FSTF Working Group Phase Two: Final Report
Academic Efficiencies
December, 2023

Overview:

The Academic Efficiencies subgroup of the Phase II Financial Sustainability Task Force started its work during Summer 2023 by reviewing the fourteen recommendations generated by the FSTF Phase I Working Group and the President's Executive Cabinet. These recommendations cut across four key areas, specifically revitalizing the academic program, retention and completion, academic modalities and pedagogical innovations, and assessing the university's relationship with Academic Partnerships.

During weekly meetings, the group discussed each of the FSTF Phase I recommendations and identified common themes across the fourteen recommendations as well as specific areas of action that are consistent with the charge of our group to identify greater efficiencies, cost savings, and/or the generation of revenue. To guide our process, the group requested data and met with key stakeholders.

By the end of our summer work, the group consolidated the remaining FSTF Phase I recommendations into three categories:

- Evaluating the academic program portfolio in the context of the university's mission, considering both existing and potential new programs with an eye towards differentiation and financial impact on the institution. Essential to this idea is a commitment to facilitating smart growth, which means analyzing the cost of running a program in relation to the revenue that the program generates, and strategic investment/allocation in our academic programs.
- Conducting a thorough assessment of what falls under our retention efforts (e.g. faculty advising, alerts in SSC, CARE Team reports, student support services, FYE, etc.) in order to create a unified and targeted plan to retain students through to graduation.
- Evaluating the university's reliance on external consultants while examining potential efficiencies created by utilizing and developing the talent of the university's faculty, staff, and administrators.

A number of potential areas of action were identified under each of the above categories, and reviewing each of those areas of action became the focus of the group's work when we resumed our weekly meetings during Fall 2023. The full list of potential recommendations can be found in our Interim Report submitted at the end of the summer.

Throughout the fall semester, the group met weekly to narrow and refine our recommendations. This process continued to be informed by the review of data as well as interviews with key stakeholders. Additionally, our group attended a joint meeting with the

Administrative Efficiencies group to discuss overlapping ideas for recommendations in a conversation with the university's Vice President for Finance and Administration.

A key outcome of the group's discussions during the Fall 2023 semester was the consolidation of our recommendations about evaluating the academic program and the university's reliance upon external consultants to generate data regarding our academic programs. The group's recommendation regarding retention efforts was refined after learning that the university, through a consultant funded by a donor, is currently conducting a review of our retention efforts. This review is being conducted during the current academic year.

After refining the recommendations, the group divided into smaller writing groups to draft each recommendation. The entire group reviewed and edited these drafts, and this final report represents the collaborative and combined efforts of the Academic Efficiencies group. Furthermore, it is informed by information and data provided by key stakeholders in Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Institutional Research and Planning, Enrollment Management, and Finance.

Chosen Recommendations:

The three priorities chosen are as follows:

1. Eliminate specific EAB contracts (APS, Global Partnerships, Edify) and develop a collaborative internal process and holistic data set that allows us to evaluate the academic program portfolio in the context of the university's mission, considering both existing and potential new programs with an eye towards differentiation and financial impact on the institution.
2. Change the Academic Innovation Fund (AIF) process, identifying shared priorities with input from all stakeholders and reallocating the AIF money to the Provost's budget, to allow for strategic decision-making and the most efficient utilization of limited resources.
3. Create a unified and targeted retention plan based on a comprehensive assessment of student success efforts to support students at all levels - academic, financial and social - through their journey from matriculation to graduation.

For each of the recommendations listed above, we will provide an executive summary highlighting the importance of the recommendation, a review of the data that led to the recommendation, as well as a bulleted list of specific recommendations with an implementation strategy.

Recommendation 1:

Eliminate specific EAB contracts (APS, Global Partnerships, Edify) and develop a collaborative internal process and a holistic data set that allows us to evaluate the academic program portfolio in the context of the university's mission, considering both existing and potential new programs, with an eye towards differentiation and financial impact on the institution.

Summary and Importance:

In 2014, the university signed its first contract with the Education Advisory Board (EAB) for a product then called the Student Success Collaborative (now SSC Navigate) for the purpose of improving student success through the use of institutional data. Since that time, the use of outside consulting products for nearly every facet of the university has grown dramatically.

