

**College of Arts and Sciences**  
**Budget Discussion Meeting**  
**21 January 2009**

1. Dean Ford discussed the potential budget situation for the College for the next academic year:
  - The College is currently planning an 8% cut, although we do not know what the actual cut will be for AY 2009-2010.
  - There are a number of core principles for any cuts that the College will make; Dean Ford and the Department Heads Council (DHC) established these in fall semester 2008. They include:
    - Protect core faculty and staff
    - Protect core programs
    - Preserve academic quality
    - Maximize use of resources
    - Ensure transparency in decision processes (all DH's involved in December reports – ideally, anyone in the college should be able to explain the cuts)
    - Represent real consequences of any proposed reductions
    - Recognize proportion of budget tied to personnel (human factor)
    - Allow flexibility in application of reductions within set parameters (allow departments in A&S flexibility to choose where to cut within departments)
    - Maintain teaching capacity for a freshman class of 1400
  - The total budget for the College is roughly \$12.9 million.
    - A 3% cut in the budget would be roughly \$386,000, 5% \$644,000, 7% \$902,000; preliminary plans for potential cuts at each of these levels were prepared and submitted in December
    - An 8% cut would be about \$1.03 million, which is what we may be looking at.
  - The College budget breaks down roughly as follows:
    - Personnel: \$12.2 million (roughly 95%)
    - Operating: \$0.7 million (about 5%)
    - tenure line faculty: \$9.845 million
    - fixed term: \$1.495 million (45 in A&S)
    - Part time: \$330,000
    - Staff: \$490,000
  - Both fixed term and part time faculty appointments tend to be considered temporary for the purposes of the University. The DHC was uncomfortable decreasing any faculty lines unless we have also eliminated the need for those lines.
  - There are various different possible areas in which the College's budget might be cut; some of these have been mandated by the Provost (as noted below). The general priorities from the Provost's office (all mandates) toward increasing the student-faculty ratio include the following:

- Reduce instructional FTE (full time equivalency positions) by 30 positions by July 1
- Implement better scheduling strategies in fall 2009
- Initiate curriculum changes (long-term)
- General comment: it appears that we have more faculty than we need, but also more lower-paid faculty than we need. The number of one-year fixed term appointments (with lower salaries) depresses the overall actual faculty salary, which affects the overall funding model for the University from General Administration (GA).
- In the last month, Dean Ford and the DHC began to take steps towards a temporary, tentative plan. Dean Ford has aligned the possibilities the DHC discussed into 5 key groups by “theme,” with various options for budget cuts within each theme as follows:
  - Create Instructional Efficiencies – options here would include:
    - increase class size where pedagogically sound and facilities available (this has since become a university-level mandate)
    - increase instructional roles of graduate assistants
    - increase individual teaching load of some non-tenure track faculty with commensurate increases in salaries (e.g., possibly 4/5 or 5/5 with a bump to salaries)
  - Modify Liberal Studies Offerings – options include:
    - spread first year seminar (FYS) offerings over entire year
    - increase FYS class size to 25 (A&S teaches 70% of these)
    - foster more equitable participation across departments in college
    - allow introductory courses in disciplines to substitute if they meet approved standards set by Liberal Studies Oversight Committee (LSOC)
    - allow students to take ENGL 101 first or second semester
    - allow students to take ENGL 102 second semester or later
    - allow advanced writing courses to substitute for ENGL 102 if they meet approved standards (currently 65-90 sections of ENGL 101-102 each year)
  - Streamline Curriculum
    - eliminate or consolidate majors or concentrations
    - reduce requirements in degree programs
    - reduce total length of degree programs relative to disciplinary peers
    - reduce prerequisite courses
  - Reduce Other Expenses
    - delay hiring replacement staff (mandate for this year: 60 day wait)
    - eliminate summer ventures (mandate for this year)
    - reduce operating expenses
  - Additional AA Initiatives (all mandates at this point)
    - schedule classes throughout the day and evening
    - increase tenure/tenure track faculty teaching at 100-200 level to 80%

