

Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Task Force Charge

“Following orientation to the budgets, visions, and reduction strategies under way in units within Academic Affairs, the Task Force will estimate the base budget gap between the University Level A allocation to Academic Affairs and the recurring costs of operating Academic Affairs units. The Task Force will recommend sustainable approaches to closing this base budget gap. Recommendations should focus on investing resources in ways that generate capacity to meet enrollment targets and achieve University, Academic Affairs, and College/School Strategic priorities.”

Process

The Task Force met with each of the college/school/library deans. Each Dean shared his/her vision, budget shortfalls, and reduction strategies. The Task Force examined the Level B allocation model, the University Strategic Plan, and the ideas submitted to the Suggestion Box during the 2011 campus budget discussions. The Task Force undertook its charge mindful that preserving the core mission and strategic priorities of the university was central to our effort. Our recommendations are made for the long-term overall health of the campus measured both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Findings

The Task Force identified

- a base budget gap of \$1.7 to \$2 million dollars for 2011-2012.
- inherent shortcomings with the Level B allocation model. The model
 - is not sufficiently responsive to major reductions in funding currently facing the campus.
 - is sufficiently complex that it limits transparency and cannot effectively be used to estimate how enrollment decisions will impact budgets.
 - does not allow for incremental funding for targeted enrollment growth.
- recommendations to address the above issues and position Academic Affairs and the University for the future.

Recommendations

1. Consider consolidation of programs and reorganization of schools and colleges to reduce administrative costs, create efficiencies and synergies, strengthen key programs, and position the university for the future. We discussed reducing the number of schools/colleges from 8 to 7 or possibly 6.
 - a. The reorganization shown in Tables 1 and 2 reduces administrative costs by \$250,000 and combines some programs of the Jordan College of Agricultural Sciences with some in the College of Science and Mathematics to form the Jordan College of Agricultural and Natural Sciences. Some programs in the College of Science and Mathematics join the Lyles College of Engineering. Some programs from Jordan go to Engineering, Kremen, and the Craig School in this proposal.

While the tables show Psychology joining the Kremen School of Education and Human Development, the task force did not reach consensus on this and thought Psychology might remain in Natural Sciences or join Health and Human Services. Economics is moved from Social Sciences to the Craig School.

- b. The task force discussed the possibility, but did not reach a consensus, of merging the College of Social Sciences with the College of Arts and Humanities to form a College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities resulting in a six college/school structure as shown in Tables 3 and 4 and save an additional \$250,000. Without a merger and the savings in administrative costs that would be available as a result, other measures would be necessary to address recurring budget shortfalls in Arts and Humanities.
 - c. In the process of reorganization, focus on shared support services. Support for some programs could be consolidated with savings of perhaps \$35,000 per consolidation. If three such consolidations occurred, savings would be roughly \$100,000. Implications for faculty governance would be handled by the Academic Senate.
 - d. Undergraduate programs with fewer than 160 majors should be evaluated for possible reconfiguration/reorganization. Changes should be mission driven, create a greater synergy and enhance collaboration. Consideration should be given to enrollment history, graduation rate, potential for employment or further graduate study, strategic plan fit, number of faculty (FTE) needed to offer the major, faculty load (SFR/Class Size/ Cost for FTE), and compensating benefits. All majors should consider whether there are unneeded options/emphases, and minors. A number of undergraduate programs may be valuable to the campus without continuing to provide a major. An undergraduate major program offering 10 majors courses over a two year period could see savings of \$25,000 per year from not offering those courses. Reconfiguration of programs could lead to additional savings. We believe \$100,000 savings would be achievable.
 - e. Graduate programs with fewer than 50 students should be evaluated for possible reconfiguration or suspension. Consideration should be given to enrollment history, graduation rate, potential for employment or doctoral study , use of Teaching Assistants and Graduate Assistants, strategic plan fit, and number of faculty (FTE) needed. Given the large number of small graduate programs, we believe \$100,000 would be the starting point for savings.
 - f. Reduce redundancies across the curriculum. For example, consider consolidating lower division statistics offerings into one department.
2. Encourage aggressive enrollment management efforts at department and school/college levels. We believe that aggressive enrollment management activities across the university including attention to low enrolled courses in some schools/colleges could close much of the gap and generate savings that could be utilized or reallocated.