During the tenure of the Financial Sustainability Committee on Academic Efficiencies, and in collaboration with the Administrative Efficiencies group, we have reviewed and cataloged all EAB contracts that now approach $1.2 million annually. This sum represents a tenfold increase over the last nine years. The committee interviewed key stakeholders throughout the university's administration, including Academic Affairs, Institutional Research and Planning, Enrollment Management, and Finance.

It has become increasingly common for the university to bring in expensive external consulting firms such as EAB, and undeniably, our increased use of consultants mimics trends across the national higher education landscape, where EAB is a well-known firm with thousands of partners. However, none of those interviewed were able to articulate any strategic decision or transformational initiative resulting from the services recommended for elimination below. The committee has been unable to assess the ROI or value-add from several of the EAB products or point to any direct benefit to students, and no one in the administration has been able to quantify any specific dollars or person-hours saved.

Further, the committee was able to confirm that campus usage of several of these consultant products has been minimal at best. Additionally, deliverables from some EAB products have not been provided in a timely fashion. For example, Edify dashboards are still under development after years of setup work. Equally frustrating is the fact that the very product that has been sold to us by the EAB has relied in part on the contributions and expertise of FSU staff. Moreover, campus users have questioned the reliability and validity of the data and the relevance of how EAB data is packaged in relation to our campus. The EAB products do not necessarily match up with the needs of our users.

Based on all of the above, three things have become clear to the committee. First, there are times when consultant services are valuable and necessary. But, the use of consultants should be vetted in a transparent process that includes community input, clear goals, and measurable return on investment. Second, it is essential that we conduct rigorous assessment of the outcomes of these products and services; without assessment, these products constitute mere expense without efficiency.

Third, we need a shift in focus from the primary reliance on external consultants to the increased use of internal experts who know our campus best and can generate useful data for those in decision-making roles. For example, we already have an Office of Institutional Research and Planning that provides rich data for important initiatives and reports such as the NECHE self-study, program reviews, and our campus climate survey. In fact, for the past several years, EAB has leveraged the skills of our Institutional Research and Planning staff in implementing their products. We also have faculty and staff across disciplines who are dedicated researchers and experts in higher education policy, strategic planning, data analysis, program evaluation, and more. Tapping into their knowledge and experience could provide tremendous insight for enhancing our university. While this would require a reallocation of some of the savings generated from eliminating EAB contracts in order to provide the human capital necessary, it would be at a fraction of the cost of private consultants.

EAB itself has done a decade of research on cost savings and efficiency on both the academic and administrative side. The core is that **across-the-board cuts don't work**. Consequently, it is crucial for institutions to engage in proactive and nuanced cost-control strategies to ensure financial viability.[1]

Therefore, we propose a nuanced and strategic approach to the problem. We propose to eliminate the costly, underutilized, and unassessed consultant products below. Then, we recommend harnessing the talent and institutional knowledge of our own campus community to develop a collaborative process and holistic data set that allows us to evaluate the academic program portfolio in the context of the university's mission, considering both existing and potential new programs with an eye towards differentiation and financial impact on the institution.

Data/Information:

The data for this recommendation came from several sources. The group reviewed cost data from EAB contracts as well as utilization data. Several interviews were conducted with subject-matter experts in Academic Affairs, Institutional Research and Planning, Finance, and Enrollment Management.

Cost of EAB Products:

In total, EAB contracts exceeded $1,170,659 in FY24. The cost of the specific products targeted for elimination is as follows: APS (cost of $89,585 in FY 24 alone); Global Partnership (cost of $98,810 in FY24 alone); and Edify (cost of $228,486 in FY 24 alone). Pinpointing exact figures has been a challenge as evidenced by the various tabs in the documents linked here and here.

[1] Reduce long-term cost growth to right size your university, EAB Research Insights, accessed 11/21/23 (https://eab.com/insights/blogs/operations/cost-control-strategies-rightsize-your-university/?x_id=003C000001gwNnvIAE&utm_source=eabdb&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=eabdb&utm_term=&utm_content=&mkt_tok=NzMyLUdLVi02NTUAAAGPkNUpEPkfb8spnLkV3jgqCgSKyE-RpUgI44LgU33SpyKhfLPkkoScDQU0NrUJTQYqU_6pQ1ss8LJfcHKgpnbk7zWSPBTrjZ8ka9gnlGRD0ko-fA)

According to the university budget figures provided by our finance team, the contracts for APS and Global Partnership end after FY24. Therefore, eliminating those two contracts would result in an approximate cost savings of $188,395 each year according to the documentation provided by our Finance Office. According to the provided budget figures, the Edify contract has two remaining years at a cost of $352,254 ($233,910 in FY25 and $118,344 in FY26).

