

# Meeting Notes

## Integrated Planning Committee Meeting

March 5, 2018	3:30-4:30	A-2029
March 7, 2018	11:00-12:00	IIC-2014
March 9, 2018	12:00-1:00	A-2029

### **MARCH 5, 2018**

#### **1. Review of meeting notes from February 15, 2018**

The meeting notes from February 15, 2018 were reviewed and accepted by the committee.

#### **2. Draft What We Heard Document**

The Committee reviewed and discussed the What We Heard draft document. Overall, committee members agreed that the report was easy to read and represented the information gathered during the consultation process. Some revisions were suggested and will be made to the document immediately. The report will then be circulated to IPC on Tuesday for further comment and finalized by the end of the day.

The document will be posted online as soon as it is finalized and communications will be developed to direct the university community to it. It will also be appended to the main Budget Report once it has been prepared by IPC.

#### **3. Draft Annotated Outline for Budget Report**

A draft annotated outline for the Budget Report was presented. The outline was fairly detailed in some sections, but it only provided general headings for the recommendations section because the recommendations will be developed through a process that includes the full committee.

Aside from the recommendations, it is expected that the financial overview will be the longest section of the report. This section will be more in depth this year than in subsequent reports because it is necessary to develop the background information regarding the university budget, budget history, and other financial information. In later reports, this information may be provided in appendices. There was general agreement to work with the outline that had been developed.

In the next two meetings, the committee will review and discuss financial information to gain a deeper understanding of the budget details (budget changes over time, cuts by unit) as well as specific amounts associated with some of the suggestions we heard during the consultations.

It will be difficult to identify dollar amounts for some of the suggestions that were brought forward, for example, outsourcing, reducing duplication, etc. Some recommendations may have longer term impacts and will not result in savings for the first few years. Furthermore, some recommendations may not be financial in nature but could speak to future directions in areas such as advocacy or communications.

### **MARCH 7, 2018**

It was reported that the What We Heard document had been finalized and will be distributed to the university community.

The committee reviewed financial information as it prepared to consider the development of recommendations for the Budget Report. IPC members were also encouraged to identify other information that might be needed in order to consider recommendations.

Ms. Pike circulated two documents that were reviewed in detail. The first document covered the history of budget reductions from 2012-13 to 2017-18 by portfolio and administrative unit, by academic unit, and by campus. The table showed that two areas have been exempt from budget cuts during this time – library holdings and graduate student fellowships. However, the library has had to adjust its journal subscriptions due to inflation and currency fluctuations. Faculties and Schools were generally protected from budget cuts during the first three years; however, academic units did see cuts to the administrative portion of their budgets in 2015-16 and 2016-17 and a cut to their entire budget in 2017-18. IPC members requested information about the total allocations and percentage of reductions in order to gain better perspective of the proportion of cuts. These will be provided at the next meeting.

Detailed information was provided about the cuts made in 2017-18. There were \$6,048,700 in budget cuts with 11 faculty positions and 32 staff positions eliminated and a \$1.6 million cut to operations. It was noted that the magnitude of budget cuts is developed centrally, but decisions about the specific actions to achieve the required base budget reductions usually occur at the unit level.

Consultation session participants asked for more information regarding cuts to administration. Ms. Pike explained both academic and administrative units have administrative costs, so looking at the situation strictly from a unit level understates the extent of administrative cuts that have been made.

Ms. Pike presented a second document that illustrated the level of expenditure cuts or revenue increases that need to occur if one or the other were the sole means of balancing the budget. It was noted that neither alternative would be implemented but the alternatives were presented as extreme measures to either close the budget gap entirely through a decrease in expenditures or an increase in revenue.

A suggestion was made that a Grenfell Student representative should join the committee. Members of IPC highlighted the fact that members were appointed based on expertise and experience and that the committee reports to PBC, where representation occurs. A student representative from Grenfell campus could be considered in the future. It would be difficult to bring in a new member at this point in the budget report process.

