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Introduction

The Ad-Hoc Committee received its charge on August 19, 2009 to examine and report on proposed Academic Affairs budget reductions totaling about $1,527,747 for the 2009-10 academic year. The committee was directed to deliver the report by October 1, 2009 as well as to present it to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and Academic Leadership Council at their joint meeting on October 6. The Committee was guided by principles provided by the Provost and Chair of the Academic Senate (see Appendix A).

The Committee used numerous documents provided by the Provost’s Office as primary sources for their inquiry. These documents included: 1) the 7/20/2009 Report to the Provost, “Possible Areas to Realize Saving”, prepared by heads of all units in Academic Affairs; 2) Multi-Year Budget Projections; 3) Base Budget Reviews FY 10, for Academic Affairs and those of each individual unit; 4) FY 2009-10 Non-General Fund Sources (trust funds and foundation accounts); 5) Lottery Funds; and, 6) the FY 2008-09 Year End Review. In addition, the Committee met with ‘expert’ witnesses from Academic Affairs to both expand on individual unit budgets and to seek clarification on possible impact if reductions were taken from specific areas.

It is important to note while the Committee was charged with focusing the report on the 2009-10 budget, it was not possible to complete this effort without projecting forward into the 2010-11 budget and beyond. While the impact of some of the identified budget reductions will be limited to 2009-10, there are many possible reductions that will have a long-term impact on Academic Affairs well into the future. In other words, there are reductions that can be taken with limited impact beyond 2009-10 but other reductions, if taken, will potentially have long term impact.

The Committee came to consensus on several broad issues focused on 2009-10 as well as the longer term:

1. Instruction is the core function of the university and should be given the highest priority in the budget discussions.
2. Academic Affairs as a whole must reflect on and identify efficiencies that can lead to savings in both the short and long term.
3. Difficult decisions must be made on the allocation of resources and the viability of current levels of effort. Can Academic Affairs continue to fund all programs at their current levels of service or should some services be reduced to more sustainable levels? In addition, will we be able to maintain the high level of shared governance that is important for the functioning of CSUSM?
4. An examination of the mix of first-time freshman and transfer students, as well as the mix of graduate and undergraduate students, needs to be considered as it has significant resource and strategic planning considerations.
5. The impact of reductions to FTES cannot be limited to cutting dollars from existing units. There must be a full examination of the current structure of Academic Affairs. Academic Affairs must immediately engage in conversations about restructuring the division, including the possibility of the reduction of programs and majors, in order to strengthen the sustainability of the University.
6. We anticipate the University Budget Committee will address questions of parity of resource allocations across the University in a timely manner. Whatever the disposition of the issue by UBC, there is no doubt that Academic Affairs will enter the 2010-11 academic year faced with an enormous deficit and this must be resolved through a shared process of making difficult decisions.

The report that follows specifically addresses the need to close the deficit in the 2009-10 academic year. It also identifies numerous issues that must be resolved if CSUSM is to remain a strong regional campus. The Committee believes the campus has no choice but to immediately begin a strategic conversation about necessary changes and halt the practice of making decisions only when in crisis.

This submission is organized by each of the units in Academic Affairs, followed by commentaries on the research enterprise, the effects of increasing faculty direct teaching loads and issues about reorganization.

I. Units in Academic Affairs

College of Arts and Sciences

The proposed reductions would entail:

1. Pride Adviser ($10,653)
2. Payment to athletics ($15,690)
3. Transfer of First Year Program Director costs for AP ($6,553)
4. Transfer to Library for GEL 200 ($2,885)
5. Environmental Studies NCSE Special Center ($3,900)
6. Supplies for “public” computers ($7,000)
7. Reduction in internal moves ($2,500)
8. Summer Arts Scholarship ($1,500)
9. Lab student assistants ($44,130)
10. Supplemental Instruction (SI) Student Assistants ($15,000)
11. Course schedule adjustments ($30,000)
12. Rollover funds ($15,000)
13. Faculty travel ($61,000)
14. Department O and E ($50,000)

Total savings: $265,811

Impact:

1. The first four items reflect current cost sharing with other units. The funding of the Pride Advisor is under discussion by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. It is expected that the CoAS
expenditure will be funded in another manner. The reduction in support for athletics centers on 1-credit activity courses taught by coaches and reflects a 24 FTES reduction for CoAS. The partial funding for the First Year Program Director is no longer needed as the pre-nursing advising is now done outside CoAS. GEL 200, taught by a librarian, has not been offered in several semesters.

