

**Appropriation Allocation Model Campus Visit Input
Spring 2018 (Round One)**

Campus	Group/Session	Question/Comment	Response/Action
1	Presidents Council	Why is the model including only the unrestricted financial aid being retained by UMS campus and applied to the students' bills in the calculation?	Initially the Team was not aware of this information in IPEDS for peers. Subsequently, Team found this variable in IPEDS so issue resolved.
2	Presidents Council	Why are averages being calculated only at the end of each cost center calculation rather than at each point within the calculation?	Team revisited this issue and made the appropriate changes. Although it had a very minor impact on the outcome, it was agreed that this change demonstrated most consistency.
3	UMA	Leadership Team	How/When do campuses have the opportunity to change peers?
4	UMA	Leadership Team	What will actual allocations be in the new "base"? (FY19 percentages by campus)
5	UMA	Leadership Team	What are the carve-outs from appropriation? (Where/how are Governance and University Services funded?) Slide shows state allocation—70% campuses; 30% System Investments
6	UMA	Leadership Team	What about considering Cost of living adjustments by geography
7	UMA	Leadership Team & Open Meeting	Why use FTE rather than student headcount for Instructional services?
8	UMA	Leadership Team	Why pull-out an outlier vs. cap at the higher boundry (Pulling out may decrease the average)
9	UMA	Leadership Team	Why don't we look at state support % for our peers rather than just "picking" 60%
10	UMA	Leadership Team	Why not also consider our cost per student by academic program (English, Nursing, etc.)
11	UMA	Leadership Team	Note: Lighten/shade background color on slide 23, 3rd column

	Campus	Group/Session	Question/Comment	Response/Action
12	UMA	Leadership Team	Would like to see comparison of keeping OBF vs. using this model	Potential content for second round visits? NO Pres Wyke - The decision has been made to end OBF. UMA was making gains as we moved up to the 30% mark. Those types of gains will no longer be occurring and with UMA's declining enrollment, UMA could begin to lose funds through OBF.
13	UMA	Leadership Team & Open Meeting	LT: Appreciate model being developed without applying to the campus budget (Logically/theoretically)	
14	UMA	Open Meeting	Concern regarding no campus representation on development team (Less concerned after explanation)	a. Ground rules were established to make recommendations based on logic, methodology, accessible data. B. Team members have made recommendations without seeing the impact in the model. C. Team members did not discuss recommendations with Presidents or other campus personnel that might influence recommendations.
15	UMA	Leadership Team	Have we thought about using merit-based measures (such as grad rates) rather than need-based?	Intention is to review the model every two years - We could consider this during such a review. While this is a possibility for the future, at this time we are first focusing on the issue of parity. Given that the model hasn't really changed in 50 years, we feel this is a major accomplishment to build out the parity piece.
16	UMA	Leadership Team	Worried regarding "go slow" approach if we are all the poorly funded, it could take forever to make a difference	
17	UMA	Open Meeting	Would like to see a posting of comments and changes made to the model over time	**In process
18	UMA	Open Meeting	Does this model just bake-in/perpetuate assumptions regarding what is more or less highly valued?	No. The model is not based on assumptions nor does it provide a judgement toward what is valued.
19	UMA	Open Meeting	What model do we use if appropriation decreases? - Would it be appropriate to use a variant of this model?	**TBD - consider after the model is finalized and implemented for appropriation increases.
20	UMA	Leadership Team & Open Meeting	Concern regarding abbreviated cost center definitions on slide	Slide Revised
21	UMF	Cabinet	Model bakes in a lot (70%) of the historic allocation (that all agreed wasn't good) into the base . Should there be some transition of some of the base to the new model (like was done with OBF's 5% per year up to 30%) rather than limiting the model by just applying it to new funds?	
22	UMF	Cabinet	UMF-- old peer list on slide (Check TME site)	Corrected
23	UMF	Cabinet	All peers in peer group are treated equally (regardless of peer "similarity" score.) Should there be a way to adjust or weigh by similarity score - How "peer" are everyone's peers?	The Team has reviewed and modeled this concept. We do not feel it is appropriate to weight peers as this concept was not discussed as part of the initial peer selection process. The Team is recommending, however, that part of the future process to add/change peers will have a very specific focus on the similarity scores
24	UMF	Cabinet	Should reconsider Graduate FTE being in the Instructional Cost. If peers have grad/undergrad-- grad would be included in their FTE but some UMF peers may not have any grad students.	

