

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Professional Studies

December 18, 2017

To: Alex Enyedi, Provost & Co-Chair *University Resource Planning Committee*
Mark Rizzardi, Co-Chair *University Resource Planning Committee*

From: ***CPS Budget Advisory Committee (CPS-BAC)*** Ramesh Adhikari, Assistant Professor; Rock Braithwaite, Chair & Professor; Krista Carroll, Administrative Analyst/Specialist I; Mary Dingle, Chair & Professor; Yvonne Doble, Director of Field Education; Erick Eschker, Chair & Professor; Tasha Howe, Chair & Professor; Claire Knox, Chair & Professor; Jayne McGuire, Associate Professor; Kim Moon, Academic Support Coordinator II; Ronald Swartz, Chair & Professor; Annette Troxel, Administrative Analyst/Specialist II; Alma Zechman, Academic Support Coordinator II; Christopher Hopper, Co-Chair of CPS-BAC & Professor; Hari Singh, Co-Chair of CPS-BAC & Professor).

Subject: Phase 2 budget cut proposal & related issues

These recommendations are based on extensive discussions of the *CPS Budget Advisory Committee (CPS-BAC)*. There is a strong consensus on these issues by the CPS Chairs, Faculty and Staff. *Since CPS is approximately one third of the university, we will appreciate if these recommendations are given careful and appropriate consideration.*

Specific College Strategies

Department Chairs have been reviewing course offerings with the Dean to reduce the number of courses without unduly impacting progress towards graduation. There has been some progress on this and we will continue to review and monitor changes.

Significant curriculum changes have been made to reduce costs and improve progress towards graduation. Some major courses have been changed to fulfill GE learning goals and reduce the number of required courses. Three departments have modified their subject courses to incorporate GE Area E goals to reduce number of classes taken by students. An interdisciplinary GE Area E course is being proposed for undeclared/CPS majors.

Budget Process Recommendations

1. **Strategic Academic Master Plan (SAMP):** Although the three colleges at HSU have grown differently over the years (**Appendix 1**) the resources have not been appropriately adjusted to reflect changes in FTES. CPS has the highest SFR among the three colleges. Academic allocation of resources are still based on a historical incremental budget allocation process. Different majors have significantly different cost implications. For

example, changing the composition of majors by shifting 800 students from high cost majors to low cost majors could save more than \$600,000. An “optimal” major target could be based on what kind of students are willing to come to HSU, the need to establish HSU brand, acute future needs of some professions (such as nursing and teaching), regional/state needs for knowledge/expertize, and job prospects for our majors. We are not recommending any program elimination but a careful and thoughtful “right” sizing of programs. *Since we should not fund everything equally, we would be best served by Deans/Office of Academic Affairs establishing a set of priorities for different programs based on a transparent set of criteria. The strategic priorities should be based on a long-term strategic vision instead of equity across the colleges. A Strategic Academic Master Plan (SAMP) needs to be developed based on what we consider the “optimal” major size for each academic discipline. Strategic enrollment management & recruitment of students should be based on the SAMP and departments should be given appropriate resources based on FTES. It does not make strategic sense to reduce the resources of departments that have significantly grown in FTES when HSU has a shortfall in overall student recruitment.* We recognize that a faculty/staff group is trying to develop a *Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEMP)*. This group should pay particular attention to potential costs & efficiencies based on the *Strategic Academic Master Plan (SAMP)*.

Recommendation: *A Strategic Academic Master Plan (SAMP) should be developed urgently based on a transparent set of criteria and coordinated with the enrollment & recruitment efforts (SEMP) based on comprehensive evaluation of relevant data.*

- 2. Performance Budget Model:** Due to our historical incremental budget allocation process there are no adequate incentives for departments that achieve specific strategic academic goals. On the contrary, when resources are cut equally, rapidly growing departments are *indirectly penalized* when their resources are stretched thin. We propose that we reorient our budget process to a *Performance Budget Model* that adequately compensates departments for meeting specific milestones such as FTES targets based on capacity and efficiency, retention and graduation of students. *These milestones should incorporate achieving learning goals based on a value added approach.* We understand that an *Integrated Assessment Implementation Working Group* has been created to develop tools to measure various facets of academic performance. This process should be given top priority since implementing the framework will take some time.

Recommendation: *Establish a performance budgeting framework such as other universities have done. CSU, Fresno is a relevant example.*

- 3. Consultative Process with All Stakeholders:** Many of the proposed budget cuts have unintended consequences affecting a wide range of stakeholders. We recognize that some budget cut options are being reviewed by specific organizations & divisions that are affected. However, many of these cuts will impact a much wider set of stakeholders and many of the persons who will be significantly impacted by the cuts have not been

adequately consulted with a collaborative process. Consequently, many of the unintended consequences are not yet known.