2. Environmental Studies NCSE Special Center reduction in funding eliminates benefits related to the proposed environmental Studies curriculum.

3. Supplies for “public” printers (toners, paper, etc.) would be reduced and printer use would be significantly curtailed. Faculty would be encouraged to use the “scan and send” feature on copiers.

4. Internal moves reduced due to no new faculty hires.

5. Three Summer Arts Scholarships would be eliminated.

6. Lab assistants would be reduced for lab instruction and some support for ISTs would be reduced.

7. SI support would be reduced by half. OBRT grant funds would be allocated to cover the reduction.

8. Course schedule adjustments based on stringent cancellation of low-enrollment course sections would realize savings. The impact could be students not being able to get classes required for timely graduation.

9. Roll over from prior years will be allocated to 2009-10 expenses.

10. Faculty travel would be eliminated, except for probationary faculty.

11. OE and E reduction in supplies, printing, and other OE and E budgets impacted by a further 20%.

**Thoughts for the future:**

Supplemental Instruction, initially institutionalized through strategic initiative funds, has seen significant results in student retention. Eroding of institutional support could endanger the program and result in losing the momentum we have gained in student performance in the sciences.

Student assistants help support instructional activities such as assistants in labs and graders. This has a direct impact on faculty workload. Continued reductions in this area would reduce this type of instructional support to faculty.

An elimination of travel for tenured faculty significantly impacts their ability to participate in their professional organizations and hinders their ability to present their scholarly/creative activity research. Continued erosion of this resource, especially for associate professors, would impede their professional development and impact their promotion and retention processes.
College of Business Administration

The proposed reductions would entail:

1. MBA unit fee ($106,680)
2. MBA unit fee (Provost portion) ($32,004)
3. Salary Savings ($756)
Total savings: $139,440

Impact:
1. CoBA will receive no financial gain from conversion. Immediate Impact of Reductions: None. Given the MBA Professional Fee is a new fee beginning in Fall 2009 the funds have not been budgeted for or allocated.
2. Provost will receive no financial gain from conversion.

Thoughts for the future:

The Professional Fee was approved by the Chancellor’s Office for the purpose of obtaining or maintaining AACSB accreditation and will hold the campus accountable for demonstrating this. Therefore, these funds cannot continuously be used as a source for budget reductions but must be used for helping CoBA obtain AACSB accreditation.

College of Education

The year-end review did not include $281,000 of carry-forward, which reduces the original charge of identifying the fiscal savings for Academic Affairs.

The reductions/savings would entail:

1. Decrease to supplies and services spent in the College ($12,500)
2. Hospitality and Parking ($1950)
3. Printing ($70)
4. Info Tech hardware and Equipment ($5800)
5. Reduction to the trust account reserve in Student Services Center ($25,000)
6. Limited Spring Enrollment ($50,800)
7. Unfilled Position in the Student Services Center ($40,000)
8. Travel ($25,500)
Total Savings: $161,620
Impact:

1. Decreasing the supplies and services allocation will impact supplies for those in the College and the reduction of services (independent contractors) will eliminate ‘outsourcing’ of specialty needs (primarily data input to the credentialing system).
2. Fewer opportunities to invite community partners to campus to work on the Distinguished Teacher in Residence Program (selection, grant determination).
3. Efficiencies in printing of documents by moving on reliance of printers in the College to the new copiers.
4. Reductions to Info Tech Hardware and Equipment will primarily impact the Special Education ‘refresh’ of instructional materials that include protocols and programs most frequently used in public schools.
5. Reductions to the trust account will reduce the reserve that has been built up to cover semesters when enrollment has fallen. Since there will be no new students in spring 2010 and the trust has been used to cover expenses in the Student Services Center, operational costs will have to be reduced impacting the ability to serve current students.
6. No new credential or master students entering the College in spring 2010. There will still be spring costs for Integrated Curriculum Program students who will be finishing their program in spring 2010.
7. One-time savings created by not filling a position in the Student Services Center. This will reduce the ability of SSC to serve students.
8. Travel reductions were taken from Student Services, Administration and Faculty accounts. In Students Services and Administration areas travel will be limited to that which is essential. Only faculty who have not yet been tenured will receive a limited amount of travel funds, all others will receive no travel allocations.

