

Summary of UM Faculty Open-Ended-Question Answers from the Fall 2009 Survey Conducted by the UM Administrator Evaluation Committee

Prepared by: Prof. David R. Dowling, Mechanical Engineering (Acting AAAC, Chair)
Prof. Elizabeth B. Moje, School of Education (AAAC, Member)

Approved for distribution to the Provost's Office and to the AEC after redactions and clarifications by the UM Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC) on January 27, 2010.

Executive Summary

During the fall of 2009, the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC) and the Provost's Office collaborated to place two questions on the Administrator Evaluation Committee (AEC) survey of the UM faculty. These questions were:

- “1. What is the primary financial or resource constraint that limits your unit's success?”
and “2. Where can costs be cut?”.

The AEC survey was sent to all members of the UM Faculty Senate (tenure and tenure track, research track, selected others), all faculty represented by the Lecture's Employee Organization (LEO), and clinical faculty in the School of Dentistry, a total of 4,994 faculty members at the Ann Arbor, Flint, and Dearborn campuses. Overall, 27% of the faculty responded to some part of the AEC survey. Categorization and review of the 600+ answers provided by the faculty respondents to the two open-ended questions suggest the following main themes:

1. The cost of supporting graduate students is too high relative to the monies available for such support.
2. Spending priorities for current and future resources should be set at the departmental or individual faculty level.
3. Cost reductions may be possible in administration of the UM.

Introduction

The administrative leadership of the University of Michigan must make critical resource allocation decisions. The UM faculty represent an important resource for guiding these decisions. Unfortunately, the time, effort, and support necessary to widely collect faculty commentary and opinion for decision-making are often unavailable. In the fall of 2009, a small pilot effort was undertaken by the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC) to determine whether or not general questions posed to the UM faculty via the Administrator Evaluation Committee (AEC) survey would prove useful to the UM's administrative leadership. Two open-ended-response questions acceptable to the Provost's Office and the AAAC were formulated and placed before the faculty on the fall 2009 AEC survey.

Following the survey, UM-faculty-respondent answers to the two questions were sorted, and are provided in the two appendices of this report. These answers represent unfiltered faculty opinion and do not represent the position of the AAAC, the AEC, or the UM Administration. The purpose of this report is to provide these faculty-respondent answers to the UM's administrative leadership and the AEC in an organized format that is suitable for skimming, detailed reading, and/or further dissemination.

Sorting Process

In late December 2009, the AEC provided a complete text file of every UM faculty answer to the two free-response questions to the Chair of the AAAC, and this file was forwarded to the first author of this report who sorted them into seven categories for the first question, and nine categories for the second. Category topics were chosen to prevent the *catch-all* (Msc.) category from collecting more than ~10% of the comments. Sorting was done by hand with every attempt being made to retain faculty answers exactly as they were written with two exceptions. (1) Faculty answers containing multiple comments on disparate topics were separated and each comment was sorted appropriately. When comment separation would lead to a loss of context and information, the entire faculty answer was placed in the one category that seemed best. (2) Regrettably, approximately 1 to 2% of the answers contained invective and personal accusations that were not sought for this faculty-to-administration communication effort¹. Such commentary has been redacted to conform with the purpose of this report. Redactions are marked by XXXs and amount to 40 words out of more than 17,000.

Based on a review of the more than 600 answers provided, the primary faculty responses are as follows. Concerning resource constraints, the faculty identify: *i*) the high cost of supporting graduate students, and *ii*) insufficient funds and personnel for priorities within the various UM units. To cut costs, the faculty recommend *i*) administrative reductions, and *ii*) curtailment or elimination of publications, activities, programs, or services that do not contribute to the UM's core mission.

Sorting Results for the First Question

After sorting, the first question received a total of 314 answers. The sorting categories and number of answers in parentheses are as follows.

What is the primary financial or resource constraint that limits your unit's success?

Theme	# of respondents
The cost of supporting graduate students is too high	57
Current resources may be utilized unwisely or are taxed inappropriately	47
Interior & exterior funds are needed for additional activities, equipment, supplies, and services	55
Additional personnel, better personnel, or rewards for current personnel are needed	55
More space, time, and resources are needed for teaching and research	47
Miscellaneous	35
Insufficient information to formulate an answer	18

Although the number of comments is nearly uniform across the first five categories, their strength and intensity were greatest concerning the cost of hiring and training research students.

¹Accusations of impropriety may be reported at <http://www.med.umich.edu/compliancehotline/index.htm>

In particular, the comments repeatedly mention that hiring post-docs has both cost and research-productivity advantages when compared to hiring graduate students. This situation produces incentives that undermine and endanger the graduate-student-training mission of this University.

For summary purposes, the second through fifth themes above can be roughly consolidated into the single statement: “spending priorities for current and future resources should be set at the departmental or individual faculty level.” Here, the apparent sentiment is that Deans and higher-level administrators exercise too much control over limited flexible funds that might be used for faculty-determined priorities in research and teaching.

Sorting Results for the Second Question

After sorting, the second question also received a total of 314 answers. The sorting categories and number of answers in parentheses are as follows.

Where can costs be cut?

Themes	# of respondents
Administration, and clerical, financial, office staff	106
Plant, Utilities, Landscaping	36
Publications, activities, programs, or services that do not contribute the UM’s core mission	50
Switch and/or combine providers, locations and/or incentives for services to realize efficiencies & savings	38
Athletics	10
Do not make further cuts	17
Graduate student costs are too high	10
Miscellaneous	31
Insufficient information to formulate an answer	16

One third of the answers to this question mentioned or alluded to *administration* as a place to seek cost savings. Two thoughtful answers in this area are nos. 87 and 88 (see pp. 23-24). In addition, the graduate student cost issue spilled over into the answers for the second question.

Conclusion

Direct broad-based faculty input on general resource allocation issues may be useful and informative to the UM’s administrative leadership. Thus, the AAAC hopes to work with the AEC and the Provost’s office to determine the impact and utility of this effort to survey the faculty on general questions of resource allocation. Once the impact and utility are known, future survey (or other faculty-commentary collection) efforts on resource allocation will be pursued and improved, or abandoned.

The AAAC is willing to provide further and deeper analysis of the open-ended-question answers. Follow-up commentary and discussion of these issues and of this faculty-to-administration communication effort are welcome.

Appendix 1.

This appendix provides a complete listing of faculty replies to “[Q11] What is the primary financial or resource constraint that limits your unit's success?”

The cost of supporting graduate students is too high.

1. student tuition
2. grad student funding
3. grad student funding
4. tuition fees.
5. Funding graduate student tuition
6. Scholarships for graduate students.
7. Graduate student funding
8. Funding for PhD students.
9. number of students, thereby revenue from tuition, has a l limit.
10. insufficient graduate fellowship funds
11. Availability of student financial support
12. need to cover grad student tuition every semester
13. graduate student fellowship dollars
14. limited financial aid for students.
15. High GS tuition rates paid out of sponsored research funds.
16. Few endowed funds for graduate student support.
17. FINANCIAL AID for students
18. Funding for graduate students.
19. Financial aid for Graduate Students
20. Obtaining sufficient student support is very challenging. Partial support would be helpful.
21. stipend and tuition costs for graduate students
22. Graduate Student Support
23. The high cost of UM student support on federal grants compared to other peer institutions.
24. tuition for graduate students i too costly to support on grants. it is more economical to hire postdocs.
25. The new policy on continuing registration for graduate students.
26. graduate student support
27. student tuitions
28. Continual graduate student tuition increases that exceed the growth rate of research funding/grant.
29. Not enough scholarship money
30. Lack of GSI slots in our dept, all PhD students have to be funded as GSRA's on a contract - hard to me CoE guarantee of 5 years of funding.
31. The lack of scholarship money makes it difficult to recruit high level performance majors who are being offered better packages at other schools.
32. Student financial aid.
33. We need more scholarship funds to compete for the top applicants.
34. Tuition costs for GSRA's are too high.
35. The astronomical costs associated with paying for graduate students; the new policy on enrollment/tuition is disastrous for the education mission of the university.
26. Fellowship support for first year graduate students in COE

27. Financial support for graduate students
28. Graduate Student Funding is a financial constraint
29. High cost of grad student support. Under current conditions, I will never take another graduate student into my lab.
30. Number and size of scholarship packages for incoming graduate students in musicology
31. Mouse costs, and student enrollment costs. In particular, covering tuition for grad students makes recruiting them financially onerous, considering that they have class load and often much need for training when they first start in the lab
32. The primary restraint is limits placed on proposal budgets by program managers and the high tuition costs associated with the University of Michigan. As a result, proposals become less competitive compared to other schools that can do more with less cost.
33. Paying graduate student tuition from laboratory (NIH-funding) resources. The students do not move the projects well or fast enough to be competitive. Would prefer to use the money for post-docs or techs who will work on the project full time
34. Lack of or insufficient graduate student fellowships.
35. Geological Sciences: Graduate Student support funds. This ultimately is what controls the total number of graduate students enrolled in our program.
36. Graduate student fellowships are the key dimension where additional resources would help my department's success.
37. our high tuition compared to peers, no of fellowships and scholarships for qualified students.
38. Support of PhD students. If you want us to teach doctoral students across the calendar year then make it so they get benefits in the summer. Otherwise quit asking us to teach them over the year.
39. The exorbitant cost of Ph.D. candidate tuition significantly hampers the ability of faculty and their graduate students to conduct research: far too much of the grant money has to be directed toward tuition. I am completely in favor of continuous enrollment, and I agree with the overall premise. However, the tuition rates for Ph.D. candidates should be significantly lower than they are now.
40. Having to pay tuition for doctoral students who are done with their required coursework and are just enrolled for research credit hours. These students should be charged only a small fee of say \$500/semester to cover their usage of libraries, computer facilities, etc., but should be exempt from tuition.
41. The fact that there are no tuition waivers for graduate students on assistantships. I came from a university and am familiar with many of our competing institutions where tuition waivers are standard. Having a graduate student cost \$60,000+ a year (tuition and stipend) is outrageous.
42. As a member of Cell and Developmental Biology, the high cost of tuition for both pre-candidate and candidate graduate students is far and away the biggest, and most unnecessary financial cost that limits the success of the department.
43. Extremely high graduate student tuition especially post-candidacy, that is poorly rationalized based on the services these students receive.
44. Research funding. With tuition going up, plus this new "continuous enrollment for Ph. D. requirement", why would someone in a research heavy Department even take a student given the student would cost more than a post-doc (especially an international Ph.D. student - and good luck finding a qualified US student these days).
45. We need to update our out of state tuition requirements to match our competitors.
46. Lack of funding for graduate students.

47. This was a very unclear policy. It was very unfortunate that the non-continuous enrollment option was not more broadly made available previously. Only a few "in" professors used this. It was unfair that those that did not know had to indirectly pay for those that were not continuously enrolled. Continuous enrollment may be fine but only if tuition is made really low. Tuition is so high that it restricts research.

