatively affect staff retention at UNC as there is a risk that several employees may seek employment elsewhere that provides more benefits. If the university decided to do this, is this something that could only be implemented for new incoming staff? Additionally, the tuition waiver should remain accessible to all current staff, not just staff that have already been utilizing the waiver. Another option is to match our tuition waiver to CSU or CU versus the proposed option.

This is a cheap recruiting tool to help bring faculty to UNC."

This is a perk of being employed by the University. Could make the University less desirable to current/future fac/staff

This is a recruiting tool for faculty and staff. It helps to compensate for lower wages. Look at doing a tier program and the longer your years of service to UNC the better the benefit.

This is a recruitment tool for staff and faculty.

This is a vital benefit to staff/faculty recruitment/retention. Recommend changes to require remaining at UNC? (for a specific time period). Re-instate waiver for employees at limited credits or percentage of contribution? What happens to recipient agreement with Aims and CSU? Space available waiver program? Limit percentage of employee-students? Sliding tuition scale based on employee salary? Concern with impact of recruiting classified/exempt. Staff/ Require employment for specified period before benefit is available. Keep grad. For employees only.

This is also a deal breaker for me. Earlier this fall, when wages were stagnant and cuts were made to my pay, the only thing that allowed me to decide to stay was the tuition waiver. I've factored this into my long-term financial plans. Without it, I would choose to leave UNC.

This is also a significant benefit for attracting new faculty members. Losing this would make it much more difficult to

attract faculty especially given the lower salaries that are offered.

This is another benefit that is necessary to have in places for all employees it helps us retain important numbers in students and money coming in to the university.

This is our #1 selling point when recruiting employees U.S., the private sector (some as well isn't salary). Many of us feel this is a fundamental compensation.

This measure will significantly impact me – my child will be applying to Colleges in two years and this does not allow me enough time to save for tuition (I have been counting on the tuition waiver for a while). I realize that this is an attempt to put us in line with other local Universities, but faculty salaries there are significantly higher (for my rank, by about \$20K-30K/year) and my salary did not, and still does not allow me to make any meaningful savings for College tuition. Just this one measure may result in me leaving UNCO (and maybe even academia). I expect other faculty/staff may be facing similar predicament, and the cost of replacing us will significantly impact, if not negate, the expected savings. Implementing this measure for new hires may at least set the correct expectations, I strongly think that current faculty have to be either 'grandfathered' in the plan or have a 5-yr waiver to be able to save some funds to meet this unexpected cost.

This tuition waiver is a tremendous recruiting tool. You remove this, with a less competitive wage(s), it will pace UNC at a great disadvantage.

This would have an large effect on recruitment of high quality staff to UNC. UNC currently does not have comparable salary when it comes to other Colorado institutions so to compare the tuition benefits to a place like CSU and call it equitable is unfair. CSU offers higher salaries as well as much larger professional development funding to faculty and staff. If UNC takes this benefit or modifies it, long term your recruitment will suffer. It is originally a reason I decided to come to UNC over other institutions. And will impact my decisions in the future to stay... if we are also looking to impact travel and professional development for cost savings staff/faculty will find universities that will better invest in their future...

Took pay cut to come to UNC – dependent tuition: will lose students, will lose faculty/staff. Taking away investment in faculty and staff.

Tuition waivers are a strong staff recruitment and professional development tool. Consider offering limited competitive waivers for most popular programs among UNC employees; keep graduate waivers for UNC employees and cut dependent waivers to 50%. Current setup is a very expensive and fiscally unsustainable professional development program that university can't afford to continue.

You're going to lose people over this one. Don't touch undergrad for dependents. Maybe I could see rolling back graduate school.

Marginal savings

Respondents that did not agree with or were unsure of the PLC recommendation on the tuition waiver perceive that it will have marginal to no savings.

I don't have any children, nor do I plan to in the future. However, I feel this is the least sensible option listed. In addition to creating a brain drain, which will not be good for this institution, it will result in very little money coming back to the university. The faculty who would take advantage of this type of waiver are unlikely to send their offspring to this university if there is no incentive to do so.

"I strongly disagree with this recommendation. It goes against who UNC is and what we do here. Waivers should be

kept as is. This tremendous benefit has a value to employees far greater than it costs UNC. Marginal cost (add one more student) is negligible but can mean a world of difference to employees/families. Education is one of the best vehicles out of poverty to financial security. Since UNC/State of CO pay well below what employees could make elsewhere, and we are in the business of education, providing tuition waivers is an awesome way to take care of our own and do right by them. Also, many Classified staff have no way to better themselves and must change jobs to earn more; often education is the only way, but they cannot afford it.

"The marginal costs for educating employees and dependents seem relatively small for the harm these recommendations are making. And the figures provided here in terms of cost savings seem suspect and overly optimistic. If these were developed by the consulting firm we are in trouble.

"This offers so little benefit. Two day furloughs have a much lesser impact on employees with a more substantial and certain cost savings.

Also, undergraduate waivers really don't ""cost"" UNC anything. Those undergrad classes are going on anyway and in 1/2 full classrooms. They aren't taking spots from other students. Plus, they still pay fees, books and other expenses to UNC. You might end up losing on this one, all things considered.

DO NOT ELIMINATE!! (and I do not take advantage of this) Again, it may be a minimal cost savings but why does it have to be all or nothing??? Why can't you limit how many tuition waivers are in place? Why can't you have a tiered tuition waiver? If you are improving your skills for a job within UNC then you are waived and have to sign a 2 year contract to stay at UNC after you have your diploma. If the major is for a job that UNC does not offer, then you pay part of your tuition. Etc. Also, this is a huge benefit to employees as we do not earn the wages that our peers from other higher ed.

Doesn't seem to show it as a significant cost savings.

Even if the revenue increases predicted come to pass, the minor increase of \$80K to \$240K in revenue is negligible to the overall budget and, in the long-run might reduce revenue. Scholarships that students receive are typically taken by the institution upfront, even with tuition remission, and that is income to the institution that families might take to other institutions.

First, I don't know of another college in Colorado be it a University or Junior College that doesn't offer some kind tuition assistants to their employees. Most schools offer 6 credit hours for FT employees, I don't think the cost is that substantial or the savings that significant. I also think that employees should have the opportunity to go to undergrad or graduate classes. It is my understanding that the graduate level classes fill up if this is the case then don't allow employees to enroll in classes that are full. Maybe as an incentive for graduate classes UNC could hold a lottery for FT employees. For some employees this is a benefit that is greatly needed. They wouldn't be able to go to school otherwise, so I feel cutting this benefit at least for the classified employees is going against the reason's that UNC was founded.

Hard to see how this will result in any significant savings - again, it is one of few perks for UNC employees.

HELL NO!!! This doesn't contribute greatly enough to the deficit to consider doing. Not to mention its great benefit to employees whom already are paid at a discounted salary when compared to the private sector. You come after this, its gonna be a bad situation.

However, cutting or eliminating the employee tuition waiver (for either undergraduate or graduate credit) would be foolish and unethical. In an organization that demands advanced credentialing even for entry-level employees, eliminating the tuition benefit for staff could be career ending, as well as hypocritical. I cannot afford to self-pay.

Second, this option represents a false cost. The marginal expense for adding another person to the class is negligible and does not represent forfeiture of a full-pay student (are we double-counting?). If a concern, delay registration. Finally, the turnover costs resulting from gutting the last available professional development for staff are not reflected.

I agree in part with the PLC recommendation. I do think we need to reduce dependent waivers. I like the CU model of sharing 9 credits between employee and dependent, which would be near a 50% waiver for undergraduate tuition. I don't agree with the PLC notion that eliminating waivers will increase tuition, especially graduate tuition.

The recommendation projects a revenue increase of ~\$80K with a 50% drop in enrollment...since I don't know what portion of that is graduate enrollment, I would project much steeper drops in graduate enrollment (>90%). I do think there are other ways to increase revenue in this area, such as removing fee waivers for everyone (dependents, GAs, TAs, employees). I would willingly pay \$400 a semester to take a 3 credit course to complete a graduate degree. I would willingly pay \$1,600 a semester for my dependent to complete an undergraduate degree at UNC.

I don't see a big enough payoff to cause this uproar. I have not had a need for this but I know it is a big deal to a lot of the people that work here. I also don't see where is it saving enough to make a big difference.

I don't understand how this is cost savings unless employees/dependents are taking the place of paying students.

Has any analysis been done as to the actual cost? I suppose it might be considered lost revenue, but many people might choose to just send their kids someplace else if they have to pay for tuition at UNC.

I understand that moving forward with this option makes sense. I question whether it will really save money. It seems like more of a shell game.

If necessary. I cannot imagine that the discount being provided to employees is detrimental

LEAVE THIS ALONE. I was here the last time they eliminated the tuition waivers, and elimination was a great big FLOP. NO money was saved, and FEW dollars were realized. Dependents GENERALLY came to UNC ONLY because it was free - once that option went away, so did the butt in the seat. Let's face it, kids who grow up on Greeley want to get out, and if they have to pay to go to school, then they'll go with their school of CHOICE, and UNC, very likely, won't be that choice. The waiver was (and is) also a fantastic recruiting tool BECAUSE our pay for most positions hasn't usually been on par with peer institutions and/or other Colorado HE institutions. If ANYTHING, modify the waiver to cover half tuition for ALL (employee, spouse, kids), but don't expect to win anyone over if you get rid of this benefit.

Minimal savings for a benefit that many staff use to further their own education. I know some people are able to take relatively low-paying staff positions here in exchange for the benefit of more education and the goal of higher paying positions later. I also think the same applies for faculty's spouse/dependents - many of us teach here, making less money, so we have the option to offer this to our kids. There is little actual cost to the University to offer a free class. I don't support change to our current policy.

Not a direct cost or savings. If I have to pay for tuition, UNC is tasked – like for all potential students – with convincing me what the benefit is. I can pay for tuition at a similar rate at other CO institutions. I will also be disgruntled as this benefit- for me, spouse, and dependent- was promised to me. I will take my \$\$\$ elsewhere. It is unclear whether this really costs anything.

Not clear how this saves actual \$s since those seats are unlikely to be filled up tuition – paying students (we're just turning 1,000s of folks away!). Comparisons between CU and CSU are moot = WE'RE PAID DRAMATICALLY LESS!

Spouse could drop to 50%. Costs far outweigh benefits. Will hurt recruitment because this offsets low salary.

Not enough cost savings to justify the impact to faculty/staff overall compensation. Bad optic. Recommend requiring students using waivers to file FAFSA to determine eligibility for grants to reduce dependence on waiver. Waivers incentivize faculty/staff to consider UNC over other schools which brings fees and housing revenue to UNC. Make tuition waiver available once employees are vested – at 5 years. Perhaps limit # of dependent waivers? (Or tie to # of years served) Do not take away employee grad waiver.

Not much revenue generated by cutting waiver for faculty and staff unless we are turning paying students away. Would decimate HIESEL, Counseling, Sports Management, Psych. Values of prof divel for employees in lieu of salary. Not sure there is much cost saving. Proportional waivers based on salary and time of service/employment.

Part of the reason why my husband took the job at UNC and we moved from SD was because of this benefit. If this isn't really a cost-savings measure, is it worth taking away?

Personally, I am most hurt by this option. Every university in the country pays for their employee's tuition. It's why many people work in higher education - so they can utilize where they work to better themselves professionally and continue their education. Budgets are already tighter for traveling to professional development events and now you don't want us to earn additional degrees/certifications? It cannot cost the school much of anything to pay for their hardworking employees schooling. Paying for employees to go to school retains them as employees for longer because programs are 2-4 years. It's a reward many people are extremely grateful for. Think about all the employees who are passionate about their school because they are a graduate. People who feel that attachment give back. If you take away employee's schooling at UNC, those individuals affected will never donate back as an alumni. At this point you need all the alumni (and potential donations) you can get.

The damage will not justify its meager savings (currently reported to be \$2M)."

This does not seem to be a significant savings, and is really a nice benefit to encourage employees to better themselves. Several colleagues have kids going to UNC and they pay quite a bit for fees, dining, housing, so it's not like it's a totally free ride. Regarding the statement "CSU only pays 50%"...if we're going to do the same thing as CU or CSU then we need to do it across the board, I'd GLADY take the salary CSU offers to someone in my same position, which is approximately \$20K more a year and much closer to industry standard.

We believe this to be a zero-sum change for UNC, while greatly impacting employees with college-age children. Revenue will not likely increase. Keeping this benefit for dependents does not cost the institution. This will constitute an enormous reduction in pay for those of us who counted this benefit into our overall compensation package and is incredibly discouraging.

Won't save anything— it is a perk with no real cost (or savings) associated with it. Most dependents will just go elsewhere.

Mobility for employees

Respondents that replied to the PLC recommendation about the tuition waiver stated how the current tuition waiver policy has been beneficial to the mobility of employees as well as having a positive influence on current employees professional development.

Agree that all graduate waivers should be eliminated. Do not agree that undergraduate waivers for employees should be eliminated as this is a valuable source of professional development and upward mobility for our lowest wage employees. Agree with reduction to undergraduate waivers for dependent children to be more in line with other Colorado institutions (although we are not comparing apples to apples because UNC wages are so much lower

than those at CSU and CU).

Agree with PLC recommendations, although it the opportunity for employees to advance their professional development through courses and degree programs is very valuable and should be recognized from productivity, prof. development, and morale standpoints.

As stated in the recommendations, exempt staff are the “primary users” of the employee waivers. Exempt employees are typically higher educated and in turn have a higher salary enabling each to assist their dependents with college expenses. Removing a benefit for lower income earning classified employees due to exempt employee utilizing the benefit is unjust. Classified employees should not be punished due to ineffective policies and processes tied to educational benefits and who uses those resources.

Dependents/Employees- The classes are going to run anyways, having the 2 extra spots for tuition waiver students does not change this-How is it saving? Can we better manage instead of remove? Dependents- how many faculty and staff will we lose because of this? Staff and faculty could have their kids look into other universities with financial aid. Dependents- Greeley will be impacted. Dependents- The waivers add to this institution and community. Employees- Exempt staff use most often- they have the least amount of other development opportunities. Employees/What is the timeline for staff grandfather in? Why didn't this work before? Employees- this kills morale. Employees- comparing us to CSU and CU doesn't help- goes to show UNC is already doing the right thing. Employees- If you get a degree here- contract to stay for a certain amount of years or paycheck tuition. Employees- of the people that get a degree, how many employees leave vs. stay?

DO NOT AGREE WITH PLC. Tuition waiver for dependents makes employment with UNC appealing in that it can offset lower wages than when compared to other universities and colleges of Colorado. Also offers professional development opportunities to employees paid low wages compared to other institutions or other employment opportunities. Instead of eliminating all employee tuition waivers, perhaps reducing amount of credits waived for (NOT the best option), or if employee does not use credits allowing dependents to use them instead of reducing dependent tuition waiver from 100% to 50%. Savings to be gained here are also quite minimal considering other cost saving measures, would significantly affect morale, and employee/dependent enrollment likely to drop even more than 50% which SAVES EVEN LESS THAN 80K!

For staff, an employee tuition waiver seems like a very nice benefit with returns for the institution (it is after all a form of professional development). It also seems clearly aligned with the university's historical mission.

Gives access to education that may not be there. It is a good benefit for us in an industry that pay is generally lower. Should be able to choose for dependent or employee to use. Cutting to employees-doesn't UNC want their employees to better themselves. Allow dependents or employees who are currently enrolled to finish their program or degrees. How would this effect recruitment to new staff/faculty. We are cutting prof dev/travel – tuition waivers are a good way to get prof dev. Option for choosing prof dev or tuition. Grad dependent should be cut over grad employee.

Great benefit to bring in qualified employees with lower salaries.

I am firmly AGAINST this option! Please do not modify the employee/dependent tuition waiver. Option 5 targets few individuals, whereas many of the other options share the burden of cost savings more equally. Furthermore, there have been many, many individuals who have benefited from the tuition waiver over the years and it unfairly penalizes a select few who are now positioned to finally take advantage of this benefit.

I believe that Dependent waivers should be modified to 50%. We've been overly generous for too many years where other institutions cut back years ago. I do think employee waivers should remain however up to 9 credits a year for

full time. Especially if this is the only professional development options that exist for employees on campus and because it ties directly into our mission and goals in providing higher education. I do believe the spousal/partner tuition waiver should be eliminated entirely.

I currently sit on the UNC Institutional Research Board as a non-voting member as a resource for the data security plan and for questions on data security. I now utilize my understanding of research through the HESAL Assessment and Statistical Research Methodology courses.

I don't have a dependent ready to enter UNC, so this wouldn't affect me. If I am not able to take classes for free anymore I would not be able to further my education. Even paying for books and supplies puts a damper on my income, so if there is a change hopefully it wouldn't be for long.

I don't think that the employee tuition waiver should be modified at all. After all, most jobs require a bachelors degree to even qualify to test for the job. Taking away the masters part of the employee tuition would mean that I would have to either stay where I am working currently or pay to get my masters to get a better job here on campus. If I have to pay to get my degree, then so be it but it won't be money paid to UNC, that's for sure. Like my other financial decisions, I'd shop around to find the best deal for my \$38,000/year salary. I have nothing against other people putting their kids through college but it's not a high priority for me- having their kids get a degree. I'm the employee, doing the work and covering for the shortage of people in our department. I'd like to think that I'm worth it to the university since I'm the one here doing the work. Taking this benefit is a big mistake and I'm not liking the message that it is sending to us as staff members.

I feel very strongly that employees should be able to attain an undergraduate degree (at no cost), no matter what—eliminating this is classist and inhibits our employees from gaining the social capital needed for mobility. I also feel that employees should retain full waivers as I don't think that would be a significant source of saving and our professional development is already being cut elsewhere (including graduate waivers). If this changes, it should only apply to new hires (they wouldn't have been led to UNC under false pretenses). While I would like the same to be said of dependent waivers, this makes more sense--50% dependent waivers still makes us competitive in the state, though, again, this would no longer supplement poor salaries. Finally, I think spouse/partner waivers could be cut entirely without dramatically impacting campus morale and offering some savings.

I see these waivers as critical to our mission to support first generation and low-income individuals/families who value education."

I think the suggested changes are terrible. The way you are leaning means you are rewarding parents and punishing those without kids or without college age dependents. It would make more sense to adopt a model more like CU's or CSU's. This is also a main source of professional development for staff since CETL doesn't provide instruction beyond introductory courses that are unable to even reach the level of a 101 course.

I've spoken with several current UNC employees over the past few weeks and each has stated one of the great benefits we have as employees is knowing we MAY have the opportunity to have our spouses and dependents attend UNC with the tuition waiver, especially for lower income employees. The dream of educating their spouses and dependents is a great benefit and those utilizing this benefit over their careers is minimal. At the beginning of my career in IM&T I requested technical training over and over and then reassure leadership what I wasn't going to get the certification and run... like many people had in the past. Over the years I have trained on technology, security and leadership outside of UNC coursework. Even to this day, the comments when our teams earn a certificate or degree are... when will you be leaving?

It depends on the modifications. I think there should be some staff members grandfathered into certain things. Also, instead of cutting something completely is there a way to reduce it? Also, I feel a lot of people have to have

bachelors degrees to get their job here so taking away an opportunity to further their education seems strange. Honestly, the tuition waiver has saved me 19,547.84 over the course of 4 years. I couldn't have have continued my education without it. Most of what I learned in class I have used, at one point or another, at work. How can we stress higher education to the masses if we don't believe the value of having it enough to allow our staff to utilize it?

Keep all waivers for employees. Compete for waiver/scholarships as employees. Undergraduate degree cuts to employees is a classist decision that impacts the social mobility of staff and their families and the greater Greeley community. Since the savings is unclear à it is not worth the risk. Because our salaries are lower than average this benefit helps out competitive advantage in hiring and retaining staff and faculty. If cut the time line for phasing out should vary by degree type. Only implement for new hire. When it happens, 50% across the board à across degree type and dependents, partners, etc. Allow the waiver to employees to transfer to dependents and partners.

One of the reasons why I accepted my job at UNC was the employee tuition waiver. I would not be able to afford paying for my education otherwise. Reducing and eliminating this kind of benefits affects employees' ability to grow personally and professionally. Again, how much more are employees going to hurt from these decisions?

Over the past 3 ½ years while in the HESAL program I have been utilizing my tuition waiver education and applying it directly to my role as a Senior Security Engineer improving the services I provide inside of our department and to campus. These include but are not limited to Cyber Security Awareness Month, an Annual Security Awareness program, Data Security Month, ShredFest, Health and Safety Fair, vulnerability assessments, and communication.

What message do we send to our employees if we don't value their growth enough to provide tuition waivers for employees? We must invest in faculty and staff.

Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Respondent's left an overwhelming number of suggestions with modifying the tuition waiver option, rather than eliminate tuition waivers, respondents urge for modification to the amount the university covers as well as grandfathering in current employees and dependents.

"Agree partially. Eliminate partner support entirely.

"Before you do this PLEASE look into it more. Please send out a survey to all faculty and staff asking them about how they use this benefit. How many employees use this for themselves or their dependents? How many current students will this impact? How many future students will this impact? I have one daughter at UNC and one planning to attend in a few years. For the daughter planning to come - we will look at other financial aid package offerings to see which is the best. Without the tuition waiver, coming to UNC is not an automatic for her anymore.

"I think instead of reducing the waiver, there needs to be some accountability for employees who use the waiver. I would recommend there being a waiting period for new employees before they can use the waiver for themselves and a separate waiting period for dependents to use the waiver. Maybe 1 year for employees and 3 years for dependent children. I think removing the waiver for spouses would be less impactful as a recruiting tool.

"I think this should be implemented for employees making over \$60K. If employee is making over \$60K, they are going to be more able to afford college than someone making under \$60K and trying to support a family.

"I'm okay with eliminating the undergraduate waivers for spouses and the graduate waivers for dependents, but I think reducing the undergraduate waivers for dependent children is not a good solution. Even if UNC waives 100% of a child's tuition, there is still revenue coming in for fees and room and board. If that waiver is reduced, we may lose that student all together and then there is no revenue coming in for them. Overall, children of professors are going to be good academics; the kind of students we want to attract, have stay and become alumni. I think a

stipulation of receiving the waiver should be the requirement to apply for FAFSA. This could offset a portion of the waiver. All help from the federal government should be taken by the student first.

(For undergraduate dependent waiver) This may be a cost savings measure assuming those students will still come to UNC. Few recruiting opps for faculty. Consider long-term changes à grandfather approach + new hires = 0 or 50%. What if dependent waivers was the "last \$ awarded: after FAFSA and scholarships/other aid? Consider compounding impact of dependent waiver + reduced retirement + etc.

\$80k-\$240k: 24 million over 10 years. (+) correlation to benefits, retention. (-) impact on enrollment. (-) impact on recruitment of students and staff. (-) Higher education institution, but eliminating opportunities; raising education of emerging issues. (+) "grandfather" in current employees, not just currently enrolled student.

1) Require all employees to work at UNC for 5 years before the dependent tuition waiver kicks in.

2) Keep graduate tuition waiver for Staff but not dependents/spouse since UNC does not have professional development.

3) Have a tier salaried system for the waiver; Less than \$50,000 = 100% tuition waived, \$51,000-\$75,000= 75% waived, \$76,000- \$99,000 = 50% waived, anything over \$100,000 the dependent tuition waiver does not apply."

50% tuition waiver for both dependent and employee. We want our employees to be learning/growing to provide benefit to the university. Perhaps require employees who use benefit to remain here for 5+ years or have to pay back tuition.

A complete assessment and evaluation of the benefit should be reviewed and showing the number of faculty, exempt, and classified employees who educated their spouse, partner, and dependents over past 10 years to 20 years. In turn showing how many utilized their tuition waiver benefit and then left UNC within a 1, 3, and 5 year time period. Without seeing the data, I would venture to guess that many employees have taken advantage of the benefit when they came to UNC knowing they would leave ASAP for a higher paying job and better growth opportunities elsewhere when the degree was earned.

Again if you want to make comparisons to what other institutions are doing you have to compare apples to apples and include a comparison that looks at salary too. Our salaries are lower."

Also consider how many HESL students are current employees. Would that program be viable without employees taking classes on waivers?"

Also, IF this ends up being an option selected, I think if both parents work for UNC, the dependent should be able to receive 50% from each parent for a 100% waiver."

At the very least, if this is implemented, the effect should be carefully examined leaving the option to reinstate the waivers if the costs are not significant."

Big change... especially Grad. Could be viewed as pay cut. Would make us less competitive. Change based on program capacity (e.g. give paying students priority).

Continue for all undergraduate employee dependents, no for graduate waivers

Create a 3 tiered system based on salary

Dependents that use this benefit still need to pay fees, room, and board.

Eliminate all waivers

Eliminate: All graduate waivers (for dependents and employees). Undergraduate waivers for employees. Undergraduate waivers for spouses and domestic partners

For employees - if they get a degree here then have them sign a MOU stating they will work at UNC for X amount of years or will have to pay back \$\$."

For employees taking classes, perhaps an employee could not register for a class until student registration is nearly complete and only if a class has space. That way it is not taking money away from the university - perhaps only online classes???"

For incoming employees

Graduate waivers for dependents à out. If cutting tuition, cannot cut professional development funds à one or other (do not compound).

How about UNC provides waivers for up to 9 undergraduate credits to staff or a dependent/year, and 50% waiver for credits beyond?

How can we go from offering one of the best tuition benefits in the state to practically nothing? I think the tuition waiver should be looked at for some compromise, maybe excluding particular courses/programs (like the online MBA is already doing) or transferring of the benefit like CU does. There is little to no guarantee that any employee or dependent would still choose to enroll in classes without the waiver. In addition, if an employee gets a degree, can there be an obligation that they should remain at the university for X number of years after completion before leaving, otherwise they will be responsible for paying tuition back, either in full or at a reduced rate? Finally, what about setting up some sort of need or merit-based grant instead of an across the board benefit? That way spouses or dependents apply and are selected to receive the grant (scholarship?) open only to our dependents, reducing the total amount and giving the employees back some of their own benefit.

I agree that this should be modified. We have seen several dependent students who end up with large refunds due to the dependent waiver and lots of other aid (not loans) they are receiving. I do not personally use the employee tuition grant, however, I know for a lot of employees I know it an affordable way for them to receive a degree.

I agree this needs to be modified. While I agree that an employee should have some discount, I think the 100% discount is not necessary and is excessive. 20-30% discount may be more in line with what UNC can afford at this time.

I am in favor of this. Some limitations could be placed on this benefit and still offer a significant value to employees. Perhaps changing to a 50%-of-instate tuition level.

I am ok with the 50% reduction for undergraduate dependent tuition, it's better than losing it altogether. However, I think employees should be able to take a course without pay. Maybe not 9 credits, but if we could still have the ability to take one class a year, that is something.

I believe employees who have been at UNC more than 10 years should not lose this right.

I disagree with the recommendation of the elimination as stated: Reduce undergraduate waivers for dependent children to 50%

I fully believe an employee should contribute to their education, so I support changing the current program to require the employee to contribute to that education. It should be set up on a sliding scale, so folks at the bottom of the pay ranges could more easily pursue a degree. Additionally, only having tuition reimbursement for people with children clearly demonstrates a bias toward employees with children, even if this was not the intention.

I get a lot of people's trepidation toward this, but it doesn't personally effect me so I don't have as much of an issue with it. I will say this, though; I am tired of you comparing us with CSU and CU. If you pay us what those faculty get paid I'm happy to consider some of these ideas, but we don't and you won't so find a more comparable university to compare us to. These ones are just silly.

I think a general reduction is fine, but elimination will be very painful to employees. UNC needs to invest in their employees somehow."

I think it should be offered to employees that have been here ten plus years. I don't agree that grad school should have the tuition waiver.

I think it's okay but depends on pay salary.

I think that a reduction in tuition waiver amounts is a reasonable adjustment. UNC already offers education at a lower tuition rate than other Colorado universities. Even lowering the tuition waiver to cover 50-75% of tuition, that's still a considerable savings. I really think we should look at particular programs that employees/dependents make up a majority of the population. For instance, the HESAL M.A. program is largely made of UNC employees. Almost to the point where we are teaching a class where there may not be a single student paying tuition within that class, yet we're paying faculty to be present and teach.

I think that this is one place to save costs, even though it is something I would stand to benefit from. Nonetheless, it is above and beyond what most employers do. Even a 50% savings would be more than would be expected across the board. Perhaps the tuition waiver or savings could be based on financial need, such that 50% of the cost was covered for the most in need, and then less and less moving up the scale.

I think undergrad. should stay at 100 percent. Then, assuming we don't already, a concerted effort should be made to recruit first gen and non-white students from staff to the university—days on campus activities, tickets to a game, free t-shirt, coupon to the Pie Cafe, help understanding forms and what is needed for college, tours specifically for staff kids etc. This would be a way to move toward being Hispanic Serving and reflective fo Greeley.

I think we leave it for undergraduate dependent and spouse degrees. suggest removing graduate school waiver option

I understand how this could be a short term measure, but if it were adjusted, I would like to see a plan to bring it back in the future. As this University already does not pay well, this is a great perk for faculty and staff.

I'm currently benefitting by this program. I'd recommend reducing the dependent portion, but not the employee portion.

If changes are to be made with regards to the tuition waiver I believe incentives should be tied to those utilizing the benefit. Make the program meaningful, with identified outcomes while tied to classroom and employee performance.

If the suggested changes are implemented, it would be good to leave the door open for possibly bringing some form of the program back for employees and spouses. possibly a revamped program that doesn't allow for programs to get filled by employees over paying students

If this benefit is being brought 'down' to match CSU or CU, then many other things, such as salary, should be brought up to their levels. "

If what we are told is true, that few places offer as robust a tuition waiver system as we do- why not put us in line with other Colorado institutions with this benefit.

In lieu of getting rid of waivers register after rest of students. Effect employees – mass exodus of good employees. CU and CSU pay their employees more. What about those employees who have already been here for a while. Employees benefit discourage future education for staff and faculty. How many seats are being taken from paying students. Programs effected – why do we have programs if they are being supported by waiver? Programs are giving us a double help with cash (pay for faculty waiver for students).

It seems reasonable to develop a similar formula for graduate waivers, except the 50% element would apply to all dependents.

Keep dependent undergraduates waiver. Eliminate all graduate waivers

Keep the employee waiver! We are an educational institution. We value education. Right?!? Eliminating this benefit removes many opportunities for advancement for current employees who would need additional education to further their career here. Employees should keep their benefits (undergrad and grad). Spouses and dependents should get 50% for undergrad, which is more in line with what other institutions are doing.