Thoughts for the future:

Many of the proposed reductions, if taken for one year, will not significantly impact the College of Education in years to come. However, if reductions to the trust account, staff line, limited enrollment, and travel were to continue there will be significant implications. The Student Services Center is down three positions in two years and without adding back at least one more advisor, the impact to teacher candidates receiving their credential certification could be major, including delays in processing the submission of their completion to the state and impeding their opportunity for immediate employment in school districts. Limitations to enrollment will also have a lasting impact. While the demand for teachers is rather limited at the moment, research is clear there looms a major gap in the teacher workforce in the State of California; a shortage of almost 100,000 qualified teachers is expected within five years. Finally, limiting travel, particularly for faculty, will disrupt the opportunity for dissemination of work to our professional communities and importantly impede a normal progression in the tenure and promotion process.

Graduate Studies and Research

Proposed reductions:

1. GSR personnel costs funded from URASC indirect accounts ($60,000)
2. Memberships ($3,900)
3. Travel ($2,000)
4. Eliminate Fall 2009 call for UPD grants ($35,000)
5. Eliminate 2009-10 call for Lottery grant proposals ($92,000)

Total savings: $192,900

Impact:

1. Funding personnel costs out of URASC indirect funds means that those funds are not available for direct support of research.
2. Membership in the Council of Graduate Schools would be canceled.
3. Travel would be reduced by 50%.
4. Eliminating Fall 2009 call for UPD has a direct impact on faculty as these funds are awarded on an annual basis for research activities.
5. Eliminating 2009-10 Lottery grants will affect the quality and quantity of proposals for innovative instructional programming.

Thoughts for the future:

Continued reduction in sources for campus funding for research and innovative programs would have an accumulated impact on research, faculty development, forward movement on innovation and a chilling effect on the RTP process. While a one-year elimination can be absorbed, caution should be taken in reducing these funds on a multi-year basis.

Instructional & Information Technology Services

IITS has provided to the University community a high standard of service and access to equipment. In times of decreasing resources, we must ask ourselves if we can continue to afford this model of service. In this scenario, six areas of reduction within IITS are presented. Those areas are: Help Desk services, refresh program, software budget, TULIP, travel, and cell phones/PDAs and computer labs.

The reductions would entail:

1. Converting to a 4 year refresh cycle ($180,000)
2. Decrease software acquisitions ($38,000)
3. Reduce student assistants and Help Desk hours ($40,000)
4. Eliminate TULIP program for Summer 2010 ($12,000)
5. Reduce travel ($25,000)
6. Eliminate PDA/cell phones except for emergency personnel and charge backs for service of cell phones ($24,000)

Total savings: $319,000
Impact:

1. Converting to a four year refresh cycle would not have a significant impact on the use of technology throughout the university (administrative as well as instructional settings). In the relatively few cases where a user requires more than the normal “fire power” due to the type of programs needed in a given discipline or area of research, IITS would review the needs and accommodate to the degree possible.

2. Decrease in software acquisitions will not significantly impact the use of technology on a one year basis. However, over time, eroding the acquisition of software would reduce our institutional ability to respond to new software developments. Identifying and making available appropriate open source software should be a priority.

3. Reduction in student assistants and Help Desk hours would require all users to adjust expectations about assistance. We would experience a change in response time. Strategic decisions based on usage level would need to be made as whether Help Desk services would be available 7 days a week or M-F.

4. Eliminating TULIP for summer 2010 would eliminate a resource for faculty who want to expand the use of instructional technology.

5. Travel budget reduction of $25,000 for one year would not significantly impact the knowledge and skill base of IITS personnel. However, such a reduction over time would have a detrimental effect on service and delay expansion of our technology capabilities.

6. Eliminating PDA/cell phones except for emergency personnel would require MPPs to pay for their own cell phones.

Thoughts for the future:

There are 19 computer labs on campus. IITS is conferring with the appropriate parties to determine how many labs are essential to instruction, with an eye to reducing labs on campus. The equipment in the labs could become available for refresh purposes, for example, for SoN and Temecula.