48. Multiyear graduate student funding packages. We lose our best applicants to other universities for this reason.

49. Grant dollars are being used to pay tuition for graduate student candidates whose sole source of "instruction" is in the mentor's laboratory. In this time of especially tight funding, we cannot afford this policy. The federal and foundation funding sources will have to improve their paylines. As a grant application reviewer for 4 national funding mechanisms, I see this from both sides--the grant recipient and the reviewer--but not as the dispenser or decision-maker on distribution of funds. I am strongly against continuous enrollment.

50. I also strongly feel that the requirement to pay Ph.D. student tuition in the semesters after they complete coursework is a huge burden on federal grants and this makes the cost of educating students so expensive that many labs opt out of taking students, and focus on post-doctoral fellows instead. I believe our mission should always be research, education and treatment--it would be nice to see the University adopt a policy to minimize the tuition burden for Ph.D. candidates on their mentors.

51. I don't know about my unit, but one needless financial constraint that definitely limits my lab's success (and ability to secure more grants) is continuous enrollment of graduate students. The very significant extra cost in tuition prevents me from taking on more students, which in turn limits my lab's productivity and ability to get new grants. De-incentivizing faculty from mentoring grad students means that the quality of both research and education will both be declining at UM. If I were looking for a faculty job now, this policy would seriously diminish my enthusiasm for UM, compared to other universities.

I'm also not quite clear on why I should be paying so much in tuition when I'm the one training the student. Some tuition in the first two years is appropriate, but UM administration is clearly out to maximize the amount of money they can bleed from faculty grants via this exorbitant tax on mentoring graduate students.

52. Tuition for graduate students has become almost unbearable. The average cost for an out of state graduate student's tuition, stipend, fringe and health benefits cost the ~\$65,000/year. This has made it increasingly difficult for faculty to accept students, when the average postdoctoral fellow costs ~\$20,000 less and has many years of experience. Being in an academic institution it is the faculty's duty to train and supervise graduate students, but there must be some middle ground that is reached. With NIH funding constantly being reduced, the situation is becoming untenable for the average faculty member.

53. As a basic biomedical researcher, I am always limited by the amount of extramural grant dollars available to me for my research. Thus, the current rules for PhD candidate tuition as well as the new "continuous enrollment policy" greatly reduce the amount of money available to me to perform research, publish papers, and secure future grants with indirects, as "candidate" tuition is much much too high. Simply put, under current rules, postdoctoral fellows cost the same as a 3rd year+ graduate student. Such high tuition thus reduces the number of students a PI can afford to mentor. Such a reality will in the long term negatively impact the research mission of the University, as research performed by graduate students contributes significantly to the University's research success and thus to its position as a top-tier U.S. research University.

54. After starting my biomedical research lab a year ago, I was shocked to hear that UofM is charging research labs a very high tuition for enrolled PhD students who have completed required course work and have met minimum Rackham tuition credit hour requirements. Such students generally take very few classes and spent most of their time performing research in the labs. The labs pay their stipends/benefits and research expenses. In another words, the labs have paid everything for their training besides the UofM tuition. Together with the unusually high tuition, student expenses in UofM are about the same as those of postdocs. This discourages labs to take graduate students, and thus seriously affects graduate education in UofM. Such policy also limits the labs financially and put them in a disadvantageous positions when compared to most other research institutions. I would say that this is also a serious problem for potential faculty recruits. Unless we don't tell them about this policy during their interviews, otherwise one can bet that these tuition expenses will become part of the negotiation. Even worse, this policy simply encourages well-performing and established faculties of UofM to move to other universities with more generous policies on graduate student tuitions. Grad students are important work force of biomedical research labs. Research labs are not lucrative business. Please encourage labs to provide quality training to PhD candidates!

55. The recent plan to enforce the rules of continuing enrollment for post comprehensive exam graduate students is ultimately deeply flawed, and will undermine the University of Michigan. Graduate education is one of the most critical missions of the University of Michigan, and the quality and quantity of students graduated has a large impact on the ranking of a school. Moreover, many papers published in highly ranked journals such as Science and Nature, have graduate students as their first authors. Despite these benefits, most students are not productive for the first 2-3 years in a lab, and sometimes are not that productive until they go on to do postdoctoral work. The stipends of PIBS students are currently \$26,500. In general these funds (which are a substantial amount of money) come out of the NIH grants of the lab PI. The size of a typical junior faculty grant is about \$185 K and an established faculty might have a grant that is \$200K. The junior faculty is expected to pay 30% of their salary plus benefits, about 56K. In addition, they need to pay a technician salary, approximately another 56K. That would leave 73K. If they have two grad students, where the university pays the post comp tuition, that would leave 20K for supplies, essential travel, publication charges, recharges for necessary use of campus equipment and essential equipment. Even without tuition payments this is not enough research money. To renew a four year, \$185K/year NIH grant, study sections expect a minimum of one publication per year. This is a very high bar, and a lab staffed with 1 technician, and two graduate students would be fortunate to write 3 papers over a three year period. It is not clear where the extra \$24K to pay the tuition of two graduate student would come from. One might argue that tuition could be budgeted into a grant, but in the current climate, even if one writes a non-modular grant, NIH refuses to budge on expanding budgets. The rate of pay of my current grants is pegged at rates from the mid-1990's when grad student stipends were \$18K, and postdoc stipends were \$25K. Now they stand at \$26,5K and \$40K respectively. While University has many economic demands, the University needs to step forward to protect graduate student education, and to protect its faculty. Individual faculty cannot pay more than the student stipends. The University of Michigan needs to step forward and restore the ability of post comp graduate students to study on campus without paying tuition.

56. Requirement to pay out-of-state-tuition plus stipend for graduate students (nearly equivalent to paying for a full-time faculty member). This policy is penny wise and dollar poor. Many students are clearly going to finish graduate school over a shorter time period because mentors

are unable to support them for the appropriate time interval. This approach may work well for a MBA, but is not good for students in the sciences. While some students in the sciences maybe ready to graduate, many students need more time to mature into productive investigators. However, instead of encouraging a "good product" in the form of well-trained students, this policy encourages faculty to seek post-doctoral trainees and it encourages faculty to push students to graduate too soon. I have seen many students who were missing several pieces in their toolkit at the end of 4 years but developed into dynamic investigators with an additional year or so under their belt. There is no time for these skills to develop if an individual is going to be productive during a post-doctoral experience.

57. Graduate tuition, plus stipends and benefits are getting far too expensive for faculty who secure federal research grants to continue to support graduate students through grant-funded research assistantships. Our incoming research dollars have not gone up, in fact grant money is scarcer and many grants are smaller. But expenses to support grad students have increased by ~over 30% (i.e. up by a third) in the past 10 years. University tuition costs are only one part. The other is the mismatch of the "union mentality" hourly laborer minimal work effort mentality that grad students are encouraged to adopt with the very high level "professional employee" pay and benefits that they are provided (this mismatched combination sadly, also sends the wrong educational message to graduate students). I myself have stopped offering (or have greatly reduced) GSRA's from my grants, instead I hire a larger number of students for the summer and just pay them hourly for a summer position. Of course this means I recruit and support less graduate students.

Sum: if you want faculty to continue to want to write and expend considerable effort in securing and managing big research grants, make it possible for us to do so. It's a very difficult time-consuming challenge for us and between GSRA costs and taking more than our 53% you are chipping away at the final straws.

Current resources may be utilized unwisely or are taxed inappropriately

1. Taxes from the Medical school and university
2. Taxation by the Medical School
3. medical school financial model for research space is unrealistic for basic science departments
4. taxes on success extracted by central administration
5. money going to the department not the division so the division sees none of it yet does the work to bring it in
6. Budget process unclear beyond administrators.
7. Lack of openness about the budget; lack of open dialogue between financial decision makers and faculty and staff -- chemistry
8. Leadership is lacking. There is no prioritization or accountability for how resources are spent.
9. No autonomy over funds generated by unit. No transparency.
10. Primarily, that all moneys made in the unit are no longer held within the unit, but "banked" into L,S and A
11. Major budget concerns are not addressed in depth.
12. Taxation of clinical revenue to support new research buildings and medical school overhead.
13. Rediculous and frivolous expenditures not related to our primary mission of training the students.
14. lack of indirects going from the department to our division

15. Too much money charged to research grants for time to do the work. [Mechanical Engineering]
16. We are encouraged by our Dean to find funding sources that demand hiring faculty that can be funded by the Provost. This is not always the best teacher.
17. Inequitable split of profits between the Hospital and the Medical School and faculty, with the former's cash reservers being valued over academic productivity and adequate support of the latter.
18. Library in the recent years has a higher proportion of administrators compared to in the past. A lot of staff has been added to the 8th floor of hatcher. Staff has been cut back in the units that serve patrons.
19. The sheer degree of research funding that gets rerouted, through excessively large overheads, towards the salaries of unneeded secretarial staff.
20. Very little support from the "university"; lack of access to indirects as grants are funded.
21. The exorbitant facilities costs, including the ridiculous costs for minor facilities upgrades.
22. Administrative bloat (including "academic services", athletics) has left the basic academic mission without adequate resources.
23. Blended tuition return (mixing non-resident together with resident). In our unit, the majority of applicants are from out of state.
24. My unit's priorities seem to be new buildings instead of high-quality graduate students
25. In my opinion, the policy of taking funds (salary offset) from tenure-track and tenure faculty and asking research scientists to teach is flawed. Many of these research scientists are not good at teaching.
26. college management of existing financial resources
27. The primary issues really are associated with the amount of wasted time spent on paper work for systems that are not properly integrated around campus. Restating similar information multiple times seems to be a waste of faculty effort.
28. An extremely high (around 30-40%) tax on income generated. Many worthwhile (and "profitable" in the sense of generating enough revenue to cover costs) are lost because the central administration takes a percentage of the revenue (as opposed to a percentage of net revenue).
29. Limited external grant sources for service core. Lack of administrative long term support to build infrastructure to increase services. Requirement to include depreciation and maintenance changes in recharge structure increases costs and limits number of faculty that can afford services.
30. Few options for exploring new faculty hires that are not tied to other university initiatives. We seem to be growing more opportunistically than strategically and this has been going on for some years and is now beginning to take its toll.
31. Financial model appears to create substantial financial burdens that are disproportionately distributed by department; particularly clinical departments where health care reimbursements are low. It appears that either the administration does not care about such problems or simply blind to them. Both are inconsistent with fostering institutional loyalty, confidence and pride.
32. My Department planned well and frugally, but the LSA Dean then takes large amounts so that we are "in debt." We are the top graduate program in the country, and can now only take a minuscule number of graduate students. This also has consequences for the success of the junior faculty. The increased teaching requirements for graduate students are bad for their education.