Keep waivers for people who make 35k or less? That number from option 1 (furlough). Is there data on how many employees send their kids here?

Like the ability to transfer the benefit to dependents. Ok to right-size to peer institutions. Keep the graduate benefit (somehow) to employees. Reconsider a 3-4 credit cap/semester. Promote learning at UNC. Important to retention tool.

make suggestion of the modifications transparent. This is currently a great benefit for all.

Making modifications to this makes sense, but eliminating almost all of the tuition waivers completely takes away part of the attraction for working at the university. We should still be encouraging both our employees and their families to be continuing their education.

Modify = yes. Eliminate = no. Make this incentive based. Reward people for years of service or other service with more benefits - either more tuition benefits or credits, etc.

Move to 505 across all categories: undergrad, grad, empl, dependents, spouses/partners.

My recommendations for a successful tuition waiver benefit program for employees include: Tuition Waiver Benefit tied to a "No Leave" contract policy if the benefit is used. If the employee leaves they are contractual obligated to repay the university for their Tuition/Fees. This could be on a 4 or 5 year scale enabling the university to recover employee training "costs" in the event someone earns a degree then leaves without giving back to the university. Employee history and a time period before the waiver can be utilized. The benefit is available after a person is no

longer on their probation period or after 1 year. Course grades maintenance. Passing grades are covered. Leadership direction and justification - how will taking the course or benefit UNC. Space available waiver program... class enrollment, only if current enrollment is not at capacity.

No class should be at capacity for enrollment and if so, drop the class to enable someone else could have the slot (Fall 2017, I dropped my HESAL Finance course so another person could have the seat, I took the class in Fall 2018. As I was not paying, and the other person was). Some universities refer to this as a space available waiver program.

No raises, one thing that differs from peer Universities. Overload of work, desires to go to school but now have to pay. Lower working salaries compared to peers. Cover undergraduate, not graduate (No waiver for graduate). Rather than removing benefits, look at UNC's lack of focus at programs that aren't profitable. Increase resources at profitable programs. Focus on programs, nit benefits of employees- nursing, teaching, music- large package of degrees. Focus on neighboring communities, advertise, get involved- promote UNC in Greeley, Loveland, Eaton, Fort Collins, etc. What's our mission?

Not ideal. Going to a 50% dependent/spouse waiver makes sense, but employee waiver should remain at 100% for 9 credit hours/yr.

Offer tuition waiver for undergraduate only and up to age 25. No graduate tuition.

Perhaps also consider continuing to provide this as a benefit for current employees but then not to incoming/future employees. Another option is rather than eliminating it, make this benefit something that needs to be earned over time with sustained commitments to UNC (perhaps a benefit that can be used after maybe 5 years of service at 50% and then after 10+ years of service at 100%?)

Perhaps instead of limiting amount, limit credits available. For dependents: 60 credits for an undergraduate degree. For employees: 30 credits of graduate classes, 60 credits of undergraduate.

Please announce the soonest this will happen to allow these vulnerable families to re-strategize for their children"

Please avoid the pronatalist approach of supporting dependent children but not spouses. Please consider 100% tuition waiver for the first baccalaureate, and tiered support there after (perhaps to 50% support for graduate study); also it makes sense to me that there be a requirement that those receiving a degree with the university's help be required to remain employed for a set period of time (perhaps 3 or 5 years) after completing the course of study.

Please consider that some folks are already in programs. Consider type of program. If cutting use different time period, grandfathering, per undergrad, a masters or PhD. If already enrolled or accepted. Give at least 5 years to finish for PhD students.

Rather than reducing the tuition benefit from 100% (as it is now) to 50%, I believe that it would be more beneficial to state the number of tuition-free, undergraduate semesters each employee receives as a benefit. As an example, each employee would receive 12 semesters of undergraduate tuition benefit for their dependents."

Similar to our health and retirement plans, this is one of the great perks of teaching at UNC. Instead of a 50% rate, could this become a 75% rate for dependents?

Slowly decrease the dependent tuition waiver for undergraduate education. Stop graduate tuition waiver completely.

the marginal cost of undergraduate waivers is likely very low, graduate waivers likely higher. Eliminate graduate, regain undergraduate as a competitive edge.

This could be cut to employee only or child only and eliminate the spouse and offer this benefit for undergraduate degrees only.

This could be modified. There are a lot of unique situations. As an employee with 3 students using this I have several situations to think of. To be honest if they do away with it I would not only encourage my dependents to attend other schools (cost saving for us based on scholarship opportunities, grants, and other financial aid) and I would probably find a higher paying job. That being said, my graduate student would not have started without this waiver. If the waiver is taken away they will not continue. As for the undergrads, right now it is a wash because the awarded grant will go away once the waiver takes place. I would like to know what the cost saving would actually be. If my dependent was not enrolled in the current class that IS NOT FULL, what is benefit of removing the waiver? If you have 5 with a waiver all living on campus and you take those 5 away and they stop coming you lose the housing money as well. (huge) However, if you have 5 not living on campus you make a bit.

This evening I mentioned to my son the potential loss or change to this benefit, and he was devastated. He could potentially receive combined academic/athletic scholarships from smaller schools that would make the cost comparable to what we would be paying at UNC if there were no tuition waiver. Unfortunately, he now says that he would also consider attending CU or CSU. There must be an alternative way that this policy could be adjusted to reward those of us who have invested in UNC for so long : 100% for 20+ years, 75% for 15+ years, 50% for 10+ years, 25% for 5+ years. Maybe eliminate the employee tuition waiver and keep the dependent tuition waiver.

This is a huge perk for working here at UNC and if it is decided upon as a cost saving measure, I am glad the focus is to 'modify' and not completely take this benefit away.

This is very challenging for employees with children who are counting on a tuition waiver. The waiver for employees should be modified, but not for employees' children. IF it is implemented for employees' children, it should be gradually put into place.

This is worth considering. Perhaps a greatly reduced tuition rather than free tuition. Perhaps a higher standard to continue benefitting from this perk.

This option should be implemented with a modification to continue to allow employees to be eligible for 9 credit hours.

This seems likely to save a lot of money. We are potentially losing housing, parking, and dining revenue and there's no evidence we won't lose a lot. Cutting employee and dependent graduate waivers and spouse benefits entirely seem very unlikely to pay off. If they were cut to 50% at least we might get some revenue.

This should only be considered IF there is a cost savings. Do we really think that employees family members are going to attend here is the savings is only 50%, when there are a lot of other options out there?

This wouldn't personally impact me currently as I already have a degree, no children and our graduate programs are not in my field. I am concerned about the impact this type of change would have on employees from working class backgrounds who work at UNC in part because of the tuition benefit for themselves to get a college degree. I also have co-workers who have said the primary reason they are working at UNC is for the dependent benefit. If the enrollment drop is closer to 50% the savings seem relatively minimal compared to our short fall. Also does the revenue increase translate into a one-to-one deficit reduction or does it come with increased costs to the University some way, i.e. with an increased reliance on financial aid for those students?

To be fair, this could be rolled in slowly--if people are already in this program, they can remain; perhaps people who were planning on using it beginning next year could still use it in some capacity as well.

Transfer benefit?

Undergraduate degree cuts for employees is classist. Not a for sure savings – not guaranteed because we don't know who will still pay tuition. Dependent waivers to be 50% seems reasonable to be in line with other universities. Education is a value – cutting the benefit of education is cutting a major work value – again will cause people to go elsewhere. Must specify time in which degrees must be completed for people already enrolled (this promise has already been made).

Understand that Dependent Waivered students may have to wait to make sure there is space but also being sensitive to the students graduation."

Understanding that this is a great benefit, treat it accordingly and in return give back to campus. Using the benefit is a privilege. Set an income level for people who use the benefit and then start a prorated tuition discount model that is not regressive. Full coverage for employees with family incomes over \$100,000 and then adjust cost coverage down with higher incomes.

Unfortunately the community culture on campus has not been one of furthering employee education along with fostering leadership and skill development. It has been my experience that an employee has to be self-motivated or stumble upon a mentoring employee to help guide their careers. We do not have a mentoring program on campus enabling employees to talk about best paths careers, training and what working towards a higher degree could mean for the non-leadership rolled employee, what leadership tracks each should take, or what technical training the employee should strive for.

Unpalatable, but ok if necessary among these other strongly negative options.

What about instituting a loan forgiveness program for UG dependents. Offering the free tuition attracts employees, then the loan forgiveness (perhaps over 4-5 year period) after bachelors graduation encourages employees to stay and students to graduate from UNC.

What are the real savings? Made up/not real savings. Dependent students have fewer needs. Until our classes are full, we aren't turning away tuition paying students, thus no savings. Losing out on housing, parking, dining revenues. Lose faculty/staff.

What is the "grandfathered" time? How does UNC stay competitive with pay? Benefits? Is there a way to cut all – not just employees? Biggest disadvantage seems to be for lower paid employees...Is this forever!? Can benefits be "earned" after years of service? (Like vaca for classified ee's).

What is the timeline for grandfathering's current staff in? How long will that last? How much do we actually lose by allowing dependents and employees to take classes, wouldn't this fluctuate year to year? Is there a way to reduce the percentage paid by the university or create an incentive program? Something like 50% at the start of employment, 75% by year 5, etc.

What SAVINGS are we talking here. I am OK with the elimination of graduate tuition for dependants as I can see the costs associated with that.. However are we looking at cost saving here or it looks more like UNC trying to increase revenue. In discussing this one with my spouse we talked about this being the straw that broke the camel's back (mine) This is a huge blow as a 20 year employee to UNC this is a benefit that is one of the reasons I stayed here

rather than to go elsewhere. Didn't we try this years ago and brought it back as we realized that it is a benefit that we can actually beat CU and CSU on and did not cost us that much. As far as the tuition waiver for staff to continue their education isn't it supposed to be where it is only if there is an empty seat? What is the cost saving for leaving it empty?

When I took this position, I was told my kids would be able to attend UNC for free as undergraduates. I don't mind the graduate waiver going away, but I feel like many of us do not make very much money (especially compared to other tenured faculty at other institutions) and taking away things that were promised to us when we started that would compensate for the low salary is wrong.

Will this really save much?-if so, go for it. If not, let us feel like we are receiving a benefit.

Yes. Keep it solid/as is for full-time staff. Offer a significantly reduced rate for full-time faculty, but they could pay some portion of the cost.

Option 6-Faculty Early Retirement

Our analysis of the comments found that 180 agreed with PLC that UNC should implement this initiative for FY20, or earlier if possible. 15 disagreed with that and 36 had mixed responses such as agreeing with contingencies.

Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Need to create an attractive retirement package/incentives.
- Should be optional, not mandatory
- Plan for replacements
- Offer for all positions (staff, administration, exempt, classified, etc.)
- Academic quality should be considered
- Implement quickly, before Fall 19
- Make changes to insurance

Need to create an attractive retirement package/incentives

Many respondents were in favor of implementing this recommendation. They felt that in order for this recommendation to be effective in saving money, they would need to offer an attractive retirement package in order to provide incentive to retire early.

A good idea if you can actually come up with a package attractive enough to make high-salaried employees retire. If offered, will this program be as half-assed as all previous ones?

Absolutely. If it's voluntary and faculty are willing to accept early retirement, then allow them to do so. It should be certain that replacements for those positions are hired at a lesser salary in order to maintain the savings.

If the retirement package is done well, I see this being the best opportunity for long-term savings IF decisions are made at the department level.

Is the early retirement package reasonable? Large savings possible. Recommended.

It doesn't seem to me that there is enough incentive for faculty to opt in.

It sounds like a great idea to me - it would offer faculty who were thinking of retiring a great package of benefits and would bring in fresh ideas and faculty as well as make them want to stay.

Sure....however, must be a compelling offer. Rather than wait until "crunch time" in budget, should make early retirement an ongoing option.

This is a great idea and if the offer was generous and fair many faculty members who are already in their 60's would participate. Make it financially worthwhile!!!!!!!!!!

Yes, as long as faculty are provided with financial future analyses of how this will work with their university investment.

Yes, as long as there is not some huge payout to them to retire early.

Yes. Should include some transition in health care and retirement to be interesting from the faculty perspective. Just faculty?

Should be optional, not mandatory

Although mandatory retirement was not a component of the PLC recommendation, many respondents expressed being in favor of implementing this recommendation, as long as it operates on a voluntary basis.

Sounds good as long as it is optional and not forced.

As long as it's voluntary.

As long as it's optional and not mandatory, I feel like this could be a good option to pursue.

As long as the retirements are voluntary, this option seems fine to me.

I believe that this may be an appropriate method of addressing faculty who either are at the point they should retire or have shifted their responsibilities. However, I believe that this should be done so that faculty feel that this is an invitation rather than being forced on them.

If they choose to take it, more power to them.

Sure; if some were willing to take this option, that's their choice. However, this can't be done at the detriment of other faculty who then must make up the slack in otherwise very busy and productive programs. This, in conjunction with thoughtful program closure/combination, may be helpful.

That might be good, as long as it an option and not mandatory

This could generate savings, but it has to be implemented in a way that would make it explicitly and implicitly voluntary in terms of nuance. In some instances, in a severe budget crisis, a culture can emerge that puts (subtle or direct) decentralized pressure in individual units on more senior faculty to retire early in order to replace them with lecturers. That in turn could have negative impacts on campus-wide morale, research quality, external marketing and fundraising, and student recruitment and retention. At the same time, if we do this, for a number of reasons I would recommend replacing retiring faculty with adjunct or contract renewable instructors as opposed to contract renewable assistant professors.

This is a great option as it offers opportunities on a volunteer basis.

This seems to be a good option, as long as it is entirely voluntary.

Plan for replacements

Respondents stressed having a plan for replacing retiring faculty in place (e.g. contracting adjuncts) and that replacement measures should be strongly considered before implementing.

This is a good idea, though I think we need to reconsider the indication that these positions can or should be replaced with CR or adjunct faculty. But overall, a really good idea. Do it!

This seems worth exploring although the expected savings will depend on the expertise of those taking up the offer. In my program's, I know the faculty likely to take us up on this are providing very valuable service and will be difficult to replace with less than a full-time faculty.

A blanket plan is not a good idea- some faculty probably could be replaced by adjuncts, but other positions will need to be replaced by lecturers and/or tenure-track faculty.

Concerns for remaining competitive if younger/newer prof's are already compensated less have than at other institutions will we actually be able to fill these positions if early retire?

Costs a lot up front to buy them out then you end up hiring inexperienced faculty to replace them who will accept the low pay because they have no better offers. We had one faculty search last year where 6 qualified candidates turned down our position because they had better offers elsewhere. You can't save money by hiring younger faculty because they expect more than what we are paying and it does not serve the students' best interests to offer inferior instruction.

Do this, but not replace all faculty with low paid, undertrained instructors, perception of quality of education experiences will dwindle.

Fourth, I'm not at all certain why we need a headhunting firm for the provost search. I'm open to being convinced of why we need this, but I have not yet heard an explanation. What the first three points tell us is that UNC has a history of making really bad decisions around external contractors. Let's not continue to perpetuate that legacy and use the expertise of our faculty to do the work we need done. When we do hire people, let's get an actual product from them."

Good option. I've seen this be very successful at my previous institution, however it was much larger and there were more faculty to spare. I think Dr. Feinstein needs to release the strategic plan of the university before so many of these options are considered or put into place as everyone needs to know what direction the university is going in so these changes can be made correctly. For this option particularly, there needs to be a plan about replacement of the faculty who retire. Obviously, departments could be severely affected if there is only one senior faculty member in the group and they retire early; you could now be left with no leadership, no experience running a program, etc., especially if you plan to fill that void with just instructors or adjuncts.

How we replace retiring faculty says something about who we are.

I suppose that means that adjunct hiring would increase in this case - how would that university plan to support adjuncts so that the quality of education offered does not decrease?

I think faculty would be more likely to buy in to this option if they knew it would be time limited and how long the vacancies would remain open.

I think this makes a lot of sense, however to maintain the academic integrity of our UNC courses and program options, it will be important to hire adjuncts and instructors who are invested into UNC and our students and who have strengths in teaching. Faculty and faculty advisor training for new hires as a recommendation from the task forces will complement this recommendation for budget savings.

I'm not sure about this - if we offer this, will higher paid employees leave and would we be able to hire new employees for less cost? I'm not sure that fits in a recruiting scheme.

It seems as if this is a risky maneuver, dependent upon filling positions. I am not against the proposition, so long as departments would not be in a position to lose critical lines.

Need overall strategic plan for replacing retiring faculty members. Tenure track vs. contract renewable.

Not applicable for me; however, I do support 'encouraged' retirement for long-term, highly paid tenured faculty, who in my opinion, are often less productive than assistant level tenure-track faculty.

Only if tenured/full professor positions can be replaced with tenure-track/assistant professor or tenured/associate professor positions, not contract-renewable. Former would give significant savings in salary without reducing quality of program; latter would reduce quality of program.

Only if those faculty are replaced in areas where they are needed.

The replacement plans (contract renewable or overload/adjunct) essentially eliminate tenure track positions for incoming faculty. How can we recruit new faculty this way?

This is a strong option w/ 1 caveat: we should seek, whenever possible, to reduce/eliminate relying on adjuncts. Adjuncts are almost always overworked, & as our reputation as a university rests significantly on the strength of our teachers, this would lead to a reduction in quality. Adjuncts cannot provide the same level of teaching, because of the lack of job security and lower pay, they often teach several hundred students (600) & reduce meaningful assignments & feedback, rely on simplified texts alone, and do not sufficiently challenge students. They can't provide individualized attention. Number of adjuncts is a visible statistic that lowers the reputation and quality of the university. I strongly discourage relying on adjuncts. I suggest maintaining tenured lines for asst profs if possible, or providing other job security, as well, to reduce turn over, which is costly. CR fac will seek other jobs if not TT, & we risk losing talented fac for a relatively insignificant cost savings.

This means replacing with adjuncts or not replacing. Denies people's specialties. But still viable.

This option can work provided that for each senior tenured faculty the new hire is made in the same tenure-track line; academic job market realities are such that such hires can be made at lower salaries and can bring strong faculty and help revitalize the University, however, hiring temporary faculty/adjuncts will have the opposite effect. It is also important to implement this measure gradually -- there are many committee duties at all levels that only tenured faculty can perform.

This should be implemented but targeted to get the most bang for the buck. That is, target professors in fields whose replacements at the assistant professor level would have the biggest gap from the current professor's salary.

Yes - but only if we there is a policy in place to determine when positions will be replaced with T/TT, contract, or adjunct. There may be some programs that could lose a T/TT faculty to retirement and not replace the position at that level, but there are other departments that would not be able to deliver their programs, meet accreditation requirements, attract adjuncts, etc.

Yes - but this should include the option of replacing with lower wage T/TT faculty. Some programs would potentially lose accreditation and there could also be an impact on program quality.

Yes as long as replacements and/or no increase in workload for remaining faculty. Add option for CR too. Not clear why staff would be excluded from plan.

Yes, an excellent idea. However, cost savings should be calculated based on difference of retirement and replacement, rather than on eliminating positions entirely. Eliminating positions will eventually harm and then destroy the university mission.

Offer for all positions (staff, administration, exempt, classified, etc.)

Respondents would like to see this recommendation implemented and then extended to ALL positions (staff/admin., exempt status, etc.)

As long as it's fair for all employees.

I am a staff member but I think generally an early retirement buyout would be good for a variety of staff and faculty. I know of several folks on the brink of retirement that might take this deal and allow us for more staffing flexibility.

Yes, but how about Exempt staff as well."

Also offer a staff early retirement program. There are some admins that are way overpaid for their positions since they have been here so long.

Best option for a significant savings. At the Division level, there may be a few places in classified staff to retire early and desk audit position.

Can this also be available to exempt staff?

Can we get more detail on why it doesn't work for state classified and exempt?

Could be useful, assuming that there are sufficient numbers of faculty ready to retire to add up to significant \$\$ savings. Not replacing positions would translate to long-term savings, but this will likely negatively affect the mission and enrollment in the long run. What about incentives for administrative retirements? We currently have about 14 VPs and AVPs, with total salaries of ~\$2.3 million (plus benefits) – any suggestions for downsizing some of these positions?

Have options for exempt and classified employees to retire as well.

I know of several exempt positions that pay way above market because of large pay increases over the last 30+ years. It would be easy to replace those positions at half the cost. If you offer it to faculty, it should be offered to everyone.

Is there also an administrator early retirement program? Some of those vacancies left unfilled would recoup a lot more money for the university than faculty positions. I hope we are looking strategically at all university positions and the value they provide. Faculty and students are the heart of the University. Let's not make all of our cuts there.

Offer early retirement to faculty AND STAFF. If more adjuncts are hired the overload will influence current faculty. Can't hire adjuncts for specialized programs/skills.

Offer this to exempt and classified employees as well.

Offering a staff early retirement program also would be viewed as more fair, even if the savings were minimal.

Please consider offering not only to tenure/tenure track faculty - but to all faculty who make above 60K. There are contract renewable faculty who have worked for UNC for 15-20 years and served in leadership roles, search committees and have been strong leaders in their division. Please allow for service time of faculty with a salary cut off of 60K

Should be offered to all classes of employees.

Similar opportunity for long standing staff?

There also may be staff positions that could be eliminated permanently. The workload could be spread out among other supervisors. For example, facilities has a position called utilities systems and resource manager, the person is close to retirement, and it doesn't appear there is much of a workload.

There may be more positions in staff that could be looked at and then absolved or re-distributed to supervisor or a committee. I.E. utility Systems and resource conservation manager.

Think this should be offered to faculty but understand the complexity of tenured and classified staff. Do think these tracs need to be restricted and visited again.

This may be advantageous to faculty who would like to retire early but they should also be offered emeritus status. This would allow faculty to remain a viable connection between the university and community and they will be listed on websites as part of the university which will help gain marketing impact from the national and regional reputations of those faculty.

This would be a great offer if it's made desirable, an offer should be made for Exempt and classified as well.

Why isn't this available for some staff positions/exempt staff? If favor for faculty. Has to be linked to #9. Have to try to keep these positions open to keep reduction in costs.

Why not exempt staff included? Need to considers current and expected weekends that result, and current salaries/long-term faculty.

Why not offer it to everyone, including Staff? Some of our staff/admin have very high salaries, even though they represent a smaller portion of the overall employees. I fee like the way that admin averaged and displayed salary cuts to salaries was disingenous and manipulative because there are some with very high salaries who would make a bigger dent in our budget and because there are fewer staff/admin, of course it would take a bigger cut to each individual to get a million dollars saving out of the group. I've spoken with some staff here and they say there are definitely areas where there isn't much productivity/contribution within staffing.

Why only offer it to faculty, shouldn't this be offered to all types of employees?

Worked well when we did this for the classified

Would we incentivize too many people to leave? Be selective on who it is offered to. Option for staff?

Yes! Open this to any faculty member who is interested. It might produce some much more substantive savings in years 2 and 3.

Yes, but also consider offering to exempt and classified as well. You can rehire classified positions at a lower rank. (i.e. Admin III retire, hire at Admin I or II).

Academic quality should be considered

Some respondents feel that implementing this recommendation will hurt the quality of academic instruction if retiring faculty are replaced with less qualified instructors.

Yes, an excellent idea. However, cost savings should be calculated based on difference of retirement and replacement, rather than on eliminating positions entirely. Eliminating positions will eventually harm and then destroy the university mission.

Quality of education will significantly decrease if full-time faculty are replaced with adjunct faculty and overloaded faculty. It also increases work load on staff having to recruit, intake, and re-train people every semester.

Do it. However, in programs with growing enrollments and highly productive grant writing faculty, TT lines should be replaced with TT lines or we will run the risk of becoming a Regis University type institution.

Faculty buy-outs will not generate huge cost savings and may do irreparable harm to the teaching/culture, leading students to leave and compounding the problem.

If we implement this option, UNC needs to be careful in making sure that the quality of instruction is still high or higher than it is currently and that students will have access to the contracted professors.

It sounded like your plan was to offer early retirement so that you can hire cheaper teachers. It will effect your student intake and retention if you do not have quality teachers.

It would be important to limit this option to academic disciplines areas where it would not harm potential growth or the service of students in popular undergraduate or graduate offerings. If we buy out faculty from the wrong areas, we could lose enrollment or increase our costs because we may need to compensate as high or higher to replace faculty in those areas.

The move toward "contract renewable" faculty, adjunct, and other contingent faculty is destructive and contributes to overt exploitation. How does having underpaid, overworked contingent faculty with no time or resources for research help our students? How will students feel when they learn their professors have to have multiple jobs to support themselves, or have to collect food stamps, or are even homeless (as has happened to contingent faculty in California and elsewhere)? What vision does this kind of model reveal? Certainly not one that values transformative education. We faculty (at least in my department, which is in HSS) do a lot to provide transformational, hands-on learning experiences, much of which is based on our doctoral and post-doctoral training and research. I can absolutely guarantee that with bigger and more classes, less pay, more colleagues who are contingent and scraping by to subsist we will no longer be able to offer those experiences.

This is a mixed bag. Cost savings potential is a positive, impact on the quality of teaching may be a downside. One of UNC's draws is class size and having actual (tenured) faculty teach undergrads. Would hate to lose this part of identity.

Will bring in fresh faculty. Gives option for people who have been here a long time to retire and allows new professionals opportunities. Once implemented – good long term savings with big \$ amount. Commitment by newer faculty may be lower – because the contract and not tenure. Possible more turn around. Probably will be teaching at more than one university. Vacancies may put more drain on other faculty and department. Could lose identity of campus by losing faculty who have been here. New faculty may be more adaptable to changes at UNC. Could make us less competitive.

Yes, but I am concerned about the suggesting that lines be replaced with contract renewable lines. Tenure is more important to quality of instruction than research; without it, contract renewable faculty members are incentivized to reduce standards to keep students happy and hence keep their jobs. They also require more support, increasing service loads for everyone and possibly increasing the need for more administrative staff. Meanwhile, we are a teaching institution and folks who do the most teaching should not be the least well paid.

Implement quickly, before Fall 19

Some respondents suggested implementing this recommendation immediately (or as soon as possible), before registration for Fall 2019 begins.

Definitely implement ASAP. The salary cost savings will benefit UNC in the coming years and will allow us to bring in new faculty and fresh ideas that will positively impact our students.

Implement as early as possible

Need a plan in place ASAP because the Fall 19 is already in place. Registration starts in April – must know before then. Deans need autonomy to make replacements for CR faculty.

Need to implement ASAP, well before registration begins for the fall semester

Make changes to insurance

Some respondents expressed support for implementing this recommendation, as long as the health insurance component to the retirement package was evaluated and adjusted before implementation.

Yes. Should include some transition in health care and retirement to be interesting from the faculty perspective. Just faculty?

Cobra insurance is extremely expensive even with 50% covered by employees. Early retirement sounds good but with Colorado expenses continually on the rise, many people would have to get employment outside of UNC just to make ends meet. SSN only allows you to have additional income of a certain amount until you reach full age of retirement.

Some faculty may not take buyouts if 18 months COBRA contribution doesn't get them to age 65. It's not specified what criteria are examined when offering buyouts.

The incentive for early retirement would need to be increased. Remove COBRA. Not an incentive.

This is really a frustrating offer to me. We have too many faculty in the retirement age that are not productive but earn a substantial salary and figure why should I quit when this is such easy money. It seems we should require retirement when they reach 70, and we definitely should NOT be offering an insurance plan with the early retirement if they are at the Medicare age, that would be a waste of money for sure. If you are going to make the offer, don't offer paying insurance to someone who qualifies for Medicare.

Option 7-Outsourcing

Our analysis of the comments found that 74 agreed with PLC that UNC should look into areas likely to generate the most savings and that further research needs to be done. 48 disagreed with that and 39 had mixed responses including agreeing with contingencies.

Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Depends on the unit, area, department that will be outsourced
- Thorough cost/benefit analysis needed
- University loses control/ability to mandate offered services
- If outsourcing is cheaper than what would it cost UNC employees
- Could jeopardize quality
- Legal considerations might be a barrier

Depends on the unit, area, department that will be outsourced

Some respondents felt that outsourcing could be beneficial in some areas, but ineffective in others. In other words, it would depend on what exactly was being outsourced and where to determine faculty/staff support for implementation.

Feel that the leadership of each department be revived by unbiased experts in each field to see if better management of each department could achieve the results the university believes outsourcing could provide. From the hourly perspective, there are a lot of layers

I can't think of anything currently. Although I do want to mention I do not think it would be a good idea to outsource Dining Services or Custodial Services. The folks that work in these areas have pride in their work and job and are committed to the university. If it is outsourced, I believe the services would not be as good as they currently are, there would be opportunity for theft, and employees would not be devoted to their job as the current ones are.

I think some things could be outsourced such as the student health insurance program.

I think this would be good to use in the facilities department. They are very expensive to use for anything. I think we run housing, dining, custodial, IT, etc very well. I'd say that payroll was an interesting idea as I think the way we track leave and do some other payroll items is very antiquated.

I've always said that if we outsourced all of our IT operations to the Geek Squad we would get infinitely more responsive and more competent service, but it might not cost less. Outsourcing janitorial services sounds like a good idea until one considers that pay is poor and turnover is high . . . and all of the good janitors are quickly reassigned to Carter and Butler-Hancock anyway. Is this a job that could be handed over to work-study students?

In the School of Music, outsource the ensemble directors and bring in guest conductors for one week at a time.

Outsourcing only seems effective in few areas.

This has been looked at for many years. In some areas it did work good (such as the student health center), but when it was investigated for custodial and for dining, UNC did a better job at less cost than it would be to outsource so I say this is not a good option at this time.

Thorough cost/benefit analysis needed

This seemed to be the most prominent theme for this recommendation. Many respondents were hesitant

to agree with the PLC because they felt that a more thorough cost/benefit analysis needed to be done in order to see the potential savings.

A thorough cost/benefit analysis would need to be done including impact on quality and availability of services and exactly how much UNC would save. Sometimes it really is cheaper to do it yourself, especially if you want it done right. How about instead of outsourcing, we stop hiring consultants and paying vendors to do work we could do ourselves?

Agreed. Needs some deliberate planning before implementation.

Benefits need to far outweigh the costs because costs are always increasing.

Can cost more and we (UNC) don't have control. Complicated – do analysis.

Consider outsourcing in those areas that would generate the most cost savings, but only in those options available based on State of Colorado Requirements

Good possible option if it results in significant savings. Is there a way to ask for an exception from the State given the situation we are currently in? My concern is the risk of employees being out of a job but the contractor coming in (like Aramark for example) will need employees so that could work out.