Careful consideration should be given to the proportionality of budget allocation between direct service and administrative services.

We should be cautious in the frequency, degree and manner in which technology resources are reduced. CSUSM must remain strategically responsive to market factors which include a growing demand for online courses. The accumulated effects of technology reductions could damage our ability to stay competitive.

Library

The Library is a key resource for the campus which admirably serves both students and departments in delivering academic programs and accessing both hardcopy and electronic materials. In assessing the Library potential reductions for 2009-10 and beyond, the committee considered the need to continue to
transition of the Library to one with a greater emphasis on ease of access to electronic materials while maintaining a in-house core collection. In this regard, we are concerned with the further erosion of acquisitions, since they are already at a very low level. For this reason, the proposed reduction in book and media expenditures was removed from the original proposal. In addition, the committee made a concerted effort to maintain a minimal level of travel in all units, including the Library.

Reductions would entail:

1. Partial payment on the 2009-10 OCLC costs from deposit balances – cannot catalog Barahona items for curriculum collection ($17,000)
2. Reduced travel ($29,000)
3. Reduce IT hardware expenditures by half ($10,000)
4. No purchase of electronic journal backfiles ($50,000)

Total savings: $106,000

Impact:

1. Certain items (children’s books in Spanish) will not be cataloged, which reduces their accessibility.
2. Limited travel but keep for untenured librarians and the new Dean.
3. May be some unfixed broken hardware, which could reduce student access to some materials.
4. Some older journals will not be available on site and will need to be obtained through interlibrary loan.

Thoughts for the future:

In moving forward, the committee recommends that careful consideration be given to the financial model of the Library in terms of the delivery of the core components of its mission during the shift to a more virtual operation. This consideration should include how to maximize acquisitions and access to electronic materials while minimizing operational costs.

School of Nursing

Reductions would entail:

1. Faculty and MPP travel funds ($2,000)
2. Info Tech Hardware funds to support faculty computer refreshment ($5,000)
3. Printing of SON annual report ($2,000)
4. Employee Recruitment ($2,500)
5. Unallocated ($5,676)

Total savings: $17,176
Impact:

1. Decreases the ability of faculty to attend important conferences, present papers and promote required scholarship.
2. Reduction in refresh funds needed for staff and faculty computers. This would reduce our computer refresh budget by about 40%.
3. Delay the production of the SON annual report to the community.
4. Delay the recruitment of an additional tenure track faculty in Nursing. This reduction in permanent funds would be temporary.
5. Funds set aside for staff salary increase and reclassifications. Funds from Extended Learning allocated for additional staff support will be used instead.

Thoughts for the future:

Through external grants and a collaborative arrangement with External Learning the SON has been able to replace faculty travel funds and meet the increased staff salaries due to recent reclassifications. The ongoing partnership with Palomar Pomerado Health broadens the ability of SON faculty to participate in joint clinical research projects. The faculty of the SON is actively pursuing additional grants for help support clinical laboratory simulation efforts and joint capacity building grants with community colleges and health care services agencies. Looking toward the future, the SON should pursue grants and projects that provide additional opportunities for faculty research and scholarship.

Other Units in Academic Affairs

The budget reduction proposals from each of these units was considered and accepted as presented.

The reduction amounts:

1. Academic Programs ($26,702)
2. Academic Resources ($14,429)
3. Global education ($5,500)
Total savings: $46,631

II. The research enterprise at CSUSM: the effects of changing faculty workloads

The research enterprise under the current faculty workload is a major contributor to the university’s strategic priorities of educational excellence (e.g., committed to the success of students by encouraging their intellectual engagement and by supporting the teaching, research, and creative activities of a stellar faculty), student life (e.g., active engagement of all students in the life of the university), campus climate (e.g., sustained professional development), community partnerships (e.g., strengthen and
further expand our local, national, and international partnerships, and educational equity (e.g., committed to respecting and modeling the diversity of our region within a context of social justice). However, these contributions are in serious jeopardy if the assigned time necessary to fully engage in all aspects of research is eroded or even removed. For example, external funding of research is strong as seen in the following graphs with over 45 to 57 awards totaling $5.5 to $8.9 million per year for the last three years with the great majority of grants having faculty PIs or faculty sponsors (UARSC Sponsored Projects).