33. Behavioral researchers (of which I am not one) really do need more research funds than the rest of us. They are clearly hampered by the recent budget cuts, but even the normal allotment affected them adversely.
34. Micro-management of units by the college and above leads to misallocations. Support for the core mission is starved but generous support is available when none should be given.
35. The LSA interference in our department's computing infrastructure makes our computer system far inferior to those at every other math department I've seen.
36. Past poor decision making for which we are now paying a price. There seems to have been little oversight at the level just above the departmental level. When foolish departmental spending was begin reviewed, it should have been stopped by someone in LSA.
37. For Ross School--University's tax on our tuition esp. tuition increases, failure of Exec Ed.
38. My unit is successful. Current 2% reduction might sound fair in numerical logic, but in practice it punishes the virtuous who have not squandered in the past.
39. UM is becoming increasingly centralized in the decision making, with Deans and Central Admin. taking away power from departments. Long term this is hurting the University.
40. onerous supervisory process that now requires additional signatures. Adding layers of complexity and pages to policies increases bureaucracy, not efficiency.
41. I am a basic scientist in a clinical department and have no direct contact with clinical financial matters. From a basic science perspective, indirect costs from grants "pay the bills"; however, the rate of indirects varies substantially across funding institutions. Rent is one of our biggest bills, especially in the BSRB. We also have very inefficient administration and financial management. We are unable to obtain accurate accounts of spending in a timely fashion, this severely impedes our ability to budget effectively.
42. Poor decision making on the part of the Dean. He has been too focused on growing the full-time programs, too ignorant of the importance of Exec Ed and the EMBA, and too risk averse to try anything new.
43. Current emphasis on a large portion of faculty salaries paid from grants at the Medical School (uses precious research funds for subsidizing faculty salary).
Use of indirect costs to benefit departmental and college units with little benefit to investigators. I.e., office supplies cannot be charged as direct costs on many federal grants - since we all still use computers, paper and pens, it would be helpful if indirects could be used to provide these essential materials.
44. Our resources and support have been constrained by budget cuts but also by a lack of political power at the level of the College and beyond. Our administrators largely ignored the recommendations of the external review completed a year ago. The perception is that our president does not support us. There was a promise of a new building, architectural programming for a new building (that burned up many hours of faculty time), then the project was cancelled without explanation. The condition of the Kraus building is an absolute disgrace to the University of Michigan. This has demoralized the faculty and led a number of us to seek other employment opportunities.
45. The University has policies in place that FORCE research faculty into UNETHICAL situations. Staff paid by research grants are allowed to accrue 2.5 months of paid vacation AND carry this over when they change positions within the University. This means that that vacation time will be paid BY ANOTHER GRANT even though the use of grant funds to pay expenses not contributing to accomplishing the grant is UNETHICAL and probably a breach of our

contract with the NIH. The rules should be changed so that research staff cannot carry over vacation time when changing position within the university

46. What is the primary constraint that limits your unit's success?

Poor administrators and weak faculty governance. Faculty governance at the UM is way too weak. Administrative abuses are excessive within the University. For instance, in the past, XXX (and/or one of his associates, placed years ago by XXX, before he left) tampered with faculty teaching evaluations, removing the positive evaluations, in order to lower their score. This is highly unethical, and should be investigated. No administrator should be tampering with the student evaluations of faculty, in order to lower their teaching evaluation scores. This is unacceptable and this was done at the UM years ago.

The choice of XXX for XXX Dean (in spite of huge opposition from many faculty in XXX) was very regrettable. A disaster for XXX. XXX is very political and vindictive. The damage to XXX will be long lasting.

47. A second issue for those of us whose work involves lots of computing: The university IT operation has started charging significantly more for data storage. This comes directly out of our grant DIRECT funding costs AFTER the university has already taken 53% overhead of our funds for these very purposes!! And the U. budget office is stating that through changes in IT they are saving the university a large amount of money. Where is that coming from? Apparently a lot of it is coming from double-charging our research grants for computing space and resources!! Charging a large overhead and the charging again for the same type of infrastructure is really not OK. It will cripple researchers and is just plain wrong.

Interior & exterior funds are needed for additional activities, equipment, supplies, and services

1. research funding
2. Funding for travel
3. Drop in NIH funding
4. money for more conferences
5. The reduced federal funding
6. General budget restraints.
7. NIH grant support.
8. lack of discretionary funds for research
9. Grants for NIH, NSF and other
10. grant funding
11. salaries of faculties on grant. There should be a percent salary on general funds fte
12. Research funding and graduate fellowships.
13. Research Funding
14. Lack of overhead from outside research grants.
15. clinical (Peds) - unsuccessful contracting with third party payors for behavioral health services
16. CSP - funds granted by the University are not sufficient to support are many programs and objectives
17. Discretionary money for A-21 costs and preliminary experiments in new research areas.
18. It would help laboratory research departments to have additional research support funds, eg to help faculty recruit postdoctoral fellows.
19. Discretionary faculty-research funding for travel and computing equipment.

20. Very low budget allocation. Compared to other universities, about 50 percent. UM should benchmark to other quality schools for budgeting.
21. Access to major telescopes. The Astronomy department is not a leader in any specific area although it has the potential to be so with more financial support from LSA.
22. Size of general fund support
23. low funding rate for federal grants (basic science)
24. No travel money for regular annual conferences of our main professional society
25. Cuts in Medicaid funding for dental care
26. lack of money....?
27. There are not enough discretionary funds available for the A21-category items (computer equipment, non-laboratory supplies) needed to support the level of NIH-supported research in our unit.
28. The package offered to our chairs is not sufficient. Going through the EBS to obtain resources has limited the ability of our department to grow and remain competitive with other departments across the country.
29. Additional investment in junior faculty. Packages to help get junior faculty through a three year period including set up of office space.
30. always budget issues, as we turn away qualified applicants to the Nursing program,
31. Research support: especially funds for travel to foreign archives.
32. Limited development dollars brought in by unit leadership resulting in limited ability to fund students and pilot strategic opportunities. This results in the need to enroll a greater number of students to generate tuition budget than is optimal for their education.
33. Limited federal research support for discipline-specific research.
34. Currently, the amount of cost sharing available has restricted my colleagues and me from pursuing promising research directions.
35. The dance minor at university of michigan flint have very low funds.
36. We have seen enrollments sour but not our budget. I feel this minor should be given more funds for production, costumes, and props for cross training classes such as pilates and yoga.
37. Downturn on research funding.
38. The budget cuts will likely affect the budgets of our unit's (SAC) media production studios and mean the loss of staff positions. This will seriously compromise our unit at a time when the Film Industry is active in Michigan and alums are trying to stay in Michigan to help build the State's economy.
39. Our building was built without growth in mind. Should we reinstate our graduate program, we will have no place for GSIs. The SMTD's resources are geared towards other departments. The Theatre & Drama department seems to get less of the pie while the costs of mounting a theatre production have gone up.
40. Lack of primary care research funds. Our department is often not wealthy enough to match funds offered by MICHR or others. (Family Medicine)
41. Federal research funding.
42. Tight general funds allocation.
43. The rising costs of scholarly resources. Although better supported than many other research libraries, the University Library still occasionally has to cancel important subscriptions due to price increases that are significantly higher than the rate of inflation.
44. Inadequate support for teaching and research. The university is becoming too much like a business which in the long run is very short sighted and counter productive since much of our

success as a nation has depended on research performed at universities irregardless of obvious commercial importance. History has shown that the countries that only do applied research are not nearly as successful as those that do fundamental basic research.

45. departmental funds limitations to support research activities

46. Lack of support for graduate students and for bringing outsider speakers to interact with our students and faculty

47. Despite or because of the stimulus, research funding has become totally random and NIH seems to be irretrievably broken - the new scoring system puts all decisions in administrator hands. Therefore some faculty are over-funded and some are struggling. It's a vicious circle if one has to support full student costs as well. The department will not be able to pick up these costs, and student choice of mentors will be greatly affected by financial rather than intellectual factors.

48. Decreased reimbursement for clinical work and reliance by the medical school on clinical earnings to fund medical school and institutional initiatives.

49. The Program in American Culture is charged with doing a wide range of service to promote the university's commitment to diversity, and its cash-strapped budget must also account for the under-resourced programs in Latina/o, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander American, and Arab American Studies. This is an untenable situation which compromises the ability of all the units to perform at their highest level and makes the administration's platitudes about how much it cares about these fields ring especially hollow.

Take these ethnic studies programs out of the Program in American Culture and make them stand alone entities under the Provost's Office.

50. Hospital/healthcare based issues (Medicare reimbursement)

51. My unit is growing very quickly. Students are very interested in the topic areas we cover. That means we have insufficient funds for counseling support staff and also for development of new courses. Also, since the topic is both academic and strongly rooted in the "real world" of work, we need more funds to hire part-time lecturers with experience outside of academia.

52. Funds beyond unit resources and grants should be available for travel, hosting and collaboration within and without the university. The humanities remain at a disadvantage in this, but increasingly across the disciplines.

53. In this era of cutting budgets, I identify only small issues that would alleviate collective stress rather than high-profile budget-busters. I would like to see the college allocating enough to buy computers (the faculty computing allowance is much too small for astronomy, and goes into buying servers and printers for everyone), through returning an appropriate fraction of the overhead on grants if nothing else. The A21 guidelines appear to be stringent, and astronomy does not have resources to solve this problem in addition to cutting its budget elsewhere. Astronomy does well in grant money, and that could/should be recognized by allowing us to meet this basic need with relatively little stress.

54. Lack of adequate University wide support for proteomic facilities (both mass spec and bioinformatic support). My area of research is not conducive to microarray analysis of message levels (message levels do not match protein levels, especially during disease states). The support for proteomics research at UM is pitiful and the political chaos from the infighting amongst current "core" labs makes this lack of support even more frustrating. In my area of research, some level of proteomics is needed for NIH support. However, this it is unclear whether it's worthwhile to keep pursuing studies in this area. I have worked with 2 different cores - each group disparaged the other and neither one produced any viable data. I attribute the lack of data

to investment in a single type of mass spec rather than a range of instrumentation and the complete lack of bioinformatic support.

55. Frankly, I am shocked (and encouraged) that anyone would care enough to ask us this question. As a faculty in a basic science department in the medical school, there are three factors that limit my (our) success. The first is the decrease in NIH dollars that has made getting grant funding much more difficult. Second is that there is no mechanism in place to ensure that cutting edge instrumentation is brought into the university for all to use. For example, getting a two photon microscope (which many universities of far less stature have had for years) took a huge effort. For us to be leading research fields and get top publications and grant dollars, we need cutting edge technology available. Third is the university's policy to enforce continuous enrollment so that my meager grant dollars must now pay for tuition rather than supplies or salaries. I actually support continuous enrollment. But not if it means that I am paying so much in tuition for my three graduate students (\$34,000 - 54,000 per year) that these students cannot do any experiments because I do not have any money left for supplies. Or I have to fire my technician in order to pay the tuition bill. I think the policy by the university is very short-sighted and is going to have serious detrimental effects in several areas. a) the overall status of the university as a research leader will diminish as we are able to do less research and especially less cutting-edge research that results in successful grant proposals. b) we are going to have a harder time recruiting top faculty because when they find out what we pay in tuition compared to our peers, they will take any other job offer they have. This is especially detrimental as we try to get the NCRC up and running. And c) the graduate programs will be severely affected because no one can afford to pay graduate student stipend + tuition when hiring a technician or postdoc is more financially attractive and technician and postdocs can do research all the time rather than teaching or taking classes. I do not understand why I should pay over \$11,000 a year of my grant money for my student to work in my lab where I do all the supervision and training.