- a. Redesign curricula to be more efficient as well as effective and find ways to make the redesign of curriculum an ongoing process. The university currently teaches about 3,250 sections of 1,500 courses each semester (not counting supervision courses). Curricular redesign that reduced the need to teach 1% of these sections would yield savings of over \$300,000 per year (at \$5,000 per section).
 - b. Redesigning more courses to improve student performance. Reducing failure rates by 50% in the 20 courses with the largest numbers of students not succeeding could save 45 sections (40 students each) per year; a savings of \$225,000.
 - c. Review the offering frequency of low enrolled courses and increase scheduling efficiency. At the department, and school/college level, we found average class sizes for similar courses varied substantially. Attention to scheduling, room capacity, and space utilization that leads to a reduction of 2% of the sections offered would generate over \$600,000 in savings per year. We believe the potential savings could actually be larger.
 - d. Initiate a training program for chairs and faculty on the implications of curricular and enrollment management decisions. Allocation methodologies should provide incentives that reward good decisions. For example, schools/colleges/departments that meet enrollment targets at a reduced cost should be allowed to capture some of the savings (after the gap is closed) for other uses such as faculty travel, research, and equipment.
3. Generate greater efficiencies in centrally funded programs and offices that report to the Provost.
 4. Centers and Institutes that are not now self-sufficient must become so over the next three years or demonstrate to the Provost why they should continue to operate. Several centers are centrally funded. Some have endowments or grants that may periodically require state support to bridge. Some have faculty directors who are released using state support. Without knowing which will continue to receive state support, we cannot provide a specific savings but believe \$100,000 is not unreasonable.
 5. Develop and implement a simplified allocation methodology based on easily understood elements. As part of the methodology, establish benchmarks such as student/faculty ratio targets for schools/colleges.
 6. Develop and implement strategies making it possible for students to take full advantage of their time at Fresno State and provide incentives for superior performance. Rewarding excellence and encouraging progress will decrease failure and open seats for other students. Examples include:
 - a. Roadmaps reflecting actual course offering patterns ensuring students can graduate in a timely manner.
 - b. Earlier registration windows for those making progress towards degree. For example, within the sophomore window, those with a higher gpa and who have followed program roadmaps would register first.

- c. A consistent message to students about their responsibility to make progress towards degree. Provide students who are not likely to make it with early warnings so they can move on-e.g. pre-nursing students with less than a 3.0 gpa
- d. Auxiliary support to the university be explored to find ways to provide incentives for student success such as bookstore credit for students meeting certain objectives (i.e., increasing gpa by a predetermined amount or percentage).
- e. Raising fees for those who spend too long getting a degree; e.g., 150 units.
- f. Obstacles to student success being removed through the use of evidence on characteristics of those who take longer to graduate.
- g. A culture of faculty driven, assessment-based, forward looking course and curricular improvement.

Table 1. Proposed Seven College/School Organizational Structure Impacts

Unit	Courses	FTES	undergrad majors	pbac & grad	faculty
College of Arts and Humanities	1055	3931	2011	370	170.7
College of Social Sciences	577	2909	2132	126	95.4
College of Health and Human Services	640	2682	3410	680	129.5
Craig School of Business	285	2034	3065	143	75.0
Jordan College of Agriculture and Natural Sciences	630	1788	1867	268	76.1
Kremen School of Education and Human Development	475	2121	2506	1245	123.6
Lyles College of Engineering	569	1809	1577	192	78.7