I support anything that starts with "identify opportunities", but I would also like to see definitions and measurable objectives/evaluations. How do we compare and contrast these opportunities? What are our values and goals?

If they can be identified at a real cost savings, this makes sense.

If this proves to be beneficial, financial, I think this should be considered. It doesn't seem like there is enough information to decide. The downfall is the UNC loses control of that area, and that can be of detriment to our unique populations and lead to student frustration. UNC is not a large school and that is something we have going for us. Outsourcing leads to the perception that we don't care.

If this saves money, it could help. But I have no idea how much money could actually be saved. Is it worthwhile.

it would have to be really worth it for extra savings.

More detailed information is needed for this option to be understood and supported.

Not sure. Make sure it would actually be a savings

Only if it would actually save money.

Only if it's cost-effective.

Outsourcing sounds like a good idea but the overall costs may not be that much to make it a feasible option.

Properly informed choices could save money here, but will definitely impact any employees who need to "re-apply" to attempt to work for the vendor, likely at lower pay. Given the mix of spouses/families who work here, this could have an impact on morale. So UNC should be sure that the savings are significant when choosing these.

This is too vague to address. What does this mean? We cannot terminate the employees we already have, so how would this work? This is just words, smokescreen.

This is unclear. What "shared services?" Also, outsourcing typically requires some sort of oversight, unless you want to reduce the quality of work. I would like to see how much this would actually save.

This is worth getting more information on; what do other institutions do? Consider looking at Metro State.

This one was very vague and hard to determine how to outsource services. I would need more information on cost savings and what could be outsourced to have an opinion on this one.

This should be pursued if it be calculated how much money will be saved.

What are the savings? – Payroll and benefits? Is there less ownership and control that impacts and service? What is the impact on students? Does UNC lose control? Time frame of getting things fixed?

What is the cost savings here?

Why would this cost less if the work still has to be done and someone has to be paid to do it? Perhaps using a contractor who does not pay well and offers poor to no benefits might save a bit, but I would like to see the figures to indicate how much in savings could be realized.

Will this save money?

Would need detailed information as to how much money this would save.

University loses control/ability to mandate offered services

Some respondents seemed concerned that, if outsourcing was implemented, UNC would lose control and the ability to mandate the services offered by external companies.

And lose control??

Control and quality will go down.

Go ahead but without reduction of force in state employee contracts, I don't see how we make anything by doing this. End result seems to be loss of quality control to our campus to firms which have little to no buy-in.

Virtually impossible for UNC (based on campus size and classified staff rules). Loss of speed/accountability. Feels like layoffs. Impact to student staff?

When outsourcing, you lose the ability to mandate or control what services are offered. This also increases monetary rates of service for those who participate in said services.

If outsourcing is cheaper than what it would cost UNC employee

Many respondents expressed that outsourcing should be considered and implemented, as long as it were cheaper than paying a UNC employee to do the job.

As long as the out sourcing saves money and doesn't cost more than internal.

I do not understand enough about contracts and outsourcing services, but it would stand to reason that Greeley itself is not in a position to support contract services for dining or custodial. If it costs more to contract with someone out of the Metro area, then it would not be worth it at all.

If contractors generally save money through lower labor and procurement costs this should be one option to consider

In some cases this could be of benefit to UNC. However, we also need to make sure that outsourcing wouldn't isolate us from being able to take advantage of other "lower cost" opportunities. Having to order office furnishings through the Purchasing Department is both costly and time consuming. Often times, better deals can be found online and department savings in the budget can be realized.

It will depend on if the outsourcing and external shared services actually lower costs AND are effective and beneficial for students, faculty etc.

streamlines services if it can save money

Sure! But I think this can get pricy overtime.

Sure. If it doesn't cost \$ to identify the opportunities - ha!

This could be a good option with the right contractors.

This could be beneficial, but I also believe that our university offers good services and seems like contracting out might end up costing more...just like adjuncts for classes.

This sounds like a good outlet. With the purchasing I do, sometimes I find it would be less expensive to outsource vendors.

This sounds like it is worth exploring, but it may be difficult to find outsourcing that is cheaper than having our own employees and you have to consider whether outsourced services can respond to campus needs effectively and efficiently.

Could jeopardize quality

Many respondents seemed to be concerned with the quality of service they would be receiving if the PLC implements outsourcing. Some respondents were in favor of outsourcing, as long as the quality was just as good/high. Some respondents argued that it wouldn't be worth outsourcing if the quality decreased.

"I'm not a fan. I know for my department, we did have to outsource some work due to staff shortages a few years ago and we paid thousands for what our fully staffed department could do, and their work wasn't that good anyway AND we went back and fixed some of their issues for them when they wanted more \$ to come back to fix it.

First thought - dining services. The quality decrease would be substantial if UNC were to go with a national company such as Aramark. Would the cost of students' dining plans decrease to match the lower quality and variety? How many employees would stop utilizing the faculty/staff dining plan?

I don't know much about this but I understand there is a lot of room for cost saving. My concern would be keeping the quality of in house programs.

I think we already do a lot of this, but yes: anything that can result in the same level of service for less is good. Key: same level of service.

I would support this option if careful consideration is given. It seems like too easy of a way to look for short term savings, but may affect the quality of these services. If the quality is poor, it may cost more money in the long run.

If outsourcing would allow for more competitive contract pricing without sacrificing quality, this should be implemented.

Outsourcing = you get what you pay for, like subcontracting, more room for error.

Outsourcing usually leads to worse customer service.

These would have to be carefully examined to make sure the service level remained as high as possible. Sometimes these types of changes can be penny wise and dollar foolish because service levels deteriorate and that actually costs more because enrollment decreases because of inferior service.

Legal considerations might be a barrier

Many respondents mentioned that state laws would constrain and pose potential barriers to outsourcing. Some mentioned that if there were a way for UNC to become exempt from these regulations/requirements that outsourcing should be considered. However, if UNC is unable to become exempt, it would not be worth implementing

Been around long enough to see this trick tried before, too. Because of myriad state rules, it's not gonna happen, at least not quickly. 20 years from now, it might start to pan out, but that won't fix anything today.

Can we ask for an exemption from the state of Colorado? This may be a wise decision.

Does not seem to be able to be implemented with any identifiable significant savings and would violate State of CO requirements in many cases it appeared to the council.

Don't know if there is a cost savings here and seems to be State requirements would hinder much of what would be valuable.

Is state rules are hurting us, consider asking for an exemption continue to explore.

It seems like this isn't really a viable option given the legal constraints.

What are the restrictions in place that prevent us from making this happen? If they are Board Policies can they be amended? If they are State rules is it possible to apply for an exception?

Option 8-Division Targets

Our analysis of the comments found that 198 agreed with PLC that UNC should consider past participation in cost-savings work when setting division cost-savings goals. 9 disagreed with that and 56 had mixed responses including agreeing with contingencies.

Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Consider previous changes already implemented in previous years
- Assist department leaders with strategic cuts
- Strategic vs. equal cuts/Equity
- Leadership needs a vision before making cuts/strategic plan
- Accountability/Measurable consequence for not
- All units, not just academics
- Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Consider previous changes already implemented in previous years

Many respondents asked that previous budget cuts be considered before and when determining future budget cuts. Many respondents indicated that their department has already been making fiscally responsible cuts and should be rewarded for doing so. Many respondents expressed concern that their unit was already "down to the bone" because of previously cuts and expressed wanting this to be taken into consideration.

Please take into consideration changes that have already been implemented by units when evaluating baseline (ie if courses were reduced this year from previous years, do not use THIS year as the benchmark for cost savings, but previous years instead). "

"This is a good idea in principal - but many units, including my own, have already done this voluntarily - a big move in this direction occurred shortly after Hank Brown took office. So, some units lack much in the way of tangible flexibility here.

"This is great idea, but there has to be accountability from the top as well as participation from the top. Some areas have more room to cut than others and some have already done so. This needs to be taken into account as well.

Across the board will hurt. Take into consideration those areas that have already cut (in previous years when asked).

Additionally programs should be given credit for cost savings made in the past two years. Some of us have been very aware of the problems and have made efforts to cut costs already to bare bones. "

Agree with PLC's recommendation to decentralize budgets and to consider units that have been cutting costs for years. Everyone on campus should have to participate in a cost cutting measure. It can't just be academics.

Agree with recommendation that any cuts taken by colleges and individual departments must take into account previous cuts. HSS has absorbed many more cuts over the years and our faculty tend to teach many more students (and hence generate more student credit hour production) than other colleges, notably PVA and NHS. We also make due with much less staffing. There should be no simple 5 % across the board cuts, but rather targeted cuts for each college based on previous willingness and ability to absorb cuts.

All units should have to participate in cost-savings. The units should be able to decide how they would implement the savings, but they all need to participate. Additionally, for consistency and fairness past participation in cost-savings work should be considered when setting division cost-savings goals.

Also, I know our department has already saved quite a bit compared to what we were spending 3-5 years ago. During the last budget freeze, positions were lost and not replaced. We have many fewer student workers. We've innovated some technology to save money. I'd take a look at year by year budgets going back about 10 years to see who has already tried to be responsible stewards of the universities money and has already made cuts, and who hasn't."

Appears unavoidable, hopefully we are also looking at ways to increase revenue. For many offices reducing expenses has been the conversation for years.

DO not forget to consider past participation and efforts in the recent past by division/colleges to reduce expenses, save costs, and be more efficient. Consolidate classes to be more efficient and fill classes without having small class sizes that cost the same as a full class.

Excellent to give control back to individual departments, but before any changes are finalized there needs to be a holistic review to insure decisions made in one area won't have undue consequences for another group.

Expense reduction. Giving divisions/departments a voice is appreciated à there also needs to be leadership accountability for consistency across campus. Consideration for how much some have already cut (to address comment on sheet about past inconsistency) Yes!

Feels like "cuts" are already inequitable... i.e departments under C.F.O. (when do others catch up?) are already learner than other departments (real cuts were taken years ago so there is less "fat to trim" now). Need to create a way that you can see the cost savings in every department or division.

Has to be equitably done. Cannot cut from essential [and already understaffed/overworked] areas à counseling services, those already operation with largely reduced budgets who have been cutting for the last x years.

I agree that some decisions should be made at the college and unit level but only after equity has been established first. By that, I mean equity in workload, class sizes for level while considering the additional resources needed to maintain accreditation and run clinics etc. I would also agree that it will be important to consider count the work certain units have already done in cutting costs...this is also an equity issue.

I agree with this option since all departments do not function the same way. However, the expense reductions need to be fair and acknowledgement of those units who have already reduced expenses and/or had vacancy savings needs to be considered.

I appreciate that these decisions will be made at the department level. Before this happens, however, I believe the university's mission and values need to be made clear. If we aren't going to be asked to do more with less, we'll do less with less. Our cuts should reflect the university's desired outcomes and direction. I also believe that historical cuts should be considered--some departments have already made significant cuts in the last 2-3 years. That should be taken into account.

I like the idea of empowering individual units to decide how to reduce cost. Historical information on the success of this would be valuable.

I like this idea IF units are held accountable. If they aren't REQUIRED to meet their target and if there aren't significant and meaningful penalties for those that don't, then don't bother. There also needs to be consideration for units that have recently made cuts.

I think reducing expenses is something every department should be looking at on a daily basis. I feel like this has been implemented 2-3 years ago, and should be a continuous and ongoing expectation.

It makes sense to give individual units control over how they go about reducing their own costs internally, however some departments may already be running close to where they need to be while others have much more extra left over in their budgets. An individual department's current status should be taken into consideration when addressing budgetary issues as an across the board target may not make sense. There would also need to be some mechanism in place to review whether the targets are fair and realistic and make sure that departments who do not meet their targets do not benefit at the expense of those who do.

Must consider cuts that have already been made – some people have already made significant cuts – others have not.

Must hold everyone accountable and look at historical inequities. Decision-makers may not be skilled at how to implement these decisions. Otherwise great.

Our department (grounds) has implemented savings since 2005. We operate on a very low budget already. Any cuts made from here may affect our competitiveness as well as divert any instead of others wanting to work here.

Strongly agree with this recommendation. It would be beneficial for the PLC to share the "Tragedy of the Commons" with departments prior to implementing this recommendation. I have sat in numerous meetings where individuals feel entitled to their budgets, and it has been disheartening.

This has potential. Units/Divisions have the best understanding of needs and budgets in their areas. Also, not all units are the same in terms of needs and what is "fluff" in terms of expenditure. I would also like to see this reflect and be adjusted to acknowledge areas that have made large cuts over the past several years.

This is going to be the most important item. The most important thing is accountability and realization that some departments have been cutting for years while others have gone unchecked.

This is necessary, but it's important to consider historical inequalities. Some have already cut a lot and are staffed at lower levels already. Some should have to cut more and others less.

This is what we are doing (it seems) and is one of my favorite options. I would like to be able to see goals for everyone and progress. As well as have actual consequences for those that don't limit spending. I would like to see them credit for past cuts as well as I work in a unit that has given a great deal. We can give more but some acknowledgment of that would be helpful.

This seems reasonable and equitable; however, last year many units already made cutbacks and those should be taken under consideration. Should they have to cut again where other units did very little to try to reign in costs? Some units have programs that are much more expensive to administer by nature of

their academic content; what dispensation do they have to explain those extra costs? What about equity among units that have same number of majors, Student Credit hour production, graduates, but wildly different faculty ratios. Shouldn't those areas of inequity be fixed before an across the board reduction is implemented?

This seems very reasonable. Units will know best how they can cut without compromising the quality of instruction. In doing so, however, PLEASE look at the history of cost-saving measures implemented by each unit. If some units have already trimmed a lot of fat they should be rewarded for that and have to cut less than units that are less efficient.

Transparency, clarity, and accountability if one area reduces less than another, communicate why. Consider the historical cuts already made à share publicly what has already been cut. Do collaboratively.

Make clear how this intersects with layoffs/reductions.

yes, have departments determine where they can save. some departments are more efficient and cost saving than others (but don't hurt those who have already slimmed down expenses)

Yes, if you take into account the performance of the individual units in deciding on any targets. the School of Music has done everything asked of it in the past years and boosted enrollment significantly. To de-fund or remove resources from a functional unit that generates increased enrollment and major prestige for the institution would be a self-defeating exercise.

Assist department leaders with strategic cuts

Some respondents felt that, while giving each unit freedom to decide on appropriate cost-savings approaches is a good idea, department leadership may need assistance/push from administration in making these difficult decisions. In addition, some respondents expressed that leadership in general needs to be evaluated to ensure that we have to best individuals handling these decisions.

Leadership within units may need help/pressure to decide strategic division- or unit-level cuts, because any given leader may just decide to be ""fair"" but non-strategic with their choices.

It is my impression from speaking with PLC members that this will happen, the only question is what the target will be. I would ask that leadership takes a very close look at each department to help identify the targets and understand the impact of cuts. It also sounds like quality decisions can't be made until leadership casts a vision for the future of the university. With a clear vision department heads should be able to identify programs for elimination and may need to invest in other programs. Without a vision, any large cuts will most certainly have negative consequence for the university as a whole. Please help us narrow our focus on what makes UNC great.

Agreed. Empower and hold accountable those decision-makers/ones on the ground. Ensure decision-makers understand huge inequities between/among units. VP's/Dean's may need training/assistance in making the decisions.

Can "passing the buck" be considered "leadership?" Why have an administration at all if all the difficult decision making falls on the backs of employees to figure it out, with limited information, perspective, control and time to dedicate to such decisions? BOOO!

Gives ownership as long as targets are educated

Good idea in theory; I work with Deans who will sign off on anything and worry about it later. Some academics are

just not good at crunching numbers.

I don't think that all cuts should be made by colleges/units because usually they are too attached to their own staff/programs to make logical/difficult decisions - the university admin should look at priorities (as well) and should consider proposing some cuts from above rather than relegating this difficult task solely to colleges/units.

I think to have efficient accountability you may have to have someone tell each department what to cut after meeting with them.

Sounds good although I'm not sure all leaders have the guts to do the right thing because they are people pleasers.

Thank you for letting the units decide best. The direction and goals from the top is great to help guide the process.

We know how our units run best. This shows a level of trust that we have not felt in a very long time.

The Undergraduate Council is very supportive of this cost-saving measure, and we recommend that leadership provide units need guidance on how to make particular decisions (e.g. how are unproductive programs defined?).

We also note that current inequities in units may be further exacerbated if guidance is not offered.

This is the most feasible. Some of these units have no idea how to reduce expenses. Such as, lets say, PRINTING!

This option really has no option but to be implemented. The units should be significantly included in the decisions made about the budget but will also need to be guided by upper management and the budget office to enable them to make the decision with thorough consideration. There also needs to be quarterly monitoring and units need to be held accountable and provide explanation for over budget line items and provide future considerations for putting the budget back in line.

This too seems to me like a good idea. Empowering Deans to make the hard decisions for their colleges is a better course of action than having those decisions come from the President's Office. Just know that some Deans could carry petty grievances against faculty members or departments that could influence their decision-making. So perhaps including with the targets some general guidelines would be helpful. I am afraid in the case of my Dean that she/he will be unwilling to make the obvious decision to cut faculty positions and majors with a tiny number of majors. I'd like her/him to be nudged to do so.

Strategic vs. equal cuts/Equity

This consideration was the most prominent theme for this recommendation. Many respondents were in favor of implementing this recommendation as long as there would not be an across-the-board, universal percentage cut to each department. Instead, respondents asked that the current department budget be taken into account in order to determine an EQUITABLE cut per unit, not an equal one.

"Division and unit-level cuts could be the most strategically effective cuts. We can do what is right by the majority of UNC students and staff if we cut strategically, rather than equally but non-strategically, because we will allow UNC to improve it's long-term viability. Two important notes for these types of cuts:

"Do not make a blanket reduction recommendation across all areas. High performing areas should be considered for not reducing.

"I like the main idea here given the issue of fairness. That being said, the amount cut per college should be calibrated by size of college and growth patterns.

"While reducing expenses there needs to be a cost benefit analysis and strategic approach used to consider investment into programs/units/opportunities that have a higher ROI and are in the position to generate higher revenue for the university short-term and long-term. Across the board cut without an opportunity for innovation and entrepreneurial activity may hinder growth.

1. Concern that decentralized changes will impact revenue (unintentionally). 2. Decentralization in combo. w/ early retirement advantages programs that "happen" to have several senior faculty. 3. Could be inequitable across depts./programs. 4. University-wide strategy is needed to make expense reductions effective.

A decent option, but not all departments have been built equally. The big department have more cushion in their budgets. I'd say cut 10% from big units, and leave the small units alone. The small units are important, and deserve a chance to survive this mess. A mess they did not create by the way.

Consider equity! Can one department do 2% cut while others cut 8% - must be decided in best interest of students.

Couldn't hurt, right? Unless there are those departments that already have a tiny budget and cutting it wouldn't allow them to operate with any measurable success.

Decentralizing the budget is essential, but the history of the budget "river" has also resulted in deep inequities among colleges and departments that must be addressed so that units are starting on an equitable footing. In particular, colleges and departments and programs need clear expectations of overall SCH production. This matters much more to workloads and to revenue generated than number of courses. I do not think all departments or faculty members should have the same SCH expectations but where colleges or departments have very different ones, there should be a transparent rationale. Once that is in place, colleges and departments are in the best position to decide the most efficient way to use their faculty to produce that SCH and can then be held accountable.

Divisions need to be strategic in this. The university needs to be strategic in how divisions are given cuts. At this point it appears my college will be pushed to make cuts to programs that are revenue generating, which is crazy.

Equity across colleges.

Has to happen. Great idea. Has to be everyone across the board – not equal %, but all units need to play at some level. There is still duplication across divisions that we must address or it won't work.

How are we actually going to hold Deans /VP/AUP accountable? Strategic cost cutting without losing revenue. Program review – get rid of "ugly babies" programs/low enrolled course.

I like this one and I think it would be best at the college level. In our college some programs are stretched thin, while others seem to be doing better. Asking each individual program to cut 5% would just increase the inequity of workload and support among programs.

I support use of this option, as long as there is equitable application of budget reductions across all colleges on campus.

I suppose- but unlikely to be implemented fairly - across or within colleges.

I think it's vitally important that as many decisions as possible be made at college or even department levels. One concern: If everybody is given an across the board percentage to cut then efficient and small programs will be hit the hardest.

I think its important to consider each department apart. If cutting the budget means less income for a growing department straight across the board cuts don't seem to make sense.

I would be strongly for this. Deans, Directors, and Faculty chairs are perfectly capable of handling this. Although I would hope the reduction in expenses would be proportionate to program success and not cut unilaterally.

In addition to the PLC recommendations, I think it will be impacted to understand that some departments may be able to cut costs more than other departments. In other words, targets for savings should not be global across all departments.

In theory, this is the best idea on this list. HOWEVER, it ABSOLUTELY MUST be implemented in a way that does not continue to perpetuate HUGE inequalities among units, especially among academic colleges. A few details might begin to contextualize this claim.

Just as long as all units contribute and not across the board but consider all factors in each unit.

Needs to be an equal/equitable across students. All departments need to look at staffing/expenses/spending/programs – look at cuts where we may be over doing it. Look at places where duplicate functions are occurring and cut. Don't cut from essential areas-consulting etc.

Not all programs should have the same cut. It depends on the performance of each unit and how much revenue each unit brings to the university.

Purchasing and not controlling where we have to purchase. Not across the board equally but equity unit by unit. Create cohesive strategic plan to have a better process for retaining and hiring employees à transparency à recognize the burden of vacancies.

Some departments are already bare-bare, while others have not cut. Let's even this out.

Sure, as long as administration follows through with making sure the reduction is done. I have noticed that there is not much accountability here. Which is why we have this problem. And the cost-savings should vary from unit to unit! Those that are losing money are probably the ones complaining. In fairness the savings should be taken by every department, but the % doesn't have to be the same. And there should be something done to the departments that SAY OK and then are not doing it - someone needs to actually oversee them. Don't let them overdraw, close the account when the limit is reached!

This could work but only if the targets are broadly set at a division level to allow for flexibility needed to make sure some programs or services would not be decimated by an across-the-board cut. For example, if Academic Affairs needs to have a 10% reduction, let Academic Affairs decide how to do it, which might mean some areas get more than 10% and some get less.

This should be reviewed as fairness should play a big role in each division/ college level.

Units do need to have some independence to make decisions. That is fundamental, but asking for the same targets in each unit is unfair. Units that have experienced growth, are profitable, and raise the profile of the university as a whole should face the same penalties as those that have stagnated and consume more resources than they produce.

Yes, we need to do this. But we need to have some consistency. For ex., one college should not go to a 3-4 load

unless the other colleges do also

Leadership needs a vision before making cuts/strategic plan

Some respondents felt that UNC needs to set forth a clear vision/mission/values before making cuts so that all departments would have similar standards to base their decisions on. Many respondents identified the need for a "strategic plan".

"Make decisions and provide a clear plan. Perhaps letting each unit decide is a part of the problem

Divisions must know the vision and goals before making cuts.

Furthermore, in some units these reductions will largely impact personnel. Losing employees without a strategic plan could spiral down quickly and have a negative effect on students.

I was expecting something remotely resembling leadership from the new President and am sorely disappointed. This is a feckless and cowardly move. Of course the units know best which areas are least viable -- but their insights need to be contributed to a university-wide discussion of who we are, what we want to be, and what we can afford to be: a discussion that almost certainly needs to occur in the context of a Reduction in Force. (We have a policy for that. Judging from the sabbatical fiasco last semester, however, I doubt the President and Madame Rent-a-Provost have bothered to read the Board Policy Manual, or regard it as more than an annoyance.) In any case, telling each college to reduce its budget by 5% assumes that each college is equally worth cutting. Ridiculous.

Need to have an overall vision/strategic plan from the university to make decisions that move us in the right direction.

This seems reasonable, but we also need strong vision at the upper administration level. Vision to capitalize on our strengths and support each other as a university community, to make UNC a place that students want to come and stay. Believe me, students get wind of all of this and I am guessing they will start leaving once they understand the low morale and lack of vision taking place. Before all of this, I could say that UNC offered undergraduates at least something unique: one-on-one interaction with highly trained faculty, research and community engagement options that really show the relevance and importance of higher ed, and good morale and collegiality. Let's not lose that!

Vision guidance for deans to make cuts.

Accountability/Measurable consequence for not

The second most prominent theme for this recommendation was asking that, if implemented, there be accountability throughout the entire university that every unit is making equitable cuts. In addition, there needs to be a measurable consequence in place for units not doing so. Many respondents were in favor of implementing this recommendation as long as each unit is held accountable for doing their part.

Accountability must happen – how will this happen?

Agreed, but I also think that there needs to be a global review and not just leave it to the units. In the past, some units were hit much harder as they actually participated when other units did not.

As long as each unit holds their end of the bargain, fine.

As long as it's fair and someone is watching over how this is done.

Assign someone to hold departments accountable. Per info from website, UNC received 185,000 in rebates from P-card purchases, if the rebated is 2%, this means \$9.3 million was spent. Better oversight is needed in this area and goals to reduce should be implemented. Earning \$185k is not worth spending \$500k on.

Best area to cut the fat, give department heads a budget and HOLD them to it. Setting targets to reduce expenses is a great idea. This should be implemented ASAP

Currently, there's a sense that some units "get it," and others don't. Needs to be accountability. This is administrative laziness – or cowardice. Time for a RIF.

Definitely - needs to include ALL units including upper administration and athletics. Need to have a measurable consequence to ensure this happens.

Duplication of service won't be identified through this process. Please hold departments/divisions accountable. Is carter hall also cutting 5%? Athletics?

Having been responsible for an academic unit budget and having worked in several different areas, this is a good place to start. There is waste everywhere as well as positions on campus that are unnecessary and not truly productive. Some positions should be reevaluated to see if there can be some combining of responsibilities and reduction of positions, at every level of administration. There is a lot of upper management also that may be excessive, i.e. several Deans overseeing one unit or department.

I agree that units should decide how to cut spending--they are the ones who know the areas that can be reduced, but they should also be held responsible for not implementing changes.

Please if implemented be transparent and exact. You must cut ____%. Also accountability to make sure everyone must do the cut.

So long as divisions are held responsible for doing so, this is a just option.

Someone need sot be responsible for the budgets. When they go over budget, what is the director's punishment.

Targets would need to be mandated across the board and then enforced. If there is no accountability, some departments will be diligent with cutting back while others will take advantage of the savings from other departments. This will then cancel out any savings made.

There needs to be SERIOUS accountability. There are some units that have already trimmed and have no more left to trim, while other campus units are still spending.

This is a good option; however, unless university attacks the issue of under performing and outmoded programs we will never get on track. Some programs have not changed or improved their curriculum in twenty years. However; the university community is reluctant to address the issues surrounding unnecessary low enrolled programs.

This is the way to go, as long as all units are accountable and share the burden. However, I'm not sure how this interfaces with the other university-wide options. Can a unit claim the savings from a faculty member who retires early? Or do they need to reduce expenses in addition to this?

This, but hold all areas accountable. The effective areas should be rewarded.

Very good idea as long as accountability is enforced!

Yes! We absolutely need to have expenses reduced at the unit level. The key to making this work is accountability. Following up with each unit and ensuring that they have submitted their budget cuts is important. We can't allow units to fall through the cracks and not make any adjustments.

All units, not just academics

Another prominent theme for this recommendation was that, if implemented, this recommendation needs to be implemented for ALL units, including administration, athletics, not just academics. Many respondents said would favor implementing this recommendation, as long as ALL units participated and were held accountable.

Agree, but these must include Athletics at a fair proportion. The ability to deliver academic and key student support services cannot be threatened in order to maintain an Athletics program that is not worth the money we currently spend. Also, Academic leadership must have the authority to make decisions that reflect contextual impact on UNC's ability to achieve the student success outcomes Andy Feinstein has publicly asserted on multiple occasions. Finance and Administration and the president's chief of staff should NOT make decisions for academic affairs. Recent history shows that diminishing the voice and authority of academic leadership has led to disastrous results, so we must change this now.

I feel this is a fair way to go. In our office, even though we have a small budget, we have been looking at ways we can save. I see so much money being spent on promotional materials and swag as well as food for trainings. I'd MUCH rather see EVERYONE cutting extras like that vs people paying more for insurance and other benefits.

Many units need to come to reality that they are overbudgeted and either not using those funds by the end of year or they spend those funds on things that are not essential to their jobs. Many of us have cut travel, student employees and other areas of our budget to the bone and have no more to give. Athletics and Academia need to follow suit.

This is the way to go for sure. I do think that all areas ought to be doing this, not just some. Making decisions for areas is not the way to go but allowing them to decide where the cuts should be puts the ball in their court. Giving them a percentage and allowing them to decide where their area can afford to cut is the only correct way to do it.

Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Additional recommendation: Set up a repository for cost saving recommendations and have someone who address all of the recommendations made by faculty and staff."

Cultural Centers. If cuts, less summer student staff à less programming à less ability to recruit students. Not being able to replace staff is hurting programming; this may decrease the # of S.O.C.

Cut the bloat of Student Services. That budget is outrageously high and has done nothing for the investment. Our retention rate is atrocious; why do we keep plugging money into this area?

Hard decisions are reined to review under enrolled programs. Address new degrees that universities are offering that UNC does not. Cut programs that don't graduate students. Combine programs and offer inter-disciplinary degrees.

Don't forget about task force options. This seems like a short-term fix. Work with upper management and divisions on their budgets to reduce spending.

How much will facilities mgmt. be asked to reduce? Overall 8.5 million goal? Need to consider the "quality" losses that could result if not thoughtful.

Huron – marketing outsourcing? Maybe outsource our marketing/advertising to save a significant cost for university branding/recruitment/digital advertising, for advising and yield? Being transparent. Student fee funds? And how departments are contributing?

I AM CONFUSED AS TO WHY THERE IS NOT A CATEGORY FOR REDUCING ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD. If unit leaders are given the decision-making power, they are unlikely to eliminate, for example, an Associate Dean position, because they hired that Associate Dean to make their lives easier. Yet an Associate Dean salary= a salary for 30-35 adjuncts per year.

If we are going with a decentralized budget we need to make sure that includes both expenses and revenues.

Let employees have opportunities to say how expenses can be lowered.

Let's build revenue-for example, it is extremely easy to receive in-state tuition at UNC, while CSU makes this a difficult procedures and receives more out-of-state tuition.