## **MARCH 9, 2018**

Dr. Golfman acknowledged the letter that had been sent to the committee from the Grenfell Student Union requesting that a representative join IPC. It was noted that in the future the committee should revisit its terms of reference to describe how it is constructed and its members are appointed. It was also suggested that if more than two student unions are interested in contributing to IPC, that student representatives could rotate.

Ms. Pike presented additional financial information to IPC members for consideration. First, she presented a revised history of budget reductions (reviewed by IPC on March 7) with additional columns outlining the 2017-18 budget allocations and percentage of the reductions. It was noted that in the past a number of areas had been protected from cuts, but the committee agreed that it should review these areas carefully to ensure that they agree the exemptions should continue. The committee believed it was important that all cost-saving measures be considered, even if they may appear to be relatively small. Any and all savings could add up and should be considered seriously by IPC.

Ms. Pike also presented an overview of the operating budget and government-funded capital budget from 2011-12 to 2017-18. Sources of revenue included the provincial government grant (operating and capital), the federal government grant that assists with the indirect cost of research, tuition, other student fees, and investment income. It was observed that the total operating and capital budgets for 2012-13 (\$374,913,130) and 2017-18 (\$372,290,680) were close to the same amount. This shows that Memorial was operating on the same amount of funding after 5 years, despite expenditure increases due to inflation and salary increases.

The third handout reviewed by IPC presented a more detailed history (2011-12 to 2019-20) of the provincial government grant. The report showed what government had provided in funding to support and what it had cut and categorized the adjustments into four categories: salaries and benefits; grant in aid of tuition freeze; government funded strategic initiatives; and government grant reductions. It was noted that the government grant reductions over the past 6 years almost equals the funding provided for the grant in aid of tuition freeze for the past 7 years. In addition to government operating grant adjustments, Memorial has sustained funding cuts in other areas which has impacted the university as well such as an \$800,000 cut to fellowship funds from RDC and direct funding to the Marine Institute.

IPC members remarked that the history and details of the provincial government grant are complex and it will be challenging to explain it to the university community and the general public. It was suggested that a narrative be developed to explain the important details to be included as an appendix in the report.

The committee agreed that it will discuss the development of specific recommendations during the following week.

# Meeting Notes

## Integrated Planning Committee Meeting

March 13, 2018

2:30 – 3:30pm

A-5014

### Attendance:

**Dr. Noreen Golfman**, Provost & VP (Academic) (Chair)  
**Dr. Donna Cox-Hardy**, Social Work  
**Dr. James Feehan**, Humanities & Social Science  
**Jillian Kavanagh**, Marine Institute  
**Renata Lang**, MUNSU  
**Dr. Aimée Surprenant**, Graduate Studies  
**Dr. Ian Sutherland**, Music  
**Rizza Umali**, GSU  
**Keith Matthews**, Academic Budgets  
**Paul Chancey**, CIAP  
**Lori Pike**, Budget Office  
**Jennifer Batten**, Office of the Provost  
**Réanne Kinsella**, CIAP

### Unable to attend:

**Dr. Laura Robinson**, Arts & Social Science, Grenfell  
**Dr. Donald McKay**, Medicine

### Discussion of Budget Report Recommendations

The Committee began discussing the specific recommendations that may be contained in the Budget Report. A handout was distributed to the Committee for discussion purposes outlining some of the key operating expenditures, capital expenses, and revenues in order to identify in what areas adjustments may be feasible. It was noted that recommendations in the report will be based around the same categories.

It was noted that the **operating expenditures** listed are largely fixed; therefore, these were not discussed at this time. Under **capital expenses**, several items are also fixed. For example, deferred maintenance is calculated based on what is required to maintain our current FCI. The cost of Core Science building is also based on a fixed source of funding and will not change.