Overall, the elimination of APS, Global Partnerships, and Edify will ultimately result in a cost savings to the university of ~ $416,881 per year starting in FY25. This figure is based on the FY24 figures for each product as well as the reallocation of hours purchased to work on Edify. We learned in a joint meeting of two FTSF committees with the VP of Finance and Administration that the university's EAB contract is structured through purchased hours. Therefore, we recommend reallocating all remaining hours towards the remaining EAB products, specifically SSC Navigate and the Admissions products that directly benefit students and impact enrollment and retention.

Utilization and Usefulness:

The utilization of the three EAB products targeted for elimination has been minimal.

APS: The university has created 39 APS user accounts since we bought the product in 2020. Of these 39 accounts, only 5 have accessed the site 10 or more times. Fifteen accounts have never logged in, and only 6 accounts have been active on the site during 2023.

Regarding usefulness, various sources have called into question the reliability and validity of the data included in APS. Department chairs have reported that the data do not provide a true picture of their departments and are not useful in developing position requests. As an example, it is impossible to obtain data for individual academic programs in multi-disciplinary departments. Also, the benchmark data for course planning optimization in APS is based on AY20. It is the group's understanding that EAB has no plans to update this information. As such, more relevant and up-to-date information about key metrics (e.g., course fill rate) can be obtained from our own internal sources such as the seats list that are maintained regularly, in real time. The EAB product is not useful for course planning and scheduling on our campus.

Global Partnerships: Global Partnerships was marketed to the university as a warehouse for best practices. However, the usage of the service has been very low, especially with respect to initiatives that are tailored specifically to Fitchburg State University. In 2022-2023, the university made use of the following services: 6 responses to questions with pre-packaged, not Fitchburg State-specific, research on topics; 18 instances of participation in EAB webinars; 6 phone calls with "experts"; and 4 market research projects to inform demand for new programs.

Regarding usefulness, the group asked at multiple levels of our administration for concrete examples of actionable items that resulted from the above-noted consultation. Other than the market demand research, no one could provide a single actionable item that resulted from the reports, webinars, or phone calls.

<u>Edify:</u> Edify was marketed to the university as a data hub that would make access to data seamless and reporting easier. A key goal of Edify is to develop dashboards that would allow collaborative decision-making across divisions of the university. The university is currently three years and $562,206 into the Edify contract and none of the deliverables are up and running.

To date, there have been 18 Edify accounts created, mostly in Information Technology working to assist in the development of deliverables. Only 8 accounts have accessed the site in 2023. Not only do we have nothing to show for the money spent to date, but considerable person-hours from both Institutional Research and Planning and Information Technology have been invested in this project.

In summary, our review of the various EAB products found several – specifically SSC Navigate and those used by our Admissions and Enrollment Management team – with value to the institution. However, three products – APS, Global Partnerships, and Edify – failed to demonstrate value in comparison to the cost of the contract.

<u>Specific Recommendations/Implementation Plan:</u>

- After evaluating our reliance on outside consultants to reduce costs in this area, we recommend the elimination of the following EAB products with cost savings to the University of ~$416,881 per year:

    - Global Partnerships ($98,810 in FY 24)
    - Academic Performance Solutions (APS) ($89,585 in FY 24)
    - Edify Data Hub ($228,486 in FY 24)
    - We recommend reallocating all remaining hours in the Edify contract to remaining EAB products, specifically SSC Navigate and the Admissions products, as these directly benefit students and impact enrollment and retention.

- We also recommend examining potential savings offered by utilizing our own staff, faculty and librarians, and administrators, and our existing organizational structure, with our Office of Institutional Research and Planning, who possess a wealth of institutional knowledge and expertise. By utilizing and developing this internal talent, while also being mindful of national best practices and trends in higher education, the university can tap into a deep understanding of its unique challenges, culture, mission, and values, leading to more tailored and effective solutions to our challenges.