Make campus attractive to students and offer activities to keep them on campus

Need to evaluate if budgets are being spent responsibly in the first place. Individual departments know what's important and what can be sacrificed. Also need to understand that the impact of cuts will cause a loss in services to students. Need to choose what's more important, saving money or impact on students. In some cases you can't have it both ways.

Participation in this option should also consider areas that impact retention for students, such as advocacy and resource office, counseling center and ASAP, career services, etc.

Push MCB MAcc program to online and have Academic Partners design this as they have the MBA.

PVA, MCV, and NHS not have been held to same cost-saving standards as HSS.

Redistribute and perhaps eliminate extra people.

Seemed most applicable to our group. Identify areas for part time work eg. 20/30 hr//wk role. How do we hold area accountable? And how do we recognize past cuts? External review of areas to cut. Identify redundancies at high level (e.g. advising). Invest to save money (e.g. printing). Let exports manage processes.

should have some minimums for departments to implement savings.

Simply "letting units decide" will lead nowhere. There is no equity on this campus and no financial rationale. We need real leadership that is prepared to make tough decisions with real data and that includes layoffs, transfers, and cutting programs. It's time to get to work for the bloated upper-administration that has all been operating with no accountability for years.

This is a cop out....where is university leadership? This does not take into account the differences/strengths/limitations in units across the university. Where is leadership?????

This is the only answer, but leaving it up to the colleges is ignorant. MCB, for example, is a wickedly expensive

program. The new profs are hired for almost double the salary of new profs in HHS, and MCB is bleeding students. How are they supposed to regulate themselves? The MBA program, which we farmed out and will now provide us only half the revenue, is another example of a program that needs to be cancelled. But MCB will not do it on their own accord. We need some leadership that will lead rather than simply continue the spineless Monfort cow-towing of years past. It is not surprising that except for the President and Provost, Carter Hall floor 4 is the same group of characters. The results will ultimately be exactly what we had, so how can we hope to become something better? Hope the President finds some courage at some point.

This suggestion should take into account which divisions have had growth in expenses in recent years and why. It does not make sense to expect all divisions to pay for the out of control expenses of a few specific divisions. Yes, we can all cut. But, we should expect those divisions whose spending has ballooned to justify those increases and take serious measures to reduce spending.

Try to stick to projected Feb-March timeline. Does make sense – will need to ensure the unit level has people qualified to manage. We are unsure of whether the unit will really have control. You have a budget of X – you decide what happens, but we don't get to decide the X amount. How are we going to put responsibility on the higher-ups that are in control of the budgets? Each program could look into charging for other to use equipment. Or have a website for each program to at least list what equipment is available to use. → Need a system.

Units will need the freedom to work with the expenses. Consider asking them how they can reduce expenses would be a better place to start, so that they are still provided with the support and finances necessary to effectively run the unit.

About 3 years ago, HSS raised caps in almost all of its classes to: 65 for 100 level, 50 for 200 level, 40 for 300 level, and 30 for 400 level. (Some classes in English and Modern Languages were exempt for pedagogical reasons.) We also began to require higher "floors" for classes to "make" (I can't remember the exact numbers but around 40 for 100 level, 35 for 200 level, 30 for 300 level, 25 for 400 level). I have spoken to colleagues in other colleges and am well aware that most colleges did not do any of this. Some colleges are still teaching LAC courses capped at 30 when they could easily be capped at 65. Many colleges are still teaching multiple sections of 100-level classes with 15 people in them.

Are student fee funded programs impacted by this reduction? How are AVPs, VPs, and Deans making sound decisions for departments and colleges? Are we asking Carter Hall to also create a reduction plan? This will create significant cost savings and can be fair across the board but how can we maintain this do less with less mentality overtime? Are programs with already limited resources and funding impacted the same or are they going to be exempt from this?

How are student-fee funded programs part of this process?

It makes sense for leaders in their areas to make decisions about their operations instead of individuals making decisions for them when they don't understand their work, so this could make sense. However, the question doesn't provide enough information for an informed decision. What target? What unit? That would decide the implementation.

Letting units decide would be a better option, however, why do some units get punished if they have been increasing enrollment and succeeding with students? This is not a productive way to find savings. "

Meaning the reduction would be set and it would be up to departments to stay within there means? Why not - that is how most household handle their budgets.

Seems to me this is already being done. Does this mean that we are going to be given further targets for reductions. We're down to the bone and everyone in my unit is struggling with classes that have been hit with raised caps and too many students/faculty. I really don't know how we can cut further.

Set up repository for cost saving ideas. Someone addresses all ideas. How will amount be determined for each college? Based on performance? Numbers?

With a March deadline – how are programs supposed to recruit students without budget for GA and student employees?

Option 9-Faculty Workload

Our analysis of the comments found that 99 agreed with PLC that this option should be addressed at the division/college level. 64 disagreed with that and 93 had mixed responses including agreeing with contingencies.

Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Consider impact on research
- Consider the impact on potential faculty hiring
- Evaluate the vision/identity of UNC
- Should be decided at the department/college level
- Consider class size and number of sections being offered
- Only for those who are not research active
- Faculty will leave
- Better evaluations of research and service contributions
- Get rid of departments with low enrollment
- Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Consider impact on research

This consideration was the most prominent theme for this recommendation. Many respondents voiced that increasing teaching requirements for faculty workloads would negatively impact research in various capacities. Research influences many other components of consideration (i.e. faculty recruitment, graduate student recruitment, quality of knowledge, grant eligibility/opportunity, etc.).

"I personally will resign if my teaching workload increases or support for research is substantially reduced. Research is an essential part of career satisfaction to me, and if UNC won't pay me to do it, I'll go elsewhere.

"If we require TT and tenured faculty to teach more, they will research less and we will lose our Carnegie classification, though I'm not sure that would be a disaster; we barely made it anyway. However, it is important to keep in mind that external grants that provide course buy-outs are differentially available, especially in the wake of historic cuts to the NEA and the NEH. This means that those units to whom external grants are more readily available will be advantaged over those to whom they are not.

"UNC T/TT faculty already have a high teaching load; further increasing that teaching load would reduce the quality of research performed at UNC.

4/4 mimic community college – what does that do to research/scholarship. Could you identify individual faculty who want to change load to teach more?

Because research is integral to our University's mission and to teaching effectiveness that should be valued as much as teaching for the faculty members that have research lines. We should also capitalize better on the revenue-generating potential of research. Heavy teaching workloads will prevent that.

Concerns about teaching more credits/courses each semester and resulting workload with research and service? Are there similar sized universities that teach 4/4 and what are outcomes on scholars activity?

Equity has to come first – workload. 4:4 would hurt research productivity – never able to achieve 10 fold increase. Grad programming should be part of long term. Decided by the individual colleges. 4:3 load be temporary (1 year) not permanent – initial savings while waiting for sustainable savings (consolidating programs).

Faculty workloads are already high & teaching overloads are more the norm than not. By requiring an even higher teaching load, faculty productivity with respect to research will be impacted. Allow discussions at the department level to identify faculty who would be interested in differentiated workload with a professional emphasis on teaching/teaching pedagogy and take on higher teaching loads while reducing/eliminating professional activity expectations for evaluation. As a tenured faculty member, if I had the ability to shift from a 3/3 to a 4/4 and in turn was evaluated on instruction rather than professional activity, I would be happy to do so. That does not mean I wish to eliminate professional activity completely, but rather I would welcome the chance to focus more on teaching and student success in the classroom rather than my publication record. I came to UNC because it was a teaching focused institution.

I should say--in anticipation of Option 9--that I am not against adjusting faculty workload so long as we also adjust research expectations."

If faculty are teaching more classes what happens to research requirements? How are we supposed to maintain or grow our exposure and attract students and new faculty members to come to UNC if we are changing this requirement?

If this can be done while balancing/maintaining the integrity of teaching and research. I am concerned that this would limit and reduce research and other areas that are essential to a successful institutions.

If UNC would like to remain a research institution, this recommendation is not favorable.

If we are a teaching university then this would be fine. Remove the scholarship expectation completely because we won't have the time. Most of us already work year round in order to get our research requirement met

If we are turning into a community college, it would be fine to increase faculty workload. But if we want to remain a university that also expects faculty to conduct research and publish findings, I think increasing the workload is a terrible idea. UNC faculty are already struggling to meet the expectations they are required to meet, especially when they are paid significantly less than what they could make even at the community colleges.

Increase workloads, reduce research

Increased workload = decreased research. Are we a teaching focused university or a research focused one. Some units only have 3 faculty, without adjuncts that unit cannot teach all necessary classes. Where does money from "uncompensated tuition" go? We agree with a division/unit level review. If we get rid of adjuncts will we get more lecturers?

Increasing the teaching workload of tenured and tenure-track faculty will result in decreased research productivity and negatively contribute to the UNC reputation, as well as to the ability to hire or retain the best faculty. It may indeed be possible to try optimizing some course offerings, but increasing the faculty workload across the University will generate significant problems.

It does seem crazy that some departments are on a 2-2 load AND their faculty teach overloads. There are good reasons for giving faculty reassignment to research, but then that time should be saved for research!"

More broadly, this goes back to the decision of to what extent do we want UNC to be a research university. This option will send the signal that we don't, and it will be reflected accordingly in our global reputation, ability to recruit and retain faculty, etc. Research productivity will drop and we can kiss external research funding goodbye."

Of course this is a tough one. I taught 3+3 for years, while limping along with research; then 3+2 while administering and coordinating several graduate programs. I only recently converted to 2+2, while still doing a ton of service, and I feel that I finally have more time to dedicate to scholarship. One approach could be allowing those who wish to have higher teaching loads to have minimal research requirements that would be reflected in evaluations. More teaching and less money for research/travel support will kill scholarship at UNC.

Replace research or service?

Research is a driving source (or should be) of income for UNC. Use great caution in overwhelming faculty so that they cannot bring that income in. There is already a fine line for many faculty members who are doing more work than their peers. Overloading them, especially without financial compensation will likely end in termination of working relationships. This will greatly impact students and units at UNC. If faculty workload changes are necessary, consider equally increasing the workload of the faculty which do not teach as well, including the hierarchal and leadership positions.

See my comments above. I absolutely can't offer the kinds of opportunities and unique training if I'm not also supported in my research - that distinguishes me as a scholar, as a professor - and that provides me with satisfaction and allows me to make contributions that directly enable great teaching. If we move toward the community college model I can't for the life of me see why anyone would choose UNC over a community college. There is more and more public awareness of exploitative labor practices in higher ed, and moving toward the contingent faculty is at the top of the list. You don't want that bad press; what you want are happy, productive staff and faculty who support their students and love their jobs.

Some faculty work extremely hard already and I am not impressed with the idea of increasing workload while we decrease some benefits (essentially taking away pay). Workload changes should be made fairly - not just assuming everyone can do more with less. This will create a huge loss of good faculty and prevent us from hiring competitively in the future. This should be considered with how it will affect students if they have teachers that are overburdened. If you want UNC to be competitive in research, reducing research workload is not going to be the way to achieve that. I don't have a horse in that race personally as a staff member, but as an institution (can have some variation by program) the priority needs to be set. You can't expect to expand research while telling faculty they need to lose their releases and teach more classes/students.

The UGC recognizes that this is the reality we are facing and believe that this may be the direction UNC chooses to move towards. We believe that an increase in teaching load will lead to decrease in research which will result in many highly qualified faculty members to leave. We might replace them with good teachers, but we will not be able to recruit researchers, therefore the repercussions of this change are serious and long-lasting. We encourage continued discussion into differential workloads.

This will negatively impact external grant applications. Is this a temporary measure?

This would strongly impact research/scholarship productivity, as well as our ability to attract faculty hires.

UNC's teaching load is already high with a 3-3 at the graduate level. Teaching 4 reduces student-faculty advising and contact time. It reduces time for research and publications and service to the university.

Without occasional opportunities for course releases, research/publication would be very difficult. I have vastly benefited from HSS competitive course releases ("adjustments"). Such competitive opportunities would ensure their usefulness.

Workload definitely needs to be looked at. I know at least one department where the faculty have been put on 2-2

teaching loads because it doesn't have enough students to offer enough classes. We also need to look at actual faculty productivity in research and service. Letting faculty evaluate each other without any objective measures for what constitutes sufficient time and effort in research and service has resulted in some faculty who have not produced anything substantive in the research category in decades and others whose service constitutes showing up (in some cases only some of the time) to meetings without doing any actual work. Don't get me wrong. We have many, many faculty who go above and beyond, and honestly, the quality of their programs shows it. We have a lot of programs where the faculty are just phoning it in, however.

Would possibly affect student experience; students need to be informed. Workload isn't consistent across units. Is one of the larger cost savings, so has to be considered at some level. Consider impact on recruitment, research.

Consider the impact on potential faculty hiring

In hand with considering the impact this recommendation would have on research, many respondents expressed caution to implementing this recommendation because it would make UNC less attractive to potential hires by not offering research support/focus.

This is not a viable option. Our faculty in many/most areas are already underpaid when compared to our peer institutions. Increasing faculty workload without increasing pay will have the effect of chasing high-production faculty out of UNC as well as making it extremely difficult to replace them / hire new faculty. Faculty retention would likely be irrevocably harmed by this.

Another idea that will drive away young faculty and absolutely hamstring recruiting and hiring new faculty.

Faculty is already overworked. Most carry at least 3 hours more than they would at any other institution. Adjuncts are necessary to cover courses and reducing their pay would make it harder to find people to accept those positions. And you can't cut course releases if you want faculty to be publishing and presenting in academia.

Increasing load 3/3 is already high 4/4 is extreme hard to recruit and retain faculty. We still have to do research, I rely increase service. Is there unmet capacity in the system? Would this generate more credit hours? Only if all classes are full.

Increasing teaching loads overall is not a desirable option given the anticipated negative consequences to both faculty and students.

Need to vet adjuncts – to make sure we keep quality. Increase course load – class quality could go down faculty need to do other things. Many professors teach only to do research – not really teach. Increasing course load may hurt recruitment.

Poor idea, faculty will leave and will not be able to replace.

Possibly, but again, UNC is currently not very competitive in terms of faculty pay. By increasing workloads and cutting benefits, faculty may look elsewhere.

This is another major concern for me. At the present time, we do not receive any compensation or credit in our workloads for graduate student committee service. This takes up a great deal of time and energy and has an unrecognized, yet significant impact on our workloads. If our teaching workload is increased, it will make our lives even more challenging. In my opinion we are already undercompensated for the work that we are currently doing and this recommendation would mean being asked to do even more. The implementation of this option without an increase in our current faculty compensation will result in very poor morale among faculty and possible result in faculty attrition. Furthermore, it would make recruitment of high quality, new faculty even more challenging.

Evaluate the vision/identity of UNC

Some respondents felt that the vision/identity of UNC needs to be re-evaluated and restructured before implementing this recommendation. Specifically, some respondents said that they would be in favor of implementing this recommendation if UNC commits to being a teaching university and is will to give up R2/Carnegie status.

"Ha! It would be nice if some full-time faculty actually taught 3+3 loads; many don't even do that much (Hello, NHS!) 4+4 loads are possible, but only in the context of the university's identity: At that point we largely sacrifice our research mission. Which maybe we should -- but first we need to decide who we are, what we want to be, and what we can afford to be.

3/3 Grad faculty load is a lot and is not comparable to similar institutions. Any faculty increase in teaching load would then model a community college and faculty would start leaving. Would not follow institutional mission/vision.

Changing faculty workload would have to coincide with a change in UNC's commitments to the teacher-scholar model in favor of a teaching model... Would we still fall within the R2 classification?

Increasing teaching load, eliminate overload staff. Then UNC needs to decide if we are a teaching institution or a research institution. Are there other models (i.e. trimester) in consideration? Must check financial aid/accreditation implications. What role can online/extended campus play?

Let's not forget our original mission and charter.

Need an identity and strategic plan communicated so the focus is known. Agree that needs to be done at college level.

The options has great potential for cost savings, but I think, again, it comes down to the vision of the university. We are an UNIVERSITY, not a college whose sole focus is on teaching. Administration can't want to increase research expenditures 10-fold, but then also give faculty no incentive to research, not support the offices directly related to research, and expect faculty to also take on additional teaching loads. I think it's important to have a clear vision of being a research institution, but give people the option to maybe taken on additional teaching loads and in return lower their research and/or service expectations. If other adjustments are going to be made for the expectations of the faculty, then I think this could work, but how can you expect divisions/colleges to address this without having a mission statement (that actually means something) and a concise, singular view of what we want to be at UNC?

This should be done at the college level, but after the university has made hard decisions on what we do and don't do.

This would depend on leadership vision for UNC. Who are we is the most important question here? The niche UNC holds is: a much smaller class atmosphere than other in-state schools, with more student-teacher interaction and a practical orientation in course outcomes. To support this vision would need to be central in any decision-making here.

Should be decided at the department/college level

Many respondents felt that this recommendation should be implemented at the department/college level and should not be an across-the-board decision.

Based on conversations with faculty this needs to be evaluated on a case by case basis. I believe changing the ratio

of tenured/ contract faculty will contribute to this option.

I agree that this should be addressed at the college/unit level. Faculty teaching more will not always increase revenue or CHP.

I think this should be an option for departments, and maybe for faculty in those departments. But if you require this then you have to restructure our evaluation criteria. It's hard (for some) to balance a 3/3 with the research requirements; I have no desire to do research while doing a 4/4. This could set up faculty for long-term failure if they find themselves having to relocate for a spouse and not having as robust a vita in regard to research as others.

Only on a division by division basis. Raise all faculty to 3/3 loads including Psychology, Anthropology, etc.

Some units do more here than others already. I agree that this should be mostly left up to the colleges, as long as they have direction to ensure the sacrifices their faculty make are equitable.

A good measure if it is implemented by individual units as part of Option 8.

Address at each college.

Again, this could get tricky and change the landscape of the university--as an R2 institution, our faculty must maintain a certain level of engagement beyond teaching. We absolutely have faculty who aren't actively producing research--they should be considered for this increase. Again, I believe these decisions should be made at the department level. As discussed in the task force, I believe eliminating departments with low enrollment may be an additional area for cost savings.

Agree that these targets should be set at division level, but we have to be willing to take on a powerful minority of faculty who are resistant to change and who have inserted policies over the years that give a disproportionate level of power to faculty while effectively eliminating the ability of administration to make necessary decisions and changes if UNC is to survive.

Agree that this should be handled at the Division level. Each Division has their own unique circumstances. Loss of Adjunct Faculty in some programs would be detrimental. Perhaps some staff can be asked to do more.

Agree with PLC to address at college level.

Agree with PLC's recommendation to put this to the division/college level to decide.

Depends on the unit

Depends.....each of these suggestions have merit; however, implementation strategy must be aligned with the strengths/needs of each unit. This option should not be across the board change.

Faculty who bring in research \$ and who actually DO research should not have an increased teaching load. This needs to be done at the college level. However, the current deans were not hired to be in charge of budgets - they were hired to (at best) be middle managers. If you are going to task them with making such important decisions, you're going to need task forces of faculty to help.

Give each department a change and let the department decide who/what needs to be done

Good to decide at college level. Allows for staff work load changes as well. For example 4 day work loads; 9 month

contracts. Impact on some faculty would be too difficult – grading for writing-intensive courses. This would change our identity as an institution à class size, emphasis on high quality teaching and research. Target faculty who have less research output/lower productivity.

I agree in specific college decisions however, first we need to re-calibrate the university. There appear to be significant inequities across colleges. My understanding is we have a base of a 3:3 load then if we have grant activity etc. we can negotiate a differentiated work load for a set amount of time. It appears a number of units start with 2:2 and go from there. Personally, I am forced to teach 4:4 due to shortages and cannot imagine adding another class (yes, I am still required to do research as part of my evaluation). This same logic applies to class sizes. I may have a regular grad class of 26 yet a colleague across campus says they are allowed to split that number into two sections; that is not an option in my world. So, let's even the playing field first please.

I agree that these conversations and decisions need to be done at the College level, but all Colleges should be expected to adhere to the same guidelines for these cost savings.

I think this has the potential for savings. From a staff perspective, more and more tasks are added to my list of responsibilities without compensation of any kind, but it seems like for faculty do anything extra they need a course release instead of having it as part of their service. I also think that when they are given course releases, there is not check and balance on what they are supposed to do as part of the release and then the balance of proof that they actually performed those services. I also think there could be savings on the \$1200 professional development money. Currently, every full time faculty member gets PD funds, but not all FT faculty have a PD as part of their workload, so if they don't have PD why are they getting funds and/or why are those funds going to a FT faculty member who already received PD funds. The issue is the divisional/college level - think you will have areas doing their part and others sliding, like with cost savings in the past.

If the management of these ideas were left to the departments and the colleges without mandates from the Provost and the president, I believe that this idea would be viable.

Makes sense where appropriate. Divisions and departments should decide.

Need to address at the college/unit levels. Need to look at overall faculty workload/FTE. Look at all 3 areas. Scholarship, instruction, service. Make sure folks can excel where they expertise. Cost savings for decreased adjunct budget is small.

Needs to occur within the colleges

Should be addressed at division/college level

This should be decided at the unit level. There are too many variations in program needs to make this work on a large scale. If you reduce the credit allowed for research, then it makes it difficult for people to move to another institution because they have not had the opportunity to build a robust program of research. This should be a last resort option

This should be strategically discussed at the college level. I'm sure the point has been made that it is impossible to increase faculty teaching workload while at the same time increase the amount of extramural funding.

Consider class size and number of sections being offered

Many respondents would like the PLC to consider class sizes (increasing caps) and the number of sections being offered per class (decreasing number of sections) before implementing this recommendation to increase teaching workloads.

Finally, I think that it could be possible to increase seats in lower level online courses by 5 without causing a negative impact, which could allow for more students to be taught per faculty member per year, especially for courses that already meet QM standards.

Eliminating overload pay should be considered in conjunction with examining ways to improve scheduling efficiency. For example, combining two small course sections into one could minimize the need for increased teaching loads as well as the demand for overload pay.

Some of this option - changing the number of course sections offered and adjusting adjunct costs are strongly feasible.

The math seems to work if there are actually enough students to take these additional courses. Perhaps there will be enough students if lots of faculty retire or find employment elsewhere!

Adding one class to ALL faculty is reasonable and significant in cost savings. However, above that I think there is much to consider before moving to more courses. Attention needs to be paid to make sure that faculty don't exceed a particular number of students. To add one 20-30 class for a person with less than 100 students is very different than adding 65 to someone who has 200 students. Please release the information that shows how much a course of 30 students brings in- and show how eliminating overloads (where the average 3 credit course is \$4500). Don't these courses pay for themselves?

Adjunct costs positively impact the institutional setup - as they cost far less than a full professor. Certainly full faculty receiving releases should be reassessed. Sections offered should also be reassessed to require a minimum and maximum cap in which the course will run. Having 10 sections at 50% capacity of the same LAC is irresponsible.

All faculty in every college goes to 3-3 load, unless courses are bought out, or due to service. If faculty are not research active, raise teaching loads. Bring back RSCW course releases on a competitive basis. Raising course caps vs. changing teaching load. (Course caps preferred). Consider differential tuition for expensive programs. Make course caps consistent and equitable across colleges, hold colleges accountable. Tough conversations need to be had to address low enrollment/failed programs. Some colleges have already raised course caps when asked, others did not, no accountability, producing huge inequalities.

Enforce course cap minimum. Accept students outside of cohort/program. Open additional sections for online courses. 100% online degree tracks (UG). Put all LAC's online.

Guidelines and consistency between colleges. Same quota for students in each class. Workload releases faculty for committee work- limit of number of committees. Look at programs that do not have many students- should those programs be eliminated? Add more adjunct vs. students not being taught by professors. Could affect faculty recruitment.

I'm not in tune with this side of things, but if there are courses or sections that don't do well then I would consider those to be let go or restructured for better opportunities.

Look at classroom use numbers. Also feels like a pay cut. Faculty overload seems to be more quantifiable than staff (i.e. add a class or advisees). UNC as a "stepping stone" to tenure. Keep UNC class size fairly consistent.

The amount of adjunct faculty we employ seems to be very high. Given the amount of research that comes out of UNC, it would seem that some faculty are "researching" but not producing anything, meaning they should be required to teach more courses. As the largest single money saver, asking faculty to teach 1-2 more courses per year is a reasonable request. At the very minimum, faculty should be held to a 3-3 load each year. Many staff members

are asked to wear multiple hats and ensure that jobs are completed, so it's only reasonable that faculty be asked to do the same. It would also be beneficial to reduce the number of courses offered. If we have 10 sections of ENG 121 and none of them are full, then perhaps we should reduce it to 7 full sections instead.

There are many English/philosophy related courses that have very very small class sizes. This increases the cost of faculty needed because there are such small classes, and so many of them offered. Reducing the number of classes for some areas with a lot could be very good.

There seems to be a large potential for cost savings available by doing this and should definitely be explored. I don't know what the average class size is at UNC but another possibility would be offering fewer sections of entry level classes with larger numbers of students or other methods of increasing per course revenue. My coworkers who were previously students at UNC have described much smaller entry level courses than the classes I had at CSU. It may also be appropriate to get rid of courses that have few people register or offer them less frequently.

This needs to be done in a thoughtful manner and across all areas. Consideration of class size and its impacts on retention should be a key factor.

Only for those who are not research active

Many respondents who are in favor of implementing this recommendation said that they would only like to see it implemented for faculty who are not "research active" or that are currently doing 2/2 workloads. Some respondents asked that those who are doing 3/3 workloads and are research active should not be asked or mandated to increase their workload.

1. How to maintain equity across depts. In a decentralized model? 2. Role of Extended Campus needs to be reviewed within this recommendation? 3. If we rely on adjunct instructors more, then do they need to be paid more? (to recruit qualified people) 4. Faculty with research expectations cannot be given overload. 5. Develop policies on differentiated workload.

All of this needs to be decided by research participation. A large amount of faculty are doing great research and receiving grants to do so - they deserve less workload because of this. There are also a ton of faculty not doing any research and receiving a hefty salary to do so - these are the individuals that should receive more of a workload. Unfortunately many of these faculty members that do not participate in research are also some of the most undesirable in the classroom as well.

Already do a lot we don't get paid for. Overload us usually by people who don't make a lot of money to begin with. Important to not ask units with high teaching loads to increase load. Could/should work to be more efficient with other units/colleges- share courses to fill them.

Also, some units only teach a 2 2. They should be moved to a 3 3 right away."

Do not forget to value the time spent by faculty that perform research that brings in both students and financial grants, do not overload those that are effective at generating enrollments and grants through their research.

Don't mandate increased loads but encourage differentiated workload (more teaching, less research, eg). Less research time à get students at UNC so many leave earlier (before it's too late).

If this is implemented it should be done in a way to force anyone with a base 2-2 to go to base 3-3. There are many programs on campus that have 2-2 as their base. Those already at 3-3 should not be asked to move to 4-4. Any elimination of course releases should be handled at the college level.

Raises above 3-3 teaching loads should be considered for faculty who are not research active. Don't raise course loads across the board. Consider differential tuition for expensive programs.

Faculty will leave

Many respondents said that if faculty workloads increased, they (or others they know) would leave and find employment elsewhere. This consideration, often partnered with the consideration that hiring new faculty would become difficult, was reason for many respondents to not be in favor of implementing this recommendation.

You have students who like it here because faculty are both involved in their fields and actually have the time to mentor them, which CU and CSU Faculty do not. Do not cut off your nose to spite your face. I, for one, will leave UNC if a 4/4 is implemented, and I have heard several other faculty say the same.

I think that if you want to do this, you should implement it gradually with new hires. I accepted my position because it is a good fit for my career interests in terms of research/teaching workload. If the requirements change, then this job will not longer be a good fit for me. I think a good way to address this is to hire teaching faculty who are only the tenure track with 80% teaching, 20% service. They do this in England where there are TT faculty who just teach and it's fine. I think if you created that option then some faculty who are here might even opt-in because they enjoy teaching more than research. Another way you can achieve this is to have better evaluations/standards of faculty scholarship. There are some folk here who have scholarship FTE but aren't actually producing anything. However, one thing I caution against is that these faculty might not like being forced into more teaching and that may result in bad or indifferent teaching and thus poor student experience.

I would leave the university if asked to take a higher workload (all the more so at my current salary). It seems positive to me to explore and potentially implement differential workloads among faculty in order to accommodate what are already different approaches to the profession and to university FTE obligations.

In our school I think we're stretched about as thin as we can be. increasing workload would again I believe result in even more personnel loss.

initially. After that point, colleges and departments could work internally to differentiate workload if desired. I am extremely concerned with how the approximate savings is worded in the PLC document. Course minimums should be established at each level (i.e., 100s, 200s, etc.) and adhered to. Please consider that adjuncts may be extremely difficult to find for certain areas and the low pay rate does not help. Course releases for research should be externally funded through grants only or through an internal granting program such as the RSCW or SSI. If we increase teaching loads, we will lose faculty, we will no longer be a research institution and we will lose students.

It's unconscionable that we could take a 10K hit in pay for the same amount of work. If this were implemented, I would leave immediately.

One of my main concerns related to this area is the loss of overload pay. Similar to one of my answers above, the opportunity to earn additional income by teaching course overloads is one of the reasons I decided to accept a faculty position here at UNC. I turned down positions that offered higher salaries when I chose to come here under the assumption that teaching additional courses would offset the lower salary offered by UNC. If the decision is made to eliminate the opportunity to teach course overloads, I will strongly consider leaving UNC.

Prepare for a departure of faculty if workloads are increased significantly.

Better evaluations of research and service contributions

Many respondents who are in favor of implementing this recommendation said that they would only like to see it implemented if differentiated workloads were possible and that faculty evaluations be restructured to require less research and service to accommodate increased teaching loads.

As I was unable to attend the meetings, I feel as if this is a really tricky initiative. During his visit to our department, I feared this would be a seemingly laissez-faire way of pushing some departments to adopt higher teaching loads, without necessarily renegotiating expectations for tenure, promotion, and review.

Agreed on these -- do we need as much service? Can we minimize faculty committees as I question their value to the university given our current shape. I love the idea of course releases for research as the university does not seem to support research as highly as it should.

Faculty workloads must be addressed, but with those has to come reestablishment of the evaluation expectations from the faculty. Minimize adjunct involvement - they do not recruit students."

I support this option with the understanding that requirements such as service will be replaced by increased teaching load. I do not support requiring faculty teach more with no redistribution of position requirements.

Get rid of departments with low enrollment

In hand with considering class size and section matters before implementing this recommendation, some respondents asked that programs with low enrollment be cut before increasing faculty workloads.