Additional personnel, better personnel, or rewards for current personnel are needed

1. Faculty lines
2. Low salaries.
3. Number of faculty
4. Money for graduate student instructors
5. Administrative and clerical support for Faculty
6. lack of qualified faculty
7. Inability to hire senior faculty.
8. Inability to hire and to replenish our faculty numbers.
9. Production and Labor costs
10. Ability to hire young faculty who are interested in anthropological archaeology.
11. GSI support
12. Staff Support
13. Not enough GSI support compared to peer institutions.
14. Technical Communications needs more faculty
15. Program has no full time staff; shares staff with other programs
16. Lack of well-trained, organized support staff for research computing.
17. not enough COMPETENT support staff to do clerical tasks that fall on us faculty
18. faculty salaries
19. Lack of raises for staff.

20. Lack of faculty in Biophysics
21. recruitment, retention and support of faculty are limited.
22. lack of administration staff.
23. Limited staff time is available to assist with the unit's goals.
24. The ability to grow our faculty to keep up with course demand, esp. for our SWC 200 courses. The unit is the Sweetland Writing Center.
25. Too few professors.
26. Money for faculty recruitment and positions.
27. We need more faculty. My unit is very stressed to cover our teaching responsibilities.
28. Not enough money available to attract qualified personnel.
29. Contracts for lecturers are limited to one semester due to lower enrollment in the Winter. This makes it difficult to retain trained lecturers from one year to the next.
- 30 lecturers in Tech Comm (in Engineering): we need a few more... we're all overworked and therefore not doing all of the things we'd do if we had the luxury of more time.
31. under-staffing
32. Quality support staff and financial/administrative competence of key administrators
33. Ability to recruit postdocs to small college town in the midwest, where employment options for partners are minimal.
34. not enough faculty..and too many adjuncts (who are never on campus and are not in turn with things as they should)...need more full time nursing faculty
35. Cuts in budget to hire lecturers; constraints in hiring new faculty
36. Lack for support for TAs and RAs.
37. The Spanish section of RLL is understaffed, which puts an undue burden on the faculty, reducing time for research and making the faculty look elsewhere for jobs. The intellectual environment of the unit is compromised and morale is lowered.
38. new hires even though we are several bodies below our limit. because past chairs did not hire we are now understaffed -- which means more work for the people who are here
39. Budgetary cuts. We need more instructors but they are not hiring lecturers in the Winter term. Not only that, the RLL is not rehiring new lecturers (those who were hired to teach in the Fall) for the Winter.
40. With a few more faculty we could do a much better job of teacher preparation and entry level course participation by senior faculty. Presently we are running around trying to put out fires here and there.
41. Recent budget cuts will adversely impact Spanish lecturers. Even though we generate the most money for our unit, we will be asked to contribute even more. The quality of the undergraduate education - i.e. the language requirement - will suffer greatly as a result.
42. Most of the unit is successful financially and resource-wise, but there is one that is shamefully understaffed; it is the playwriting unit which, despite being housed in the Walgreen Drama Center, despite Arthur Miller being our illustrious alumnus and despite the Hopwood awards that were initially funded by dramatic writer Avery Hopwood, there is only one person teaching playwriting on this huge campus.
43. The difficulty in getting authorization to hire to replace lost faculty lines. The imposed budget cuts for the next three years will not help, either.
44. Positions. In XXX the Dean holds extraordinarily tight control over positions and uses them in a punitive manner. Our department is starved for man-power. We are not longer able to offer, on a regular basis, core courses for our undergraduate majors and graduate students, let alone try

develop new courses for non-majors. I appreciate the fiscal constraints that the University is currently under, but the Dean seems driven to disembowel our department.

45. To meet the required cuts in budget we will dramatically decrease our lecturer numbers, thereby decreasing course variety and total seats available for undergraduates. Also reducing number of incoming graduate students by half.

46. Not enough faculty and classrooms for the number of students we have.

47. Lecturer salaries

48. Engineering: Too little funding for GSIs and for instructional equipment.

49. we need more new young faculty in our school...our emerging strengths in collaborative, coupled human and natural systems work are crying out for energetic young scholars to join us and translate these skills into new pedagogical and professional ones for our students.

we have some older faculty who could continue contributing as emeritus, and should do so, enabling the above process to unfold! of course, this is difficult.

50. Inadequate support staff despite significant indirect grant funding that should translate into more support

51. Faculty members are, on the whole, extremely productive. They are currently using all their available time, mostly in pursuit of important goals. We cannot achieve everything being done now while adding new responsibilities. To do more would require more people. That may not be possible in the near future, so we will have to do less in some areas.

52. Lack of resources to support a sufficient number of GSIs for our courses. Lack of resources to hire qualified staff with sufficient skill levels to whom faculty could delegate many tasks.

Right now, we spend too much time doing things that we are over-qualified for.

53. Inequality between Faculty promoted from inside the University and those 'bought in' from outside at Associate or Full Professor rank. This creates situations of great inequality between colleagues of equal rank doing the same jobs, and a climate of uncertainty because it encourages people to apply for jobs outside the University to get (and indeed sometimes accept) outside offers. It is also detrimental to women since they are often less confident and therefore not always good advocates for themselves internally and don't promote themselves for outside jobs to the extent that their male colleagues often do. More ability for departments to equalise salaries for people with the same research profiles and doing the same jobs would enable these problems to be addressed. (LSA)

54. My colleague just said, "Cutting off one end of the blanket to sew on the other end." That is what it feels like. We keep cutting and cutting, and it doesn't seem to actually be helping. It hurts most when we cut people. I am working typically over 80 hours a week, and I am worn out, but there need for what I do is growing and genuine. I am starting to make stupid mistakes from fatigue. What does that cost us? What we need most is, I think, staff.

55. Financial cuts and the need to replace faculty who have left. Also, the closure of the Shaman Drum means that humanities faculty now have no way to order foreign books. It is a disaster. If the students order them internationally from Amazon, it costs them far too much. If we create readers for every single class, it takes away huge amounts of our time to create them. If we use scans via CTools and the students bring computers to class, they are on Facebook for much of the time when they should be paying attention

More space, time, and resources are needed for teaching and research

1. Lack of space.

2. Lack of summer classes in department.

3. Limits on course offerings and hiring of full-time faculty.
4. Adequate space for faculty in a single modern lab-based building (EEB)
5. Space
6. Classroom and Studio space (Department of Communications and visual arts, Flint)
7. Not enough space
8. Mechanical Engineering: outdated, inappropriate space for new hire's research programs
9. insufficient space
10. Decreasing funds and the need for smaller class sizes due to labs
11. Needlessly drastic limitations on summer course offerings and some intro courses in fall/winter.
12. Exponentially losing ground against competitors due to delapidated facility.
13. Overcrowded spaces for teaching and substandard faculty offices.
14. We need new sources for teaching laboratories equipment and supplies.
15. More of the classrooms could have great access to technology. ie. The RC only has 2 projectors available for all the faculty.
16. Access to clinic space and operating time. Assistance with research compliance in the medical school.
17. lack of adequate facilities.
18. It is difficult for my students to gain access to studios if they are not enrolled in a course for that particular studio.
19. I am new so I am speculating here, but my guess is that we are short on bridge funding, local monies for supporting research, and adequate space.
20. Time involved in clinical education at both undergraduate and graduate levels.
21. The teaching load in ME (2 courses/semester) is higher than other CoE depts and to peer institutions. This puts UM ME faculty at a disadvantage in research output and attracting external funding.
22. School of Music Theater and Dance; Our facilities are the worst in the Big Ten and more importantly are an embarrassment when compared to other peer music schools.
23. 2% per year budget cuts and proposed teaching load increases will make it more difficult to compete for new faculty and retentions.
24. Space for instructional labs
25. Space -- offices are in very short supply. [History Dept.]
26. resource constraint: outmoded and outdated classrooms; painful access to any kind of media room. Using technology in class is not worth the pain of carrying a projector, computer, cables, and finding that the system does not work.
27. constraint on developing new courses to meet evolving student needs
28. The number of students we can enroll (graduate and undergraduate) is the primary constraint on revenue. As we find ways to admit more high quality students without compromising on their educational experience -- we will have more resources.
29. Lack of adequate facilities for instruction and research (Mech. Eng.)
30. Need more time - reduce needless committee work (e.g., carrying out departmental reviews that are ignored by deans, etc).
31. new or renovated space for optimal collocation of resources and services -- University Library
32. Theatre faculty are also paid less than other faculty.

33. I would like better electronic classroom facilities, dust screen, larger screen, brighter projectors
34. Space
35. The rundown condition of facilities in E.H. Kraus, and the malignant neglect of this problem XXX make it impossible to compete against first- and second-tier universities with modern research facilities.
36. Unit 1 (Residential College): classroom facilities. Not only are most classrooms not "smart," AV equipment is antiquated. Overhead machines focus poorly and TVs have such poor sound and picture quality that I have given up using them. A few times a term I bring in portable equipment, but students would benefit from a more habitual exposure to visual and sound aids. Unit 2: limited access to professional development support
37. I work in a department with less than 15 tenured faculty who have a teaching load of 4 courses a year. This hinders the availability of our faculty to take time away from teaching and administrative work to give more time to working on competitive grant proposals.
38. Perhaps the most significant resource constraint in the College of Engineering (CoE) is the insufficient availability of laboratory space suitable for sophisticated experimental research. The problem is not a new one but has been compounded in the past few years by the significant expansion of the faculty headcount in the CoE. A long-term plan for research space is urgently needed in the CoE.
39. Space...not classroom, but meeting rooms, labs and office space
40. Lack of space for faculty research labs and student lab space
41. Decline in enrollment means more time spent prepping new courses, which crowds out time previously spent on research.
42. Space assignments that were made upon the initial appointment of the faculty member may be inadequate once that faculty member establishes multiple sources of funding. In general, the ability to expand beyond the initial space supplied is very limited.
43. faculty time
44. CASL-University of Michigan Dearborn.
The facilities were never properly completed during construction in 2000, and we are left with a sub-par facility (especially in terms of technology) that does not even compete with the surrounding junior colleges. Students regularly complain of equipment and resources not being as current or up-to-date as what they had in high school. They come to UMD expecting to get something close to a UM education, and are then frustrated when they get here. There is no getting around the fact that this will be expensive, but it has been put off for too long and is necessary.
45. Insufficient physical space and inadequate funds to maintain the costs of relevant materials, computing resources, and student support to ensure that the best environment is maintained for faculty and students.
46. We need better equipment, and laboratory and classroom space for instruction. I am in Mechanical Engineering and the past CoE Deans have not invested in this Department in spite of our importance to the state of Michigan (i.e. UM ME is a primary producer of engineers for the auto industry). I still have hope that XXX will be different. If we had more and better teaching space it would be possible for us to increase the size and quality of our undergraduate program.
47. Animal care costs (among the highest among peer institutions); Lack of core facilities for research unrelated to cancer research

Msc.

