

Summary of ABB Survey Responses – January 2016

No of survey recipients (who received the survey directly) – 86 (Includes deans, vice pres/vice prov, administrators and ABB committee members). Note: Anyone with a UW Net ID could access and respond to the survey, irrespective of whether they received the link directly or not.

No of survey respondents – 28

Employee Classifications – 3 deans, 14 faculty, 7 administrators & 4 staff

1. How have you learned about ABB

Majority of the respondents chose all the options (Presentations, ABB website, word of mouth, College administrative staff, and OPB communications/staff)

2. Level of comfortability in understanding ABB

13 respondents report feeling comfortable with their level of understanding of the current ABB process, 9 are partially comfortable and 6 report not feeling comfortable.

3. Parts of the ABB process/method that need more clarification

- *How is the 65% tax on ICR allocated by the Provost? Currently there is no report that shows, by FY, how the 65% is used.*
- *We are not able to predict the impact of changes in the number of students on our ABB allocation.*
- *There does not seem to be a good understanding of the “tax” and what it funds. No adequate report is available that shows what state funding, ABB tax on tuition and ICR, or institutional overhead covers.*
- *It is unclear how ABB can adequately fund a department whose primary focus is graduate education. It would be nice to have a business plan that illustrates how a graduate program can be self-sustaining through ABB.*

4. ABB Website

15 people mentioned that the information in the website is useful. They provided some suggestions, including:

- *Adding graphics to further illustrate how funding is allocated and including simple flowcharts on how the funds are funneled down between the gross and net revenue.*
- *The addition of an FAQ page to the website.*

- *A simpler tool for calculating ABB return.*
- *Better access to underlying ABB data.*
- *The use of drop-down menus, since the narrative format of the site does not allow the user to quickly find documents.*
- *A better explanation of how the 65% tax on ICR is allocated by the Provost.*

5. Positive aspects of ABB

- *Transparency regarding where and how funds are generated (connection between credits and dollars).*
- *Greater predictability about unit budgets, along with more control over decisions about managing budgets.*
- *The continued connection between activity/demand and funding.*
- *The incentive for units to re-evaluate and re-consider all activities.*
- *The motivation for units consider the costs of offering classes; faculty have come to understand that the changes in enrollments have financial ramifications, and they have become more mindful of that.*

6. Negative aspects of ABB

- *There is an increased competition for tuition dollars between departments, discouraging collaborative efforts around course or program development.*
- *ABB works best for undergraduate and is very detrimental for graduate education.*
- *The incentives provided by ABB have led to larger courses. Smaller courses simply won't pay for themselves.*
- *ABB creates major disincentives for the kinds of interdisciplinary, inter-college collaboration that are key to some colleges, particularly in course development and teaching.*
- *Due to ABB, Epidemiology department that had historically enrolled only grad students, had to cancel some of our small graduate courses because they don't bring in much tuition revenue. We recently had several cutbacks on faculty, staff and programs. Hence, the effect of ABB on the financial feasibility of graduate education needs to be reviewed.*
- *Tuition exemptions and Provost Supplement revenue for graduate teaching efforts have lagged under ABB.*
- *Lack of data to review impact of ABB model. It is difficult to identify ABB data components (i.e. SCH).*
- *Activities that are not revenue generating but that are important to our educational mission (e.g., NIH training grants) are losing their appeal.*
- *Some departments in a particular school split ICR regardless of the level of effort of a faculty member. This practice discourages research and grant related activity.*

7. Consequences of the current ABB process that adversely affects UW as a whole

- *At the graduate level, schools have begun to admit subpar students in order to increase class size. This degrades the quality/level of graduate education at UW.*
- *Units are pitted against each other as they compete for tuition revenue.*
- *Decreased number of course offerings and larger classes may negatively affect the quality of UW graduate programs, thus making the programs less competitive.*
- *Under ABB, graduate education is not funded at the level required; graduate programs may not be sustainable under ABB. This has led to decrease support for certain faculty groups. It has also forced departments to create undergraduate courses/programs to earn sufficient ABB tuition dollars to underwrite graduate programs that are, on their own, unsustainable under ABB.*

8. Other issues to consider

- *All parties must be using the same data, and the ABB process/model must be replicable.*
 - *Potential simplification and formula adjustments.*
 - *It is worth knowing whether the institution of ABB has helped the legislature understand the UW funding more clearly – and if so whether that's had any impact on improving the level of support for the University.*
 - *It might be useful to study a SCH distribution only model.*
 - *ABB is primarily designed with undergraduate education in mind. It does not support graduate education. The formulae used to allocate tuition dollars should be revised to give a large amount for graduate student credit hours and enrollment.*
 - *It is time to consider whether tax rates should be adjusted for some schools/departments to ensure no unit goes under.*
 - *Role of UWEO in ABB model.*
-