	Campus	Group/Session	Question/Comment	Response/Action
25	UMF	Cabinet	Should early college be in FTE? We would argue that early college students , taught in high schools by high school teachers do not incur the same costs/should not be included in FTE.	Team continues to recommend the inclusion of EC credit hours. 1)we are consistently using IPEDS data...both UMS data nd peer data. EC credit hours are included in our reporting to IPEDS and we are not aware of the component of our peers' credit hours. 2)State is placing an emphasis on EC so we should include in the model.
26	UMF	Cabinet	How is what the trustees want prioritized reflected in this model?	It's not reflected
27	UMF	Cabinet	If ever a cut in appropraiton, would we use this model in reverse?	Team Reviewing
28	UMF	Cabinet	E&G as a percent of total campus budget would be helpful...i.e., to put the state appropriation in the appropriate context.	
29	UMF	Cabinet	Still have a concern throwing out any data - even if it might be an outlier. (Understand concerns regarding data integrity [internal and external] with IPEDs but would like a better option than to eliminate data we don't like or trust.)	If a peer has reported data in any of the 3 years being included in the model for a functional expense, then the denominator for that peer average will be 3. If a peer has no data to report for a functional expense for any of the 3 years being considered by the model, then that peer count will be excluded from the overall averaging denominator of the functional expense.
30	UMF	Cabinet	Is the 70% (campus) -30% (strategic initiatives) split for new funds reset annually?	No, It is what was recommended to the BOT and approved by as current policy. -- Ryan will advocate for reducing or eliminating the 30% once reinvested admin review savings (\$2.5 M)have been "paid back".
31	UMF	Cabinet	Multiple questions regarding campus (UMF) % of E & G per category data.	Laurie will be reviewing campus budget and IPEDS reporting.
32	UMF	Open Session	Have to check these UMF numbers. (% of E & G per category). What specific IPEDs fields, etc? Question this methodology	
33	UMF	Open Session	Where are early college in credits for FTE (and headcount) - if in denominator, would it drive down actual cost per FTE? Should early college credits even be included?	Team continues to recommend the inclusion of EC credit hours. 1)we are consistently using IPEDS data...both UMS data nd peer data. EC credit hours are included in our reporting to IPEDS and we are not aware of the component of our peers' credit hours. 2)State is placing an emphasis on EC so we should include in the model.
34	UMF	Open Session	This model is based on how funds have been allocated during tight fiscal times, is it really appropriate to use this as the allocation going forward?	Using 3 year forward rolling average so it can and will change annually. The model will also be reviewed every couple of years so we can look at this over time and determine if an adjustment is warranted.
35	UMF	Open Session	Make sure all peers are posted on TME	Peer model and final peers posted with unified finance materials.
36	UMF	Open Session	Reminder from President Foster that for UMF, state appropriations only make-up about a third of the overall campus budget.	
37	USM	Cabinet	Instruction costs - What is the impact of early college? Should these credits be included?	Team continues to recommend the inclusion of EC credit hours. 1)we are consistently using IPEDS data...both UMS data nd peer data. EC credit hours are included in our reporting to IPEDS and we are not aware of the component of our peers' credit hours. 2)State is placing an emphasis on EC so we should include in the model.