- review and adjust faculty course release time
- cancel low-enrolled courses (and adjust schedules appropriately when offering consistently low-enrolled courses)
- implement differential staffing (e.g. a 4/2 load for some faculty rather than a 3/3)
- reduce size and complexity of degree programs
- eliminate courses not recently taught (in past 6 semesters)
- review all master's programs
- prepare to cancel low-priority searches, eliminate positions (currently 24 faculty searches in A&S = \$1.5 million, although 22 of these searches are replacement lines)

2. After this summary, Dean Ford took questions from the faculty.

- Does canceling concentrations or courses not taught in 6 semesters actually save money?
  - [Ford] This is an AA initiative. DH's saw this more as clean-up than cost-saving.
  - Where it could make a difference is in frequency of offerings, particularly where it affects the frequency of teaching certain (possibly under-enrolled) courses.
  
- The Provost seemed to indicate that a free pass was being given to professional programs or anyone else with an accrediting agency, as there is only really one discipline that has a mandated series of courses. Many departments in the College of A&S actually reduced hours in their curricula during the last major revisiting of curriculum in 2000, rather than some of these other programs.
  - If the Provost's language suggested a free pass for some, there has been different language used in the Council of Deans. Accreditation standards are often competency-based rather than course-based, with the onus being on the department to specify which competencies are developed in which courses. All departments (not just A&S) will have to justify their number of courses at this point: no free pass is being given.
  
- But many programs from other colleges are using accreditation as a trump card in refusing to reduce their curricular hours, and nobody seems to be calling them on this. At what point do we stand up for the sovereignty of our own college curricula, as well as liberal studies?
  - Other colleges are being held to the same standard we are in the Council of Deans. But we all need to be vigilant in demanding that when programs use accrediting bodies in this way, they are transparent in producing the standards of the accrediting bodies, e.g. to the LSOC, such that it is clear whether actual courses or competencies are the standard.
  
- Although it's not accreditation per se, the American Chemical Society does mandate a specific series of courses.
  - Public affairs, the (revised) journalism program, and public relations are trying to move in this direction, but those are almost all the programs in A&S that would have accrediting bodies for specific programs.

- Are the 30 full time positions actually part of the 8% cut, or in addition to it?
  - We don't yet know for sure what the cut will actually be. We are currently being told that it looks like a 6% cut.
  - We look like we have more faculty than we need, because we have been funded for admissions numbers that we did not make over the last couple of years.
  - One way of remedying that would be cutting 30 FTE faculty lines immediately.
  - When the Provost was awarded another 20 positions based on overestimated enrollment this year, he held them. So he has them available for a one-time cut, as well as to put toward the possible 30 positions. So we might be looking at a cut of 10 FTE.
  
- What do admissions numbers actually look like? Because one way to remedy things would be to increase students rather than lower the number of faculty.
  - The current numbers are more than double last year's interest (applications, completed applications, etc.)
  - But we should also note that reducing the overall number of positions actually increases the average faculty salary. And since our overall funding is tied to average faculty salary, we would actually be funded at a higher level by the state.
  
- Has there been discussion of differential cuts? Would the 8% cuts be across the board, or, since A&S teaches the majority of liberal studies courses, would there be a possibility of, say, a 6% for us and more for others? And what about non-academic departments such as the IEF?
  - All units, both instruction-giving and other, are being looked at here.
  - The Provost has said he doesn't believe in across-the-board cuts, but he did assign the 8% scenario across the colleges.
  - The DHC has been steering away from "eliminate this department" type models to other ways to cut the budget.
  - A&S, however, is by far the largest college, with by far the largest budget, so we will be hit significantly here.
  
- Has there been any consideration of cuts by attrition? (retirements, etc.)
  - It is often politically attractive for universities to do, but the problem is that the need for those positions may remain.
  - The needs in certain departments relative to their number of faculty can become very unbalanced if we allow attrition to occur in this way. Of the 24 searches we are conducting right now, 22 are actually replacement searches for faculty who are retiring or leaving for other reasons.
  - We have to be able to service a freshman class of 1400 next year, which means all the necessary service courses as well as upper-level courses.
  
- Is there any discussion of impact on budget due to individual accountability issues, e.g. greening, computer use, etc.?
  - Right now, instructional and program efficiencies at the departmental level are most important for us. But suggestions as to these other issues are certainly welcome.