- More specifically, following the elimination of the consultant products above, we recommend developing a collaborative process informed by a holistic set of data to align academic program plans with the university's mission as well as long-term enrollment demands. This collaboration requires input from all stakeholders including Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Institutional Research and Planning, Enrollment Management, and Finance, as the current practice of relying on academic data generated by various offices, divisions, and EAB has been a source of operational confusion and unnecessary expense.

The key to success must be a process and a data set on which all institutional stakeholders agree. A different version of the “Phase 1 Data Report” produced by the university in years past offers a potential place to start. Through collaborative conversations that inform all stakeholders about potential variables to include, a new approach to generating a complete academic data set by our Office of Institutional Research and Planning would better meet the needs of analyzing our academic programs. The committee recognizes that the reallocation of some of the savings above may be needed to provide the human capital to get the work done; but, substantial savings will still be realized.

This robust data set would allow us to facilitate smart growth, which means analyzing the cost of running a program in relation to the revenue that the program generates, and making strategic investments in and allocations to our academic programs. Likewise, it could assist us in implementing a strategic process that would drive the modification of existing programs and/or the creation of new ones.

Recommendation 2:

Change the Academic Innovation Fund (AIF) process, identifying shared priorities with input from all stakeholders and reallocating the AIF money to the Provost’s budget, to allow for strategic decision-making and the most efficient utilization of limited resources.

Summary and Importance:

In Spring 2022, the Academic Innovation Fund (AIF) and the University Innovation Fund (UIF) were created. Each was started with $250,000 (for a total of $500,000).[2] It is unclear where this pool of money came from; we learned that it was not redirected from a previously existing source and it was not allocated to Academic Affairs. It is also unclear if this funding mechanism will remain in place during future years.

During the first year of the fund, an internal grant application and review process were quickly established, as the funds needed to be allocated within a few months. During the second grant cycle, the grant application was significantly revised, particularly with respect to requiring applicants to discuss outcomes assessment and sustainability plans. Additionally, a university-wide committee was established to review grant applications and provide recommendations to the Provost. The committee included seven MSCA members selected from various disciplines to represent the breadth of the university curriculum as well as representation from Academic Affairs (two deans and the AVPAA as an *ex-officio* member).

[2] As our group is focused on Academic Efficiencies, the focus of this recommendation will be on the AIF only.

We endorse the concept of the AIF grant that taps into the interest and expertise of our faculty and librarians to initiate academic innovation. We also recognize the value of the new RFP (Request for Proposal), built with reference to the strategic plan and sustainability concerns. However, given that the AIF budget - the primary driver of new academic initiatives and programs - lies outside the purview of Academic Affairs, the current AIF process raises issues that need to be addressed.

While the funded projects are exciting and valuable in many ways, and each has intrinsic value in itself, the AIF process prevents the collective impact from being apparent. In the absence of coordinated curricular priorities for the campus, the model risks leading us to an increasingly fragmented academic portfolio. It also risks leading to a proliferation of initiatives that are valuable but unsustainable, and thus the current model does not represent the most efficient use of our limited resources. Moreover, many of the grants provide seed money but do not plan for added expenses to support the outcome of these projects in a sustainable way.

Though we fully support innovation and investment in our academic program portfolio, we suggest a different approach and process that may yield more successful, cohesive, sustainable, and measurable outcomes.

In order for the Academic Innovation Fund model to be successful, the following ambitious conditions must be met.

- The highest academic priorities in terms of establishing a comprehensive university curricular portfolio must be agreed upon and clearly articulated prior to a grant cycle.
- These specific academic priorities need to drive grant decision-making in relation to the comprehensive curricular plan.
- Communication across the academic community needs to ensure interconnectedness.

Given the complexities associated with meeting all of the above conditions, the current internal grant process is not the most efficient way to fund the development of programs and initiatives. For example, as will be highlighted in the data below, over $100,000 across both grant cycles was not invested into academic innovations.

Further, until we are able to have conversations and agree on shared priorities and goals (the first bullet above), we cannot move forward strategically, as an institution. Thus, a more lasting investment in our academic programs would be to have these urgent conversations at the School level and to strengthen the Academic Affairs budget to support the collective strategic vision for the campus curriculum.