1. Slowness at DRDA.
 2. Our dean.
 3. Insurance reimbursement rates.
 4. insurance reimbursement
 5. Low pay causes high turnover and low morale
 6. Age of Assessment materials available.
 7. We receive insufficient reward for our clinical activities.
 8. --limited access to adequate health care benefits for some members of the unit
 9. budget tied to enrollments
 10. undergraduate scholarship funds
 11. increased demand to provide uncompensated care.
 12. Having to reduce the budget by 6% over three years.
 13. We could all use more money, of course.
 14. Medical reimbursement
 15. no salary equity M/F, X-Y-Z structure ---- burden of the Y rule
 16. Incentive program carries little incentive and there are seemingly no punishments for lack of performance.
 17. Overdependence on federal grant funding.
 18. poor leadership at the chair level. There is a everyman for himself mentality.
 19. Too many deadwood faculty who are not pulling their weight.
 20. I don't feel limited at all
 21. Development dollars.
 22. Failure to identify individual contributors.
 23. My unit's success depends on other factors, not the economic ones, frankly.
 24. I found the questions above lack commonsense. If Ph.D. candidates do not pay tuition, the university will lose a major portion of the tuition revenue.
 25. Restrictions on hosting (e.g., recruitment events and star faculty visits).
 26. Low enrollment in graduate programs
 27. Study coordinator to brief every patient on opportunities to participate in research and infrastructure to bank waste blood or tissue.
 28. None so far.
 29. Economic stresses are affecting our students; some are dropping out of school altogether or scaling back their education due to family financial hardships.
 30. Given the difficult situation of the local economy, I feel that my unit is undergoing surprisingly little financial or resource constraints -- certainly no more than I would expect given external conditions.
 31. There really is not one; we have the tools to advance our interests and programs. We do need more help on web design and the university should be able to organize a cohort of our best students to provide these services to the individual schools and departments
 32. The Chair of the ABIA should be a faculty member.
- The faculty need to have more power in the ABIA. The XXX needs to be curtailed in his practices. Also, student athletes need to be accorded the same protection as other students. XXX curses his student athletes unmercifully. The faculty (ABIA) should be chosen to monitor the XXX practices. XXX certainly has failed to do so (wonder why??).

33. The refusal of University Michigan administration to pay for older travel expenses incurred for university travel was taken without a clear advanced announcement. A step like this, does not financially benefit the university, while it heavily penalizes the faculty by making them pay taxes for expenses incurred for the university.

It is in my opinion an unbelievable signal of administration that not only does not care about the faculty, but cannot differentiate legality and fairness. This step has changed my opinion about this administration.

34. I appreciate you asking the final question. I'm sure you're aware of many prominent colleges that do provide a break for faculty children. Faculty have decided in favor of such colleges at least partly due to that reason. Both my husband and I are alumni of UM and work at UM... yet there is nothing 'special' for us to send our 3 kids here in the coming years. Given the current economic reality - it is a challenge to justify. I do believe kids should be admitted upon merit, but if admitted - recognition of family commitment to UM is in place and would be much appreciated. Thank you.

35. Equipment!

And Athletics- especially Football! One of my students was offered a very good internship for the summer between his Junior and Senior years but, since he had been a starter on the FB team his junior year and was expected to be again his senior year, he was told by the Football program, that if he wanted to start and/or even play his senior year, he would NOT do the internship, rather stay in Ann Arbor and practice football. Guess what he did!

Insufficient information to formulate an answer.

1. NC
2. n/a
3. NBJ
4. NBJ
5. NBJ
6. N/A
7. I don't know.
8. No basis for judgement
9. School of Education Dearborn NBJ
10. Very new at U of M. I have not been able to make a fair assessment.
11. Limited ability to increase revenue and have maximized cost cutting.
12. I am a new faculty member. NBJ yet.
13. none
14. - not sure
15. can not respond to this question for lack of information
16. No one knows what funds we have except for deans - so, cant answer your question.
17. My lack of knowledge of the overall University budget disqualifies me for making suggestions.
18. Not sure. There is a total lack of transparency at the department and college level, so it is hard to figure out what or who is limiting. Since I am not sure who is reading this, I'll not include examples.

Appendix 2. This appendix provides a complete listing of faculty replies to “[Q12] Where can costs be cut?”

Administration, and clerical, financial, office staff

1. administration
2. Administration
3. Administration salaries
4. Faculty salaries.
5. admin personnel and expenses
6. People. Is there anywhere else?
7. Administration
8. Office staff
9. Support staff and non-academic offices
10. administrative salaries
11. LSA Administration
12. University administration, departmental administration
13. Less administration. We have too much administration.
14. deans' office staff
15. I would think the top administrator's salaries could be cut some.
16. top administrator salaries
17. Administrative costs by the deans office
18. Lot of the finances are going towards inefficient utilization of support staff
19. The administrative support staff is bloated.
20. HR and Finance Staff seem to have increased exponentially in LSA in recent years.
21. Rackham--what are the benefits
22. Too many central administration staff in CoE
23. I would dramatically cut the number of human resources staff.
24. in central administration of the school
25. There are too many support staff members. The University is turning to a big bureaucratic organization.
26. Administration
27. Administrative bureaucracy and political correctness
28. administrative costs, construction costs, athletic facilities costs, Coleman Initiative
29. administrative costs, bureaucracy and number of administrators can be decreased substantially.
30. Reduce research overhead, i.e. IRB process is getting more cumbersome.
31. We didn't need another Associate Dean (for Special Projects) in the College of LSA.
32. Administrative salaries seem out of proportion to others
33. Too many administrators at the University level. [we don't have enough staff at dept level]
34. Departmental Key Administrator Salaries are too high.
35. Medical school administration. Do we need all those deans and their support staff?
36. Administration generally.
37. There is excess administration within the dept.
38. Higher level administration
39. Increased productivity would enable staff cuts. We have some excess staff with very limited work loads.

40. Adm support staff are underutilized.
41. consolidate public outreach and recruitment programs
42. Reduce expensive, multi-layered, top heavy, overlapping administrative structures.
43. In administration, huge cuts can be made
44. administration
45. The Exec Comm should have a careful look and provide advice on possible programmatic and administrative staffing cuts.
46. Departmental administrative staff.
47. Medical school administration has ballooned in number of Assistant and Associate deans.
48. Some staff cutbacks
49. There are too many poorly performing staff that should be replaced or removed to save cost.
50. All administrative salaries should NOT BE MORE THAN RAISES given to faculty - that is a darn good start!
51. lots of wasteful bureaucracy and rule-bound behavior in LSA
52. We are down to the bone within the department. Upper administration salaries, number of support staff in the administration above the department level
53. Central administration at school level. Number of assoc deans has increase from 2 to 4 over the past 10 years.
54. There are far too many administrative positions and staff in the College of Engineering. XXX has just hired another associate dean, who is about to leave for sabbatical at the start of his appointment.
55. administration
56. Administrative, staff, and secretarial appointments and salaries.
57. Excessive administrative staff. You have 5 people doing the work that one person could do. Secretaries have secretaries. Assistants have assistants who have assistants. Too much delegation of work down the food chain.
58. Financial administration (new travel policy) seems extraordinarily cumbersome and time-consuming for us and for administration.
59. Salaries for the University President and other central administration staff.
60. I am not familiar with the complexities of finance; we certainly seem to have more bureaucrats that we need (School of Music, Theater and Dance)
61. Reduce the number of administrators, such as VPs, Associate and assistant VPs, Associate and Assistant deans, and their staff. The administration has been bloated greatly; re-examination and reduction of this trend during good times are long overdue.
62. We have a high staffing level relative to the number of students and faculty.
63. Thorough review of administration and overhead functions (outside of the academic units) -- look at the growth of administration and overhead costs over the past 10 years. It is absolutely clear where a significant amount of the increased expenditures are coming from, and only a serious house-cleaning will address this.
64. In general, administrative costs are high in every Dept and at the College level.
65. Cut administration. There are many supernumerary assistant, associate deans, and way too many deans, advisers, and other hangers-on. Why should the university sponsor an office for LGBT affairs? Why should it do so for "minorities"? The university should be a place for learning and research, not for pursuing currently fashionable social agendas.
66. Reduce salaries of upper level administrators; Reduce the growing number of administrators; Eliminate Rackham

67. Administration streamlining. Better integration of redundant functions and reassessment of information at multiple levels.
68. The number of administrators is large and continually growing. It just never seems to end.
69. Administrative overhead and cost accounting practices for internal funds are excessive.
70. Too many non academic employees. Too many administrators and their bloated staff. The University should return to its roots of educating students first and then do the other things. The increase in administrative staff far out paces the increase in faculty and students since the 70'ies.
71. Eliminate large and obsolete administrative structures such as the Rackham Graduate School. Cap the salaries of senior administrators such as presidents, medical school and other deans, etc. (and reduce their numbers).
72. Administration, top salaries
73. administration
74. administrative salaries, administrative appointments, new initiatives, new requirements for paperwork, requiring that faculty have to seek multiple on-campus sources for funding events, the total number of events, speakers, etc.
75. The bloated Administration. No more than 15% of the annual UM budget should go to administrators.
76. Administration: we should be able to do with fewer levels, and there should be less micromanagement, which I would guess is quite expensive. There do seem to be real redundancies in the number of administrators.
77. We seem to be top heavy with administrative positions whose activities and contributions are not transparent to faculty. In the meantime, faculty face shrinking staff support in terms of clerical assistance, etc.
78. Administrative bloat is immediately obvious when one peruses the directory of the LSA dean's office, and I suspect that similar excesses may be found in other administrative offices and in the Fleming building.
79. The administrative areas of the University have grown significantly. Are all of the units and positions necessary for the University to operate effectively and efficiently?
80. Review the work of all departmental members and see whether their work justifies their pay. If not, give those overpaid and underutilized staff more work and a reclassified position.
81. by reducing the number/salary of the administrative personnel; some of them are underqualified and unable/unwilling to adjust to their evolving job requirements; it takes less time for the faculty to do themselves rather than explain/expect efficient help from the admin; the money saved could be used to support the department research programs which will lead to more grant funds
82. Tough question. But it seems that here, as at most universities, the number of administrators grows disproportionately to the number of students and faculty.
83. Administration.
84. Salaries of higher level administrators could be cut.
85. Administrative structure of the Rackham graduate school seems far too big, of little real help for graduate education, and an engine for the production of unneeded busy work for faculty and staff.
86. Cutting a few deans at Rackham would both save money directly and likely increase the productivity of other units on campus.
87. Change the culture! The level of administrative productivity accepted as satisfactory here would be CLEARLY unsatisfactory in the outside world. And this is as much the fault of the

Administration as of the personnel. I strongly believe that there could be a 15% reduction in administrative costs with a simultaneous increase in efficiency if a proper management system and performance standards were put in place

88. It's too easy to say that there are too many administrators, and they're paid too much, because the ones I have dealt with are overloaded with work and put in absurd workweeks. That being said, it would be a great p.r. move if nothing less to commit to cutting administrative costs across the board by a higher amount than units are being asked to cut. The primary mission of the university is to teach and to do research, and this needs to be reaffirmed by actions as well as words.