The committee therefore focused on items listed under **revenues**:

- Provincial Government Grant –the university will be notified of a specific amount in the coming weeks.
- Federal Research Support Grant – there will be very little change from year to year as it is calculated on the basis of a three-year rolling average of tri-council funding received by the University.
- Parking Fees – Proposed increases are currently being explored and calculated for consideration. However, the extent to which parking fees can increase will be influenced by collective agreements (currently, CUPE and MUNFA members would be excluded). Based on current projections, it is estimated that increased parking rates could result in up to \$255,000 in increased revenues. Increases would not be applied equally to all parking spaces but would be based on the current rate, proximity, and other factors. This will be subject to change based on the current MUNFA negotiations. However, Committee members felt that IPC should recommend that parking fees be increased to cover the costs of the parking space (rather than being partly subsidized by the university), as well as the possibility of generating revenue. IPC members suggested that further details be presented to the Committee by Kris Parsons, Chief Risk Officer.
- Student Services Fees and Campus Renewal Fees – although these are listed under revenues it was noted that the full amounts are distributed directly back into those pots and does not present an opportunity for changes to revenue. It was, however, noted that inflationary increases have not been included in such fees. The IPC noted that this could be a recommendation in the report.
- Voluntary departure program – this is currently being explored; however, such a program might not result in savings to the university for some time.

It was suggested that, of the savings achieved from the current decrease in faculty positions due to attrition, a percentage of savings should be re-invested into faculty renewal in order to maintain programs. It was suggested that this be a recommendation in the report.

The committee discussed the potential recommendations that could be made in regards to tuition. Regarding Graduate Student tuition, a proposal was made to increase tuition for professional masters programs to what the local market will bear. For example, the MBA tuition could increase significantly, the M.Ed and Master in Nursing tuition could increase to an extent, while the Master of Social Work tuition would likely not increase. Course-based Masters programs tuition could increase while tuition for thesis-based Masters and PhD programs would remain the same. PhD continuance fees could also increase.

The question was posed whether a grandfathering approach would be applied to current graduate students. Some felt that it should be a key principle (in order to maintain our commitment when they were first accepted) and others felt that grandfathering should not be applied. Another suggestion was to apply it to some programs and not others (MBA).

The committee proceeded to discuss undergraduate tuition. It was proposed that tuition be increased. If tuition were increased by \$500 per student per year, it would result in an increase of \$6 million in revenue. It was noted that removing the current differential fee for Canadian students versus Newfoundland and Labrador students would also result in increased revenues. IPC members maintained that all Canadian students should pay the same tuition rate.

IPC members also discussed a needs-based system, mentioned during the consultation sessions. There is currently a provincial student aid program; however, there has been a 75% decrease in the use of the program, which may suggest that a new model would better serve the people of the province. A suggestion was also made to explore other opportunities that can benefit students such as programs like MUCEP.

IPC members recommended that whatever tuition increases are proposed, they should not increase to a greater extent for international students compared to Canadian or Newfoundland and Labrador students. This has been echoed by government as well as during the budget consultations. Although the tuition for international students at MUN is much lower than international tuition elsewhere in Canada, Committee members discussed the importance of maintaining internal equity within our institution.

Overall, whatever tuition adjustments are recommended in the report, there will also be a need to advocate government, on behalf of students and the university community, to implement a needs-based model to better support those who may not be able to afford tuition increases.

# Meeting Notes

## Integrated Planning Committee Meeting

March 22, 2018

9:00 – 10:00am

A-2029

### Attendance:

**Dr. Noreen Golfman**, Provost & VP (Academic) (Chair)  
**Dr. Donna Cox-Hardy**, Social Work  
**Dr. James Feehan**, Humanities & Social Science  
**Jillian Kavanagh**, Marine Institute  
**Renata Lang**, MUNSU  
**Dr. Donald McKay**, Medicine  
**Dr. Laura Robinson**, Arts & Social Science, Grenfell  
**Dr. Aimée Surprenant**, Graduate Studies  
**Dr. Ian Sutherland**, Music  
**Rizza Umali**, GSU  
**Keith Matthews**, Academic Budgets  
**Paul Chancey**, CIAP  
**Lori Pike**, Budget Office  
**Réanne Kinsella**, CIAP

### Unable to attend:

**Jennifer Batten**, Office of the Provost

### Discussion of Budget Report Recommendations

Dr. Golfman notified members of IPC that the provincial budget will be announced the following week, on March 27. However, there is still uncertainty regarding whether Memorial will be subject to further cuts and consequently what impacts the budget could have on the current budget consultation process and report. At this time, it is important for IPC to continue working towards budget recommendations, and to continue consulting with the university community. Memorial's budget will be presented to the Board of Regents in approximately 1.5 months.