Recommendation: *A formal consultative process should involve all stakeholders who are potentially impacted by a budget cut so that we get a better sense of all the intended & unintended consequences that could result from the change. This does take time but it is essential to make sure that major stakeholders are not adversely impacted and do not lose our confidence.*

Specific Recommendations on Phase 2 Budget Proposals

- 1. Developing an Effective Advising Model:** Currently multiple areas provide advising. *The advising by different entities is often contradictory and not updated appropriately and confuses students.* CPS Departments have done significant work to engage students from their first year onwards. We try to ensure continuity in advising by contacting students even before they come to campus. Advising is changing all the time as circumstances in departments, disciplines and professional contexts continue to evolve. The level of nuance involved in integrating academic, personal and professional advising that we need to do with our majors can best be done by people who are personally familiar with the working environments of our programs and professional contexts. Only the Academic Departments in CPS are able to provide timely updates and advice to students. Although many factors influence academic goals, it appears recently the increase in *Advising Center* resources has been correlated with a decline in university wide retention. Clearly there are different viewpoints about who can deliver effective advising. We should allow each college to do what works best for students in that college. Once more data is available, we can make an objective assessment of which advising model is more effective.

Recommendation: *CPS strongly recommends that advising resources should be provided to the college to continue to do effective advising and that we reduce the confusing overlap in advising functions. As discussed with the Provost, a detailed proposal will be made by March 1, 2018.*

- 2. The Importance of the Children Center:** The Children Center provides many critical functions to the campus community. Changes in the Children's Center could have many adverse unintentional consequences such as lack of affordable & flexible child care for students/faculty/staff, lack of employment opportunities for students, reduced ability to recruit better faculty, etc. *The long term strategic benefits of a Children's Center seem to outweigh any short term cost saving.* It is a critical investment in the future, and impacts retention, growth, and timely graduation of students.

Recommendation: *The Children's Center is a critical resource. If we consider any restructuring of the Children's Center it will be essential to include the Department of Child Development in the dialogue. **Appendix 2** provides more details.*

3. **Consolidating Administrative Positions/Functions:** Significant cost savings can accrue if many of the administrative functions and senior administrative positions are consolidated and service access to students is streamlined. As one of the Open Forum participants pointed out typically Associate VP's appoint a Director, Directors appoint an Assistant Director, etc. and then a staff person is appointed to do the work. When budget cuts are made the personnel doing the actual work are given more responsibilities or their positions are consolidated. This pattern of increase in administrative positions may differ in each situation but clearly more support needs to be provided to personnel who are actually do the work rather than creating multiple supervisory layers.

Recommendation: *All senior administrative positions should be reviewed by an objective audit to consolidate responsibilities and streamline services to students. Significant cost savings can accrue with consolidation of administrative services and reduction of existing positions by attrition, and/or reassignments.*

4. **Staff Workload:** The amount of work delegated to supporting staff has increased significantly over the years (**Appendix 3**). Typically the additional work has not been accompanied by additional recourses. Proposals for reorganization could impose an even higher workload.

Recommendation: *Any reorganization of departments should take into account the impact of additional workload increase on staff and faculty and their ability to serve students.*

5. **Cost Savings in Chargebacks/Purchase Options:** The extent and amount of chargebacks between departments and service organizations are getting increasingly complex and, due to various restrictions, do not result in cost savings. University services and products should be competitive. Otherwise, departments should have flexibility to procure external services & equipment at significantly lower costs with a streamlined procedure. Noncompetitive services should not be maintained and surplus personnel could be reduced by attrition or reassignment to other areas.

Recommendation: *The whole process of procurements & chargebacks should be evaluated and streamlined to reduce costs and increase efficiency.*

6. **Class Size Issues:** Cancelling low enrolled classes at short notice can be disruptive for student schedules and faculty staffing. Although in general low enrolled classes should be avoided, it is best to provide departments with flexibility to manage their own resources. Departments may decide to subsidize a few low enrolled classes by having higher enrollments in other classes. A small graduate program may be subsidized by more robust undergraduate enrollments. The best indicator of how long term resources are utilized is the *Student Faculty Ratio* (SFR). The SFR needs to be adjusted due to fluctuation caused

by release time for new TT faculty, self-support programs and other factors to reflect true department costs.

Recommendation: *The Deans in consultation with Chairs should set a benchmark target SFR that a department needs to maintain based on relevant considerations and college/university averages. This SFR should be appropriately adjusted to reflect overall accurate net costs that incorporate labs, equipment, grants, etc.*

7. **Chair Release Time:** Previously Chairs were on 12 month contracts. After the demise of furloughs, Chairs were reduced to 9 month appointments. This saved significant money in terms of vacation dollars and retirement base funding, etc. Recently more work has been delegated to Chairs. There are more reporting requirements, significant increase in the size of some majors, training mandates, and the work related to maintaining accreditation standards has increased for professional programs. Reducing Chair assigned time when workload has significantly increased would ultimately result in less faculty agreeing to do the work and could result in many important things falling through the cracks.

