

*(Presented at UBC Meeting 4-14-2004)*

**Future Planning and Budget Recommendations for Academic Affairs**

As has been noted on many occasions, reductions to the CSU budget are likely to continue into the next fiscal cycle (2005/06), unless the CSU receives substantial new revenue from fees or new revenues from the State of California. The State of California is projected to run an \$8 billion structural deficit this coming year (2004/05) and unless taxes are increased, the deficit will need to be addressed through further reductions to the budget. Therefore, we must continue to plan for fewer state resources.

We are a residential campus that provides exceptional opportunities to help students grow intellectually and morally. Our focus on students has distinguished the campus and has brought generations of the same family back to Chico. We must be mindful, when considering the future of the institution, of the need to continue to provide a range of educational experiences in and outside of the classroom to our students. Some short-term solutions will be needed to address our current budget crisis, but it is only long-term solutions that will allow us to maintain our distinctiveness. In short, we may need now to reduce the budget opportunistically but we must regrow the institution strategically.

**The following are offered as suggestions for:**

1. Thinking about how the institution should be organized to maintain its primary focus on students;
2. Shifting our focus to an assessment of student learning, as opposed to focusing on time in the classroom;
3. Managing to assure that increased numbers do not translate automatically into increased costs; and,
4. Assuring that our Strategic Plan continues to drive our decision-making process.

SUGGESTIONS

**Potential organizational changes:**

1. Consider moving some or all graduate programs to self-support.
2. Consider suspending and teaching out all graduate programs that do not fully meet the Graduate Program Performance goals.
3. Consider suspending all graduate programs with fewer than 10 students in a cohort.
4. Suspend and teach out all undergraduate majors with fewer than 25 students, unless the program is in a growth mode.
5. Eliminate options and tracks within the majors with fewer than 25 students in the options and/or tracks.
6. Suspend the upper-division themes, i.e., break the link with all theme courses.

7. Seek to bureaucratically combine departments with fewer than 25 majors. (This would mean that disciplinary identities would be retained.)
8. Consider the consolidation of colleges and develop concrete plans to implement over the next two years. (Allow faculty/departments within the colleges considered for consolidation a choice as to the college with which they would merge. The factors that could be considered are the FTES generated by the college; potential for growth; opportunities for growth and program enhancement through consolidation.)
9. Consider university offices that might best be consolidated in order to better serve student need.

### **Financing:**

1. We need to develop a new model for budgeting, e.g., an activity-based budget model, which takes into account such factors as SFRs, cost of laboratories, cost of lower and upper-division GE, number of majors. A timeline for implementation should be set.
2. We should continue to seek permission to implement college-based enhancement fees.
3. We should increase funding for the recruitment of international and out-of-state students.

### **Curriculum:**

1. Require an “innovation-through-substitution” rule for all curricular changes.
2. Streamline offerings in majors, minors, options, tracks, and/or areas of concentration.
3. Manage the GE curriculum by:
  - a. A new funding formula.
  - b. Minimum class sizes for courses.
  - c. Suspending upper-division themes for 1-2 years.
  - d. Reduce a department’s lower-division GE courses (e.g., one for majors and one for non-majors, or cap the number of G.E. courses allowed by a college or department, or cap the number allowed by a college or department for the specific areas.)
4. Establishing appropriate SFRs for each discipline, through activity-based budgeting.

### **Workload issues:**

1. The composition of professional duties and responsibility of individual faculty must be consistent with department and student needs (Article 20 of the CBA). As such, the College Dean is responsible for assigning faculty the duties and responsibilities consistent with the requirements of the CBA.
2. Review all non-reimbursed AWTU activity and reduce where possible.
3. Reduce department, college, and university committees that are not directly supportive of the strategic priorities of the university.
4. Request modification of the MOU for probationary employees, to reduce the workload of both the faculty being reviewed and the departmental committees.

**Possible transformations :**

1. Assist faculty who wish to focus on assurance of student learning outcomes, or who will break the link between seat time and credit.
2. Assist faculty who can find ways to use academic technology to enhance student learning, reduce their workloads, and reduce instructional costs.
3. Consider other modes of supporting faculty development. (For example: Support faculty research/development by building into local and external grant applications electronic access to research documents or travel to major research libraries.)
4. Assure that faculty and staff development opportunities are provided, both on and off campus that are directly linked to our first strategic priority.
5. Assure that all organizational efforts are aligned according to the Strategic Plan.
6. When it is pedagogically sound and appropriate to do so:
  - a. Increase 3-hour courses to 4 and 6 hour courses, depending on writing assignments and service-learning requirements.
  - b. Link Area A, B, C, D, and E courses to form 6+ unit courses. (These approaches can allow students to make progress toward their degrees, generate FTES, and allow faculty to manage workload.)