The removal of assigned time to conduct externally funded research will have negative consequences for the current and future of sponsored projects at the university:

1. In terms of current grants, each one carries a written commitment of time and effort. Not all of this time and effort is covered by the grant funds but has been proposed on the basis of research time being available during normal working hours to the PI(s) or as a cost share (i.e., assigned time). If the time commitment is not honored, the grants will be in violation of the basic agreement with the agency and time and effort will need to be renegotiated with each award agency. If the decrease in time and effort is viewed by the agency as decreasing the ability of the PI to accomplish the specific aims of the project, this process could entail lowering or eliminating an existing award. To approach granting agencies with such a change would put future grant proposals in jeopardy based on failure to fully deliver the outcomes in the timeframe outlined.
2. Faculty will have considerably less time to submit new grants. Since some agencies have very stiff competitions, such as NIH and NSF, it is important that faculty not only have the time to submit a proposal but also have time to send it out for peer review and to edit prior to submission. It is also very common for a proposal to be submitted up to three times before funding is obtained so the time commitment is multiplied through this process.

3. Successful PI's are potentially mobile and could move to other institutions under these circumstances, taking their grants with them in many cases, such as those from NSF and NIH.

4. The ability to attract new faculty who will be research active and contribute to a growing pool of external funding is likely to be severely curtailed. This is particularly problematic in light of research active faculty workloads in comparable institutions outside of California where the course loads are already lower than 3:3.

5. Successful grantsmanship also entails peer review of proposals, an activity that is considered highly during the tenure and promotion process. This activity gives faculty members a better sense of what is a successful proposal, which enhances their ability to attract future funds.

6. The university has developed a viable infrastructure in UARSC and the Office of Research and Graduate Studies to support grant activities because there has been a consistent message that externally supported research and the active participation of our students greatly enhances the reputation of CSUSM and educational experience of our students. If faculty are restructuring existing grants and reducing their requests for new support this momentum will suffer.

7. The indirect monies generated by external grants and contracts are currently used to fund many operations across campus, including successful seed grant proposals, start-up for new faculty, allowing PIs to explore new research directions, funding part of the UARSC operation among others. Loss of these funds would further erode our ability to attract new funds.

In addition to externally funded activities, many faculty are engaged in research and creative activities that require little or no grant/contract funding but contribute to the advancement of their field, give students direct access to the generation of new ideas, engage the external community and/or the academic field in partnerships, and bring notoriety to the university. The various kinds of scholarship contribute to keeping the faculty current in their fields and the pursuit of academic excellence as a key priority. Without the ability to perform these responsibilities, the university and its students will ultimately suffer, the current requirements for tenure and promotion will need to be significantly changed, and the strategic priorities will not be met. The next section specifically addresses these issues.

### III. Effects of increasing direct instruction and college projections of cost savings with a 21 WTU assignment in 2009-10

In looking for additional fiscal savings for 2009-10 in Academic Affairs, the issue has been raised about whether significant fiscal savings might be realized by scheduling TT faculty members to increase their direct instructional assignment from 18 to 21 WTUs for AY 09/10. For faculty in CoBA, CoAS and SoN this change would most likely mean teaching an additional 3 WTUs in spring 2010 (CoE is already at a 21 WTU load). The assumption is that TT faculty would teach courses currently being taught by part-time, lecturer and adjunct faculty. It should be noted that, although this report deals with AY 2009-10 and the necessity of making immediate fiscal reductions, there was acknowledgment among the committee
members that the implications of the analysis should be applied to any future adoption of a “universal” 24 WTU direct instructional assignment at CSUSM. This would include making assigned time a fully budgeted and transparent resource.

Projected Cost Savings

Each College projected its cost savings using a different methodology, but with the same underlying principles that accounted for external and internal grant buyout and internally funded service release time (department chair, Senate release, etc.). The projections assumed that most tenure-track faculty members would teach 21 WTUs in AY 2009-10 with no additional assigned time for research in Spring 2010 (see report on research implication for a more detailed analysis). The total projected savings for the 2009-10 AY, if every tenure-track faculty member increased their teaching load is projected to be $863,160. The estimates represent the maximum possible dollar savings; in reality, the actual savings could be much less. For example, the calculations do not account for an unknown number of currently unfunded teaching assignments (thesis supervision, independent studies, etc.) or service activities (e.g. graduate advisors, university service beyond the norm, unfunded department chair and program releases) that would necessarily continue in a 21 WTU scenario. Agreement must be reached about what these activities include, since any scenario that increases direct instruction would require that such activities be fully accounted for and funded.