<u>Data/Information:</u>

AIF AY23-24 Funding Cycle:

$250,000 was made available to support initiatives during AY23-24. Twelve grants were awarded with a total of $154,124. The specific grant amounts ranged from a low of $6,252 to a high of $25,204, with almost half of them falling under $10K. It is unclear what happened to the remaining ~$96,000 in the AIF pool for AY23-24. The money was not redirected to any other academic initiative that the committee could identify and the money is not in the budget of the Provost.

Eight of the twelve grants impacted the academic program portfolio. More specifically, two grants supported the creation of new majors, while two funded the development of new courses. Four existing courses were redesigned using AIF monies. A number of grants were awarded to repeat recipients and program areas. See the full list here.

AIF AY22-23 Funding Cycle:

$250,000 was available to support initiatives during the spring of AY22-23. Thirteen grants were awarded with a total of $222,101. The specific grant amounts ranged from a low of $5,000 to a high of $39,250, with five of them falling under $10,000. Approximately $18,000 was unspent during this cycle. Where those funds were redirected is unknown and they were not in the budget of the Provost.

Eight of the thirteen grants impacted the academic program portfolio. More specifically, three grants supported the development of new majors, and one supported the creation of a new minor. One grant was allocated to establish a new 4+1 program, and two supported the development of new courses. One grant supported the redesign of a course while another supported the redesign of a sequence of courses. Finally, there was also a grant to formalize high-impact practices, a key institutional priority, but only in four specific departments. See the full list here.

Specific Recommendations/Implementation Plan:

- We strongly support the goals and funding of the AIF as an investment in academic innovation and quality, but not the current process.
- We recommend reallocating the AIF money to the Provost's budget. It is the responsibility of the Chief Academic Officer to oversee the innovation of the curriculum. This will allow for strategic decision-making and help prevent the development of initiatives outside of strategic academic processes. Further, we recommend that the Provost create an internal budgetary process to empower the Deans to play a more significant role in the efficient use of academic resources and the leadership of academic innovation.
- We recommend that the Provost, the Deans, Department Chairs, and Faculty and Librarians facilitate urgent conversations at the School level to articulate a concrete vision and set of strategic priorities for academic innovation in the context of the curriculum that Fitchburg State University offers. These priorities will be based on the input of stakeholders as well as the mission and needs of each School.
- We recommend strengthening the Academic Affairs budget to support the development of a collective strategic vision for each School that will drive its growth and renewal.
- We thus also recommend changing the Academic Innovation Fund (AIF) process in relation to the above.

Recommendation 3:

Create a unified and targeted retention plan based on a comprehensive assessment of student success efforts to support students at all levels - academic, financial and social - through their journey from matriculation to graduation.

Summary and Importance:

To improve the financial sustainability of Fitchburg State University, we must focus on retaining our undergraduate day students once they enroll. Retaining our students is essential to fulfilling the mission of Fitchburg State University, and a hallmark of financial sustainability. National estimates show the cost to recruit a new student exceeds the cost to retain one who is already enrolled.[3] We cannot build our financial model on the assumption that students who leave can be easily and inexpensively replaced.

Based on publicly-available first-time, full-time enrollment figures for the 2021-2022 academic year, 157 Fitchburg State University undergraduate day students failed to continue from their first year to second year (FSU Factbook 2022). Using the conservative price point of in-state, off-campus tuition and fees of $11,046, the attrition of these students reduced university revenue by $1.7 million dollars (FSU Website COA). In addition, the size of the university's first-year class fell 30% between 2018 and 2022, from 1108 to 775 (FSU Factbook 2022). It is imperative that retaining students be a key efficiency focus of our community.

Data/ Information:

We anticipate increased access to retention and student success data in the near future. Funded solely by an anonymous grant, Fitchburg State has hired Batista Consulting Services to perform a comprehensive review of FSU's student success and retention processes, policies, and initiatives. The scope of BCS's work includes:

- Performing policy audits related to student success and retention through an equity lens.
- Reviewing institutional data related to student success to identify gaps.
- Evaluating FSU's matriculation and onboarding protocols for specific populations including transfer, first-generation, and pre-major (undecided) students; this includes an assessment of our orientation programs and their modalities.
- Reviewing FSU's mixed advising structure, which combines professional and faculty advising.

---

[3] Gonzalez, Vanessa (2022). The cost of academic dismissal and attrition from students on academic probation. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 198, 75-85.