Recommendation: *The Dean of each college should evaluate if a change in the assigned time is warranted in each specific case.*

8. **Incentives for Creating More Revenue:** Departments and programs should receive overall institutional support to create additional sources of revenue. Current university policies for these types of activities requires a revenue neutral approach, with a requirement that funds received from special programs are spent annually. Consequently, it is not possible to plan for development of funds that may be used for other educational purposes in a department, such as faculty travel to professional meetings. Departments may be able to offer workshops (non-credit bearing), seminars, summer camps, trainings, testing programs and other activities that can generate a fee for service. Departments with various types of expertise could offer programs and activities for community and professional groups. These types of activities may provide important services for specific groups and also enhance community engagement.

Recommendation: *Departments should be encouraged to pursue revenue enhancing activities by being able to retain a significant amount of the revenue they generate.*

TEN YEAR COLLEGE TRENDS

		2005-2006	2010-2011	2016-2017
CPS	FTES	1817.6	1874.3	1952.13
	FTEF	116.9	76.4	92.02
	SFR	15.5	24.5	21.21
CNRS	FTES	1985.5	2387.7	2902.94
	FTEF	129.2	114.1	149.3
	SFR	15.4	20.9	19.44
CAHSS	FTES	2934.4	2949.6	2926.56
	FTEF	143.3	124.1	141.85
	SFR	20.5	23.8	20.63

Children's Center Recommendations

There are several very serious issues that need to be carefully reviewed and evaluated before considering such a recommendation.

- **The Children's Center provides key support** to the operation and graduation goals of this University. It serves faculty, staff, and student parents, providing essential day care options that are not similarly available elsewhere in our community. As part of the campus community, **the Children's Center offers a flexible program that meets the scheduling needs of faculty and student parents in a way no other local service does. Students in particular cannot afford to pay for full day care when they don't need it which is what off campus care generally requires.**
- **The Center employs HSU students**, providing a good and flexible source of income on campus and experience. Loss of this employment option would make it harder for students to make ends meet and find alternate employment that is as flexible or as meaningful (especially so for students in the Child Development and Liberal Studies Elementary Education programs for example).
- **The Center is an attraction for new faculty members who have or wish to have children.** Closure of the center could negatively impact our ability to attract and retain new faculty who have or wish to have children. Given the lack of child care in this area, loss of on-campus care reduces our attractiveness as an employment option.
- **There is a critical shortage of child care openings in the Humboldt Bay region, particularly for very young children.** Quality programs consistently have waiting lists and by necessity serve families on a full day, year around basis so they are not designed to provide part day, academic year care. **In order to partner with community programs, we would have to have a way of creating new programs and new capacity.** *It is critical the campus NOT assume that there will be care available for student, staff and faculty children if the Center is closed.*
- **There are potential unintended consequences of a loss of campus child care.** Without access to subsidized child care, *students may have to drop out of school simply as a financial matter.* Even with our current program in place, there have often been times when the waiting list was long and the Center was not able to meet the need. *Faculty members have found their work experience undermined by the lack of child care, and a couple of young faculty listed it as one of the reasons that they left HSU a few years ago.*

Since there is no estimated actual savings associated with this item, and there are clear potential losses to the University, we hope that you will be very, very thorough and careful in evaluating this suggestion. Ultimately, we recommend that you maintain the Children's Center because it serves students success, retention and progress to graduation as well as supporting the quality of the work environment for staff and faculty thus being a very real and important contributor to University goals.

**Department Coordinators Increased Assignments
Formerly Done by Other Areas**

1. Background checks on all new employees, including students – Human Resources
2. Order of Work on lecturer hires each semester – APS
3. Justification forms on new lecturers – APS
4. Reference checks for new lecturers - APS
5. All data required to be entered for Requisitions, locating vendors, requesting cost estimates, elimination of payment requests resulting in increased number of requisitions – Procurement
6. School of Education, Social Work & Child Development MOUs with school districts, CD placements and agencies are now done by the department and sent to Contracts - Procurement
7. Increased assignment of many more funds and program codes, each requiring budget and expenditure tracking by Department Coordinators – MBA fee, MSF fee, RSCA awards, Student Concussion Program, Lottery awards, trusts in Advancement Foundation
8. Requiring amendments/changes on Travel Claims to go through the claimant – Accounts Payable
9. Billing requests for revenue accounts (such as Concussion) – Accounts Receivable
10. Academic Advisors in ACAC contacting ASC's for information on Academic Advising – ACAC
11. EOP requesting assistance on student advising for KINS and Business majors - EOP
12. Athletic Academic Advisor incorrectly advising KRA students resulting in KRA faculty fixing mistakes. Athletic Advisor listing themselves as advisor in order to lift holds resulting in extra work to clean up by KRA - Athletics
13. Tracking faculty to provide exams – Testing Center
14. Book orders and new requirement for no cost classes – APS and ITS
15. Input course rotation in PeopleSoft/U Direct – Registrar
16. Course audits each semester – Registrar and APS
17. PeopleSoft programming of APDB (FAD) of Education supervisors which are listed twice – APS