The College of Arts and Sciences projected a net savings of $669,183 per semester. Included in this calculation was preserving most assigned time for department chairs and program director release, excess student support, and external and internal grant buy outs for course sections for the purpose of research activities. It should also be noted that approximately 15% of the CoAS faculty currently carry more than 9 WTU’s of teaching (10-12 units) and an increase to 12 WTU's in their case would not net a full savings of increasing teaching from 9 to 12 WTU's. When the CoAS workload report is prepared, first an analysis of the census enrollment summary is done to assure all teaching activities, including supervision courses, are accounted for on the report. After that, the information provided by the individual faculty member is used to complete the 15/30 WTU load. Teaching activities are fully accounted for in the report. However, if the faculty member reports more than 15/30 WTUs worth of activity, this process may result in an underreporting of research and/or service activities reflected in the assigned time report submitted by a faculty member. Under any change of direct instructional workload, these activities would either have to be budgeted for or they would simply cease. Increasing the teaching workload would remove a source of compensated time for faculty to pursue research that is not explicitly funded by internal or external grants but which is nevertheless mandatory under current tenure and promotion criteria.

The College of Business Administration projected a net savings of $172,797 on average per semester. In addition to the impacts generally stated below, those savings would most likely cut faculty research productivity to a level that would preclude any effort to meet AACSB accreditation standards. This is significant in that although other requirements for AACSB accreditation are not yet in place in COBA
(mainly a sufficient number of tenure track faculty), COBA faculty are currently doing the level of research that could meet these accreditation standards.

For the College of Education in future AYs, the projected savings of moving from 3:4 to 4:4 is $301,600. In addition to the impacts generally stated below, those savings would take faculty from the projects they presently conduct for the school districts and in the local school community as part of their Mission Action Plans. It was estimated that more than 50% of current school activities would cease (some portion of COE faculty work with local schools is funded through the DTIR program). Not only would the school districts lose important CSUSM faculty expertise as they address their own challenges, but CSUSM faculty would have less understanding of the local schools and therefore would have less hands-on knowledge to offer teacher credential candidates.

The School of Nursing projected a $21,180 net savings per semester. Currently, the faculty in the School have been quite successful in obtaining externally funded grants and already buy down their teaching loads. The possibility of losing assigned time for grant writing is partially offset by other sources of funds, such as a partnership with Palomar-Pomerado Health, but this model may not be sustainable in the long term.

Impact of tenure-track faculty teaching 12 instructional units per semester

Modification of the direct instructional load to 4:4 on a permanent basis represents a cultural shift at CSUSM that would have a profound impact on the university and its mission as explained in the following sections.

Teacher/Scholar Model

Divergence from the teacher/scholar model would create a significant movement away from our stated mission and vision. From the University Mission Statement: “students work closely with a faculty of active scholars and artists whose commitment to sustained excellence in teaching, research, and community partnership enhances student learning” and from the University Vision “a faculty of active scholars and artists will foster student learning through teaching that reflects ongoing discovery and experimentation.” It is also contrary to the Vision stated by Academic Affairs to “support faculty research and creative activity to create a community of scholars that collaborates with a community of learners.” Faculty activity as scholars enriches the students’ education both in the classroom itself and also via the opportunities for faculty and students to jointly engage in scholarly endeavors. See the research section for additional considerations.

CSUSM has built a reputation based on a teacher/scholar model that places discovery for both faculty and students, many of them from groups underrepresented in higher education nationally, at the center of the educational enterprise. The success of CSUSM graduates at CSU-sponsored research fairs and in gaining admission to highly regarded graduate and professional schools speak to the success of this
model. Faculty engage in a high level of scholarship themselves and sponsor student research and experientially-based projects. Much of the existing curriculum, as well as existing scheduling practices, have been organized to ensure that all students have access to these opportunities as part of their major. Going to a 12 unit instructional workload, a 33% increase in teaching, faculty would no longer be able to sustain this model. Not only would faculty scholarship decrease, so would many opportunities for research and professional experience now available to students.