Dr. Feehan developed a brief document outlining his proposed recommendations to balance the budget. It was suggested that other members of IPC prepare similar proposals outlining ideas they may have so that all viewpoints can be discussed as the IPC develops budget recommendations.

It was noted that university revenues were discussed at length during the last several meetings; however, discussions regarding operating expenditures have been limited as such costs are largely fixed. The question was posed whether the university could hire a third party to review expenditures and identify potential areas for savings. IPC members agreed that this could be included as a recommendation in the report. The current budget report should also communicate the need to change the way Memorial has been doing things overall, such as breaking down internal silos, focusing on culture change, and reviewing administrative structures and operations.

The IPC continued its discussion regarding tuition. The Committee reaffirmed its belief that Canadian students and Newfoundland and Labrador students should pay the same tuition. The differential fee that current exists does not promote internal equity and leads to increased and unnecessary administrative work. The IPC should recommend that such differential fees be eliminated so that NL students pay the same tuition as Canadian students. It was noted that approximately 25% of a tuition increase would be expected to be offset by the tuition tax credit.

The Committee also discussed the need for a new approach to student aid. It was noted that Nova Scotia and Ontario launched needs-based programs and Memorial University has subsequently seen a decrease in enrolment from those two provinces. It was also suggested that use of the NL student aid program has decreased in recent years, likely due to the ongoing tuition freeze at Memorial and decreased need. Memorial's role will be to advocate government for a more progressive, needs-based model to better support students in the province.

It was also noted that there have always been some students who did not qualify under the current student aid system yet could not afford to attend Memorial due to unique circumstances. Previously, there had been a committee based out of the Student Aid office that reviewed individual cases and accommodated students depending on their situation. It was noted that this committee has been inactive during recent years. However, in light of proposed increases to tuition, it was suggested that this group be reactivated and promoted to ensure that Memorial is accessible to all who want to attend.

IPC also agreed that once the budget report is released, the university must ensure that all of the details are effectively communicated to the university community, to government, and to the citizens of the province, particularly in regards to the recommendation to increase tuition.

The question was posed whether government will automatically take back the \$4 million dollar grant in lieu of tuition if Memorial increases tuition, and whether the university should take into account this additional budget gap as IPC puts forward recommendations to balance the budget.

The Committee will not meet the following week. However, those putting together the budget report should develop a narrative to describe the views and recommendations expressed by the IPC during the current meeting, including the need for the reactivation of the student aid review committee. The Committee will consider projections regarding both scenarios during the next meeting.

A specific deadline for the budget report has not been set. However, it is proposed that a report be ready for review by the Board in May.

# Meeting Notes

## Integrated Planning Committee Meeting

April 2, 2018

3:30 – 4:30pm

A-2029

### Attendance:

**Dr. Noreen Golfman**, Provost & VP (Academic) (Chair)  
**Dr. Donna Cox-Hardy**, Social Work  
**Dr. James Feehan**, Humanities & Social Science  
**Jillian Kavanagh**, Marine Institute  
**Renata Lang**, MUNSU  
**Dr. Laura Robinson**, Arts & Social Science, Grenfell  
**Dr. Aimée Surprenant**, Graduate Studies  
**Rizza Umali**, GSU  
**Keith Matthews**, Academic Budgets  
**Jennifer Batten**, Office of the Provost  
**Paul Chancey**, CIAP  
**Lori Pike**, Budget Office  
**Réanne Kinsella**, CIAP

### Unable to attend:

**Dr. Ian Sutherland**, Music  
**Dr. Donald McKay**, Medicine

### Discussion of Provincial Budget

The provincial budget was announced. Dr. Golfman indicated that Memorial did not experience further cuts than what was previously anticipated. The budget gap will remain as it was previously defined. However, the pension payment has not been announced and will not be determined until a later date. At this time, the University will focus on closing the known budget gap (\$6.7 million) as well as the \$3 million attrition requirement. It was noted that tuition increases or other means of revenue generation are not deemed options for the next two years.