Table 2. Proposed 7 College/School Organizational Structure

CHHS	Communicative Disorders
	Health Science
	Kinesiology
	Nursing
	Physical Therapy
	Rec Admin and Leisure Studies
	Social Work Education
	Nutrition
CSB	Accountancy
	Agricultural Economics
	Economics
	Finance and Business Law
	Info Sys and Decision Sciences
	Management
	Marketing and Logistics
	Fashion Merchandising and Consumer Science
	Prebusiness
	MBA
JCANS	Animal Sciences and Ag Education
	Biology
	Chemistry
	Earth and Environment Sciences
	Plant Science
	Science and Math Interdiscip
	Viticulture and Enology
	Food Science
KREMEN	Counseling and Special Educ
	Curric & Instruction
	Educ Research Admin and Found
	Education Interdepartmental

	Educational Leadership Doc Pgm
	Literacy and Early Education
	Psychology
LCOE	Child and Family Sciences
	Civil and Geomat Eng and Const
	Computer Science
	Elect and Computer Engineering
	Engineering Interdisciplinary
	Industrial Technology
	Mathematics
	Mechanical Engineering
	Physics
	COSS
Anthropology	
Chicano and Latin Amer Studies	
Criminology	
Geography	
History	
Political Science	
Sociology	
Womens Studies	
CAH	
	Art and Design
	Communication
	English
	Linguistics
	Mass Comm and Journalism
	Music
	Philosophy
	Theatre Arts
	Modern and Class Lang & Lit/Humanities

Table 3. Proposed Six College/School Organizational Structure Impacts

Unit	Courses	FTES	undergrad majors	pbac & grad	faculty
College of Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities	1632	6840	4143	496	266.1
College of Health and Human Services	640	2682	3410	680	129.5
Craig School of Business	285	2034	3065	143	75.0
Jordan College of Agriculture and Natural Sciences	630	1788	1867	268	76.1
Kremen School of Education and Human Development	475	2121	2506	1245	123.6
Lyles College of Engineering	569	1809	1577	192	78.7

Table 4 Proposed Six School/College Organizational Structure

CHHS	Communicative Disorders
	Health Science
	Kinesiology
	Nursing
	Physical Therapy
	Rec Admin and Leisure Studies
	Social Work Education
	Nutrition
CASSH	Africana & Amer Indian Studies
	Anthropology
	Armenian Studies
	Art and Design
	Chicano and Latin Amer Studies
	Communication
	Criminology
	English
	Geography
	History
	Linguistics
	Mass Comm and Journalism
	Music
	Philosophy
	Political Science
	Sociology
	Theatre Arts
	Womens Studies
	Modern and Class Lang & Lit/Humanities
	CSB
Agricultural Economics	
Economics	

	Finance and Business Law
	Info Sys and Decision Sciences
	Management
	Marketing and Logistics
	Fashion Merchandising and Consumer Science
	Prebusiness
	MBA
JCANS	Animal Sciences and Ag Educ
	Biology
	Chemistry
	Earth and Environment Sciences
	Plant Science
	Science and Math Interdiscip
	Viticulture and Enology
	Food Science
KREMEN	Counseling and Special Educ
	Curric & Instruction
	Educ Research Admin and Found
	Education Interdepartmental
	Educational Leadership Doc Pgm
	Literacy and Early Education
	Psychology
	Child and Family Sciences
LCOE	Civil and Geomat Eng and Const
	Computer Science
	Elect and Computer Engineering
	Engineering Interdisciplinary
	Industrial Technology
	Mathematics
	Mechanical Engineering
	Physics

Table 5. Estimated Savings Available from Various Strategies

Curricular redesign	\$300,000
Redesign classes increase student success	\$225,000
Reduce low enrolled courses and improve scheduling	\$500,000- \$1,000,000
School/College consolidation-JCANS	\$250,000
School/College consolidation-CASSH	\$250,000
Shared Services from consolidation	\$100,000
Undergraduate program consolidation/reconfiguration	\$100,000
Graduate program consolidation/suspension	\$100,000
Centers/Institutes become self supporting	\$100,000

Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Task Force Members

Antonio Avalos

Michael Caldwell (co-chair)

John Constable

James Farrar

Robert Harper

Andrew Hoff

Dawn Lewis

Dennis Nef (co-chair)

Colleen Torgerson

Manoochehr Zoghi