Shared Governance

Any increase in direct instructional assignments would necessarily impact current models of shared governance at CSUSM. The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA, 2007 – see http://www.perb.ca.gov/laws/statutes.asp#ST3561) recognizes that “joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of these institutions”. Since its founding, the CSUSM faculty have maintained a high level of shared governance in departments, colleges and schools, and at the all-university level. Only a small proportion of this service is now budgeted for and funded and a good deal of current service activities lie outside the 6 WTU reported by all TT faculty for routine service. There are types of service activity that are central to the academic community that can only be done by tenure track faculty: curriculum development, program review, ongoing assessment and faculty peer review are some examples. It is likely that increases in the direct instructional load of faculty would greatly diminish the faculty’s responsibility for university leadership and would negatively impact consultation and shared governance that have developed at CSUSM.

RTP Policies

Any change in the direct instructional assignment of faculty would require modification of current Retention, Promotion and Tenure policies to reflect the changes in instructional workload relative to research and service. For faculty who are now on the path towards tenure and/or promotion this would negatively impact previously supported and agreed upon professional development and research agendas. Moreover, CSUSM has an obligation to support faculty in the development of career profiles that would allow them some degree of professional mobility both prior to and after the award of tenure.

Attract and Retain Quality Faculty

It should be anticipated that increasing the direct instructional assignment of faculty would negatively impact the institution’s ability to attract and hire faculty as it would place CSUSM at a competitive disadvantage with peer institutions outside the CSU. The long-term impact of this dynamic - the inability to attract or to retain high quality and productive faculty - would deny CSUSM students access to excellent faculty and would erode CSUSM’s overall reputation. Once lost, this reputation would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to regain.

Irreplaceable Expertise

The proposal to increase the direct instructional assignment of TT faculty assumes cost savings from simple replacement of current part-time, lecturer and adjunct faculty in the classroom. There will be
instances this is not possible as their expertise is essential to the academic program and does not exist among the TT faculty. In other cases, lecturer and adjunct faculty who provide quality instruction and who have developed deep, strong and in some instances exclusive ties to CSUSM and its students would essentially be “laid off”. This action is inconsistent with the university’s commitment to preserve as many jobs as possible during the current crisis and with CSUSM’s commitment to educational quality.

Student’s Educational Experience

The decrease in opportunities for faculty sponsored student research has been noted above. In addition, as faculty experience a 33% increase in the numbers of students that they teach and in the number of contact hours for which they must prepare (and in some departments/programs this will be manifested in four separate course preparations), it is likely that they will need to change their current pedagogical practice to cope with the workload increase. It is anticipated that faculty will be unable to provide the current degree of individual attention to students. Commitments to student research will diminish, as will many of the active pedagogical strategies which are now a hallmark of CSUSM. Faculty will be slower to return graded assignments to students, while those assignments are less likely to contain extensive, substantive comments, denying students either timely or useful feedback. Faculty commitment to the all-university writing requirement, another mark of excellence but already strained with rising class sizes and increased SFR over the past decade, will likely erode further or disappear.

Student Faculty Ratios (SFR)

At present there are no agreed upon ways of measuring either SFR or accurately describing the current faculty workload. The university is still grappling with how to report and evaluate workload at either the aggregate or individual levels in order to arrive at a shared understanding of faculty work. For many TT faculty who teach 9 WTUs/semester, their teaching has already undergone a workload increase as contact with upwards of 125 students per semester in classes that average around 40 students each. For these faculty, the prospect that an additional, similarly sized class might be added to their workload is incomprehensible, but this prospect would be a very real one whose implications for educational quality, learning outcomes and pedagogy must be considered. It is critical that CSUSM find a shared language around SFR and class size prior to making any change in the actual course load of TT faculty.

Conclusions

The question of workload, of how many direct instructional WTU TT faculty will be required to deliver, is about more than how many classes an individual faculty member teaches; rather, it is a question about the identity of CSUSM and about the educational experience of CSUSM students. For this reason, workload ought not to be considered solely in terms of potential salary savings but must include an intentional conversation regarding the other important issues raised above. In addition, consideration should be given to the faculty positions already lost and not regained from the past series of budget cuts.
IV. Potential reductions in administrative positions

The Committee considered the value of reducing the number of MPPs in Academic Affairs. This has the advantage of potentially generating significant savings, while impacting a relatively few number of people. There are currently 25 MPP positions in Academic Affairs. The annual salary cost for these positions is approximately $3 million, not including benefits.