"Cut the programs that are redundant, like music's bluegrass program (last I heard there were 3 students enrolled, and how much money went into creating and promoting such program?).

By the way, get rid of Extended Campus, and fold its operations into the various colleges. It's offensive that some of our faculty refuse to teach courses in their own departments because they can teach them for Extended Campus at a much higher compensation rate."

Cut crappy programs. Increase the number of courses offered during interim sessions and online.

Cut down on the degree programs that have hardly any students

cut programs that aren't profitable and have subpar enrollment

Dependent on student enrollments.

Some colleges/divisions (e.g. HSS, Sociology, Gender Studies) have already made drastic cuts of adjuncts and increased enrollment caps and cut low-enrolled classes while classes in other divisions/colleges are taught with three people by adjuncts/ Changes must be made more equitably, should holds others to same standards we've already implemented. Hold colleges accountable. Consider differential tuition for PVA.

Some programs do not justify the number of faculty compared to the program enrollments and projected growth.

There should be an "enforceable" minimum class requirement for the class to take place. If we are consistently having low enrollment (or no enrollment) in some classes or programs it may be time to replace their resources with the classes that have a waiting list.

This seems like a very promising option, what about eliminating poor performing courses and double up our strengths?

UNC absolutely needs to ELIMATE the course releases for "research intensive" designations. At all other major universities, faculty are expected/required to "buy out" a course using grant funds; they are not just given a release for writing papers and grants. They have to actually land the grant to fund the buy-out. Currently, these releases provide an incentive to NOT grow program enrollments. It is a DISINCENTIVE for program growth. In addition, it creates major disparities across colleges and departments. There is nothing strategic or systematic about the way they are used. Whoever asks gets them, particularly programs with declining enrollments. If faculty balk at the change, they should go to an R 1 institution. They don't belong at UNC where the teacher-scholar model is our ethos.

Additional suggestions, comments and questions

4/4 mimic community college – what does that do to research/scholarship. Could you identify individual faculty who want to change load to teach more?

Increased workload = decreased research. Are we a teaching focused university or a research focused one. Some units only have 3 faculty, without adjuncts that unit cannot teach all necessary classes. Where does money from "uncompensated tuition" go? We agree with a division/unit level review. If we get rid of adjuncts will we get more lecturers?

This will negatively impact external grant applications. Is this a temporary measure?

Can grants be applied for to help offset this?

Does it make sense to increase faculty workload in an environment where there have been no raises for a number of years and where salaries already are not even close to salaries in equivalent institutions, to say nothing of the wider world of Academia?

Everyone in my department (school of music) already has a very high courseload, and adjuncts (paid very little) already teach many of our classes. It's hard to imagine saving much money here. Are courseloads in other departments the same?

Faculty or generally unhappy and feel underpaid/under appreciated. How will this be balanced?

Has UNC looked into offering more classes online and or in the evenings? Maybe review some of the requirements and rules that are set by UNC that don't give the competitive advantage? 10 years ago I looked to UNC to receive my MBA but one was not offered...yet. I reviewed CSU's program but they required I attend a class 1 time per month during the 2 year program (this was not an option for me as I was a single mom of 3 kids who worked full time). I ended up obtaining my MBA from Colorado Christian University because they were the only "local" school that offered a program 100% online. Many who wish to attend higher education work and/or have kids and need more flexibility with the scheduling and options for education. This could increase enrollment and therefore increase income.

To me this seems like yet another way in which the wrong people are being shouldered with the burden of correcting our financial situation. UNC has many new programs/offices/administrators that account for the bloat in our budget. Why are faculty being asked to shoulder the burden of correcting that?"

We need to enforce course capacities and allow non-cohort/program students in to courses if there is space. The fact that an instructor can deny a student access to a course simply because they do not want to teach "too many students" is not acceptable. Why not serve the student if there is space and collect the tuition revenue?

What about reviewing administrative costs and consolidating units? Are all of the administrators needed? Could administrators help with teaching?

What is the impact to students?

Why just faculty.

Yes! This must be considered. How are we defining priorities of teaching-less research? What is most important? Who can teach more? Who are the people who have a greater capacity to teach? Can people then opt out of research?

Increasing teaching load, eliminate overload staff. Then UNC needs to decide if we are a teaching institution or a research institution. Are there other models (i.e. trimester) in consideration? Must check financial aid/accreditation implications. What role can online/extended campus play?

Need to vet adjuncts – to make sure we keep quality. Increase course load – class quality could go down faculty need to do other things. Many professors teach only to do research – not really teach. Increasing course load may hurt recruitment.

Of course this is a tough one. I taught 3+3 for years, while limping along with research; then 3+2 while administering and coordinating several graduate programs. I only recently converted to 2+2, while still doing a ton of service, and I feel that I finally have more time to dedicate to scholarship. One approach could be allowing those who wish to have higher teaching loads to have minimal research requirements that would be reflected in evaluations. More teaching and less money for research/travel support will kill scholarship at UNC.

As was made clear in one of the task force reports, HSS has around 16 full-time admin FTE. NHS has 37. I'm willing to accept that NHS may be a larger, more complex unit, but it is certainly not more than twice as large and complex as HSS.

Most faculty in CEBS make more than 90% of parity. Very, few in HSS make more than 90% of parity and some make below 75%. Absurd."

Additionally, President Feinstein has indicated wanting to grow external funding by ~10 fold - how will this occur with increased teaching loads? Research-active faculty, with and without differential loads, are already putting in more than 100% effort - so it is difficult to see how this will positively benefit the University"

All contract renewable should be 4-4 with NO research unless bought out."

Altering course releases for research should only be considered if expectations of faculty scholarship and research are reduced."

Although it pains me to say so, I think that the payment for summer teaching could also be reduced significantly. A 10% reduction in pay would still provide incentive to teach an extra summer course.

Any administrative positions that reduce responsibilities toward the end of their career should be reduced in salary, accordingly. There are faculty positions that continue to make elevated salaries that are not commensurate with the responsibilities they have. Also, those on payroll in "consulting" roles should be eliminated immediately.

Don't rely too heavily on underpaid adjuncts to fill spots vacated by tenure-line faculty. If adjuncts are going to be utilized, please make sure they are adequately compensated. This is not just a recruiting decision but also an ethical decision to treat employee types equitably.

Getting rid of the continuous enrollment fee at the Master level, especially summer, would help us attract adult learners"

I think consolidating adjunct costs into a smaller number of contract-renewable faculty gives us more committed, mission-driven faculty while preserving the flexibility needed to shape and right-size the faculty. The cost may be the same or marginally more, but the benefit is a better and more consistent product in the classroom, which promotes student success and retention/revenue.

I think that undergraduate students should be encouraged to engage in more faculty-led research as it makes them more competitive for graduate programs. In addition, I think that as appropriate the university should utilize graduate students as Teaching Assistants for introductory level courses. By doing so, UNC can not only provide learning opportunities to increase the long term success of their students and increase the retention rate of graduate students.

I would like to see the comparisons at other similar schools (NOT CU or CSU). How does UNC line up. As a staff member, I don't know what is typical of faculty loads. I think further research is needed, but this should not be taken off the table.

Maybe reset back to class 60%, research 20%, service 20% split across the board and maybe change by department. Burnout rates increase? Maybe tenured faculty teach 1 more class each semester to be on par with contract. Is this effected by potentially early retirement?

Potentially helpful in the short-run, but may backfire in the long run. Perhaps making faculty loads more flexible is a better strategy. For example, a full professor with 10 year or less to retirement may not be actively researching/publishing. Allow the faculty member the option to reduce professional activity responsibilities by increasing teaching possibilities. Accreditation and other considerations must be made, but it may make everyone happier, students, faculty, administration. Not everyone has the same gifts and talents but we are forced to treat all faculty the same with distribution of responsibilities.

Salary freezes for years; our faculty compensation GOAL is at 90% of peers; now considering raising the workload? Why does the faculty and staff have to continually have to bear the weight of the trustees' and administration's gross mismanagement and poor decision making?

UNC must cut academic programs that are not a good ROI such as Women's Studies, African-American Studies, etc., that are not a good ROI and emphasize areas that not only fit our mission and culture but also emphasize how the real world and reality of the job market is nowadays. Politically correct solutions to what has happened at UNC(10 million budget shortfall) only prolong the ultimate fix. While I agree with the idea of inclusion and acceptance of all ideas and thoughts, UNC's reality is we MUST deal with REALITY and invest in programs that will actually help students get jobs in the real world.

Option 10-Layoffs

Our analysis of the comments found that 61 agreed with PLC that layoffs should be decided at the division/college level if needed, and that there should be overarching parameters established to guide these decisions. 86 disagreed with that and 113 had mixed responses including agreeing with contingencies.

Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Administrative layoffs
- Morale
- Redundancies/Consolidation
- Merit
- Programs
- Vacant/Temps

Administrative layoffs

Respondents emphasized that if there are layoffs they need to begin at the administrative level, as respondents noted the administration is overstaffed and has the highest salaries.

A work-flow type of analysis would be good for all the areas. The power is supposed to rest with the directors/deans and AVPs but some areas really need to be looked at hard and held accountable. There are several areas that come to mind off the top and I am sure there are others. I think a complete analysis, will take time, but it will enable UNC to figure out where it is overstaffed and understaffed and shuffle personnel or layoff positions that are no longer needed or are not effective. For example: Registrars office has increased their personnel but a lot of their processes are becoming automated and interactions with students have declined over the years. HVAC personnel is formula driven but is there enough work load for so many positions. Middle to Upper Management - do we have too many or too little in the upper levels for the size of the University? How do we compare with IPEDs staffing and personnel of our peers?

Administrative only. It is the faculty that makes this university work: teaching, research, and recruiting students. Laying off faculty will severely undermine everything we work for. It is the mess made by the administration, it should be appropriately resolved by letting the people responsible go. Given the 6 figure salaries most of them have, this could be a very significant source of saving, not to mention the social sense of justice that comes with it. And with those salaries I would not worry about their wellbeing, I am sure they have plenty of financial cushion before they find another cozy university post elsewhere (I think some of them already have).

Again, a notable absence in this area is potential downsizing of administrative positions. Though it would take 10.7 faculty position layoffs to generate ~\$1M in savings, it would take only 3-4 VP/AVP positions...

Agree that some layoffs may be beneficial, but we have some areas that are grossly understaffed (1-person units serving the entire campus, cultural centers, honors) and others that have added layer upon layer of staff and administrators (EMSA, UR for example). We have to be able to right size staffing.

All positions from top down should be evaluated.

Also, holding existing leadership accountable for the current state of the budget would be idea."

As long as it's 4 administrators for every faculty, then go ahead. Spending an entire administrative position to deal with HLC matters is a dead waste of time and money. Start there, and tell the HLC to piss off.

As long as they are from staff, administration and faculty.

Be sure to consider redundancies in administrators.

How about getting rid of all of the assistant/associate/deans and senior associate assistants to the directors? These positions have ballooned in the past five years, and cost the university way more than the people who actually work with the students.

How can you be allowed to produce such poor outcomes and still have a job? I would be fired if my students outcomes were as bad as your management outcomes are here. Very clear were the layoffs need to start

I appreciate this word is actually being spoke out-loud. I think it is inevitable when so much of the budget goes toward personnel. The issue I have is that it should be addressed at a division/college level - layoffs have an overarching impact on the University as a whole, therefore should be addressed at the upper administration level. This needs to be done at an upper administration in collaboration with the colleges/divisions, but ultimately the buck stops with the President.

I do not agree that this should be left up to division and departments. I believe divisions and departments should be given the opportunity for feedback, but decisions to eliminate positions rests with PLC. I also believe that layoffs would be less necessary if departments and divisions were forced to consider roll-back efforts (assistant and associate director level positions to their initial coordinator and entry level positions). This type of bloat is common in Student Affairs and is largely an attempt to create position vacuums (if coordinator position becomes an assistant director, then we need to fill the new coordinator level position underneath). I would examine which positions have been created or augmented in the last 15 years and see what could be returned to initial levels.

I think this is an excellent time to consider employee efficiency. As we work on some restructuring, it seems there is opportunity to streamline and consolidate. Get rid of duplicate positions and responsibilities. We should also look at administration. Do we really need so may VPs and AVPs?

I would like to see the University cut operating expenses and other expenditures before layoffs are used. We all know you won't get anything back after its gone. We should be more creative in our teaching methods, use less, and keep our colleagues together. I would also say that if your title is Asst. to someone else, that someone else should question the need for their Asst. Most faculty and staff don't have assts. Many are questioning Asst. Chairs, Asst. Deans, Asst. Vice Presidents. point made.

It seems that over recent years many new administrative positions have been created. Carefully evaluating various administrative positions and eliminating some that we can function without for a few years may provide a significant cost-savings option.

Please consider redundancies at the upper administration levels. Please consider ways of facilitating the process of grant applications and award management. If faculty are going to teach more, they would need more assistance with the paperwork involving grant applications.

Reduce the number of AVP and support positions. We had an explosion of higher level administration hirings in the past 5 years. Institutes not vital to the purpose of the university should be slimmed down (Stryker) or eliminated (CETL). What is the cost/benefit analysis of CETL? How many faculty actually utilize that resource? (Very few...)"

Restructuring to a student affairs division may allow for some extra positions to be eliminated.

While layoffs are never anyone's first choice, it is something that absolutely has to be addressed. There are redundancies within offices and many positions that are simply no longer needed, however, we continue to hold on

to them because we feel bad about letting anyone go. Changes in software have made jobs more streamlined so 2 people may now be doing the workload that 5 people previously did, yet we're still employing all 5 and job duties have not changed. There are also certain units who are over-staffed. For instance, the Registrar's Office has continually grown, yet enrollment numbers have not been growing. So it is necessary to have additional staff and continue to request more when we are servicing no more students than before? Perhaps teaching our current staff better time management skills and ensuring they're doing their job efficiently is better than hiring more staff.

"Eliminate redundant or under-performing academic programs (Gerontology, Mexican American Studies, etc.). Evaluate administrative staff in non-academic areas for efficacy (eg IM&T, Registrar, Extended Studies). Extended studies as a whole should be evaluated to see if it is worth competing with CSU Global and other online degree programs. If nothing else, the property at Centerra should be let go and Extended Studies should be housed on the main campus.

In my opinion, UNC is very top-heavy, with too many administrators of questionable necessity. I noticed very little in these ideas that would cut the administrative costs at UNC--a glaring omission! For example, do we need an assistant dean in each college?

Absolutely necessary for under-performing units, and for overstaffed administrative offices.

Administration layoffs may be necessary where there is overlap or non-necessary programs. Instruction should not be a place that layoffs occur. UNC is nothing without instruction. I can't believe I have to write that.

Administrators and administrative positions need to be included.

Are there any layoffs or cuts at the "upper" administration level?

Are upper admin considered in the 11.5 exempt staff positions? How will this change with the proposal of new organizational charts? How are we making sure that we are not eliminating services that serve students?

I think upper level management should be considered in this one. I still think our CFO needs to be held somewhat accountable despite who she previously worked for. I think the "river" is an inefficient way to do accounting and leaves everyone in the dark with little incentive to save or bring in revenue. I think layoffs sends a really bad message. I also think certain areas should be protected, like State Classified and Student Fee-funded positions.

I would like to see this considered for upper administration first. Over the past 10 years we have seen stagnant student enrollment coupled with an explosion of upper administrators. Many of us call it the "Vice President of the Month Club."

If necessary, start with management and faculty positions

If this is being considered, I think it needs to be done carefully. So many academic units are struggling to keep up with the workload. I can see layoffs that affect folks already struggling with an unreasonable workload and low pay leading to a rush to the exit. Would high-level administrators be eligible for layoffs? That seems like a place where significant salary savings could be found.

If we are going to discuss faculty layoffs, I would expect this to include administration as well.

Is upper administration part of exempt? Are they being looked at?

Last resort option, and it should start with upper administration - AVP level and above. Since there is nowhere else

to offer general comments, I want the president know that his decision to place his trust in the same three people who got us in this mess (revisionist history aside, and scapegoating people who aren't here any longer) is doing incredible damage to his reputation on campus. None of these people were hired through a search, and at least one seems to have obtained the job through the good old boy network. Please consider making some changes in top leadership as a significant step in improving UNC. If not this, at least enact a policy that no new VPs will be hired through direct appointment without a national search.

Layoffs need to happen but it is important that layoffs happen in the areas where our budget has ballooned in recent years. We need to lay off high-level administrators. High-level administration is where salaries are most bloated, where our recent growth has been out of control, and frankly, where the leadership that got us into this mess resides.

Look @ top administrators.

Look for duplication of services, especially in student affairs. All positions that are kept need to directly impact students and align with our mission.

My suggestion is to really take a look at the management and middle management levels. Supervisors are important, but to have 1 or 2 levels above them (Managers, Assistant Directors) to get to the Director level? Not needed. These are also fairly high paid positions as well. There is a reason middle management is often hit hard in layoffs in the private sector.

No reductions to faculty! Reductions to staff as needed as well as administrative positions.

Numerous faculty and staff have repeatedly stated that the administration has too many positions. I agree. Making a cut at that high level would go a long way in creating trust with faculty and staff.

Of administrator bloat. Yes.

OK, but we should start with the ineffective administrators and trustees that got us in this mess.

please do start with CFO, get Gloria out of there and try building a real team, Lay off the administrators. Did you get rid of that person with the pronouns and multi-gender bathrooms yet? There are way too many administrators who have not demonstrated that they are competent...i.e. look at where we are? What happened to the 80 million reserve we had. IN the private sector ALL of the administrators would have been fired. That needs to happen here.

Reduce this impact by using employees rather than contract employees (People already drawing on PERA). Looking in on positions for layoffs. Administrative overhead in non-academic areas has grown tremendously over the past couple of years. New positions being created to make UNC "feel good". I have heard many people comment on this and yet they don't want to say anything as they feel like they could be targeted.

Seems like there's a lot of jobs in administration that haven't been doing well, perhaps you should start there

So long as starts with administration, go for it.

Sometimes it has to happen, but make sure that from the admin level the cuts don't go so deep as to make it impossible for the work to get. Some admins could do double duty between different departments, but only if UNC offers proper training to admins which at this time is next to none.

The layoffs have to happen, as painful as that is. The areas should be deciding these and they should happen even

at the higher level considering all the hiring that has happened in the last 10 years, this probably really lead to our deficit.

This depends on who is laid off. The number of redundant administrators is ridiculous and grossly uncalled for. There do not need to be nine hall directors, and the university has hired too many administrators with ambiguous titles that contribute little to the academic mission of the university. This president obliquely referenced tuition price hikes in his comments in January 14's email, but not once did he discuss thinning out the bloated administrative and housing staffs.

This may be appropriate for under-performing academic programs and VP level positions, specifically.

This should be an absolute last priority, particularly in colleges that have already cut significantly. If it's going to be implemented there needs to be some reasonable equity about it, including in administrative services and athletics, not just in the academic side.

This should be part of university level decisions (what we do and don't do) and college/division level decisions. How can we spend \$1m+ on diversity initiatives when we are laying off faculty that teach classes? How many VPs and AVPs and Directors at this campus do we need -- really need? What are our priorities?

Trim the fat!!! Eliminate redundant staff, in particular administrative staff, in particular VPs where savings per employee layoff are the most considerable and would carry the most effect on cost saving. Consolidate workload to be more efficient. "

We need transparency and to see a list of who is affected if it happened to make sure all levels are affected. Including some of the "fat" toward the top and middle management. "

What infuriates me is that it seems administration is not being considered. We have so many redundancies at that level - and at six-figure salaries - that if none of them lose their jobs and a bunch of faculty and staff do you're going to have a lot of angry faculty. Hell, I'll lead the charge."

Who gets laid off? This decision will be made at the college level? What protection is there for tenured faculty? I imagine attempting to lay off these faculty would result in lawsuits. What about administrators who contributed to the financial mess that we're in? We have a CFO who is making close to 300,000/year who contributed to the mismanagement of finances at this university. We have Deans with too many Associate Deans and other administrators whose jobs are hardly justifiable. We're about to hire "GPS Navigators" for the Commons who will make \$60,000 a year and yet tenured and tenure-track faculty who have sacrificed so much to work here, who do the work of faculty at an R-1 University, and who make much less have to worry about whether they'll have a job this year or next?

Who would be laid off? Administrators?????? If so, yes!!!

Will there be any administrative layoffs? During the past decade or so it seems that there have been MANY additional administrative positions (with high salaries I might add) created. There were so many assistant VPs that I had trouble keeping track. I hope that layoffs do not occur anywhere on campus, but if they do all levels of employees should be considered when it comes to layoffs and restructuring including upper level administration.

Yes, I would imagine there are many areas we can cut back, especially in all of the administration and support functions.

Yes, of unnecessary admin positions.

Yes. Layoff upper level administrators who were hired/brought on by Kay and Robbyn.

Morale

Respondents stressed that layoffs will negatively impact the morale of employees, which some respondents noted, is already low.

Carefully consider which employees are not necessary and can be retired. This will effect moral for everyone on campus, which may greatly influence student applications and retention. While some programs are ready to be retired, it is important to look at the higher paying employment positions within UNC to see what jobs are ineffective, or are being duplicated.

I don't like this option, but I fully expect layoffs to be part of the restructuring that UNC undertakes. The fact that this is an option is very anxiety inducing for me as an employee and likely is for others as well. I would ask that public notice is given ahead of time before layoffs start to minimize the surprise involved, even if the notice to an individual is on their last day. I expect that layoffs will have a negative impact on worker morale of remaining employees.

There would also be a large loss in institutional knowledge. Delay/don't fill currently vacant positions that are deemed unnecessary or move qualified existing employees with less vital roles into open positions as opposed to hiring externally. Student employees could be hired for entry level positions due to their cheaper cost and the potential long term benefit that a student may get from the experience. If a job just has to be refilled later, potentially at a higher cost, layoffs would be a temporary solution.

Layoffs could be minimized by the thoughts of 1 through 9. Make people use more of their vacation hours or take furloughs. Pay a bit more in health insurance and tuition waiver ideas above. Layoffs would kill moral and to me there are better ways to cut spending that this.

Faculty morale is something we must consider since it is mostly faculty that students have the most time face to face with - as such, avoid layoffs of faculty.

A slippery slope to go down which creates fear and anxiety in the work place.

Also, how would the work that was being done by these positions be distributed within the department without causing the remaining employees to be overworked? This could lead to a decrease in motivation and morale from remaining employees and could lead to issues with retaining staff at UNC.

Because of its demoralizing effect, this should be a last resort.

I am not in favor of this option at all, as the overall campus morale can take a tremendous downward hit if this option is moved forward.

If these are necessary I feel we should do it, however, it does strike fear in people. I think one of the worst things you can do is say nobody has to worry about layoffs and then start laying people off. This happened at my prior job and caused a lot of issues with employees. If it has to happen be open about it.

Impacts morale/staff burn out.

Layoffs would have an overwhelmingly negative impact on morale.

Moral could go down.

Only at the unit level if part of overall cost savings. Absolutely devastating to morale (speaking from experience at another University).

Please avoid; morale is already very low.

Remember, there are people who work at UNC and are also ALUMNI of UNC. We take pride in working for this University when we could take a higher paying job elsewhere. Many people have already left who had good salaries but those of us who love UNC because of its mission, culture and ALUMNI don't want to leave this wonderful university.

With most folks on campus already doing 2.3 jobs, layoffs will only further harm morale.

Redundancies/Consolidation

Respondents highlighted that before layoffs are necessary, positions should be evaluated to see if some can be consolidated and noted that many positions (specifically administrative positions) appear to be redundant and could be eliminated.

After a consolidation and restructuring.

Analyze UNC's department structure and needs to serve our students. If layoffs need to occur, there should be an analysis to restructure departments/personnel, minimizing duplication of efforts, without affecting the level of service we provide to students.

How about just letting staffing numbers fall through attrition? Lots of people have left the university in the past month- do we need to replace them with new people? Why not figure out where we are overstaffed (if that's even a possibility at this point) and move folks around. Or is this really a way to get rid of people that folks personally don't like?

I would rather explore option 1 than have people lose their jobs. I also think positions need to be looked at and consolidated where possible.

If someone is filling a position - be it faculty or staff - and their position no longer serves a purpose (meaning, they're not needed), then, yes, layoff seems appropriate. If possible, I think giving as much notice as possible would be useful - tell the person ("we are going to be laying off your position and we are telling you now - a month in advance - so you can begin to do the work to find another job...- let us know how we can help you in this transition.")

"This will be painful for everyone, those laid off and those that stay. I do feel though, that departments have developed into silos and there is a lot of redundancies. This is a structural problem and I see this as a natural result of fixing our structure to be more efficient.

Examine duplication.

Having people work harder for less is just kicking the can down the road. However, If I'm being honest, this could also be an opportunity to streamline offices that may have dead weight. I'm ambivalent but would be open to this.

I agree that many areas are over-bloated and some positions should be eliminated.

I don't think layoffs should be a demanded thing, but I think colleges and divisions need to start looking at their

personnel and consider letting those go who are not performing, have no clear purpose or benefit to the university and consider if duties can be combined or reworked. If you have two people leaving the office, is it possible to combine their duties into one role and just replace one person?

I think careful consideration needs to be made so that layoffs are made where positions are REDUNDANT and NOT in a way that adds to or doubles the work load of already over worked staff."

I would rather have unwarranted positions eliminated or positions combined that do not warrant full time, rather than have benefits taken away from ALL faculty/staff. Increasing health insurance costs and taking away tuitions grant waivers are great benefits and add to the quality of life and make UNC one of the premier employers of choice in the community. If you take away these benefits, you may lose good staff and faculty as they may not longer see the benefit of working for UNC.

If we have people doing things that don't need to be done, then yes, lay them off. But if you make indiscriminate layoffs, expect product quality to suffer in unexpected ways.

In my short couple of years at UNC, I have noticed a lot of jobs that aren't really necessary to the functioning of UNC.

It is hard to say it, but layoffs is definitely a viable option.

Is there a way to create transfer opportunities for employees with similar skill sets?

It may be necessary and better to do now as a one-time difficult step instead of drawing out lots of benefit lowering mid-range steps over the course of years that affects everyone and reduces employee morale over the long haul. I would recommend unit/colleges decide where it is most effective and give every college/Unit the same (set and consistent) parameters so it seems equitable. Pull from unproductive programs and areas where consolidation can occur first.

Let's right-size. For example, do we need 2 ½ people in the card office all day (plus a student)? Logic says no.

Look at areas where they are over staffed – do they really need that many people.

Looking at positions that do same work across programs.

Never the best option unless there are clear guidelines as to what positions can be deemed redundant. It's also never a good idea to lay an employee off and expect another employee to take on their job responsibilities with no additional financial compensation. This leads to people leaving the University for other opportunities - we've already lost enough good people to Aims, CSU and other institutions that pay more than UNC.

No, a university can't run on bare bones. A look at the effective departments and any redundant services provided by more than one unit should be looked at.

Operations positions could be evaluated to potentially combine sport responsibilities. I believe there are also football coaching positions that could be eliminated/combined.

Should be a last resort. But if we don't have the work for them then we should let them go. And if they are incompetent they should be laid off.

Some positions have become obsolete, or can be done by a student, which helps them pay their bills, my concern

is before we lay people off, why can't we get people to stop sending all of their budget fearing that if they don't, that someday if a large expense come up they will have the university support to cover that expense, I wish that we ran our budgets here, the way we have to at Home.

There are plenty of staff and exempt positions on campus that are not needed, if the divisions and departments were led properly. Intelligent layoffs have the potential to reduce expenses with minimal negative impact on productivity.

There are some areas where there are excess and not essential staff that could be consolidated."

There are some redundancies in some units on campus. Since this is a sensitive subject it is best to be left up to units and VPs

This could be a good option if studied and eliminating positions that are not efficient/needed....

This is again something that should be looked at globally. If left to the divisions, no layoffs will happen. A review of the org chart and what people are actually doing across the institution would allow to see where duplication of duties exists and look at those positions for layoffs.

This is an extremely difficult option to support. However, if there are over-employed areas and relevant layoffs that could/should be made it is not an unsubstantiated option.

Those who could do the same tasks/role for 2 or more departments instead of just 1. This could be common in areas with declining enrollment.

Underutilized positions need to be considered. An example would be Parking Director

We know (see Task Force reports) there are redundancies, people working jobs they aren't qualified for. Cuts should be made (i.e. Tom Smith) sustain the university mission.

When you look at the coach/athlete ratio in athletics, there are some positions that are unnecessary. The salaries are very minimal but both tennis teams do not need assistant coaches for 6-8 athletes. I also believe the responsibilities of each sport with Director of

Merit

Respondents stressed that if layoffs are necessary, those who are underqualified, unproductive, and incompetent should be the ones laid off.

Be sure to consider efficient staffing levels in each unit.

Doesn't hurt to review jobs and productivity and see if there are areas that could save the institution money; however, be careful who is laid off, their job may be more critical than expected. If an "expert" is hired to come and evaluate the institution and only come to see employment numbers, productivity, and workloads - they tend to miss critical information because the "expert" is only an expert in the information they are given and don't know or understand the full picture of UNC and each person's responsibilities and duties here. Relationships and individual integrity and character are not seen on reports and job descriptions.

Fixing evaluation process and criteria is step 1 – need to hold the higher-ups in units to ensure a more rigorous criteria and evaluation.

I don't believe this would really save money as someone would have to do the job and some things wouldn't get done - which could end up costing us more. I do believe evaluations should be done and dead weight should be addressed. There are a few that work at doing as little as possible until the end of the day.

Look at positions where competency has not been proved in all departments throughout campus.

Layoff based on faculty evaluations.

"Quite honestly, incompetent people should be laid off. One of the Task Force reports admitted that a good number of student affairs staff are unqualified for their positions. Lay them off and hire people who are qualified. Fundraising at UNC has been a disaster for quite some time. Lay off whomever is in charge of that. Marketing here is terrible. Lay off whoever's fault that is. I don't actually think that protecting every job and every member of the UNC community is necessarily a priority; I think the health of the university community as a whole is a bigger priority.

Agree with PLC's recommendation to put this to the division/college level to decide. However, I feel that there needs to be a more rigorous process for staff evaluations AND a punishment for both faculty and staff for poor job performance and for not turning in evaluations to HR. This is unacceptable that some employees are not being evaluated. The supervisor should be held accountable for this. I feel that staff should have a 360 evaluation so that it is not just a self-report and the supervisor's evaluation being done each year. Getting feedback from employees on campus who work with the person being evaluated is highly beneficial for both positive and negative feedback.