Is student retention an expense or investment?, Education Insights Blog, Ruffalo Noel Levitz, accessed 12/5/23 (https://www.ruffalonl.com/blog/student-success/is-college-student-retention-an-expense-or-an-investment/)

- Creating an inventory of current student success initiatives and retention strategies to identify gaps and duplication of effort.
- Reviewing FSU's inventory of student success data management platforms to identify gaps in our processes for leveraging the data we have regarding student success and persistence.
- Partnering with Institutional Research and Planning and Student Success to develop an evaluation plan for the First Year Experience program; this is in anticipation of program expansion to include co-curricular components.
- Developing a report of the findings and recommendations.
- Partnering with campus constituents to develop an implementation plan.

As noted in recommendations from the NECHE report, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning "has significantly advanced the value of evidenced-based practice on this campus." Consistent with this approach, the Associate Director of Institutional Research, and the new role's focus on student success, will be instrumental in supporting the assessment of key questions that emerged while our academic efficiencies group was conducting its work. These include:

- What is the role of Enrollment Management in retention?
- How can the ROI on programs and services promoting retention and student success be meaningfully calculated?

Specific Recommendations/Implementation Plan:

- We recommend creating a comprehensive map of all our existing retention efforts (including staffing, advising models, curricular efforts, student services, enrollment management, externally funded efforts, and more). This map will integrate the outcomes of the Batista Consulting Services' review.
- We recommend using the comprehensive map of Fitchburg State retention efforts to:
    - Identify where our retention efforts are successful, where there are gaps in our services related to student success, and where there are duplicative efforts.
    - Examine expenditures in relation to these successes, gaps, and duplications
    - Gather data across undergraduate day student constituencies to determine. factors that influence retention (including and exceeding direct retention efforts).
    - Identify key areas of intervention (curricular, financial, institutional, etc.) as well as potential efficiencies, including the coordination of services.
- From the above map and analyses, we recommend creating a coordinated and targeted retention plan, through collaboration between Academic Affairs, Enrollment Management, Student Affairs, and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, that is specific to the needs of Fitchburg State University.

Future Considerations:

While our group chose to focus on the aforementioned recommendations, there are additional areas for evaluation and future consideration with respect to academic efficiencies.

The first is to assess the university's relationship with Academic Partnerships (AP). After much discussion and consideration, the group decided not to put forth the recommendation to reevaluate our contract with AP at this time. The primary conclusion was that eliminating the partnership would not be the source of significant-enough savings in the immediate future, as our contract runs through 9/30/26. That said, AP charges ½ of the tuition and fees generated by the university for programs run in conjunction with AP. This calculation does not include the significant cost of FSU staff time in managing our programs with AP. Therefore, the group recommends re-evaluating the AP contract when it is up on 9/30/26. (The contract will be automatically renewed for 5 years unless we give notice 270 days prior to the end date, or by 2/1/26.)

A second area for future consideration is related to marketing and enrollment management. We recommend investigating how marketing strategies may impact program enrollments and exploring additional opportunities for academic-specific/mission-specific marketing campaigns. The group met with the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management. He relayed that it was his belief that targeted marketing efforts for specific academic programs are not feasible at this time. Reasons provided included a more pressing need to market the brand of Fitchburg State University as a whole and limited resources. Our group suggests further discussion about this approach and whether or not it has yielded the outcome desired.

The AVP also provided a strategic enrollment plan brochure to the group. He indicated that it is not available online as he did not want our competitors to know our plans. The plan included reference to an Enrollment Advisory Group that reports directly to the President. However, it is our understanding that while members of Academic Affairs attended the initial meeting of the Enrollment Advisory Group, they have not been included in any subsequent meetings of this group, if any occurred. The Provost has not been a member of this Advisory Group. Looking forward, it is critical that the Provost and Academic Affairs be involved in all aspects of enrollment management. Going forward, we recommend including the Provost and Academic Affairs in the Enrollment Advisory Group and further exploring the benefits of marketing our unique and distinctive academic programs.

Other Accomplishments:

It is important to reiterate that this report is the product of a collaborative effort between representatives from frequently siloed units across campus. We believe that bringing together voices from across the campus - administrators, staff, faculty and librarians - is incredibly important and productive and should not be limited only to emergency situations. We have all appreciated this opportunity.