A Post-Secondary Review was also announced in the budget. However, very little information regarding the review is known at this time.

### Discussion of Budget Report Recommendations

The Committee discussed the following points:

- Given the budget gap, some programs may need to be eliminated. The Committee discussed graduate interdisciplinary programs. Administrative cost savings could be achieved by eliminating such programs; however tuition revenue would also decrease.
- Increased parking costs may still be proposed; however, the amount of funds generated would be minimal.
- It was noted that across the board cuts can no longer be sustained among smaller units. Committee members felt that such cuts should be made at the discretion of portfolio heads. A question was posed regarding the percentage of cuts required to balance the budget. Ms. Lori Pike will report back to the Committee with specific numbers.
- A question was posed whether the University may consider a planned deficit for the current year that would be covered by savings initiatives implemented in the upcoming year. This has been implemented in the past. The Committee did not support this approach.
- It was suggested that the Committee review vertical cuts to non-core areas such as the Childcare Centre, or the Aquarena.
- The University will continue to pursue a voluntary retirement program. The savings achieved should go towards helping to balance the University budget.
- The Committee discussed academic unit amalgamation.

- The Committee considered and discussed a review of senior level salaries at the University, furlough days (\$1 million in savings with full participation), and voluntary reduction of salaries.
- Members discussed how best to empower managers to save money and/or generate revenue.
- It was noted that it will be particularly important at this time to ensure information is effectively communicated to the University community and externally, especially in light of the upcoming Post-Secondary Review.

# Meeting Notes

## Integrated Planning Committee Meeting

April 16, 2018

3:30 – 4:30pm

A-2029

### Attendance:

**Dr. Noreen Golfman**, Provost & VP (Academic) (Chair)  
**Dr. Donna Cox-Hardy**, Social Work  
**Dr. James Feehan**, Humanities & Social Science  
**Dr. Donald McKay**, Medicine  
**Renata Lang**, MUNSU  
**Dr. Laura Robinson**, Arts & Social Science, Grenfell  
**Dr. Ian Sutherland**, Music  
**Rizza Umali**, GSU  
**Keith Matthews**, Academic Budgets  
**Lori Pike**, Budget Office  
**Paul Chancey**, CIAP  
**Réanne Kinsella**, CIAP

### Unable to attend:

**Dr. Aimée Surprenant**, Graduate Studies  
**Jillian Kavanagh**, Marine Institute

Ms. Pike provided an update on the budget. The Committee reviewed a handout outlining adjustments to the 2018-19 budget projection. Rather than \$12,679,350 the budget gap is now calculated to be \$5,900,000. This is in large part due to the pension payment. Previously, \$6 million was allotted to cover this payment; however, there has been no further information provided regarding the specific amount. At this time, the budget gap and the budget report will exclude the pension payment from its calculations until more information is forthcoming.

Other adjustments to the budget include a decrease in tuition revenue due to decreased enrolment; adjusted amounts for the Campus Renewal Fee and Student Services Fee revenue; increased health and dental premiums; and decreases to specific expenditures such as operating adjustments, utilities, insurances, and snow clearing.

A second handout was reviewed by IPC which provided a detailed account of across the board budget reductions by campus and by envelope. The handout also provided a listing of items that are typically excluded from across the board cuts. A third handout outlined the specific attrition targets for 2018-19.