Divisional input on the person to be laid off should be used as some staff could take on/learn other duties when you have a staff/faculty that has been coasting by for years and could be let go within the same division.

Evaluate staff eval. Process – doesn't require input from anyone but employee and direct supervisor.

Faculty evaluation – as is – makes it hard to identify weaknesses.

I agree with the PLC's recommendation. I also think that we have too many staff in some areas on campus and not enough in others. It is important to shift positions/people to create a better balance. I also think cutting vacancies is better than cutting/laying off actual people still sitting at their desk. I think most departments could find where their inefficiencies are and should make the cuts. I think one way to do this is by fixing/updating the evaluation process. Bad/inefficient employees should now have glowing evaluations.

I think layoffs should be strongly considered. There are many staff around campus who could do more with their time or work more efficiently and be able to take on added responsibilities.

If there was a fair way to do this, I would support layoffs. It is frustrating to see how many people are being paid but not doing their jobs

It would be ideal if people could be held accountable for an extended record of under-performance, non-performance or negligence. I suspect, however, that the process developed for layoffs would not be able to take these issues into account in a meaningful way.

Look @ metrics to evaluate how each unit contributes to the mission of UNC.

Merit based. Get rid of people who don't do their job! Lots of dead weight it weighs the rest of us down.

Only if positions thoroughly reviewed and determined the students wouldn't suffer.

Task force data shows staff in positions they were not qualified for.

This should be a division area. There is a lot of dead wood covering for faculty who are not carrying their share of the work.

This sucks, but if it has to be done then it has to be done. I would rather cut a whole person than make 1000 tiny cuts to everyone else. Reward the productive personnel and use this as a chance to trim some fat.

We all hope NO ONE is laid off. However, perhaps it's past due in regard to unproductive employees.

Yes, we want to protect jobs if they are needed and are currently staffed by competent/hard-working individuals. β This* some people just aren't doing a good job – consider these first (is position needed?)

Programs

Some respondents noted that if there are layoffs, they should be in academic departments that have low enrollment, are low in demand, are under-performing, and unproductive.

With a clear vision department heads should be able to identify what programs are essential to the University moving forward and programs no longer fit. Based on this, layoffs can be effective and beneficial to our future success.

At least as far as tenured and tenure-track faculty are concerned, "layoffs" should be discussed only in the context of a Reduction in Force, that is, the elimination of weak and/or low-demand programs and the termination of tenured/tenure-track faculty in them.

Evaluate underperforming programs and areas and consider layoffs in those areas. Blanket across the board layoffs should not be considered.

Get rid of the degree programs with the least amount of students

I am concerned that layoffs would mean lost lines so essentially whether we're talking about faculty or staff the workload of that person who is laid off will be passed along to others. That being said, if a program is not productive, getting rid of programs and personnel should be on the table.

May have to happen. What makes more sense is to eliminate unproductive units. No evidence that any criteria have been established for determining productivity.

What happened to the idea of cutting chronically low enrolled programs?

Avoid layoffs at all costs. Any layoffs need to be preceded by extensive strategic planning. Do not ask each unit to cut a position. Identify low enrolled programs and either work with them to grow, which is preferable, or cut them.

Do it. Layoffs would be tough, but they are long overdue. We are allowing the ENTIRE ship to go down, if we don't make the tough call to just lay off the unnecessary workers, which is completely unfair to the academic programs with the potential for growth and to our long term survival. It's time to be real. Cut the positions that are not essential to the success, retention, and education of our students. Cut the programs that are serving less than 50 students. It's time.

If there are programs, departments, staff, or faculty who are teaching/working in programs that are under-enrolled and unsustainable, then tough choices should be made.

Look at programs in addition to individual positions.

Unfortunately, I think this is what is needed. We may need to cut programs so that those who remain can survive as well as recruit new faculty and students. Rather than making everyone miserable by cutting pay, removing health benefits, reducing tuition remission, etc., just make the difficult decisions to get rid of programs that are not efficient and do not serve many students.

Vacant/Temps

Some respondents noted that they would rather have temp positions eliminated and vacant positions left unfilled instead of laying off current employees.

"While this may be an unpopular opinion, I feel that lay-offs may be the best way to do what we need to do in a quick and efficient way (if personnel has to be a part of the reduction plan). Again, I believe that the university needs to decide on their priorities first. Tell us what you don't want us to do/continue and we'll be able to make adjustments accordingly, including adjustments in personnel. With this in mind, please make sure folks who are asked to leave are given adequate notice and given the opportunity to find other work. In short, losing a few now makes more sense than losing countless by slowing killing morale. I understand doing a close evaluation of naturally vacant positions, but I believe some of the positions that make the most sense to eliminate won't be vacant for a long time because of the folks in the roles. A less extreme option is allowing staff to opt-into nine month contracts, four-day work weeks, etc. This could provide some savings without losing folks. "

A reduction of adjuncts, and increasing tenure or TT faculty teaching workloads, could benefit the UNC's overall reputation as more faculty with research backgrounds would be teaching students. Also, adjuncts are often part-time and relocation is not an issue. "

Reviewing vacancies before layoffs.

"Indefinitely suspending" vacant positions in certain areas might be an alternative, but before you consider layoffs, consider eliminating and/or all University Aide and Tech-Pro positions. These positions are how VPs and AVPs are getting around 1.0 FTE anyway, so ditch these temp positions first and let's see how things shake out.

avoid if possible, look for vacancy saving, position/department restructuring, creative ways to fill student needs

I think layoffs should be a last resort. Certainly with the 60 day hold on filling open positions, maybe some of those positions could be re-assessed as not essential and then those positions can be eliminated. This would be similar to layoffs but not affect anyone's livelihood.

Is it layoffs, or, just not replacing positions that open up?

Keep open positions vacant until it is determined they are necessary. No layoffs if possible.

Look at open/unfilled positions.

Start w/ vacant positions.

This option hopefully can be implemented by not hiring positions for a few months creating cost savings through vacancy. In some cases departments may decide to leave a position open indefinitely or eliminate a position

permanently to address unit budget needs when positions are voluntarily vacated. Recommendation of PLC to include units in this option to first identify positions units feel can be eliminated is good. There may need to be a more systematic way of deciding if a position is eliminated if enough savings cannot be generated through vacancy savings.

Utilize folks leaving as a way to get this implemented. Don't fill vacancies as oppose to letting people go.

Option 11-Contracted Services

Our analysis of the comments found that 147 agreed with PLC that no university-level services should be eliminated at this time, but they should be considered at the division/college level. 9 disagreed with that and 29 had mixed responses including agreeing with contingencies.

Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Need more information
- Consider redundant programs
- Hire internally
- Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Need more information

Many respondents indicated that they need more information about this recommendation, including how much money it would save, or mentioned that they do not fully understand the option or recommendation.

Do not know enough about this topic.

Don't know enough about this. Suggestion to request feedback and perform evaluations on any/all services, software, etc. on a regular basis (though I imagine a lot of this is already done).

don't know enough to respond

I am not sure I have a firm grasp on examples of low ROI services that would potentially be eliminated so I have no comment on this.

I don't understand this one.

I don't have enough information to form an opinion.

I don't know enough to have an opinion.

I don't understand this one, but it seems fine.

I would be interested in who gets to make decisions regarding ROI.

I'm not sure what this entails.

I'm not sure what this means, but it sounds like a good idea.

Low return on investment contracted services should be eliminated when identified. I don't have a broad scope of what these may be, but more comprehensive review of existing and new services should definitely be included.

While not exactly a service, during the part of year that the grass is being watered it often seems to leave the ground

overly soggy and results in a lot of runoff. Maybe watering for less time or less frequent watering could save the University some money and would also be good for the environment in a dry part of the country. Maybe keeping the

temperature of buildings at 70 during the winter and 74 during the summer or something similar would also generate a little bit of savings.

Not sure what those are, difficult to comment.

Seems like a good idea but unclear on how much money this would save.

This is unclear. What contracted services? And what constitutes a low return on investment?

This seems to make sense, but I don't have much info on this.

Too vague here, an example would be? If there would be ways to integrate with the surrounding community for some student support services or law enforcement etc., these seem reasonable and might actually generate productive synergy. If there are folks who are a "drain" on their unit bringing down morale etc. these returns on investment seem like they should be addressed. Who would define "low return?"

unclear description and unclear savings.

We need more strategic members and input in the technology committees.

What's the actual cost savings?

Yes, but didn't have enough information on cost savings or how this would work to offer comment. We need to stop hiring outside consultants for every little thing we need done... which has happened on a clip of at least one a year the entire time I've worked here.

Consider redundant programs

Respondents mentioned that this option should include an evaluation process to eliminate redundant programs.

Eliminating redundancy should also be explored first (i.e. differences in digital signage platforms around campus).

Evaluate software for overlap and duplication of functions (university-wide process).

I totally agree with this - we have so many systems that seem to be redundant. That using the information provided is not accurate, not shared, not effective. Example: Degree Works/SSC- basically do the same thing, why do we need both? Banner has a reporting and room scheduling modules, why do we need Insight and 25Live?

I would like to see a dollar amount for what we spend on outside contracting. Must we do national searches for Deans, Provosts using consulting firms. Has to be a way of evaluating the investment. We have very educated people at the University who should be able to handle some of these services.

Look at redundant software and pick one to stay with.

Hire internally

Some respondents suggested that some services that are currently done by contracted services should be done by internal employees instead.

agreed. Leverage in-house expertise to accomplish duties that contracts are brought in for.

Implement at unit level. Assist unit in determining value of services and other options for services possibly including enlisting the services of the university's IT and Financial Services departments to help determine ROI.

In the areas that this is feasible, this is a good idea. Internal services retains UNC jobs and builds moral.

It has been my impression, over many years at UNC, that most consulting firms contracted, for a variety of things, have been a large waste of money. Further, it seems to me that many of these types of professional services could be contracted in house, hiring faculty to do these services, perhaps as overload pay, summer salary or differential workloads, at a considerable savings.

Leverage internal employees in lieu of outsourcing projects.

Need to utilize in house resources more. Why did we use a firm to create a new logo? We have a marketing school and visual arts programs. They should have utilized our own students.

Of course this would work. We have contracted too many outside services when university employees could do the job as part of their work load.

plenty of in-house talent to get the job done.

This can be considered. If there are jobs that can be handled by internal employees rather than contracted services, then we should lean towards that. We should also consider possibly training folks to be able to help provide those contract services. Unfortunately, I don't know enough about what contracted services we have but, for instance, I still see Deep Rock water delivery on campus. Since the drinking fountains have largely been replaced with those that allow for filling of reusable bottles, why are any units still paying for water delivery?

Eliminating redundancy should also be explored first (i.e. differences in digital signage platforms around campus).

Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Some respondents mentioned specific programs, such as Digital Measures, as programs to get rid of and respondents also mentioned that this should apply to all contracts, not just software programs.

"I don't know much about this, but it seems worth looking into. One thing to consider, too, is balancing the efficiency a given piece of software provides with the resources necessary to teach people how to use it. We've purchased a LOT of software that hasn't worked for us (e.g. whatever that software was we used to use to report assessment, Livetext?). People have to learn how to use it, then we get rid of it. It's a waste.

Allow for anonymous nominations for services that may not be returning investment.

Ask the people who use software's for their opinion.

Digital measures – get rid of it.

Digital measures (mixed).

Eliminate UNC hosted shared servers (personal and college network drives) and migrate everyone to OneDrive. We have been paying for both services for at least 3 years."

Evaluate contracts for effectiveness and delivery of product.

Get rid of Digital Matters, Slate, Canvas, and the other 20+ software packages that help university support by pushing their workloads to faculty. Fine, keep Canvas, but who the hell thought investing in Digital Matters was a good idea? Fire them, and get rid of that piece of crap, time wasting software.

Get rid of the Boomerang Bus...it's very expensive and there is not much of a return on investment. Or...please consider a cheaper option that the university can operate...we have the vehicles (people movers).

I agree that a more rigorous review of requests be applied. This needs to be done on a unit or case by case basis, with guidelines regarding use, benefit, and need.

I support further consideration of this option. In addition to software and services, I also recommend the furniture purchasing requirements be lifted as it is typically much more expensive to purchase furniture through our contracted vendors versus purchasing directly from a vendor of choice or from Amazon.

Make sure division level decisions aren't made without first obtaining division – wide feedback on needs/uses for software and services.

Make the standards for evaluating contracted services more public and transparent.

More guidelines from the university level for eliminating contracted services with low return on investment . Absolutely agree with more rigorous software review requests and renewals. consider offering share points where multiple users using software some of the time can still access the program without costing per user. Justification of high use for a single user installation.

Please continue to review what is currently going on. It makes sense to cut things that don't have a good return on investment - unless it's my job of course :-)

please do and please stop adopting painful, useless software that the faculty HATE, like DM

Please review the contracted services, including those that include agreements with other institutions for teaching/student swapping and get rid of the ones that have low ROI or that actually lose the university money.

Re-evaluate use and value of current programs.

Review software subscriptions that automatically renew each year.

Shouldn't we look at everything to see which have low returns on investment?

Stronger hiring guidelines.

STRONGLY agree w/ more rigorous review from IT – to allow their support, more centralized efforts, less software with similar functionality.

The recommendations only address software contracts - how about all of the consultants we have hired over the years with no return on investment. We need a policy for senior leadership decisions about hiring consultants that brings accountability to those leaders when they continue throwing money at overpaid "experts" who have no investment in the outcomes.

There are certainly some services that can be eliminated. Some of the library subscriptions come to mind, but I'm sure there are more and this is something that should be explored.

Transition all faculty and staff to windows based machines. This could eliminate licensing for apple variations of certain software products. Only keep Macs in labs and creative studios where necessary.

We could just follow board policies on contracts (vis-a-vis the story from last semester about the university being scammed by a contractor).

We encourage a careful review (w/ criteria for evaluation) of our contract services.

What technology exists on campus that could be used more widely if: more folks knew it existed, software was appropriately supported (not only in IT but also in depts.)

When new versions of windows are installed, an employee no longer has access to programs they needed to perform their jobs. All the window program should be available.

Why does this apply to just "software? Computer should have all the windows programs.

yes and a better screening process for new services

Option 12-Travel

Our analysis of the comments found that 59 agreed with PLC that travel should be addressed at the division level. 121 disagreed with that and 118 had mixed responses including agreeing with contingencies. Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Professional development
- University reputation
- Impact on students
- Research
- Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Professional development

Respondents stressed that implementing this recommendation would negatively impact professional development for faculty by impacting promotions and tenure and if implemented respondents noted that faculty evaluations may need to change to take this into account.

This will negatively impact recruiting, faculty morale, and professional development. Doing this on a temporary basis is one thing, but it will be difficult to sustain quality with such a policy.

"Again, this should, eventually, be addressed at the division level, but not until the inequities are ironed out. I get that needs vary, but inequities are still vast. Yeah, it might affect people's ability to get tenure, but we could simply change tenure requirement. It would, however, harm UNC's reputation as a research institution and professional development opportunities.

I don't like the use of "permanently" in this. I think tightening our purse straps for a couple of years makes sense. If we do this "permanently" once again, we are inhibiting professional development, which will make UNC a less desirable school with less desirable staff and faculty. This definitely IS an area that can be reduced and have more restrictions made, but if our product is education, we need to have staff and faculty that are continually learning and growing professionally."

Additional cuts would have serious impacts on faculty's ability to meet expectations for promotion and tenure. If we want to attract students, we need to maintain our reputation individually but also as UNC as innovators in our fields. The way you do this is by sharing your research with peers. I would like to see the PLC including Dr. Linda Black in these conversations. As the head of the graduate school and the office of research, she has additional insights into how these types of cuts will impact graduate programs and faculty's ability to do research and apply for external grants.

Additionally, part of the tenure/contract renewal process involves "professional development" - and that involves travel to bigger cities and sometimes overseas where the educational opportunities are hosted."

Again, this makes us less competitive. For faculty, this could inhibit them from getting tenure. For staff, I hope there will at least be a competitive scholarship they can receive. It's difficult to put UNC on the map if we aren't in these spaces. With this in mind, I would be more willing to give this up than taking a pay cut.

Agree with PLC take-aways, but emphasize the far-reaching negative impact of this option. This would yield relatively small returns while seriously harming the productivity of faculty who are actively engaged in RSCW. Instead, be smart about it and, if necessary, implement a rubric that limits funds for faculty who are NOT actively engaged in RSCW and retains funds for those who are and can demonstrate need for these funds. However, they should NOT be available through a competition like PAT, RDFD—they should be available to faculty who need them

for their professional activity.

Concern that staff's professional growth/education will be limited.

Conference attendance for students is often dependent upon faculty attendance at conferences, especially for undergraduate students. Allowing students to attend conferences is a great opportunity for academic growth, as well as networking and forming a professional identity. Therefore, I think it is highly important to allow faculty to still attend conferences with financial support so that their students in turn can attend such conferences. This will increase the chance that students participate in research and make UNC a well-known name in the research world.

Create funding on a bi-annual basis to still allow networking and development.

disagree with PLC; conference, grant, research and sabbatical travel are essential components of a faculty members professional roles/responsibilities and disallowing travel could have a negative impact on tenure and promotion opportunities as well as the ability to secure grant \$

Faculty – affects evaluations – have to maintain expertise (staff too).

Faculty can't flourish, present research, etc., without this. What incentive would a tenure-track or newly-tenured faculty member have to stick around UNC if UNC doesn't invest in their professional development?

Faculty travel is so important. Ex: generates new ideas, increases publication activity and UNC's profile, increases funding opportunities (the difference between getting a grant or not), informs teaching, contributes to tenure and promotion.

For research-active faculty the ability to travel for research or conferences, especially at the teaching-intensive University such as UNC, is absolutely essential. Eliminating, or reducing, already quite meager travel support will again cause retention and hiring issues. This will also have a significant negative impact on our graduate and undergraduate students, ability of our undergraduates to continue to graduate programs, impact the quality of tenure and promotion, and overall, is one of the measures that will have a quick and visible negative effect on the University at large. Maybe one option can be reducing the per-faculty funding allocation and increasing the amount of funds available through the internal grant programs, such as PAT or RDFD, to increase the impact of this funding.

For those with graduate programming, mentoring our students to present at conferences is important to their development as scholars. It is also our method for attracting potential graduate students. I think the impact would have a differential impact on graduate vs undergraduate faculty and faculty seeking tenure vs those who are tenured. Not sure you can make a blanket policy as it would have a differential impact.

How will our underpaid junior faculty achieve higher ranks if they are not supported for travel? How will we ever attract excellent faculty if we don't support travel?

Hurts professional development.

I do not agree that travel should be restricted. Could the current funding amount be used for faculty who are presenting either oral or poster? This will truly affect the ability to be promoted and tenured for many programs/departments. Then, for faculty who are not presenting, they would receive a smaller amount of funding.

If we want to be an institution that doesn't require professional development of its faculty, then fine.

If you cut travel you're going to seriously limit professional development for fac/staff. There needs to be a fair

application process. It's frustrating to see some staff members that get to travel while others do not. Especially when conference travel is imperative to the job.

Implement option until a significant change in deficit is achieved. Determinations must be made at unit level but a more equitable distribution of travel related to professional development should be considered. Faculty have opportunities for funding for professional development and career advancement opportunities that exempt or classified staff do not.

In order to do my job effectively professional development is important. I don't feel this is sustainable as we want students to know UNC is doing their best to have well-trained staff and faculty. Every division should get \$.

Just as it is difficult to recruit staff while offering no professional development, this could severely dis-incentivize faculty recruitment. However, creating more oversight and limits on per-diem, lodging, and airfare (certain faculty will only fly first-class and stay at 4+ star hotels) would be reasonable and still allow their participation.

Lack of pro. devo. opportunities continues to put UNC behind.

let each department decide if a conference fits in their budget or not, cross campus blanket calls may stifle professional development

Look @ a more rigorous travel application process for faculty travel – faculty should submit a short report of the impact of their travel on their professional activity.

Many faculty members rely on travel to remain relevant in their fields. Please strike this option.

No - faculty must be able to travel/present research as part of their path to tenure and promotion.

No, unless it can be resolved to not affect promotions

not an option given already low pay. how are we to be professionals?

Professional development is limited through UNC.

Professional development pretty much requires attending at least one conference a year. It is not uncommon for me to attend two--in which case I often pay for a large portion of the second out of pocket. It is hard to attend a conference for less than \$800.00.

Restrict when possible, but again, it will likely help if this was a time limited strategy as it will impact promotions, tenure, and recruitment of new faculty.

Restricting travel would restrict my ability to do my research and present my findings. If this is done, the qualifications for promotion and tenure would need to be changed.

Scholarship requires dissemination of knowledge for advancement, promotion and tenure. Set a limit on amount of travel reimbursement, currently in my area it is 1500 which does not cover travel, lodging registration etc for most conferences. Employee is already paying a share. Do allow grant funded travel.

Should be done very selectively. The ability to present scholarly work at national and international conferences is essential to faculty career development. I would suggest using funding criteria that recognize this essential function. Travel just for the sake of networking or info gathering can be heavily restricted/reduced, but sharing peer-reviewed

scholarship with a larger body of colleagues is crucial if we want to have a faculty as strong as those in our peer group.

That would negatively impact our tenure and promotion evaluations and hugely impact some of our work satisfaction.

The amount faculty receive now for travel often times is barely enough to cover travel expenses for one conference. I think taking this benefit away sends a negative message that UNC is not willing to invest professional development for their own faculty. It's also important for UNC to have "a face" at these types of events to promote networking with other institutions.

Then forget about being an R-1 and get rid of this criteria in our tenure and promotion guidelines. Conferences cost a great deal of money. We gain national reputations at conferences. We earn promotion through our participation in conferences and by serving on committees at conferences. Making 58,000 a year, and potentially less in the future based on some of the recommendations in this table, I will not be able to afford to attend any conferences if travel is cut (and I only attend one state and one national conference a year).

There are many faculty/staff positions that REQUIRE conference attendance to maintain various credentials to do their job. I believe those positions should be assisted with funding to do so, however, coaches and faculty/staff positions who just go to conferences voluntarily should be restricted. Those positions that REQUIRE continuing education should be identified and assisted.

This is an important part of professional development. Maybe have a centralized system to help with fairness and consistency. Also maybe implement an application process.

This is ridiculous; if we are evaluated on professional development and dissemination we should be supported in this manner. Furthermore, networking face to face frequently leads to grant ideas and development.

This makes me nervous because of the value this can add to a professional's development.

This makes no sense while trying to grow the research mission of the college. This would severely impact professional development and extramural funding to the university. This would also have a negative impact on our ability to hire new young faculty.

This measure appears rather restrictive and unrealistic. It does not allow professional development.

This negatively impacts faculty promotion/review. It makes UNC less attractive as a place to continue working or to recruit faculty to work here. This is also the way UNC's reputation gets heard. This has also been how faculty recruit good students.

This seems unsustainable. Travel is an essential component of professional life for faculty and exempt staff.

This will affect those faculty highly involved in research, and affects promotion, tenure, but also professional development. Should be not reduced across the board but in accordance with efficiency of receiving grants and funding for their research and their student teaching satisfaction .

This would also put UNC at a competitive disadvantage AND would mean changing evaluation for faculty across campus as well. I do not support this.

This would be challenging for some, as promotion and tenure decisions are often based on presentations of research done at conferences. Perhaps some of this money could be shifted toward a grant-based application process rather than an assumption that all faculty have a certain amount of travel money.

This would be difficult for Tenure Track faculty that are seeking promotion to meet their research and professional obligations since they are typically on a low salary already. I would NOT cut travel allowances for faculty or any staff that it is a requirement for their role or accreditation, etc. Keep what is currently in place.

We believe that money dedicated to travel has a positive impact on employee professional development. Reducing travel funds would strain faculty's ability to attend conferences, particularly those that take students to academic conferences. A reduction in travel funds might negatively impact recruitment efforts and individual faculty member's research guides program curriculum. Less opportunity for faculty research travel could result in weaker curriculum for students. Quality of our students' education must be our priority. Perhaps this might be implemented until such time that finances improve.

What will be the impact on staff development and curriculum development for faculty and staff.

Would impact evaluation and tenure

Yes, but. For faculty this is difficult because conference presentation is essential to tenure review. This is an area I believe you could put it into a competitive process. As for staff, admissions often needs to travel while my unit hasn't travelled in two years now accept to local (driveable) conferences. It is difficult to make this an across the board cut.

University reputation

Respondents highlighted that implementing this plan would hurt the university's reputation by making it less competitive, making it harder to recruit and retain faculty, it would make the university less known, and veer from the university's mission.

"Depends - could be reduced at the college/department level. In Theatre & Dance our faculty goes on recruiting trips - and this significantly helps us in growing our program and retaining higher numbers.

Another idea that will drive away young faculty and absolutely hamstring recruiting and hiring new faculty.

Any reduction travel will greatly impact our exposure as a university. Travel is not always necessary for professional development, however, permanently reducing or removing this option may be hard for all employees to swallow.

Are we a university in which we honor the elements of the "academy"? Engagement with professional peers at professional events/organizations is essential to community building and university reputation and visibility.

Can restrict ability to attract and retain productive faculty.

Certain disciplines only offer national conferences. We'd be unable to stay up to date and keep our reputation as a leading program, which is what draws students. Possible long term revenue impact. The amounts allowed now are not enough as it is.

Conference travel is good for spreading ideas and getting our school's name out their, but maybe cut down on travel costs.

Doesn't sound like a good idea. This would need to be amended. For people who are conducting research or

presenting information we need to have UNC's name out there or it will forever be ignored.

Don't touch faculty travel, as it is what allows us to secure grant funding and advance the research that puts UNC on the map.

Faculty conference travel is critical for research and the advancement of knowledge, as well as the improvement of teaching. This is another road to becoming a university in name only.

How do we stay competitive in academics?

Hurts recruitment retention.

I would not support this ... this is a way for us to get our name out there and to work with faculty across other universities and disciplines.

If you want faculty to be the stewards of the university and positively represent UNC at the state/national/international levels you have to support their travel. We have already seen huge reductions in travel funding including elimination of the OSP travel awards and reduction in FRPB internal grants.

If you want UNC to be a place where leaders in their fields attract and teach lucky students, this seems unwise. In my field conferences are essential to remain up to date on cutting edge research and to disseminate the results of my own research. I also actively contribute to my discipline's professional societies, which in turn gives UNC visibility. Perhaps there could be more rigorous criteria to determine which conferences/presentations are the most likely to provide a return on investment, (e.g, if a faculty member has gone to x number of conferences and that professional activity is mirrored by publications/grants, it's a good sign those conferences were necessary and productive; if not, perhaps re-evaluate).

If your goal is to increase the university's visibility, stature, and research revenue, then this is a terrible idea. Faculty travel, collaboration and dissemination of scholarship are hugely important to maintaining the University's reputation.

Like cutting research funding, limiting participation in research and conferences hurts faculty, students, and the university as an institution of higher education. Reducing scholars' ability to produce and disseminate original research defeats the purpose of being a university.

Long term, this is not a wise choice. If our faculty are not interfacing with professionals around the country and around the world, they are not moving academic discourse forward. How will this impact our HLC and other accreditation programs? No faculty member will want to stay here long term without this benefit. Turnover will be very high, and that actually ends up costing the university more money. You have to think long term on this issue.

No absolutely bad idea! Once again does UNC want to lose faculty? This isn't honestly even that much and I don't think it will really save the university that much.

Not a good idea: already been cut a lot; affects morale and professional competence

Not sure if this applies only to faculty, but the ban on staff travel is having a serious effect on staff morale. Why not give managers a travel budget and cut off the funds if they go over?

Perhaps obviously, from a faculty perspective, this does not seem like a good idea; we are already tasked with raising the research profile of the university. Perhaps there are better, more stringent processes for deciding the

allotment of development funds.

Permanent travel restrictions could hurt faculty and be a disservice to the university as a whole.

Permanently? So again, you are asking employees to work more, but be paid less and/or have fewer benefits, and still no plan for raises in the near future. Good luck hiring new faculty.

Please be aware that the assiduous - and successful - recruitment efforts in the School of Music require travel. Without it, student enrollment and quality of the students we attract will both nose-dive.

Restricting travel could hurt UNC reputation over time and cont. ed.

See #9. One of the only saving graces for many of us over the past few years is that UNC had a fairly robust travel fund. If you restrict faculty conference travel you should also reduce scholarly requirements. That, though, is another example of shooting yourself in the foot. You want faculty who are current in their fields and engaged on national and international levels. They bring prestige and desirability to the school. Why in the world would you even consider taking this away? Networking, getting UNC's name out there in programs (a form of marketing) would be reduced and faculty would be bitter and intellectually deprived. We did not even get cost of living raises for the last two years, something Walmart employees get. We are not happy or able to make ends meet, and we are trying to support you. Don't do this.

See answer to option #8. This puts UNC at an academic and professional disadvantage.

The institution loses when our staff is not current, trained in best practices, or making critical connections w/ other institutions, colleagues, etc.

This impacts our reputation; faculty opportunities to present research.

This is a short sided way to save a little money and really hurt morale amongst faculty. It would lead to even more faculty leaving and make it even harder to attract good faculty at the horrible salaries

This is antithetical to UNC's mission.

This is how we recruit in the School of Music, so this would have a negative impact on recruitment and enrollment, which seems to be not a good idea.

This option would isolate faculty and therefore the university.

This will KILL scholarship at UNC. That said, administrators and some faculty who regularly travel to Asia should be looked at with a critical eye. What has been the return on that investment?

This will negatively impact data dissemination, UNC's visibility, and networking opportunities

This would be detrimental to the University

This would make UNC less attractive to work and hurt our scholarly reputation, but I'm not totally opposed.

Unless this impacts student recruitment and retention, yes.

We will lose faculty and staff retention.

While I see this as a potential cost-saving plan, conference travel is a wonderful way to increase the desirability of a program and increase the prestige of this university. As such, I would say that it may be better to continue to pay for this but instead have faculty indicate what will likely come from this travel that would benefit UNC as a whole or their specific program. With this in place, we could then better see what travel should be paid for and what travel is potentially a loss at this point in time. By permanently reducing travel or faculty conference travel, we will decrease the desirability of this university for programs that are primarily research based.

You are really going to Lose Faculty on this one. The Quality of your Faculty in a lot of areas is determined by the papers they submit to conferences and they only get credit if they go to support them. Which brings Recognition to the University and more higher-level students.

You will lose good faculty, you disadvantage us when we apply for external funding, and you won't be able to recruit any good new faculty. HORRIBLE idea.