	Campus	Group/Session	Question/Comment	Response/Action
38	USM	Cabinet	Non-degree seeking students are important to USM - How are they included?	Our calculation of student FTE is from IPEDS total credit hours (degree and non-degree)
39	USM	Cabinet	"Student FTE" should really be re-labelled to "Credit hour based FTE" or something similar as it is not what federal reports classify as "Student FTE"	Will Revise
40	USM	Cabinet	Should we consider tweaking the formula based on actual demographics of peer data?	Much more labor intensive than is likely to be worth in the long run
41	USM	Cabinet	Fair amount of discussion around what percentage of E & G "should" be state share. What is the range within our peers?	
42	USM	Cabinet	Should percentage of state support for graduates (instate and out of state) and/or support for out of state undergrads be higher based on state demographics/workforce needs?	This may be a good targeted discussion to have with legislators but probably should not be built into the model. This is more a discussion around how do we attract (and keep) out-of-state enrollments rather than how the entire system is funded.
43	USM	Cabinet	Concerned about putting all student types in total credit hours-- cost share slide doesn't show distinction between undergrad/grad credit hours	
44	USM	Cabinet	Seems to favor growth in undergrad vs grad. Is this accurate?	The intent is not to favor growth of one over the other. The discussions revolve around should state's % of funding support for graduates be less than, equal to, or more than undergraduates.
45	USM	Cabinet	Is the 30% strategic initiatives / 70% campus split for new funds a done deal?	No, Ryan will advocate for reducing or eliminating the 30% once reinvested admin review savings (\$2.5 M) have been "paid back".
46	USM	Cabinet	Cost share-- will some of this help to advocate for grad (one time) investment to support workforce engagement	Not directly. KPIs and scorecard may be better to support an ask for one-time funds. (There may, however, be an educational opportunity for legislators regarding grad students as "future residents".)
47	USM	Cabinet	This is based on <u>current</u> enrollment - and accounts/allows for future increases.	
48	USM	Cabinet	How will IPEDs clean up impact this?	Don't know (Financial IPEDs, Cabinet agenda)
49	USM	Cabinet	Really like the % Parity Calculation Model	
50	USM	Cabinet	Also like that this is a measure against peers vs each other and appreciate how transparent this is. Its interesting to look at peer spending and have the ability to refresh with IPEDS data annually	
51	UMFK	Cabinet (via Polycom)	When will we get real numbers?	End of April to first of May
52	UMFK	Cabinet (via Polycom)	Presume that if real numbers go in and the funding gap is enormous (or nonexistent) seems we may need to adjust this?	What would be adjusted is the state support figure (currently at 60%)
53	UMFK	Cabinet (via Polycom)	How are early college FTE in this model?	Currently counted in credit hours. The campus is encouraged to make their position known regarding this matter as there has been much discussion on other campuses about possibly excluding these credits.
54	UMPI	Cabinet (via Polycom)	Does our very different benefits rate potentially impact calculation of average instructional and other costs?	We are not imputing our own benefit rate but using peer costs. While some institutions may not include certain types of benefit costs in their benefit rate, those costs would be included somewhere within their IPEDS cost information.

	Campus	Group/Session	Question/Comment	Response/Action
55	UMPI	Cabinet (via Polycom)	Are dual enrollment counted in headcount? FTE?	Currently yes, dual enrollment counts. The campus is encouraged to make their position known regarding this matter as there has been much discussion on other campuses about possibly excluding these credits.
56	UMPI	Cabinet (via Polycom)	Parity allocation - Is the intent to get everyone to 100%	Yes, over time
57	UMPI	Cabinet (via Polycom)	There is growing variability - in tuition levels, headcount, FTE calculations - due to dual enrollment, CBE, etc. What will the impact of this increasing variability be on the model? This model assumes we ought to get our per FTE spending to that of our peers regardless of what kind of students the peers (and we) are serving	The model will be reviewed every two years and we'll have to monitor potential impacts of such variability.
58	UMPI	Cabinet (via Polycom)	Is shared services funding part of this model?	No - the methodology of shared services allocations is not impacted by this model
59	UM	Campus Leaders (Snow day)	Academic Support measure - Support for a student taking 1 course would be very different from support to a student taking 15 credits, lab courses, etc. Might FTE be a more appropriate measure?	The Team is continuing to recommend the utilization of headcount. The majority of UMS expenses in this area are for Libraries/Art/Museums, Information Technology, & Distance Education which we feel are more relative to Headcount.
60	UM	e-mail	2. We wish to echo Sue's suggestion that per FTE student is more appropriate than per student headcount for calculating the cost associated with academic support. A student taking 5 classes a term arguably entails more support than the student who takes only one.	See response to 59 above
61	UM	e-mail	3. Whether FTE or headcount, however, the model's information is dated and therefore might either understate or overstate the the campus's likely enrollment in the budget year. Was using the most recent year considered, or, better yet, projected enrollment?	UMS enrollment information for the 3 most recent years is included in the model - with the most recent year more heavily weighted.
62	UM	Campus Leaders (Snow day)	Question inclusion of early college. High school teachers teaching students within a high school setting is not a similar experience - and does not likely have a similar cost as providing a full university-level teaching experience.	Team continues to recommend the inclusion of EC credit hours. 1)we are consistently using IPEDS data...both UMS data and peer data. EC credit hours are included in our reporting to IPEDS and we are not aware of the component of our peers' credit hours. 2)State is placing an emphasis on EC so we should include in the model.
63	UM	Campus Leaders (Snow day)	Concern regarding assuming "-" for IPEDS data means data wasn't reported. What if the spend was "0" - Is that reported differently or also just left blank (-)	See response to 64 below
64	UM	e-mail	6. Regarding the matter of \$0 research costs versus unreported research costs: We examined data from the finance survey submitted by a few institutions and did not see any instances with blanks -- only zeroes. Further, when we have downloaded IPEDS data in the past, zeroes have been in the cells. The only missing values we've run across have been when we pull GASB fields for a FASB school. From this, we conclude that \$0 should be used in these cases and figured into the respective mean accordingly.	If a peer has reported data in any of the 3 years being included in the model for a functional expense, then the denominator for that peer average will be 3. If a peer has no data to report for a functional expense for any of the 3 years being considered by the model, then that peer count will be excluded from the overall averaging denominator of the functional expense.
65	UM	Campus Leaders (Snow day)	A big part of what we report as instruction (typical faculty duties of teaching, <u>research</u> and <u>service</u>) actually supports research - (ex: researching/writing grant proposals,e&g funded "service" projects)	Acknowledge that the accounting for "research" is impure but this is true for all institutions so if our peers are truly similar to us, the same accounting likely holds true for them.