89. Place all development staff under the supervision/metrics of central development.

90. Reduce the number of non-faculty appointments in the Dean's office by 20%. Then require that if any subsequent Dean may propose to add such appointments he/she should be required either to make a corresponding reduction in existing appointments and/or to set definitive and meaningful performance metrics at the time of the appointment that will measure whether the new appointment was indeed cost-effective, with a consequence of termination in the event of a negative answer. (College of Engineering)

91. There is too much "administration". We have staff for everything now, in part because of centralization, and these staff's existence requires MORE work by the faculty, as they are ultimately those asked to perform the needed tasks. UM should make an across the board commitment to reduce its staff by 30% and pay the remaining staff better.

92. Administrator salaries for one!

93. Salary and benefits of administrators in central administration, from the President to Vice Presidents and Deans. The salary gap between these administrators and faculty (and staff) is too large. The money saved from these salary cuts can be used to compensate the the reduced funding from the State. The University has no convincing power to argue for a bigger share of the State budget when its top administrators are getting such high pay and generous benefits.

94. Reduce the administrative staff (how many secretaries and helpers does the dean really need?) reduce the number of "assistants to the assistants," reduce the number of associate deans, dismiss the XXX in the XXX (he is an overpaid pompous XXX), get rid of this dean and hire one who knows how to manage time and money. Cancel the XXX program and its FULL TIME overpaid staff person. Insist that highly paid faculty members resign outside teaching positions that amount to a conflict of commitment.

95. Perhaps there is too much overhead to support rackham administration? And in general, charging tuition when no classes being taken seems kind of strange.

96. Our costs could be reduced if the Univeristy lowered the rent and hired fewer but more competent administrators.

97. Scrutinize administrative support to ensure it is aligned with teaching, research and clinical needs. Make sure the use of administrative space is as efficient as possible. If possible reduce the number of "middle management" personell.

98. After XXX reign, the Department of XXX has several dozens of administrative positions. Instead of cutting lecturers and increasing the class size, administrative positions should be consolidated, and cuts in administrative expenses should be made. XXX has really expanded the bureaucracy at the department. For each miniscule function there is a separate position. Consolidate the duties of the mailman and the front-desk person - they are both sitting idle most of the day. The main purpose of the department is education and research, so dispense with

secondary personnel. Hopefully the new chair will clean this mess (although I understand it will be difficult).

99. Try to audit and streamline the overly complicated administrative processes associated with grant submission and compliance procedures.

100. Administrative overhead, the large number of administrators and staff, and the exceptionally large physical campus that is inefficiently managed, from mowing grass in the daytime to overuse of energy and lighting in the eve. Why has the city of Ann Arbor adopted led lighting and much of light goes off into space? I recognize the extraordinary efforts toward a green campus, but much more must be done. I applaud a vision of new transportation with the campus, a regional approach, etc. but this needs to be a priority.

101. Administrative requirements (reports etc. - with less paperwork and less committee work, more time would be available to teach) Consolidate the massively multiplying "Centers" on campus and stop accepting gifts for new ones. They're free at first, then require a staff to run and lead them forever. Stop Housing from wasting so many resources on useless workshops and meetings. The current training requirements for RAs and RDs are absurdly exaggerated. Cancel big, well-intentioned events like "Provosts Seminars on Teaching." These are good, but produce few concrete results, and if something has to be cut, this should be it. Focus negotiations with GEO and LEO on cutting paperwork/bureaucratic requirements. Promise that money saved will go towards benefits/pay increases and/or towards Lecturer/GSI budgets for departments.

102. Reduce the salaries of the top administrators. Remove destructive administrators. Remove XXX as XXX Dean. Increase faculty governance and participation.

103. I have been a faculty member in the College of Engineering at the Univ. of Michigan for more than 17 years, and in that time I do not remember a major or minor administrative unit being eliminated, but I do know of several that were created. Given that personnel are the largest general fund cost, I believe that culling of the UM administration is place to look for cost savings.

104. Clearly, in Rackham. I have not had a clear explanation of the rationale of the changes Rackham is proposing (though I ought to have had one), so I cannot comment on those, but a lot of Rackham policies are foolish and wasteful. For instance, in one Department Rackham did one of their fairly ridiculous reviews, the faculty corrected all the errors in their data, and Rackham then sent the College that same erroneous data all over again.

In LS&A, which is rightly trying to cut costs but seems to be being made to take on a wholly disproportionate share of the cuts, frugal departments are being penalized for their past prudence. The right way to make reductions is to reduce all salaries in a graduated manner (so the better paid take a larger cut) by a small amount; LEO would have to fall into line (they ought to prefer that to wide layoffs). To cut every other kind of expenditure by a large amount will make everyone miserable without solving the problem. But are the other schools playing the full part they should in doing so?

105. The university has far too many clerical and staff positions. Outside of UM, the U. is known as a place where you can get a lifetime job security with high benefits for not doing very much work. The university should be about two things: 1) teaching and 2) research. For those reading this, this is coming from someone who had a staff position before getting my PhD and now a faculty member. As a (well-compensated and reasonably hard-working) staff member I did (meaning I was required to do) probably 1/10th, maybe less of what I do now as a faculty member. High compensation for 9-5 jobs that are non-essential staff or non essential programs jobs are where the university should cut. Let's focus on teaching students and research.

106. I think more can also be done to save money on administration (too many of them and I'm not sure what they do)

Plant, Utilities, Landscaping

1. Energy use.
2. Energy efficiencies
3. Building and staff
4. more economical use of resources. more economical use of electricity.
5. Plant's Budget...they drive newer trucks than I do.
6. maximizing energy efficiency
7. Supplies, energy costs, phone services.
8. Reduce the size of our physical plant.
9. Plant costs are exorbitant and unreasonable and significantly impact unit and project budgets and operations.
10. Energy and water usage. Vent hood mis-use.
11. Enhance classroom utilization to reduce building construction and maintenance costs.
12. Turn off the lights when you are not in the room!
13. Preventative maintenance of the physical plant in UM buildings and a systematic way to monitor maintenance needs and completion would save millions of dollars a year once implemented.
14. Better management of physical plant for utilization and efficiency
15. continued energy saving devices/policies
16. Lighting and use of electricity in classrooms as well as buildings after hours.
17. Lights that shut off automatically when the room is empty.
18. parking strain would be lessened if a light rail system had a station near the hospital and medical school
19. Building new buildings that are not needed, e.g., Palmer Commons, the expansion of the Stadium, and the new dormitory on Washington St.
20. I can go to Home Depot and make minor upgrades to Dept facilities at a fraction of the costs charged to my dept by Med Sch facilities
21. Lights should be turned off whenever possible. Heating systems in the dorms should be updated -- currently, students often leave their windows open when their rooms are overheated
22. Geological Sciences: Utility costs may be cut with present conservation measures being instituted.
23. Eliminate a lot of seasonal changes in landscaping. Every time I see landscaping crews out digging up seasonal plantings like lillies to replace them with something else for the next season I am amazed at the waste of resources. There must be ways to do low maintenance landscaping that would look good enough and cost so much less.
24. Facilities and plant - modifications to laboratories are expensive. Physical plant has not accountability - leads to inefficiencies and poor performance. Many times now we do not even contemplate the changes we need - unfeasible in the time it takes and the money.
25. Reduce landscaping work (vacuuming up leaves, planting tulips)
26. Limit the construction or purchase (e.g. the Pfizer North Campus purchase) of new buildings for which there is no clearly demonstrated need.
27. grounds maintenance, construction, energy use

28. Heating and cooling--need to do work on buildings HVAC to enable all parts of buildings to be cooler in winter and warmer in summer. Improve insulation and storm windows. Discontinue applications of chemical fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides. Lower the cost at which bids for renovations/repairs can be solicited from outside the University.
29. Easier said than done! I happen to believe we waste a lot of money with improperly working heating and/or air-conditioning systems, but I don't know how significant this expense is in the big picture.
30. We could make some of our buildings more energy efficient and try different methods of heating and cooling, such as geothermal. I believe the city of Ann Arbor is discussing the possibility of a geothermal utility. The university should step up as a large customer for such a utility. Although an initial investment in infrastructure would be required, that investment would be recovered in a few years and pay dividends in lower heating and cooling costs for years to come.
31. Air conditioning in summer - the office is freezing and we have to bring long trousers and sweaters to put on after coming in from outside.
32. Stop pouring millions of dollars into the Kraus black hole and give us a new building! Two new buildings could have been constructed with the funds that have been dumped into this building over the past 20 years. The waste and inefficiencies will only continue.
33. Heating & cooling (I can wear t-shirts inside in the Winter, but need a flannel shirt inside in the summer)
34. utilities. The Dennison building is crazy - the air conditioning and heating are sometimes on at the same time, the windows are single glazing, and it's not clear to me that there's enough insulation in the walls. With all this planet blue stuff going on, it seems to me that an investment in the building makes real sense. If the university can afford to put hundreds of millions into buying the old Pfizer buildings, it can afford to upgrade the insulation of the building, and save a lot of money on utilities.
35. Somehow introduce competitive bidding within the various physical plant services. The UM's Physical Plant Operations do NOT seem to be lean and efficient. The same has been true (at least in the past) about Purchasing. Install motion sensors for classroom and other building-internal lights so that they turn themselves off. Let lawns become meadows.
36. I think the university has done a great job in cutting energy costs and I applaud them. But more can be done. In my building (BSRB), there is sufficient lighting at night that I can make my way through the entire building without ever turning on a light. But these nighttime lights cannot be turned off. Even if there is no one in a lab, there are lights on for no reason. Why can't some of these be put on motion detectors and/or timers? Also, in most buildings the air conditioning is set so low that we wear sweaters or jackets most of the time.