Impact on students

Respondents suggested that this recommendation would negatively impact students by limiting faculty's opportunities to improve their teaching methods and would prevent faculty from being able to mentor students at conferences.

I believe this need should be determined by the Provost and Executive staff and reduce if possible as long as it doesn't affect the education of our students.

I don't see how having faculty not participate in their field for conferences is beneficial to the students.

Many areas rely on professional organizations and conferences to gain valuable knowledge in their areas that is not available locally. This improves programs and services on campus for students. Additionally, in some areas, continuing education is essential to ensure legal compliance. If travel will be reduced/restricted it should be done intentionally and thoughtfully to ensure UNC staff and faculty are offered opportunities for PD to maintain essential skills and update knowledge in their areas.

Many of us are already shouldering much of the cost for professional development - and presentation at national and international meetings, by faculty, graduate, and undergraduate students - is a critical component of the creation and dissemination of new knowledge - the mainstay of the University. Further, the savings realized would not amount to a significant savings.

Not a great strategy--we need our faculty to be visible in their area of expertise in order to draw students to their programs.

This is a bad idea - this allows faculty to engage in promoting their research and connecting with others with whom they can collaborate. This trickles down to students, especially in research focused programs (undergrad research and graduate school).

Research

Respondents noted that this recommendation would hurt research at the university and the ability for faculty to bring in grants as travel is necessary for sharing and collaborating on research.

"Faculty travel is an essential part of the university. Dissemination of new research is part of the process of the creation of new knowledge.

"More thorough vetting of travel and conferences is needed. Ideally this should be done at the department level, but experience says that this doesn't happen. Only conferences where 1st author research is presented or where faculty are on a governance board should be approved. Conference attendance for ""networking"" or membership should not be allowed. Small panel discussions or roundtable attendance is insufficient reason.

Faculty who have a research assignment need conference travel support. It could be cut from those who do not.

For non-research producing faculty, sure. But not the ones who travel and publish and bring in grant money.

I want to first highlight the importance of keeping faculty research active. Nonetheless, reducing the budget for travel seems feasible without a big reduction in productivity, even by 15-20%.

If this takes place, I assume that the research component to faculty workloads would need to be reduced.

If we are going to say this is a research institution, then I don't see how this would be helpful. Having said that I do thing there could be restrictions on what the travel/PD funds could be used for - it used to be they could only be used if you presenting and then in morphed into buying books, just attending a conference, etc. Also funding is given to all full-time faculty, CR, TT, Tenured, whether they have a PD component to their workload - why? If they are not doing research, then

It's hard to share research and collaborate with colleagues if you cannot attend conferences and resent your research, or listen to others do likewise.

No. We need to do research. This is the future of education.

Possibly, but some faculty travel as a means to earn grant dollars. This could be a way for UNC to gain funds.

Research productivity will drop and the best-qualified faculty will leave. Conference travel is essential to successful research, and faculty research travel funding is pathetic as it is.

This is a university. Conferences are a vital part of creating visibility for our university research, collaborations with others in the field and contribution to one's discipline. This is completely unreasonable!

This is not a viable idea given the very clear directive that faculty be producing more research and bringing in more research money.

This should be decided at the department level, not University wide. Some travel is necessary for accreditation and research.

This will have serious consequences in the effectiveness of faculty and research. Which will in turn have serious consequences for students. Great caution should be used when taking away the further education of your faculty.

Travel should be competitive for faculty with clear research agendas. Too much travel is recreational in nature. If a conference is in Hawaii (other prime locations) suddenly everyone in the department travels and is a scholar. Have the conference in Boise, Id and nobody is interested.

While I believe that this can offer short term cost savings, I believe that reducing travel or restricting conference travel may have huge impacts on research productivity. This seems in direct conflict with one approach that our new President has mentioned multiple times, which is increasing grant funding at the university. Without funds to

attend conferences, or travel for research, many faculty members may not be able to begin collaborations that may lead to grand funding being brought in to UNC. If no other options exist, then I would support this option though.

While this is a seemingly easy fix to budget deficits, it negatively impacts faculty, especially those who are active in scholarship opportunity to disseminate knowledge and represent UNC in the wider research community. Restricting travel to that which faculty are actively engaged in (e.g., only supported or presenting) would be acceptable.

Would lead to decrease in research productivity. would have to modify faculty evaluation criteria.

Yes. I also think we need to continue travel where it is needed and makes sense. Travel should be justified and be of benefit to UNC. Conference presentations, essential training, research presentation should be expected for approved travels.

Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Many respondents who indicated they agree with the PLC recommendation felt that if implemented there needs to be more restrictions, there should be a limited number of trips allowed, travel should be kept in state, there should be accountability for those traveling, the recommendation should include staff and administrators, not just faculty, and it should be a short-term plan, not permanent.

"Eliminate automatic faculty travel and make it a competitive process. Offer faculty option of changing position to teaching focused, no need for research or travel.

Again, travel needs to be managed. If we have guidelines they need to be enforced. Recruitment travel should come first.

Allow travel supported by grants.

Can there be an application process for travel?

Can there be more strict requirements for travel and limitations on departments or colleges?

Can virtual or remote training/conferences replace travel?

Centralize international travel in a transparent, accountable way to ensure cross pollination: when faculty travel overseas, they are expected to engage in UNC related research, recruitment and partnership work on behalf of UNC with a written report submitted upon return. Priority should be given to faculty traveling to UNC partner institutions or engaging in activities that foster academic work and/or recruitment opportunities. A centralized approach allows to professionalize the current fragmented operation when nobody knows where our staff and faculty travel. This poses a significant risk in case of an emergency, natural disaster or political unrest without UNC's ability to act fast to ensure safety.

Centralized travel budget, by division? – request/proposal for travel, internal prof. development (similar to CSU), in-state resources.

Consider reducing both faculty and administrative travel. Regarding faculty conference travel, one option to reduce (but not totally eliminate travel) would be to offer funding on alternating years. For example, half of UNC faculty would receive funding during "odd" years and the other half during "even" years. Similarly, funding for administrative travel could be cut in half (or eliminated) as well.

create a more competitive process, submit impact reports detailing how this contributes to scholarship

Create standards/rules for travel that are more universal.

Depending on the area and expense this should be considered

Don't eliminate it, but scrutinize it more.

Don't think this should be permanent. Conferences are valuable to our educators. Do agree with short term restrictions.

EVERYONE should be subject to this, including faculty. However, everyone should be able to request travel with the review done within the division. Is it possible to limit the amount of funding provided by the University? Require the request for grants? Out of pocket expenses?

Exceptions are needed to attend regional or national trainings in these cases. Otherwise, good idea.

Having travel requests be reviewed by a 3rd party (other department or upper management) to determine if the travel is necessary or to review if there are other methods of obtaining the same results with no to little travel is a good idea. If there are faculty that are "required" to travel, are they reviewing the best, least expensive options for their trips?

I agree that all out of state travel should be scrutinized and maybe made public to see how important it really is. Especially in this day and age of technology.

I can get all the training I need, and I do have mandated training, online and it is high quality. I can attend conferences online. Some universities are doing this to reduce carbon footprints also.

I do not agree with PLC recommendation to address at division level. Equitable cuts to travel for all divisions. Leave it up to the employee or provide a similar small budget to each department that will rotate through faculty/staff. At a previous institution, I was not able to travel every year to a conference, but shared a travel budget with colleagues, which rotated between staff each year. Also, this absolutely disproportionately affects lower salary earners (and early career employees), who ultimately need institutional support to receive professional development early careers.

I don't know if a permanent across the board reduction is appropriate, but maybe travel going forward should be more thoroughly vetted than it has been in the past. Continuing all travel restrictions until the budget deficit has been addressed makes sense.

I feel like there are far better things to restrict than faculty travel. The catalyst retreat could be eliminated instead. It primarily serves as a university funded political trip. Those resources could be far better used to help other employees and faculty with training and travel costs.

I think a permanent reduction would be acceptable, but more than that, I think that faculty should have to apply for and get approved for conference travel. No offense to any faculty, but it's not as though we have tons of widely-known faculty members that are in demand at conferences. Yes, they provide opportunities to network, gain new information, pedagogies, etc., but much of this can be gained in other ways as well, such as webinars, reviewing

materials from conferences, etc. Faculty are important to this university, but not so important that they cannot be asked to sacrifice in order to ensure UNC's financial security.

I think trips to China should be suspended

I understand this is a research facility, but I also think that conference travel should be restricted to one conference per academic year.

If possible, maintaining provost travel grants as an option.

If you do this, you would have to adjust our FTE as we are required to travel for conferences.

I'm not faculty, but making progress in my career in terms of compensation and growth only possible through participation in our departments governing body and conference through my own cost with the hope of maybe getting a chance to be paid more is ABSOLUTELY ASININE.

Implement permanent reductions in travel for everyone.

In AY16-17, faculty professional development funds were increased \$200 to \$1200 total. Reduce it back down to \$1000. Limit hotel costs to actual federal travel guidelines. If they book a hotel that is \$50 over the nightly limit, that amount cannot be paid by UNC, regardless of if there are travel funds left.

Increase standards for approving fac travel.

Increase standards for approving faculty/staff travel.

Instead of reducing this amount, I recommend requiring faculty to disclose the benefits of travel, especially if they have received it before.

It should be fair and based on need. Some professors and administrators can go to China several times per year while others struggle to get coverage for their annual conference. Make it fair.

Let Admissions do their thing, but the rest of us may need to hold off for now.

Many license agreements require travel for training or conferences – travel restrictions helped – so keep in effect under approval basis in case by case scenario.

No, bad idea to make it a permanent policy. Short term, one or two years makes sense

OK, but employee review process must be adjusted in response.

Only one trip per year? (except for accreditation – staff too)

Or have a rotating schedule. Every other year?

Perhaps make travel funding more competitive and central. This is only for the faculty travel side though; it seems like a lot could be saved by reducing travel expenses for athletics.

Permanently establish rigorous approval process for all staff/faculty travel. Only fund if PRESENTING or with good defense of importance of attending. No international unless a major role in proceedings.

Permanently is a long time - perhaps evaluate on a yearly basis

possible if criteria is consistent across departments, would need to adjust annual evaluations criteria based on changes. Possible to reduce the number of conferences attended

Recommend an application process.

Recommendation: in-house trainings, speakers, etc. and no catering – we'll brown bag!

Reducing travel is fine, but it should not apply only to staff as is the current policy. We may need to develop some type of policy that requires more justification for travel and that something happen after the travel is completed to share what was learned or somehow contribute to the greater good of the university, not just the individual employee building a vita.

Remove automatic \$1,200 funding for faculty but allow funding to remain and make process competitive.

Restrict faculty from sharing funds. If faculty A does not use funds, cannot transfer them to faculty B for travel."

Restrict travel to a specific \$/person or department.

Sabbaticals that are productive are much more important than travel. These allow research and pubs to occur that is almost impossible otherwise. There does need to be more accountability on the other end though where faculty show what they accomplished. "

Severely restrict faculty travel or unify the application process for travel.

Shared unit pools. We don't all need travel every year.

Should also review travel for staff not just faculty.

Should apply to all types of staff, not just faculty, everyone.

Sure, but you will have to change tenure/promotion requirements. But you could reduce to \$600-800. And stop going to Asia, administrators.

Take away the automatic \$1,200 that all faculty get and turn it into a process for them to apply for the funds if they need them for travel.

There are people in staff positions on campus that need to be up to date with compliance regulations, need outside resources and training to do their jobs well and keep the university name out there, so cutting travel permanently is not a realistic, favorable option.

There could be restrictions to the travel - limit the amount we pay out for the trip, the distance covered, the amount of people, if they went last year/wait for two years.

This is one where travel needs vary widely by division. Agree to keep it at a division decision but continue to have stricter guidelines.

Tiered allocation for travel (Jr. faculty rely more on travel for prof. development).

To avoid harming junior faculty still on the tenure track, units who count presentations must be directed to change their evaluation criteria.

Track dept./divisions. – makes equitable, might see where abuse is happening in certain areas or the same people keep traveling. (i.e. 20 people in housing attend the same conference perhaps do some train the trainer?) (i.e. same few people in dining go to some conferences over and over).

Travel expenses should be part of each department and division and they need to mbe reviewed on a case by case basis

Travel should be approved only when the employee traveling is benefiting UNC.

Travel should only be done when required to perform job duties.

Upper Administration also needs reduction."

Use internal experts and trainers. Work with other front range institutions to provide local (Colorado) training opportunities. Reduce out of state and international travel.

Use the experts we have on our campus to provide training and professional development.

Use webinars and video conference.

We don't need multiple people traveling to the same conference.

Why not staff here? They can probably weather this better than faculty.

yes but for all employees not just faculty

Yes. Also reduce inappropriate spending; like having lunches catered for meetings! Review REIMB to staff/faculty with more scrutiny.

You're already doing this to Exempt staff so why shouldn't everyone? Faculty and Executives.

Like cutting research funding, limiting participation in research and conferences hurts faculty, students, and the university as an institution of higher education. Reducing scholars' ability to produce and disseminate original research defeats the purpose of being a university.

Option 13-Athletics

Our analysis of the comments found that 125 agreed with PLC that UNC should set a cost-savings goal for Athletics as part of the campus-wide process, focusing on reducing costs rather than exploring a conference/division move at this time. 4 disagreed with that and 24 had mixed responses including agreeing with contingencies.

Key themes found in the comments are highlighted below:

- Need more info
- Move back to DII
- Focus on a few sports (eliminate some)
- Accountability
- Academics should have priority
- Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Need more info

Many respondents noted that this option did not provide the information necessary to make an informed decision. Respondents highlighted that they would like the option to be more transparent and would like more information regarding the Athletic department's budget, how much money Athletics brings to the university, and how much money this option would save.

"Agree with PLC's recommendation to set a cost-savings goal for Athletics. I think it would be helpful to the campus to get a some statistics on how many student athletes are on scholarships and what it would mean to move from Division I to Division II. How will this impact our students? I believe having this information will enlighten the campus and give us a better understanding of how many of our student-athletes are NOT on scholarships and how many would not be at UNC without their scholarship \$\$\$. Consider having student-athletes have more of a role in getting people to attend their games. Before games they could be around campus encouraging students to come to games or offering tickets to local high school and middle schools to introduce prospective students to UNC and athletics.

When they offer faculty/staff events send out the notices more than 2 hours in advance of the game!!! Can't we have a list of when all the faculty/staff games are for the season for each sport?"

I am not sure of the implications.

I believe that much more serious thought be put into this option. It is somewhat inflammatory that such detailed recommendations were made on options 1-12, and the last option on the list simply states that we should review athletics for cost-reduction ideas.

No Numbers were given with how much costs savings could be accomplished in this area. Lack of transparency here. Athletics can better offset budget reductions through active fundraising campaigns which is not available to other divisions and colleges. Waste of funds should also be evaluated, and equipment/uniform refresh schedules should be revised for cost savings. This should not be left up to Athletics at their discretion but should be imposed from the university level.

Would like to see the actual numbers for the sports.

YES. I would like to see actual numbers. How much does athletics cost? How much does it bring in (ticket sales, sponsorships, tuition revenue)?

After attending today's discussion, this one left me the most unsettled. Essentially, I heard that this wasn't proposed because it's too complicated or it will take too long? Athletics aren't mission critical. I would love to see the numbers--are they making us money? Would going back to DII save us money? What would it mean to eliminate just one, expensive team? We can't be everything to everyone and I don't believe athletics are at the core of UNC's identity, nor are they contributing to students' sense of belonging. We have incredibly low student attendance at the games--it doesn't seem to be used as a recruitment tool. I know that athletic scholarships create access to higher education for many of our student athletes, but I think this area needs to be closely examined as it could be a significant source of savings.

Again, not sure about their budget so can't really speak to this item.

Agree with PLC recommendations. I would be curious to know how much revenue Athletics makes on an annual basis and how much of the institutional budget goes to Athletics and how much of the Athletics budget consists of institutional dollars.

Aim for lower rank (in terms of funding). Lots of regulation/policy prevents this. Per P.L.C. recommendation, look at division cuts. Question how much do certain sports (i.e. football) lose per year. Equity here. Salary of coaches.

Change back to D2. How much are athletic scholarships costing us?

Conduct a cost-benefit analysis and related ROI when athletics was Division II and when it became Division I. Focus on what we do best, eliminate sports or teams that do not perform well, consolidate on success rather than trying to be all things to all people. Athletics does not seem to work as a successful recruitment strategy for UNC.

Cost analysis is needed! Must look at athletics for cost savings! UNC is not known for athletics- dropping to different division may not make impact. Do not know enough! Can we know numbers?

Do more than review. Drop the football program. Other universities have done this. Currently, the athletic department already has to offer incentives to people to attend the games. It is all a waste and does not align with our educational mission

don't know enough to respond.

Evaluate number of students in programs where there is a course release for coordination.

get as much out of streamlining the costs in athletics. Do an inventory of expenses and reduce as needed.

Going into Division 1 sports has been a huge failure. Notice that no dollar amounts are given as to the cost of maintaining these programs. We should return to Division II or eliminate sports altogether. What is truly disgusting about these cost-cutting measures is that they altogether exclude the elimination of administrative positions, which ballooned under Kay's reign. In other words, the new administration will continue to eliminate deficits, caused by their poor management, on the backs of the faculty.

I am unsure of the financial implications of this, but I think we should be Division II...

I feel as if the President doesn't take this option seriously. It seemed like he was trying to protect athletics more than he was willing to protect employee benefits. Athletics particularly football does not generate a large amount of money. Continuing to give money towards a department that doesn't generate lots of revenue seems like a useless endeavor. I was disappointed in the PLC because it feels like this option was not fully explored. No numerical data was available about what moving to Division 2 might save or what cutting a team might save. It feels

like the PLC wasn't allowed to look into this further because of the Presidents seemingly favoritism to not touch athletics. It is a shame that the President would rather protect losing teams than the employees that work at the institution. We as a campus deserve real numbers of what cutting athletics might look like. We deserve the full picture and to be heard even if the cost saving item is the Presidents pet project.

I feel that I need more information on the current budget and revenue to have a full opinion on this option. Can this be provided?

I have never liked the emphasis on sports, anywhere I go. But, I am probably in a minority. If this helps attract, and it is cost effective, leave as is. If the attraction is not worth the cost, then do this. I suspect an analysis of the data is required."

I support further consideration of this option and would like to see more transparency related to the cost of Athletics at UNC. I have no understanding of Division I versus Division II sports and the costs associated with each. As a side note, I have heard many students, faculty and staff complain about the lack of lights at Nottingham Field, preventing evening games.

I would like more specifics

I would need to see the actual Athletics budget to make an informed opinion on this but I do know that for the cost of Division I sports compared to how are programs are performing, it would seem pertinent to re-evaluate how our Athletics Department has been run and expectations from the BOT of how the program should be funded. Cost savings from Athletics are a MUST. Everyone else is having to do it. So should they.

If cost-savings can be found here, then yes. An analysis should be done regarding the degree to which a strong, visible athletic program feeds enrollment at UNC and similar institutions.

More transparency in athletics budget. What do students think about athletics on this campus? Is it bringing people here?

Move to division two. Be more transparent with actual costs. How much does the institution spend on athletics? A small number of our total students are athletes. Many students do not attend athletic events.

Return to Div. II. Why not Div. III? Focus on what we do well! What would we save if our funding levels were 11/11 instead of 9/11 and 7/11? Provide better data on the amounts costs/saved?!

Review is OK, but our athletic budget for a D1 program, even in relation to our own conference, is quite low, and once we factor in the large number of non-scholarship athletes who generate tuition revenue, the marginal cost of running our athletic program is not out of line. That said, I do think there are some sports that could be trimmed because the number of athletes in them might not justify the cost. That requires analysis.

The Undergraduate Council does not have enough information for an opinion on this. We encourage the PLC to research possible financial savings of a move to Division II athletics. The understanding several members of the UGC have is that the transition to Division I was meant to bring increased revenues and attendance and this increase has not happened. We believe that UNC could be more competitive within Division II, bringing the potential for more success, more student and community support, and an increase in morale.

Think athletics budget should be more transparent. Do understand they currently run on a very short budget compared to our conference. Our coaches are very underpaid. This this is an area where community fund raising needs to increase heavily.

This option had the least specification to it. I was not pleased with the unspecified amounts, and the fact that this option seemed to have the least research conducted. I recognize that Athletics is a revenue-generating department for UNC and donors are large contributors to the programs; however, it is important for leadership to explore options to save on frivolous spending. Is revenue coming back to UNC, or just going back to Athletics? Are new jerseys every year necessary? Are those in charge of booking travel considering options with a frugal mindset? I don't think scholarships should really be the focus; rather, where can frugal spending be implemented?

This seems smart - how much do athletics bring in? Are athletics a better return on investment than supporting the faculty and staff who make UNC a great place for students, and who could ensure that they stay?

THIS! I think some transparency needs to happen with Athletics. How much do scholarships cost UNC? How much revenue does each sport bring in? How much does each sport cost? I would love to see some numbers.

To many of us, it seems pretty straight forward that a change to division II would have many favorable outcomes including cost savings and an increase in student morale should our team start to win more. Again, more thought and concrete plans should be put into this option.

We need a cost/benefit analysis and these results need to be shared publicly. Not a part of our core mission. Let's be known for what we are good at. How fast can we drop to Division II and what would the savings be? Eliminate an expensive team/teams that don't help recruiting, retention, or reputation. We acknowledge that athletic scholarships help students gain access to higher ed.

What is cost difference if we get out of Big Sky? Athletics needs to be included in the cost – savings goals! *Yes! Absolutely! Don't want scholarships to go away, maybe just manage better.

What would it cost to go back to division 2? Would we lose students who pay full price to work w/ a Div. I coach? We are pouring \$ into maintaining Div. I so we need to increase revenue. Incentives for staff to come. Generate pride and enthusiasm.

Yes! But once again I don't know how much this will really save in the end.

Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. Pretty much everyone I know agrees that the move to Division 1 was an absolutely ridiculous move. I was told at last Spring's budget meetings that athletics runs in the red every year; if that's the case, I find the language of "net tuition revenue" included, here, a bit deceiving. To be sure, don't get rid of sports that make money, but consider getting rid of, or at least trimming, those that don't. Or, perhaps consider getting rid of them all. I'd also like a bit more clarity about what takes so long to move to a new conference. At the moment, though, I agree with the short-term solution of a cost-savings goal that is in line with equity between athletics and other units. I realize that Mr. Monfort loves athletics, but I hope he loves UNC more. We all have to bleed, and I think his pint may have to come out of sports.

Move back to DII

Many respondents noted that they think that moving to a new conference of division should be strongly considered as many events have low attendance, UNC is not competitive enough to be DI, most students do not come to UNC for the sports and dropping down a conference of division would increase morale.

"Even with initial costs to go to Div. II, that is what we need to do. This would be sustainable in the long run. Majority of students do not come to UNC because of athletics - evidenced by poor student attendance at games. There is no positive exposure for UNC at Div. I because we are not adequately competitive from year to year. We need to stop making decisions based on 1 or 2 current successes and look long term.

"Explore possibility of moving back to Div II. We are outmatched in the vast majority of our athletic competitions and are routinely embarrassed in certain sports.

"I know that football pays the bills for most other sports and most other colleges. Is that the case here? Nobody really cares about football because we've been bad for nearly 2 decades. If we're going to rely on football to help pay for other athletics, then fund it properly and get in quality coaches (yes, you'll have to pay them more). If not, either drop down to Div.II, or drop football and other non-revenue generating sports and focus on the ones that do bring in money (or are at least self-sustaining).

"I realize it may take time but let's get on it! Let's go back to DII. Moving to Division I was studied then the group recommended against it. Of course the President of the Board and of UNC went ahead even though we cannot afford it. We had better attendance, it was more cost effective and quite frankly more fun when we were DII.

"It seems that Athletics is not a draw for recruitment for UNC Students. For most sports events attendance is not that great. Baseball, Wrestling should go to the wayside and perhaps begin the process to move back to Division II. Most staff and faculty think it was a mistake to move to Div I to begin with.

"It was foolish to go D-1. Even if a change to division would not be timely, we can reduce the investment in the meantime. National press coverage of our athletics has been less-than-flattering for the past 10 years (we're known for our uniform options and success against 3rd-strings in the 4th quarter). The resources consumed by many of the athletes is exorbitant (given their low likelihood for playing professionally). Our student body would not notice or would not care (as demonstrated by abysmal attendance). It is preferred to be a dominant D-II school than a joke in D-I.

"Leadership needs to cast a vision for what athletics at UNC should be. We currently have a disproportionate number of sports which are receiving lower than average funding. Let's narrow our focus on a few sports and decide if we want to be a top Div. II school or a developing Div. I agree with PLC recommendation: Implement

"Reevaluate going back to Division 2.

"The major focus of this should be right here. They don't perform to the standards of many departments in the rest of the university, they have proven to be ripe with scandals, don't attract other students to UNC, and are exponentially more expensive than academic departments. If you have to cut something, you should cut what you do poorly and support those things that you do well. UNC does athletics REALLY poorly! Downgrading athletics to division two or even division three would save a lot of money and would allow UNC a to compete with true peer institutions. Being in the Big sky and thinking that UNC is in the class of schools like Eastern washington, Montana, and Portland is a joke"

"The PLC's recommendation does not make sense. The move to Division 2 needs to be implemented ASAP, or an outright elimination of the Athletics program for club sports. We are an education institution, this is our mission. Many faculty I have talked to see the Athletics program and the move to Division 1 as singly responsible for our current deficit.

1. Start evaluation process for move to Division II. 2. Assessment of Athletics goals equally with the rest of campus.

ABSOLUTELY! UNC isn't well known for it's athletics and to be honest, it's kind of embarrassing in some respects. We really don't belong in Division I to begin with. While a move back to Division II isn't really seriously being considered, I think it should. In the meantime, I think we should really look at where money is being spent within athletics. Coaches and scholarships are expensive. The amount of marketing that goes into promoting mediocre teams is

probably considerable too. Yet no one sees/hears much (if anything) about teams that are actually competing at a high level, such as wrestling. At the very least, perhaps we should look at focusing on those sports that are doing well and not just the typical athletic offerings like football and basketball.

agree and disagree with PLC; agree regarding cost reductions for athletics; disagree regarding no action on division/NCAA status, UNC should immediately request the NCAA to return to D2 status; talk to student senate they are not in favor of D1 status and have some good ideas

Agree with PLC recommendations. Also, many believe the move to D1 was a mistake; this should be re-visited.

Athletics is a drain on UNC. All options should be on the table to cut funding. We should not be Division I. We did great as Division II. This may take time, but should be considered.

Consider returning UNC to Division II and/or eliminating football to reduce athletic costs.

Duh. Why is this the last on the list? We should be Division 2.

Get out of big sky. Important to keep scholarships though! Benefit to UNC.

Go back to DII. Remember the late 90's?! Go Bears! What are the politics that go into this? Is it a status thing? Who is pushing to keep DI? BOT?

Go back to div II

Go back to Div. III! People/students do not come to UNC for athletics. We have other stellar programs (PVA, nursing, education). Why support area that loses money?

go back to Division 2

Go back to division 2 would be more appropriate.

Good idea to move to different conference.

GREAT IDEA. REDUCE ATHLETIC EXPENSES AND RETURN TO DIVISION II

Have not heard many/current employees say moving to Div. I was a good idea. Can't eliminate completely; attracts certain students here. We're currently underfunded to be Div. I, but can't contribute more. If Academic Affairs is cutting 5%, then Athletics needs to as well. Tough for everyone when teams aren't successful in Div. I.

Hold them accountable budget wise. Athletics should pay the cost of student-services to help student-athletes maintain their GPA for eligibility. Go back to D2.

I don't know why we moved up to D1 to begin with. I think Athletics spends too much money for a school whose culture doesn't support it. They can't get butts in their seats, they can't get students to go to games, support their athletes the way we need them to in order for it to be proportionate with our spending in this area. I just don't think UNC has a very athletics, sports-going culture and I don't think that's a bad thing at all, I just think we should get a new pulse on how our students feel about athletics and reevaluate how much money we spend on something that doesn't seem to be getting a proportionate return.

I think this option is a great idea. Even moving back to Division II as I saw in the open forum is a good suggestion.

There are a lot of ways that Athletics could cut back so I would definitely look more into this option.

I think we should explore moving back to Division II. It's unclear the larger benefits that the university has achieved by being in Division I.

I think we should seriously consider going back down to D2. Maybe cut some more expensive/less producing programs.

If going back to Division II would save a lot of money in the long run, then do it. Don't reject a good idea just because it wouldn't show a ROI this year.

I'm not that into the athletics, but it seems like Division I status costs a lot of money and we don't do that well in it - before we went into DI - we used to win a lot of games!

It's very unfortunate that athletics are not even considered in this budget process. The move of the football team to division I was a huge mistake. I say we cut it and grown our own food with all the land available on campus.

Look at options of moving down divisions – will this hurt recruitment of non-athlete students. How much do we save moving down a division on scholarships, etc.

Moving UNC to Division I was a bad idea that hasn't yielded the financial gains past administrations thought it would. That being said, can we move back to a different conference without it also costing a fortune. We do not compete well in this conference and that has impacting student and community support. Can we cut expensive teams/sports while still maintaining our requirements for Title IX and Big Sky Conference. What are the possible cost savings? I would put this back on athletics to make budget cuts and let them try to think through it first, but there are some sports programs that are far more expensive than others with little return on investment.

Need to go back down to lower division. We do not have the money to compete in our current division. Students do not support the athletic teams because our teams do so poorly in this division.. We need to cut some of these sport teams that just cost money and there is very little student interest.

Not just review - seriously consider going back down to D2. UNC will never be able to compete at the D1 level, especially not with football. Students don't care about supporting the athletics program. I have heard one rationale that having D1 teams makes sure we are able to keep our numbers high in terms of underrepresented students. That is just sad. If playing on a team is the only reason for a student of color to choose UNC, we are doing something seriously wrong.

Please consider going back to Division II. Currently our athletes expect Division I facilities and benefits and we do not provide that. In addition, we may also win a few more games (in some of our under performing sports) and therefore increase the reputation of our athletics teams. Trying to pretend we are Division I is false advertising to our athletes and costs a great deal of money.

Prior to coming to UNC as an employee I was unaware and very surprised to find out that UNC was a D-1 school and I have lived in Northern Colorado my whole life. I have been an employee at UNC for close to four years and have never been to an athletic contest. Most of my coworkers also have little interest in UNC athletics. If members of the UNC community find little interest in athletics it is unlikely to attract attention from the local community for revenue or from the national community for non-athlete student recruitment. When most schools lose money from their D-1 athletic programs there is little reason to expect UNC to buck the trend. UNC Athletics should be expected as part of this process to find significant cost savings. Even if in the short term a transition to a new athletic conference/division is not feasible I strongly feel that it should be explored in the long term. UNC should not be a D-

1 athletic school at the expense of the rest of the University.