- What about fixed-term appointments vs. tenure-line in terms of budget cuts?
  - The number of fixed-term appointments we have does make things a bit easier for us, because we can make some reductions by not renewing contracts rather than breaking contracts.
  
- Would other methods of instruction be cheaper (e.g. distance ed.)?
  - It depends on how they are counted. If funded as part of load, no. If funded on overload or part-time, yes. There are also issues of quality control to factor in to those discussions, however.
  
- What about moving to a 4 day week, with Monday-Wednesday and Tuesday-Thursday courses only? This would potentially at least save on utilities.
  - It may be that the GA determines this as something we have to do. But we in A&S currently use our 30- and 35-student classrooms virtually all the time, so it's not clear that that would even be possible.
  
- What happens if an under-enrolled class of say, 7-10 is actually canceled?
  - Ideally, the proactive thing to do would be to work on modifying course rotations such that we are not offering courses that are consistently under-enrolled that often.
  
- Some of our courses have been under-enrolled this year that have consistently filled in the last couple years? What's happening?
  - If these are primarily 100-200 level, the explanation is most likely that over the last couple years, we've moved from enrolling 1600 freshmen to 1300.
  - We are going to have to adjust the number of tenure-line faculty to the number of students.
  - Part-time lines will have to be adjusted as well.
  
- Has there been an analysis in costs of administration vs. faculty costs?
  - There is actually a formula that ties overall institutional funding support to a factor of the overall average faculty salary. So everything is based on that number.
  - For reference, the average faculty salary in A&S is just under \$59,000. For another college, however, it is roughly \$93,000. For the university as a whole, it is about \$73,000. So this last number is the factor that determines all our funding.
  - But every division in the University will have to cut positions this year, not just academic units.
  
- What about cutting costs at the administrative level? Is there any possibility of administrators picking up, say, one class themselves?
  - That is a possibility, but that would not reduce the amount of administrative work, and the number of courses this would create is negligible. But we have to remember that everything is tied to that faculty number – if we have too many faculty relative to our students, then everything else is currently overfunded

according to state budget models, as well. There are, however, some studies going on comparing the administrative units to others nationally.

- What kind of timeline do we have for a reevaluation of program curricula?
  - This is a longer-term issue, but Dean Ford has to have one report in to the Provost by February 9.
- Do we have problems in Admissions that need to be resolved? Aren't the Director and Assistant Director positions both empty?
  - Increasingly, the office is relying on outsourcing. We have been told to plan for an incoming class of 1400.
- What about fundraising and annual giving? Would that help some?
  - Yes. Development is currently planning to be more decentralized such that more can take place at the college (and department) level, but this will take some time. There is a major phone-a-thon for A&S that will be happening shortly. Departments are encouraged to help let the Dean's office know of any faculty awards received, etc., to include in talking points; anything that might help sell A&S fundraising.
- Isn't the source of the problem here that we are being held by the state to administrative projections in our enrollment numbers that we have just missed?
  - To a large degree, yes. We have to find a way to have some voice in enrollment projection possibilities (targets and guidance). We have both over-projected resident credits and under-projected distance education credits. But over 90% of our hours are resident credits.
  - One alternative currently being considered is moving the mini-mester from May to January. Currently, student credit hours produced in May are not counted for funding; however, if they were produced in January, they would be funded. Dean Ford gave some positive feedback on this to the Council of Deans. Models here for differential staffing might include 3-1-2, 2-1-3, or 3-0-3 teaching loads.
- It seems that the problem is not just the enrollment target, but what the actual number of enrolled students is going to be. What are we doing to predict what the numbers will actually be, not just what we're aiming at? And who makes the projection/prediction?
  - We are currently projecting neutral growth, so we can readjust in terms of faculty lines.

3. Dean Ford concluded the meeting by noting that she intends to call a College of A&S business meeting later in the semester to discuss and act on three issues:

- How to fit interdisciplinary programs into the college governance structure, by-laws, etc.
- The TPR process: possibility of a 3<sup>rd</sup> year college-level review, and tying the AFE and TPR processes together, as the system is just too inefficient right now (too many evaluations of faculty)
- Proactive planning: presentation and feedback of four unifying themes for A&S

Respectfully submitted,  
John F. Whitmire, Jr.  
Secretary of the Faculty  
College of Arts and Sciences