Members of the working group met during the previous week to continue working on the draft report. The committee turned its attention to Section 6 – Recommendations. The following points were raised:

- Recommendations should be categorized incrementally as short-term, medium-term, and long-term with some additional recommendations to be implemented on an ongoing basis (e.g., efficiencies).
- The report should provide commentary and recommendations regarding more items identified through the consultation process.
- The recommendation to develop a communication/advocacy strategy was deemed to be especially important. Dr. Golfman noted that work is already underway to develop a website to highlight Memorial's activities and to demonstrate the university's value to the wider community. Improved communication with the general public will be especially important in light of the upcoming Post-Secondary review.

- The report must contain strong and clear language to address the tuition issue in particular. Tuition was brought up repeatedly throughout the consultation process. It is important that it is reflected in the Budget Report.
- The report must make clear that the Board of Regents sets tuition at Memorial, not government.
- Some IPC members proposed that a 2% tuition increase should be recommended. It was acknowledged that such an increase would likely not be accepted by the Board. However, IPC members noted the importance of the recommendation, based on the committee's analysis of the situation and the consultation process. Even a slight increase to NL student tuition, such as 2% to represent inflation, would decrease the anomaly between NL students and all other students. There was some disagreement with the proposed increase.
- The report should recommend that differential fees be a part of the review of tuition and fee structures.
- More information should be provided regarding the review of SAM scales. The review is currently underway and is led by an external committee with some internal involvement. The review includes an assessment of all job descriptions. This information should be detailed in the report.
- The report should provide more information regarding the pension payment, particularly to signal that the university is giving thought to the required payment that will be required at some time this year. The report should outline potential impacts on the university should the budget gap grow from \$5 million to \$12 million over the year. It was noted that this will be discussed in Section 4 which describes the budget gap.
- Recommendations should encourage a shift towards greater efficiency, restructuring, and improved long-term planning.

No other business was raised. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

# Meeting Notes

## Integrated Planning Committee Meeting

April 30, 2018

3:30 – 4:30pm

A-2029

### Attendance:

**Dr. Noreen Golfman**, Provost & VP (Academic) (Chair)  
**Dr. James Feehan**, Humanities & Social Science  
**Dr. Aimée Surprenant**, Graduate Studies  
**Dr. Donald McKay**, Medicine  
**Jillian Kavanagh**, Marine Institute  
**Renata Lang**, MUNSU  
**Dr. Laura Robinson**, Arts & Social Science, Grenfell  
**Rizza Umali**, GSU  
**Lori Pike**, Budget Office  
**Keith Matthews**, Academic Budgets  
**Paul Chancey**, CIAP  
**Réanne Kinsella**, CIAP

### Unable to attend:

**Dr. Donna Cox-Hardy**, Social Work  
**Dr. Ian Sutherland**, Music  
**Jennifer Batten**, Office of the Provost

The IPC's only item for discussion was the most recent draft of the Operating Budget Report. Dr. Golfman indicated that the report will be posted online this week, providing an opportunity for the university community to provide feedback. The report will then be formally submitted to the President the following week.

Dr. Golfman thanked committee members for their input to date regarding the report. A note was made for the writing committee to revisit Dr. McKay's comments sent in at an earlier date, to ensure that the current draft of the report accurately captures consensus among what we heard, and among the Committee.

Committee members provided a number of specific editorial changes to be made to the report, including the suggestion that recommendations should be combined, rather than being organized by short-, medium-, and long-term.

The Committee discussed the recommendations proposed in the report. One member disagreed with the proposed approach, indicating that the sole recommendation of proportional cuts is not enough, and places the burden on units to continue to find more savings. A majority of members expressed a need to propose tuition increases in view of the severity of cuts across the board. A decision was made to move forward with the existing recommendations, with a note indicating that although increases to tuition are not currently being proposed, they will be part of future recommendations from the IPC.

The report will be circulated to IPC once more the following day for any additional feedback. The report will then be presented to PBC on Thursday for discussion and feedback. By the end of the week, the report will be posted publicly.

No other business was raised. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35pm.