MPPs serve “at will” and the process for releasing them is less complex than for bargaining unit members. While there is a financial advantage in reducing the number of MPPs, the savings realized in the short-run are limited. Some MPPs have retreat rights to the faculty. Eliminating an MPP with retreat rights will only save the difference between their current salary and their salary as a faculty member, usually around $20,000.

Eliminating MPPs does not necessarily eliminate the functions they perform. If an MPP position is eliminated, the functions performed by the person would have to borne by others. The additional responsibilities could cause these impacted individuals to be less effective in the performance of their responsibilities. Some of this might be mitigated by hiring lower level individuals at lower salaries to perform the functions previously performed by the MPP, but this would reduce the savings and still could result in lower levels of service being provided.

V. Considerations for restructuring within Academic Affairs

Given the serious budgetary situation facing the university in the next few years, attention must be given to levels of staffing and administration in all units. Current models of service must be questioned and adjusted to meet new realities and the university needs to find a better way to describe optimal efficiency in support and administrative operations. One possibility in finding these efficiencies is to consider restructuring within the division. Analyses of various scenarios should begin immediately in conjunction with the 2010-11 budget discussions and the potential for 10% permanent and 5% fiscal cuts. For example, there have been considerations of reducing the number of colleges and creating one focused on applied disciplines (e.g., business, education and health related fields). Academic programs that have experienced progressively declining enrollments and support units that are not operating at full capacity must also be considered in terms of combinations with other units. All aspects of such reorganizations must be considered in making these decisions (Academic Affairs Structure Task Force report).

Another avenue for potential restructuring is in the mix of students that the university should admit, as noted in the Introduction, and the kinds and size of operations that are needed to support this mix. The university has increased its percentage of first-time freshmen relative to transfer students in recent years without a full analysis of the impact on the students and the university. Likewise, does our current number of graduate programs best serve these postgraduate students and their career goals?
While a great deal of discussion has centered around the potential savings from changing the faculty teaching load, a parallel analysis should take place on the use of administrative resources for possible fiscal savings. These analyses should be put in the context of the core role of instruction in the functioning of the university. In addition, none of the restructuring in Academic Affairs should be done in isolation of the other divisions since our programs and support services are intertwined and it is likely that they could also find efficiencies in their operations. There is little doubt that the projected budgetary shortfall for 2010-11 and the possibility of ongoing deep cuts will have devastating effects on the university and all reductions should be carefully considered.

Appendix A: Principles and Guidance for the Ad Hoc Committee on AA Budget, Fall 2009

From AA Retreat 8/12/09 & ASEC Meeting 8/13/09

1. Students are the focus of our decision-making
2. Preserve to the greatest extent possible the vision of AA, mission and goals, to wit:
   a. Create and implement innovative approaches and programs that add value to our diverse communities.
   b. Expand learning opportunities bridging theory and practice.
   c. Develop relationships that connect CSUSM to external communities and organizations.
   d. Support faculty research and creative activity to create a community of scholars that collaborates with a community of learners.
3. Respect and support the varied roles of all faculty: teaching/professional performance, research/creative activity, and service.
4. Avoid an irreversible downward spiral in providing instruction and preserving programs (cut sections → lose FTES → cut more sections → lose more FTES → lose programs)
5. Meet enrollment targets (keeping in mind the 11-12% reduction in FTES anticipated for 10/11)
6. Consider the impact of cuts in support areas (e.g., IITS, Graduate Programs) on instruction
7. Maximize and redploy the available resources in AA
8. Minimize the impact of cuts on the permanent state of AA
9. Separate as much as possible the budget processes for 09/10 and 10/11
11. Consider the positive impact of revenue from sources other than state government
12. Call in "expert witnesses" for information about proposed cuts and their potential effect on all units

Make a report to AALC/EC that: contains pros/cons of various budget-cutting scenarios; is as transparent as possible; maintains the confidentiality of information as legally mandated (e.g., layoffs); and can be made public in AA.