	Campus	Group/Session	Question/Comment	Response/Action
66	UM	e-mail	1. Why isn't the average research cost (based on one's peers) expressed in a way that takes into account the scale of one's campus? Just as the average cost for academic support is expressed per student, the average research cost could be expressed, say, per tenured/tenure-eligible FTE faculty. A similar case could be made for average public service cost.	Team recommending to utilize FT Teaching Tenured & Tenure Track Faculty for Research & Public Service
67	UM	Campus Leaders (Snow day)	If appropriation decreases will we use this model?	TBD
68	UM	Campus Leaders (Snow day)	Will this model work against us for having a higher percentage of out-of-state students?	The model does exclude out of state credit hours in the determination of appropriation as the appropriation is intended to subsidize in-state students
69	UM	Campus Leaders (Snow day)	If part of the purpose of a state research institution is to foster economic development then why should there be so much less (or no) state support for graduate or out-of-state students? This doesn't make sense.	See #68 above re: out of state. Team is reviewing % for graduate.
70	UM	e-mail	Regarding slide 22, we don't see the logic or justification for having different percentages (for the state's suggested share) for undergraduate and graduate education. (What would be the argument for the state legislature to provide less support for graduate education??) In our view, there should be a single percentage for the state's suggested share (e.g., 60%), followed by the residency-based calculations (separately for undergrad and grad).	Team is recommending increasing the State's share of Graduate students to 40%
71	UM	Campus Leaders (Snow day)	Would like to see the suggested state funding (60%) based on IPEDS, peer data or something...	
72	UM	e-mail	First, we wish to express our general optimism regarding this new model. It replaces the intractably troublesome OBF model with one based on principles of equity and fairness, and, further, will produce results that can credibly frame important discussions about the adequate funding of higher education in Maine.	
73	UM	e-mail	Student financial aid isn't included as a cost center on slide 11 but it is on slide 21. What variable was used for student financial aid cost center? Perhaps it is the field institutional grants from unrestricted resources and therefore not relevant to slide 11?	IPEDS data reflect unrestricted aid so we have the actual amounts for peers without having to apply our % of E&G spending to total spending
74	UMM	Open Session	How is the Standard Deviation Upper & Lower Boundaries determined?	2.5 Standard Deviations
75	UMM	Open Session	Is UMS usually underfunded?	yes
76	UMM	Open Session	Any cost distinction between Master's & Doctoral costs?	no
77	UMM	Open Session	How often will data in model be updated?	annually
78	UMM	Open Session	In some states like Penn. & Vermont, the land grant institutions are funded separately from other state publics. Any discussion in Augusta to making a separate appropriation to UM?	In the past, UM has made this carveout request of Legislators but nothing was enacted. There have been no discussions at the Board of Trustee level that would support this approach
79	UMM	Open Session	How often will peers be reviewed/replaced?	UMS is talking with Hanover about improving the peer model to tighten similarity scores. The Allocation Team will prepare a recommendation on this topic.
80	UMM	Open Session	Model is based on FTE & headcounts. Can we factor in something for socio-economic populations or students who need more assistance?	This may be a measure to be explored in future updates to the model but we are not able to incorporate these subjective measures at this time.
81	UMM	Open Session	Makes sense to use headcount for student services	