Publications, activities, programs, or services that do not contribute the UM's core mission

1. food / events
2. in the number of hardcopy publications
3. Construction of new facilities when not necessary.
4. Academic programs of questionable scholarly value and standards.
5. Benefits seem to be generous given the standards in private industry.
6. Paying for employees' tuition for any courses.
7. Reduce or cap honoraria for guest speakers.
8. Constant computer upgrades. Faculty don't need a new computer every three years.

9. Administrative developed programs that generally turn out to be failures.
10. Use of paper letters to in house physicans -- should all be done electronically.
11. Be more green.
12. Glossy paper magazines hailing the successes of units. Do these expensive productions really accomplish anything?
13. Stop giving everyone paper copies of staff directories, and course catalogs. Make them available to the web-averse by request.
14. Continue to put as much paperwork online as possible to cut down mailings etc.
15. "Gee whiz" technology that functions mainly to impress donors.
16. travel - the university should invest in adequate videoconferencing software and encourage alternatives to traveling where possible, reasonable, and appropriate.
17. Seems simple, but has anyone thought of reducing by 10% office supplies? So many are used for purposes other than the office. Also, who uses business cards anymore?
18. General fund support for activities that don't directly support the educational mission of the School.
19. Stop printing handouts for students when they have access to electronic copies on CTools.
20. ULAM!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
21. Evaluate all expenditures in light of the primary mission of training the students.
22. Graduate programs with low enrollment and who are unable to maintain national recognition (e.g. majority passing on certification exams) - should be eliminated
23. Generating referral letters to internal referring physicians.
24. Some of the centers seem superfluous, and some administration is clearly larger than necessary.
25. Cut back on expensive, expansive building projects for trendy fields like health sciences and nanotechnology. There are some very nice lobbies on the Medical Campus that will never house labs or classrooms.
26. lunches, etc
27. Travel is excessive. People should rely much more on teleconferencing and similar technologies.
28. we are operating under cuts that are hurting our students. cost cuttingshould be limited to categories such as energy use, food at events, and reorganization of operations in order to increase administrative efficiency.
29. Cut lavish hosting expenses and unnecessary expensive trips to China and other exotic destinations by administrators.
30. Rationalize use of copier services? No more water coolers? It's come down to that, unless we want to start imposing furloughs and going after faculty research accounts.
31. There are many things on campus that could be cut and hardly anyone would notice: CRLT and SAMS come to mind immediately.
32. In building renovations, technology upgrades, multi-million dollar labs (eg, the microfabrication facility) that essentially subsidize high-tech corporations instead of improving the academic environment in my unit.
33. Hosting, Travel, Energy usage....President's salary?
34. In activities that are NOT related to teaching, research, or promoting strong ties between faculty, students, and potential donors for development. Ensuring that college management is closely tied to the activities of students and faculty might reveal opportunities to more efficiently budget resources.

35. All the people who send out unnecessary email that dilutes our time and effort. Overcommunication. These communications exceed communications from students. Get an e-room and post, I can go and look if interested, email is a huge time waster especial junk stuff.
36. support for graduate student travel (do not eliminate, just limit).
37. Fewer parties, fewer events.
38. Where it can be considered a luxury, like the new addition to the Football Stadium, or dinners and receptions. Definitely not from salaries, research, hires, technology, teaching resources, grants, etc...
39. I personally don't make use of secretarial services, really, at all. And, here in the Business School, there are huge numbers of faculty functions (parties, essentially) that could be easily scaled down.
40. MHealthy is ineffective. The Central Administration should not force expensive programs on the colleges and schools that are ineffective.
41. In expenses with unnecessary printing at different levels at the University. For example, if all the content of the Record is online, I don't see a reason to generate a paper version.
42. Large number of administration initiatives that are marginal to core academic mission, eg Michigan wellness program, and office of "student success."
43. We seem to have a lot of staff, including highly-paid staff in things like Marketing & Communications, & Alumni Relations/Development who spend a lot of time traveling including internationally. Some of this is necessary but I'd rather cut staff travel than e.g. instruction or student financial aid. Why not cut the World Alumni Day or whatever it is called in the Fall?
44. Reduce the number of meetings, reduce the number of committees. When I look around at a committee meeting, I see a lot of salary dollars being poorly used. Most of these committees (I am in Medical School) have no decision-making power so they are weakly advisory or more often just a means of communication. One helpful hint: Every special committee that has a one-time task should stipulate that there will be 3 meetings of 90 minutes each, and that's it. You'd be surprised how much gets done when time is limited.
45. Engineering: The Dean's office continues to introduce new initiatives: entrepreneurship, multidisciplinary minor, international programs, etc. Although these programs are nice, it may well be they have lower priority than other needs, for example to support instructional equipment and GSIs. It might be that these are activities where cuts can be tolerated. However, since the budget for these activities is not known to me, I cannot say with any confidence.
46. Less teaching relief for administrative duties (especially when the Chair teaches only one course a year, as happens in a relatively small unit like History of Art); fewer visiting lecturers who are dull and merely friends of faculty; the equivalent of one position could probably be cut from the Visual Resources Center of the History of Art dept; moratorium on buying new furniture and equipment for a year, with certain exceptions to be approved by a cross-School committee; a year's moratorium on salary increases for anyone earning more than \$180,000
47. Eliminate redundancies within and between depts and centers; co-sponsor fewer (and consequently better attended) invited talks. There are too many colloquia series on campus; they all cost money and are underattended. Moreover, they distract grads esp. from their studies, esp. research, etc. outside of seminar. Now that hosting expenses & honoraria are absurdly and insulting low for invited outside lecturers, this would be a good time to simply cut down and synergize.
48. Every level of the University should continue to pursue more economical delivery of core missions and a reduced focus on what's not really central. The central focus for LSA must

continue to be the undergraduate program. We should be trying to build new strength there by taking advantage of the opportunity for reform the current financial crisis creates.

49. Paper waste throughout the university (fliers, invites etc etc)

50. Get rid of ALL of the small grants that the University gives out. Those are mostly a waste and the benefit from the few good ones cannot be justified by the total costs of these small grants. How can you as faculty to pay more of their medical, get less contributed toward their retirement and probably take a salary cut while you are sending them emails informing them of the worthless opportunities to apply for the vast amount of money we're wasting?

Switch and/or combine providers, locations and/or incentives for services to realize efficiencies & savings

1. Reduce the number of GSIs and hire more undergraduate instructional aides

2. Switch from PCs to Macs - could get rid of over have the IT staff

3. Have tenured and tenure track professors more involved in teaching and mentoring (School of Nursing).

4. Allow more active work from home, as in virtual classrooms.

5. - consider hiring more clinical faculty where appropriate - use adjuncts where appropriate - not sure

6. I suspect that there are lots of processes that are inefficient--for example, online application processing and review.

7. Field work transportation. Too rapid a renewal of computer systems and software.

8. Utilizing work study students for a larger percentage of the work.

9. Hiring adjuncts to teach the easier courses

10. more income generation activities in summer

11. Efficiencies can be achieved in joint course offerings and scheduling (e.g., executive models, web formats).

12. Hire graduate students within the unit only; do not offer teaching appointments, especially one-semester contracts, to GSIs that are not within the unit.

13. Departments could purchase international phone calling cards (really just PIN numbers) for use by faculty or staff to make business-related calls at rates of about \$0.02/min instead of much higher standard phone company rates.

14. reducing number of small classes being offered

15. do not replace all faculty on leave -- instructional budget for visitors smaller, used only for dept priority classes rather than every sequence.

16. Cutting subscriptions to expensive electronic versions of specialist journals at the library. Is it possible for universities to form some kind of consortium to provide access to this material?

17. My dept. and my School can get substantially more out of non-acad. personnel if they invest in specifying performance more carefully, training personnel, measuring performance, and rewarding success. These are now basic rules for running service industries, and we could use them here.

18. UM can cut costs significantly by better use of modern web-based IT systems, in all its administrative functions (e.g., budgets, travel, purchasing, admissions, etc.).

19. reduce overlap, duplication and redundancy in some IT and back-office areas, for example, have one library management system, not 3 (UL, Law and Business), and look into ways to reduce costs through greater resource sharing with Flint, Dearborn and others.

20. Reduction in number of staff directly supporting the chair and number of courses taught by research scientists.
21. Assigning a higher teaching load to faculty with low research productivity would reduce the need for lecturers. Offer a retirement incentive for very senior faculty. Offering more summer courses would raise additional tuition revenue. Offering more freshman and sophomore kinesiology courses to substitute for current requirements outside of kinesiology would increase revenue.
22. Could probably improve outpatient family medicine clinic efficiency by calling all patients prior to appointments (ie, raise income for clinic--we're pretty lean so not much room for cutting but definitely room for increasing clinic income).
23. Positions from the President's initiative should be cut, and the provost's special positions should be constrained significantly. The quality of hires made this way is bound to be inferior to that achieved using the regular search process.
24. Tough question - given the hierarchy of the university, it will most likely fall on the lecturers. There is not much we can do except modify how we teach.
25. We pay a salary to someone called "webmaster" who never does any work. Also, computer file backups can be done much more efficiently and inexpensively than they are currently done (this is one of the ways in which our computer systems are inferior to those elsewhere).
26. The President's initiative to increase the faculty size through cluster hires should be curtailed. These positions should be allocated to colleges and schools to address core curricular needs. There is no sense in having frosting when we cannot afford the cake
27. Primarily by encouraging better efficiency at the level of the department and unit. For large departments, this should not require moving resources or positions to a centralized authority, which is likely to result in jobs not being completed successfully either locally or more generally.
28. LSA should require excellent performance from everyone. No encouragement of obsolete technology. Wider digitizing of important documentation. Let's target departments who have performed poorly in managing their resources. Let's reward collaborative efforts and let us re-train administrators who have given voice to unreasonable demands.
29. staff need to be cross trained and incentives provided to encourage them to efficiently serve and provide more services. Raising their salaries tied to assumption of new and more duties would probably lead to a need for fewer staff members
30. A UM Travel program could cut costs. For example, at UCLA where I a recently moved from, faculty and staff were issued a corporate travel credit card that could be directly paid instead of issuing a reimbursement check to the faculty who then paid the bill.
- UC Travel also negotiated rates from airlines, rental car companies, and travel insurance making the trip planning seamless. Air travel could be direct billed to grants again, reducing the paperwork of reimbursement.
31. The housekeeping staff at my building sit outside most evenings and smoke cigarettes. They are outside each and every time I drop in my office in the evening. Switch from bottled water rental/service to filter installation at sinks. IT services remain a disaster at this top-tier university, and a careful examination should be made to reduce duplicative services (MCIT is a prime target for eradication)
32. Can we not outsource more of our IT/web systems infrastructure? For example, WebCafe at Wharton was a far superior system to our internal Ctools set-up. Over the longer-run (3-5 year period), I wonder if we couldn't reduce direct and indirect (e.g., wasted faculty & admin assistant

time & effort) through subscribing to outside IT sources rather than maintaining internal staff & efforts. Please do NOT reduce research budgets or support staff salaries.