Reduce costs now AND consider moving to Division II!

Relook at Div. I and go back to Div. II. Reexamine attendance at all sports events. People are not attending events stands are empty. Reexamine what spurts are athletics and what are club. Some club teams have more in attendance than athletics.

Should have never gone DI despite TV revenue. Expenses and culture have both suffered since doing so. When we were DII, we knew the athletes and the coaches because they were the same as us. Now that they're DI, they are their own thing and separate. We don't know the coaches or athletes and we've had issues year after year. We were a football powerhouse in DII, but now we're not and it has affected the culture. If we stay DI, maybe football goes away and we focus more on basketball, volleyball and soccer (substitute football with men's soccer or maybe hockey). If you want to keep football, let's go down to DII and compete. Either way, expenses and revenue need to improve and it be nice if athletics was a part of the school again and not just doing their own thing.

Students don't come to UNC for athletics. They come for music, theater, education, nursing... HS football stadiums are better than UNC's. The stands are empty. We are not an athletic school. And we're definitely not a D1 school. (We have a football team?!?). Going to D1 was stupid to begin with. And it's not working. Cut, cut and cut. And we're 7th and 9th for budget in for Big Sky? Hmm... we should be 11/11.

This is ABSOLUTELY worth investigating. While athletics are a value add to student life, they should not be the focus of a university. I actually attended a university that did not (still does not) have a football team. I have to imagine the costs related to the football program are HUGE, and since moving to D1, the program has had extreme difficulty being competitive. Nottingham field is smaller than some high school football stadiums. I would really like administrators to take a hard look at the benefits vs costs of current athletics with an emphasis on our football program, and either consider eliminating football OR moving BACK to DII to allow for a better opportunity to be competitive. Nobody wants to support a team that consistently loses... UNC has to be losing revenue year after year with a non competitive D1 football team that can't competitively recruit with other more successful DI programs at CSU and CU so close-by.

UNC does not need to be in Division I. We've shown that we often cannot compete at this level.

UNC should only support the sports that are required by the Big Sky Conference. Additionally, UNC should set a cost-savings goal for Athletics as part of the campus-wide process and focus on reducing costs. In the near future, UNC can begin exploring alternative conference/division options.

We are never going to be a big sports school, moving to DI was an empire building project from President Brown with no fore thought as to the financial implications. The smaller sports programs are not terribly expensive and some actually pay for themselves. Nobody attends the football games as we don't win anymore so from a strictly business standpoint this is a low return on investment. We produced some very successful student athletes when we were DII, we won, people attended the games and people donated.

We did much better as a Division II program.

We do not need to be division 1. This should be top priority to implement. This does not benefit our institution. It doesn't attract students. It's a money suck on the institution.

We don't have the money to sustain in D1, it makes sense to be D2 where UNC athletics has little school spirit support. Being a D2 again would bring back support and save costs.

We have been asked to cut academic programs, even though the cost-savings impact won't be felt for years. The same thing should be true for athletics. Drop to D2 as a long-term cost savings method and begin the process this spring - the same as academic affairs is being asked to do.

We need to drop back down to DII. I don't understand why we haven't yet. I don't know what the savings would be, but it couldn't hurt. On top of that, we may actually be good again, which will increase school spirit, student participation, etc. and perhaps generate more revenue. I'd rather be a champion at DII then suck at DI.

We should never have moved to division I in the first place. We either need to move back to division II or cut the football program. We are not competitive in this area, the students are uninterested and somewhat embarrassed by this program, and I'm certain it is costing us more than it is bringing in.

While I do believe we can reduce costs in the athletic department, I'm not sure being a division I school even makes sense. We are having a hard time competing at this level. Adjusting our NCAA sports might be a good option - just not sure which ones makes the most sense to keep us in line with Title IX

Why do we pretend to be D-I? We are the size and culture of a D-II school.

why does UNC need to be Division I? Has this really helped? As far as university culture and atmosphere, UNC will not in the foreseeable future compete with CU or CSU. so why try? Why not save money and return to striving to be the best in Division II, thus creating a clearly unique identity for UNC?

Yes! And this department still travels! Drop to D-2 UNC isn't at D 1 caliber. Cut programs.

Yes! We need to move back to D2 and focus on what we do best....which is not sports!

Yes, they should cut football- return to division 2.

Yes. D2 isn't a terrible idea. Football here has been terrible for over a decade!! Lets move down and kick some butt!

Yes. Drop some sports and move down a level

Focus on a few sports (eliminate some)

Many respondents indicated that some sports should from be eliminated and UNC should only focus on a few. Suggestions for sports to eliminate included low performing sports and sports with low tuition revenue.

"I was reading about a university that had a 3 million budget issue and they shut baseball and golf and the swimming pool, but our students fly to games. We need to make some tough choices.

"Is there a way to research and investigate which sports generate the lowest tuition revenue?"

A cost-saving goal only makes our sports less competitive. One would think that about 17 years of being non-competitive in football would be enough of an experiment. As much as I, and many, would hate to see it go, it makes so much sense. It moves the needle for the university and simultaneously can make us more competitive in other sports. What's wrong with doing fewer things, but doing them at a higher level?

Absolutely. I think this needs a short and long term approach. I've heard a lot of students and faculty who do not

feel very connected to the athletics events on campus. I've heard that regardless of the division, winning games seems to be more of a draw for people than what level we are. It's something to consider. Perhaps reduce the number of sports we offer.

Academic Quality should be our #1 priority. Are div. I athletics a big draw for UNC students? Cut out/reduce travel budgets. Div. I brings exposure to UNC; it's hard to put a value-added \$ amount on that. Review/reduce the # of sports we have.

Are there non-Big Sky sports that can be reviewed? Even if it takes years, we should think about changing.

CUT FOOTBALL!!!!!!!!!!!! This saves millions. The summit league would gladly accept us to their league which would create automatic rivalries with DU and former RMAC schools. The fee's to leave the Big Sky and join the Summit would be minuscule compared to the cost of football.

Eliminate football.

Eliminate football.

ELIMINATE THE FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL TEAMS. harsh? possibly. But so much of our budget is in sports. I have done some research on this. It's not a popular choice, but I honestly think our academics are more important.

Explore possibility of eliminating football program. Cost benefit analysis for the students who attend specifically for football, minus the cost of scholarships, travel, recruiting, coach salaries, facility maintenance, etc. The reputation of the coaching staff is awful and recruitment and participation are at an all time low. It may take a few years, but start phasing it out. "

Football is an absolute waste of money. All the expense of moving to Div 1 was supposed to bring more students. The whole thing has been an expensive disaster. Do we have the courage to finally admit this?

GET RID OF FOOTBALL! I cannot believe this coach was retained after his record. Our athletic department is no different from most across the country; they all put budgets in the RED. Get rid of football and move to the Summit conference. Add men's soccer in a push to move to a Hispanic-serving institution. There aren't many men's soccer programs in this state and that would bring in students and potentially a new donor group.

Get rid of some sports teams. We don't need 19 athletics programs

Get rid of the football team. It costs too much money and no one goes to the games. The coach is paid way too much, so even just eliminating that position would save more money than letting go of 3 other people.

I believe we should be reviewing athletics for the potential to cut teams. I think our non-Big Sky sports (wrestling/baseball/swim/dive) should be looked at first. I realize that many of these athletes are not on scholarship and cutting these sports would reduce the overall tuition gained from those athletes. However, it is likely that many of those athletes would continue their education here anyway, as they would be unable to secure scholarships at other institutions. Cutting football would be the next option if the non-Big Sky sports were off of the table, and that would require us to move conferences, possibly the Summit league. The athletics staff is underpaid, facilities are inadequate (weight room, equipment room, athletic training room, office space) to handle over 400 athletes. Cutting football would reduce the need to update the rest of those facilities, as that would immediately make them adequate to handle the remaining sports.

I played football here, I have former and current ties with the department, and I honestly think CUTTING VARSITY

MEN'S FOOTBALL would be the best thing for the athletic department and the campus community. Oh, and it will also save millions.

I think we need to make some hard choices and shut something that doesn't help with recruiting as much such as golf and tennis. I attend basketball and football and even for these major sports the attendance is not great."

I think we should seriously rethink our Football program.

Need to eliminate "non-revenue generating sports", such as baseball/wrestling that require all units to pay their way.

Obviously if football and all the scholarships needed is losing money anyway, then you might as well cut it-and I'm a football fan.

Reduce the number of sports we offer. If we are reducing degree programs, it only makes sense to reduce athletic programs!

Review non core conference sports. i.e.: baseball and possibly other men's sports. Number of assistant coaches and operations managers has grown, should be able to shrink. Reduce number of people who travel with the teams.

Since Athletics is a great drain on the budget, this area should have a bigger percentage to cut than academic units. We should not cut academics in favor of athletics.

Students do not come to UNC for our athletics, this is not an area we should invest in. As a former college athlete, I appreciate what athletics did for me, but we should let other universities do that for students. The cost-benefit is not there. I want the PLC to seriously consider ending certain athletic programs.

UNC is an institution of Higher Education, not a sports club. Strike the lot of them. MOST students don't come to UNC because of our football program. Heck, the people who would be hurt the most by eliminating Athletics... are in the Marching Band.

UNC should only support sports that are mandatory by big sky conference.

We don't need to offer all the sports we do. Let's focus on being good at a few.

Yes - we are not a football school. Cut the program. We can't compete with the other programs in the state.

Yes get rid of coach Collins and the whole football team, get a hockey team. And find a sport that attracts students and the community no one goes to games because the fan experience is horrible and the team is horrible.

Yes, particularly those that do not have a good return on investment or recruitment.

YES. Maybe cut a sport or two. But that depends on cost/profit of sports

YES. We are not known for our athletics. Invest only in programs that have a proven track record. (mind the pun)

Accountability

Many respondents indicated that some sports should from be eliminated and UNC should only focus on a few. Suggestions for sports to eliminate included low performing sports and sports with low tuition revenue.

Agreed, athletics should have the same reduction goal as the rest of campus.

As we attempt to identify low performing software and departments, might we apply the same scrutiny to sports?

Athletics as well as other areas of campus have a lot of waste. Assessing their budget in detail could discover a lot of savings.

Athletics Department should have to follow the same rules as the rest of the campus.

Athletics has to pay its "fair share" of the cost. There will be many, many angry people on campus if Athletics is not also held accountable for the university's structural deficit and the corresponding cost reductions.

Athletics is an area that I know we spend a lot of money in and also receive money from. Just like any department looking for cost-reductions should always be something to think about.

Athletics needs to adhere to the same expectations of other departments/units on campus. In any business, all income and expense generating areas/activities should be reviewed on a regular basis to determine if they're cost effective.

Athletics should go through the same review that all units go through; set the goal and have individual units identify cost saving strategies.

Cuts to athletics, at the same level as other colleges, should make this more acceptable. Rumor is athletics will get cut less.

EVERY department should be affected if any are, so yes, Athletics needs to pitch in. No sense sparing one department when we're all paying for this.

I believe a strong athletic programs helps recruit students--but given the severity of the cuts suggested above, it seems fair that every element of the system make sacrifices. "

i mean... yes they should be included too

If everybody has to make cuts, then athletics should be no exception. Particularly since that's not our strength."

If this is a part of Option 8 where athletics is given a realistic target and it can decide how to reach that then this is good. Athletics should not be singled out. It is not the only problem.

Same cost reduction goals as the rest of campus

Should be held to the same scrutiny. Do need all the athletics that have switching division-increased cost short term-savings long-term.

The athletics department should not be exempt from cuts. They should bear at least a share of cuts.

There should be deductions from this department also.

They should be held accountable to the overall budget reduction from #8 like all other departments and colleges. Even if a move to Division II will be a long process, this seems like the best idea for the University in the long-run.

Athletics is not a staple on this campus, nor is it something that students would consider necessary for student life.

This is LONG overdue. Athletics is not immune. If donors express hesitation to reduce costs in athletics, they should be spending more to support it. The current model is not sustainable, and it's not serving UNC well long term. Nothing should be a sacred cow in this budget climate.

This university needs a winning football team as that has been shown to increase enrollment, unlike the other sports. I don't think it's right, however that is just a known stat unfortunately. But the entire athletics department doesn't need everything handed to them and should be in the same boat as the rest of us.

Yes! There is a perception on campus that Athletics does not have to take their fair share of cuts. They should be part of the review process.

Academics should have priority

Respondents mentioned that academics should have a priority over athletics at UNC as academics is vital to the university's mission.

Although it is often said that there are many alums and outside supporters who are very much in favor of promoting and expanding athletics at UNC, I am not aware of any real data supporting this contention. We are competitive in several sports that ironically are funded at low levels, but the argument for sports really revolves around football and (to a lesser extent) basketball. However, for these sports to be competitive at a national level will take tremendous monetary support and incredible recruitment - neither of which seem likely to succeed, and both of which will negatively impact academics, the main focus of the University. I believe there is considerable flexibility here to realize significant \$\$ savings.

Athletics are also a form of marketing of course and I cannot speak to this but reviewing is of course a good option. If you have to deprive instruction or athletics, i hope to god you would choose instruction. UNC has some good teams, but this cannot be a primary concern. UNC was built on and will survive on, the quality of its teaching. Protect that.

I personally believe that our education should come first and if that means implementing cost reduction for athletics then this should be one of our first options to consider.

I strongly believe that the role of the University, first and foremost, is to provide a quality education. So for me Athletics is probably the fist place for cost savings. We are not known for the quality of our sports teams and, given game attendance, it is probably not the top issue for our students as well. We can reduce the number of competitive sports, hiring expenses, look for outside funding sources for athletics, and maybe revisit this issue if, and when, the University gets financially healthy again. Without strong academic programs, enrollment will go down and we'll lose the funding for athletics anyway. Reducing salaries for athletics coaching and senior administrative staff will provide a lot more savings than doing it for many faculty.

I think asking the athletic department to be mindful of their expenses and look at ways to reduce costs, just like all other departments on campus is the best approach. So many faculty and staff on this campus jump to ideas like cutting sports, dropping to Division II, cutting travel, etc. and they have no idea how athletics works. You can't just start cutting things - there are title IX rules and conference requirements. In addition, going down to DII, would cost money. It may be a potential long term improvement, but not an immediate one. We'd lose students who are here because they want to play DI. Not all those are on scholarship, so that would mean a loss in tuition dollars. The overall affect these changes/cuts would have on revenue, alumni support and donations, and campus climate need to be strongly considered. I actually think Athletics should be encouraged to get a money game on the schedule every year. Go play at big time places that will pay us to come.

I'm totally for that. This is a teacher's college. Correct me if I am wrong.

Michelle Quinn's presentations last fall made it clear that Athletics, overall, loses money. I support student athletes, but if we spend more on scholarships, academic support, and coaching salaries than we get back in alumni donations, sponsorships and ticket sales, we cannot afford to do this. Pointing out that those student athletes won't come without an Athletic Program is obtuse: if we lose money when they come, we are doubly sacrificing our educational mission. Pointing out that athletics is good for morale is also obtuse: severe budget restrictions are even worse for moral. Every student should have the kind of academic support and individualized attention that our student-athletes receive, but some of our most academically promising students don't get it because they don't happen to also play a sport.

Most students do not go to these games. We have these teams for alumni. It's not essential to our academic mission. It's not a part of the culture.

Starving academics to feed the teams is a longstanding UNC tradition. Sad to see this isn't changing.

This should be #1 on the list, not #13. The education received at this university needs to be #1.

Yes. Why cut programs before athletics??

Additional suggestions, comments and questions

Many respondents appeared to agree with setting a cost savings goal for Athletics but did not agree with staying in the current conference. Respondents suggested savings costs by reducing coaches', assistant coaches', and staff salaries. Additionally, many respondents specifically noted cutting the football program.

Cost reduction measures that are across the board the same for all parts of campus is negligent when considering their ability to recruit, their efficiency and success overall. Cuts should be made such that areas that ARE generating the university funds should be supported and encouraged and other areas should be made more efficient or phased out. "

Also need to look at drastic reduction of athletic travel costs.

Athletics can drive University donations, so a smarter strategy would be to improve the programs. This is what my alma mater did and the University has grown significantly in the past 10 years, all behind a push for better athletics and better research. But the difference is they supported their faculty to do this, not asked them to do it while making drastic cuts. You can't have it both ways.

Athletics has never made any money for this university. We don't need them.

Athletics is a hemorrhage of money for UNC. Review will not be sufficient. If UNC wants to climb out of the 10 million dollar annual deficit, Athletics costs will need to be tightened.

Athletics needs more corporate sponsors.

Can we give scholarships to needs-based opportunities. Scholarships towards the university we are trying to be.

Certainly other areas should be looked at for cost savings in athletics.

Could some of the number of coaches and statisticians be reduced? When I attend games/events the “bench” seems to be on the heavy side with coaches.

Eliminate athletics all together. very few if any students attend the games, the teams are not competitive and there is at least the savings needed to balance the budget. Honor the scholarships already offered and disband the athletics department.

get rid of all....you can't afford to play games when you are paying your bills

Give more tickets away in the community to get support up. More press on the winning teams.

Having been involved in academia for 24 years now: Club sports can be just as engaging for students on campus, are more democratic, and cost significantly less to implement.

In an ideal world we would have no competitive sports as that does not align with our mission. How about an absolutely amazing club or intermural program with BIG prizes like lap tops. We would likely have more student participation and be more inclusive.

OR you put some more money into football and actually gain students and Greeley's interest. "

Personally I think UNC should focus on Intramural programs for the students and eliminate Intercollegiate Athletic programs altogether. Make UNC the premier Intramural program in the nation. Intramural sports is big and growing. There is no return on NCAA Intercollegiate sports at UNC and never will be. Dreaming big isn't going to make it a reality."

Please stay D-1. This offers a great deal of exposure that can't be purchased.

Possibly. The programs need to either focus on pathways to generating enthusiasm and community success, or UNC may need to look at a reduction. I would say it would be better for both the university and the program to find ways to enhance the program rather than cut it.

Reduce unnecessary expenses.

Seems that we spend a lot of money bribing athletes to come to UNC with scholarships. I feel these could be scaled back and more wisely used.

Start by reducing the salaries of our coaches, assistant coaches, and support staff. How can we possibly justify high salaries for coaches of teams that lose us money year after year?

Stop paying losing coaches hundreds of thousands of dollars. They haven't earned their pay.

Successful division I – what would this look like and what would it cost? – if not feasible go down to division II and be successful! Cut now – reap savings to reinvest in academics à innovation funds!

Support, but not reducing the academic support staff for athletes. They are the only reason coaches get bonuses for good academics, and the academic staff don't see a penny of it. UNC is one of the most highly rated NCAA schools for athletic academics thanks to Jimmy Henderson and his staff, and any cuts there would be detrimental to UNC and students. Athletics (particularly football and the football coach) costs far too much money for their performance - or lack there of.

The recommendation is to hold off on this as it will be time-intensive to figure out the ramifications. I believe that, if we start now, we could be entirely free of athletic obligations within perhaps 10 years, and THAT would be a huge savings. In the meantime, can we use our expensive Div I resources as a source of revenue? Rent out the football stadium and practice fields to the local high schools? Get the Broncos to return to summer training here? Some other multi-purpose aspect of those costly resources to help off-set the investment?

This item should be looked at thoroughly to be able to eliminate costs where possible. Moving to another conference is too costly. I believe we are spending too much in athletics, please explain!

This should be the first place you look. I am a huge believer in athletics, but if it comes to all the things listed above, or athletics, then you cut here first. We are a freaking D1 school - if it can't support itself, cut it. No state support at all.

This would also allow to fund basketball, and other sports, to perennially compete on the national stage. Not to mention, if we are looking to be a Hispanic serving institution, the ability to add men's soccer and compete on the national level because we could recruit top level talent since very few of the power 5 institutions have a men's soccer program. For a school at our level not to think about this makes me question wholeheartedly the leadership in the athletics department.

UNC needs to also consider public perception of cost saving actions."

We are spending a lot (\$18 million, 11-12 million of budget) on student athletes 450. Travel to athletic events should be evaluated when other travel is limited.

Yes. However, they are hurting as well. Maybe less expensive trips (even though some trips need to happen to boost UNC reach to potential students).

Option 14- Other

Several comments, thoughts, concerns and suggestions were made in the “other” category.

Suggestions

"Has this already been considered; running the campus on a 4 day week rather than 5 day week? - Scheduling classes to meet on a MTWR or TWRF schedule, first benefits the commuter, saving them a day of travel, less congestion on highways, less pollution.

- There's savings in the pocket for students, faculty, and staff to save 20% on gas and maintenance. Whether you come for 1 class, or many, it's the same travel investment.

- There's savings also to the university to run the utilities, including heat or air conditioning, and water, one less day per week.

- To lighten the security and services load one day a week; less mail/ deliveries, food service, pool cleaning...

- It could help facilities and IMT to work on projects during the off day, while classrooms are all empty. They just need jackets.

- I'd suggest TWRF. There's a number of Monday holidays to consider that already disrupt class meeting times.

Treat Mondays as a weekend date rather than a holiday where all the buildings are locked?

- As to whether or not to have offices open the fifth day or closed and we work longer days, it saves the environment if we were to work from home one day a week, or work a longer day 4 days a week.

- Could we close the library one day a week? With all the online resources, could that be included as savings?

- it gives a full day a week for students to schedule their student/study groups, internships, work, musical practice, or focused study/research, exercise, reduce stress over time management....and maybe explore the Rockies."

My department implemented a 4 day schedule a few years ago, and it's worked. Our goal was to provide a full day for students and faculty to be able to focus on art and research projects. But we are just one of 60-some departments.

Summer energy-savings. 4-10/hr. days, close on Fridays (AIMS). Offer more “hybrid” classes. Allow telecommute options. Cut upper-level administration equally with the rest of campus. See IPEDS data for correct sizing. Use faculty service to perform administrative tasks that faculty can do. Take service seriously so fac. Don't shirk it or “make work”.

Would it be possible to consider a voluntary proposal, of negotiating classified and exempt staff positions to work a 35 hour or 32 hour week, rather than a 40 hour week? Employees could be offered reduced hours while keeping full-time status and benefits, to be reviewed on an annual basis as to continue, or return to 40 hours a week?

In depth IPEDS audit. Where/how are we spending money? Data shows more \$ than peers, staffing levels/budgets don't reflect. Show me the money! We recruit students and then we cut student revisions on campus, then we lose students. How much money spent on recruiting vs. retaining?

Look at revenue growth. Invest in stellar areas and cut those that lose money (taking mission and other things into account). Look at past to avoid the same mistakes. Need big picture plan.

Money making brewery on campus. #Bru-inn. Seek more external funding/fundraising. Stop watering sidewalk. Return to DII*.

Offer more online – increase rev. – use current infrastructure and over the years add more. Rent unused office areas. Add a brewery on campus – increase public use of facilities. Lock in tuition rates – rates don't change if you stayed enrolled – same with housing and dining rates – may increase retention.

Over the years UNC's CETL program has focused on education for faculty with limited availability for classified and exempt staff. It's well known across campus the training for employees is lackluster and it shows directly in employee development and morale. Unfortunately our campus culture has learned and accepted, this is just the way it is. We have SkillSoft and in IM&T we utilize several different training tool sets for skill improvements, yet these are not comparable to in person academic courses offered on campus.

Agreement of addressing layoffs at division/college level. How did we get to 10 mil deficit? What makes UNC a destination college? Why do students come to UNC? What's our specialty? Focus? Advertise our best qualities. Decrease non-profitable programs. Increase resources to profitable programs.

Discount rate reduction. Redundancy. Centralizing roles. Business manager. Contracts. Travel. Student employees. Have wider departmental meetings to see all aspects of all individual departments. Decision making lower in the organization. Must own service level as a university with all of these cuts. Do less with less.

Cuts should be in line with a vision. Student success is primary and proposed cuts should not impact student supports. Marketing ROI? Leadership needs to make the tough decisions! Decisions based on data not across the board cuts. Look at enrollments, success etc. Be strategic!

General comments – visiting 85% of these cuts on the units – what is the administration doing to cut positions/pay/increase load?

1. Review moving expenses for new employees. 2. Consistent implementation of university policies and procedures.

To retain students dedicated to learning: consider recruiting non-traditional students earning their associates from Aimes college – start tracking and advising a degree path so they have a defined goal prior to their last semester at Aimes.

Transparency (i.e. student fees, informing students of their benefits like rec center, PVA tickets, etc.). In the long term how do we reinstate items when we are in better financial health? Define UNC (but don't change the logo). Our identity. How do we increase recruitment/retention w/ less?

Did you think about this... Over a certain salary takes a reduction salary. Rather take a reduction in base pay than retirement. How will we ensure that cuts don't harm or inhibit retention goals, classroom quality, etc.?

Make sure there is accountability.

Consider 10-month (or 9 or 11) contract as a perm. cost-saving option instead of furloughs for selected individuals. AIMS does this. Consolidate custodial! Supervisory savings. Consistent training and materials and procedures and oversight.

Internationalization is the tide that lifts all boats. We are too far behind. Increase our endowments – i.e. name unnamed buildings. More clear expectations around generating research, grant funding. Become a HIS as quickly as possible. Reduce FTE in the summer à voluntary? Decide at unit level.

Optimize faculty time over breaks rather than taking time "off" when classes are not in session. Eliminate "breaks" and close university for everyone when classes not in session. Highly individual by unit.

Adjustments built into system (auditions, student teaching).

Look @ students who may owe \$ and offer incentives for them to complete their degrees @ UNC.

The need for Employee Training and Leadership Programs

Use faculty expertise! E.g. consult comm. dept. and journalism about UNC marketing and PR. Consult SRL for studies of university climate. Consult relevant programs about diversity/equity. Consult business/finance, etc.

Recruiting to poorly maintained building does not go all. 1% cut in pay would be less painful than many of the options offered (healthy ret. Etc.) Fundraising is poorly done. Need leadership to improve (build) new building à not an inviting campus. Education bldg.. is a non-example of an inviting classroom.

Sell concessions at commencement.

Stop putting billboards in stupid places that can't be read. Stop changing the logo!! Recognize our market.

A. liberal arts institution. B. focus on non trad./first year students. Be involved in the community/more visibility. Utilize the brewing make \$.

Comments, Opinions, Concerns

Ultimately, the Undergraduate Council would like the President's Leadership Council to be thoughtful and strategic with how they choose to proceed with cost-saving measures. As we look to the next step, we encourage continued investment in identifying long-term strategies for financial security. As one Council member stated, "I would love a bigger house, but I'm not going to burn my house down without knowing where I'm going to move next."

While we are glad that each academic Dean will now have more control over the budget for their college, there are some positions that should be centralized. I was just speaking with Jennifer Knock, one of our stellar admins in the School of Music, who served on the staffing and inefficiencies task force (sub-group H). She seemed to think that their group came up with many such efficiencies that could be implemented almost immediately. For instance, it is a headache for her to deal with our travel paperwork because she has so many other duties and only does it a few times each year. If travel paperwork could be centralized and sent through a few people who were highly efficient at processing it, people like Jennifer could be freed up to do what they do best more efficiently.

Why is catering so expensive for UNC offices to use? Prices, room rental fees. Why is facilities contractors so expensive? Potential system for using lab equipment. Summer programs – why don't we use more of these to recruit students – high school. If colleges find ways to generate revenue – do they get to keep it and spend how we want? à President said yes! Are the foundation and development offices included in cost-reductions??

No more talking. It's time for decision making so people can plan. "Accountability" is critical when asking divisions to make cuts.

I am writing to ask for your support in offering a buyout to Contract Renewable faculty with some caveats. . In the PLC paper it did not differentiate levels of faculty. Instead of limiting this opportunity to tenure and tenure track faculty only, would it be possible to offer this opportunity to all faculty who earn over

60K and have been at UNC for over 15 years? It seems arbitrary to limit the offer by title only. I understand there has to be a payoff to the University. However, if you could cap it at 60K you might get a better return from some faculty to make this worthwhile. As I mentioned, until today I had no idea that Contract

Renewable faculty were not included in this potential savings. And I am sure there are other Contract Renewable faculty who assumed that this opportunity would be granted to them. This was not clear in the 13 points. It did state no staff – but it also stated faculty. I find it very disheartening to be excluded from this offer after the time and effort I have given to my students, coworkers and the University.

Coordination support is inequitable à course releases vary from program to program.

Concerns about recruiting and retaining faculty. Are you trying to make is a less attractive place to work so people will leave? Staff and faculty get trained here and move on. Have faculty work over breaks – generate.

Need instructional design support – faculty spend too much time on tech w/o the expertise. IDD person based in each college (1 per college). Extended campus – unclear what they do – need clarity, cost analysis.

It could be argued the elimination of the waiver benefits is directly counter to the UNC Mission, Vision, Values, Purposes, and Goals. We are an educational institution, yet removing this benefit could show UNC does not support education of its own employees and the people they care for. Removing this benefit could show UNC does not strive for Life Long Learning, or to help its employees professionally prepare for a rapidly changing society and their roles at UNC. Removing this benefit for employees is against what our vision is of “improve students' competencies in critical thinking, communication, and problem solving, leadership, and technological applications”, we want it for our students, yet for those who can't afford college we remove the benefit.

It seems that 85% of the \$10 million in necessary cuts will come from individual units meeting a budget cut target. We are being asked to take a \$400K cut in the School of Music. I hope that the upper administration is imposing similar cuts in their operations. I feel sure that your sense of fairness would dictate that upper administrators would share the pain of cut-backs with faculty, staff, and students, but that has not been obvious in the process so far. The rank and file are still smarting from the insult of the former President getting a large bonus when she left UNC with the budget in disarray.

CSM utilizes a SkillSoft learning expedition as part of a curated learning program for its employees. <https://www.mines.edu/human-resources/professional-development/>

CU's Career Advancement and Learning Employee Services group has a strong focus on resources and tracks. <https://www.cu.edu/employee-services/career-advancement-learning/leadership/elp>
I know we can do better than the other Colorado universities for our students, employees and community. With the direction our leadership it taking, our campus community and culture is changing and heading in a new and exciting direction. The buzz on campus is showing the needed changes will be effective.

Over the past several years I have casually researched university leadership programs and the local programs which stand out are CSM and CU Boulder Leadership Institutes to help grow their internal leaders.