33. costs in terms of finance and energy/carbon could be cut in hosting and attending conferences, and in equipping michigan to be a center of excellence for videoconferencing?

34. Rationalize the use of research space. Encourage more collaborative and efficient use of research space.

35. Can you simplify the graduate student application procedure with rackham? UM is one of several universities that must have been "sold" such system which is completely incompatible with a web-based approach. MIT and Berkeley (at least in ME) have figured out that a simple web form, with a few radio buttons and a free-form comment box, is what is needed -- not 10 screens to click through (my shoulder gets sore every time around this year!) and PDF version of the letter. Just the text is what we need to evaluate students, not the letterhead.

The Record used to be sent once/week, now it is sent once/day which is too frequent for me to keep up with. Can you go back to once/week? That should save not only the time to prepare but also the time to read (or delete).

36. UMD - Travel per diem is a good idea that will save. Share more resources with the Ann Arbor and Flint campus. More integration between the campuses, rather than 3 distinct universities-- each with their own administrative offices-- will save money, increase diversity and give students access to more.

37. We have already cut everything that is obvious, all the "low hanging fruit." We've cut a lot of the midrange partially bruised fruit also. I don't know that the solution is "cutting" so much as rewarding people for shifting emphasis to alternatives, specifically in the area of better utilization of online tools and resources in support of for-credit distance learning opportunities. Also, reward more telecommuting, less chained-to-the-desk work. That could cut facilities costs, and improve job satisfaction and efficiency.

38. MICHR should be able to provide a number of core support services to increase efficiency and produce grants/studies supported by the federal government and/or private industry. To date, MICHR appears to be designed to support a few investigators and provide little global benefit. Reorganization of MICHR to provide core services (examples could include a staffed tissue repository, administrative core for translational research, bioinformatic support) to support basic, translational, and clinical work and encourage cross-fertilization among researchers and clinicians is more likely produce leading studies in translational and clinical studies than the current model.

Athletics

1. athletics

2. Football!!!

3. NCAA sports programs

4. Athletic programs

5. Athletics.

6. Sports.

7. Salaries within the Athletics Department.

8. Athletic Dept. makes our school known but does nothing for the academic excellence of the school.

9. I do continue to be shocked by the level of salaries for the top coaches at UM.

10. The university is spending HOW MUCH to build skyboxes on a football stadium that is already bigger than most professional team stadiums and yet I have two of three classes in classrooms which are not "smart" classrooms. I either have to carry projection equipment half-way across campus so my students can present with power point or order the equipment to be delivered from some other point half-way across campus so my students can present with power point. Maybe the university could have put the \$2Million it used to pay off XXX debt into classroom equipment to help the professors and students with their academic work - which, after all, SHOULD BE the mission of any university - especially Michigan, which likes to advertise itself as a great academic institution.

Do not make further cuts.

1. We are barely making it.
2. They can't.
3. I am not sure there is much to be cut
4. Nowhere.
5. DANCE - nowhere!! We are operating with less than needed to survive!!
6. they cannot; we have already been through years of rescission
7. no where! we are operating on a very tight budget model
8. nowhere- we're pretty much down to the bone
9. Nowhere. We are only just managing as it is.
10. We're pretty lean right now. I don't see many areas for substantial cost savings.
11. Tight as a clam right now.
12. If Michigan wants to remain competitive, it shouldn't cut anymore. It is already bare bones.
13. our unit is extremely lean to begin with. I strongly deplore the policy that demands that all units cut an equal percentage from their budget. We ought to proceed unit by unit
14. No where; one consideration is in reallocating teaching expectations for tenured or tenure-track faculty by adding one more course or comparable teaching assignment per year (or semester?) and reducing use of adjuncts...
15. we are running on bare bones so i do not see a place for it to be cut.
16. This is very hard as we already seem pretty lean within our unit.
17. I do not think that there is much room for cutting in my department, though we could make better use of our undergraduate work study students, who often seem to be surfing the internet or studying rather than doing work for the department.

Graduate student costs

1. Graduate student candidate tuition.
2. Graduate Student Tuition - It is higher compared to peer institutions.
3. Significant reduction in candidate tuition.
4. grad student tuitions charged to faculty members who train graduate students -- pls remove the tuitions.
5. cuts to graduate student tuition would greatly help to have the few federal dollars available go further in research
6. graduate student tuition here at Michigan is very high. Colleagues in my field at other institutions pay much less, hence the same amount of grant money goes further for them.

7. The fairest solution is to provide some degree (if not complete) tuition remission for students who have completed their candidacy exam. It is completely unreasonable to ask faculty to pay for their own instruction of students.
8. Tuition remission must be provided for graduate students on sponsored projects.
9. I as well as many other faculty strongly believe that "candidate" tuition must be significantly reduced, to some kind of "symbolic" rate (e.g. \$100.00/semester?). Faculty advisors, who are the ones providing the student's training, should not be responsible for paying student tuition. Thus, question 9 above is right on- "tuition should not be charged for enrolled doctoral candidates".
10. tuition for enrolled PhD students who have completed required course work and advanced to candidacy.

Msc.

1. Salary caps.
2. improve morale
3. Our dean.
4. new construction or renovation should include lockable classroom doors.
5. Increase In-State Tuition / Increase Out of state / out of US enrollment
6. Medical School salaries
7. More money dedicated to classroom instruction, less to administration.
8. Salary of incoming faculty who are cronies of the dean.
9. No other University pays the retirement health benefits of benefits.
10. faculty should not be given course releases for minor positions they've held for more than one semester.
11. Re-examine the number of faculty shared with other departments to clarify cost-effectiveness.
12. Lecturers and staff only. Maybe fewer Assistant Professors hired.
13. Support and advertise the two smaller campuses as lower tuition opportunities without strong research pressure on faculty.
14. Payraises of very senior faculty.
15. decreasing department investment in research programs for faculty who already have adequate funding from external sources.
16. stop life science initiative (hiring of 100 new professors while other departments cannot even reach their allocated FTE positions); is this really the right time to open up an entire new campus (Pfizer)?
17. Limiting the number of paid leaves that we can take.
18. Huge salaries to many favored administrators and faculty members
19. All faculty earning more than 250K per year should take a 10-20% salary cut in a progressive manner.
20. STUDENT TUITION. They should pay for their own education
21. Undergraduate financial aid is probably inefficiently distributed. How do you know this money is being spent efficiently, that is, are you spending more than you need to to enroll a freshman class?
22. Without harming the mission? It is probably not possible to make this level of cuts without harming our functionality. I prefer the method that allows each unit to figure out how to do this with as little pain as possible -- but it will be painful.

23. Web based text books for students. Increase parking charges to encourage use of mass transport, carpooling etc(Not a cost reduction but..)
24. Need to reevaluate the diversity of offerings and eliminate programs/departments. U of M can't continue to be everything to everyone! EXPERIMENT with new teaching models (IT driven models); we have a teaching model from the middle ages and have not reinvented our methods. WE CAN NOT AFFORD TO CONTINUE TO TEACH USING OUR "TRADITIONAL" MODELS! We have priced higher education out of the reach of most of the families in the state. If we are a leading research institution we need to focus our intellectual talents internally and develop new methods of instruction.
25. I'm sure health care costs are a big burden on the university, but on the other hand, no one wants benefits to be cut or contributions to rise. Do we really pay fair market value for all the space we rent around town, or are we over-paying?
26. A horrible, horrible question. In hard times, we should also be considering how to generate more resources -- new research initiatives to attract funding, new programs to drive tuition, and new businesses to generate additional revenue streams. Please get a clue.
- The central administration can stop its slow bleeding of the business school. The 'tax rate' on the school has skyrocketed over the last decade as the school's provost allocation has disappeared and now we are seeing a significant portion of our tuition increases siphoned away, too.
27. Somewhere else (semi-facetiously)... Units/departments that are operating above margin should not be asked to cut costs to the degree that those operating at a loss should (would that be a 'regressive tax?'). Travel budgets are the most obvious but probably difficult to cut, as off-campus faculty representation should continue to be supported. Limiting cost-of-living raises or even decreasing faculty salaries would be an option, at the risk of losing faculty whose salaries are already below median for specialty, time or place in rank. Providing university support to assess unit efficiency would be helpful, as different units might have different areas where cost-cutting would be feasible.
28. I believe the tuition that the Rackham graduate school should be severely reduced or waived. Many Ph.D programs are moving to this model to help the investigators and the quality of training. It is not clear to me what happens to the tuition and how the tuition is ever recycled back to the departments. After all, many of the faculty are teaching the course they are paying tuition for.
29. Provide incentives for cost saving ideas. For example, launch a campus wide cost-saving-idea contest and share 10% of the savings with the authors of the ideas that were adopted.
30. Certainly not in tenure-track faculty or lecturer appointments or salaries. Lecturers play an extremely important role in the delivery of high quality education at the university and the role of TT faculty is a given. It is important to attract and retain top quality instructors, but given the huge inequity in salaries and retention "perks" it seems as though some financial resources can be gained in this area.

I personally know of a faculty member who was given a large increase in order to retain them at the University, which may be fair, but what might not have been fair was that their spouse was also given a promotion in rank and a raise in salary. This was not only an increase in the unit's expenses, but also created a certain amount of disharmony among the units faculty who were not even consulted in the spousal upgrade.

The unit with which I am attached seems to be operating on a bare-bones budget, so I find it hard to imagine departmental budget cuts. Perhaps a reduction in conference travel

allowances might be possible, but this could, of course, result in lessening of the ability of faculty to participate in nationally recognized conferences.

It is also my understanding that it is common for some units (my own included) to offer faculty a 5% raise when they publish a new book. Perhaps this is a bit excessive. Perhaps there should be a cap on publishing raises, or base such "perks" on salary level. Clearly if someone is making \$60,000 a year a 5% raise (\$3K) is a welcome increase. But if someone is making \$100K or more, 5% (at that point \$5,000 or more) may be a bit excessive and not as important to their quality of living as someone making the \$60K salary. Perhaps a limit on the number of "publishing raises" or a decreased amount if you publish exceedingly often might be appropriate. Someone who publishes a book a year (as I know some faculty members do) can quickly add up a substantial drain on available funds.

31. salaries (have everyone take a 1% pay decrease) , benefits (the university does not need to contribute 1.5x what I do to my retirement account), etc.

Insufficient information to formulate an answer.

1. NC
2. n/a
3. NBJ
4. nbj
5. NBJ
6. I don't know yet.
7. No idea.
8. don't see them
9. No basis for judgement
10. School of Education Dearborn NBJ
11. I am a new faculty member. NBJ yet.
12. can not respond to this question for lack of information
13. There is no obvious place in my school and I'm generally too busy to consider such a question thoughtfully
14. No basis for judgment.
15. I honestly don't know.
16. I don't know. But to build the luxury boxes for the stadium is one example of a bad decision. I doubt the costs would be recovered due to the current state of the economy.