

# **Report of the Faculty Task Force on Academic Reorganization**

## **INTRODUCTION**

At its Summer Quarter retreat on August 18-19, 2009, the Executive Committee of the CSUEB Academic Senate determined that faculty input on potential reorganization of departments and/or programs was necessary to respond to the current fiscal crisis in the CSU and to come to terms with the extensive cuts in the CSUEB budget in AY2009-10, as well as the likelihood of further cuts in AY2010-11.

Since the start of this crisis in December 2008, the faculty representatives on ExCom have been concerned that the faculty's voices, ideas, and opinions be heard and that appropriate procedures be followed in our campus's efforts to meet these challenges. At the August meeting, the President described change at CSUEB as a necessary and dynamic process and agreed that faculty involvement and engagement are fundamental to this change.

In response, ExCom appointed an all-faculty Academic Reorganization Task Force to serve as a faculty clearinghouse for ideas on ways to achieve greater operating efficiencies while sustaining or improving educational efficacy.

The Task Force members were as follows:

Chair: Dianne Woods, Department of Social Work, Vice Chair of the Academic Senate  
Dee Andrews, Department of History, FAC Chair  
Jennifer Eagan, Department of Philosophy, CIC Chair  
Denise Fleming, Department of Teacher Education, ExCom member  
Carolyn Fong, Department of Nursing and Health Sciences  
Michael Lee, Department of Geography & Environmental Studies, CAPR Chair  
Nan Maxwell, Department of Economics  
Eric Suess, Department of Statistics and Biostatistics, COBRA Chair

The Task Force was charged with

- Facilitating faculty recommendations for cost savings or cost-neutral options;
- Serving as a clearing house for faculty proposals.

## **STRATEGY FOR COLLECTING INFORMATION**

Members of the Task Force met twice before the start of the Fall Quarter to establish the essential questions, groundrules, and procedures for the Town Meetings.

The Task Force requested that the Chair of the Academic Senate send an announcement and an email reminder regarding the Town Hall meetings (see full versions in Appendix A) to all tenure-track and tenured faculty, with instruction to Department Chairs to forward the notice to Lecturers.

**Hayward Meetings:**  
**October 7, 2009 at 4PM in LI 2250**  
**October 8, 2009 at 9AM in LI 2250**  
**October 9, 2009 at 11AM in LI 2250**

**Concord Meeting:**  
**October 7, 2009 at 4PM in Oak Room**

At its annual retreat in early September, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate decided that faculty input is essential for the constructive consideration of the ways in which CSUEB can address our fiscal crisis while maintaining academic quality....

Next week we will hold a series of Faculty Town Hall meetings on Weds, Thurs and Friday to discuss the potential restructuring of our academic organization (see attached announcement). ***These are extremely important meetings!*** Please consider attending one or more of the meetings, if at all possible. The budgetary challenges we face will require all of us working together to find ways to maintain the quality, breadth and depth of higher education we provide our students. ***Let's play an active part in finding solutions!***

The Task Force also posted a chart and table listing all CSU colleges, and the location of various interdisciplinary and professional programs within those colleges, on the Task Force Sharepoint site, open to the university community.

The four Town Halls were convened as planned, with one Task Force member serving as moderator and one as secretary at each meeting. A total of approximately 60 faculty, including the members of the Task Force, attended. The Task Force re-convened the following week to organize the many proposals received, based on the notes taken at each gathering, and to summarize the concerns of faculty regarding ground rules for reorganization.

Faculty, including Lecturers, who were unable to attend the Town Meetings were invited to submit comments, plans, or inputs by email to the Chair of the Task Force. The Task Force Chair received 4 proposals by email.

### **SUBSTANCE OF THE TASK FORCE FINDINGS**

The Task Force findings are divided into two sections.

Section 1 provides 4-square grid of reorganization proposals made by participating faculty, according to levels of difficulty in implementation and impact on budgets.

Section 2 provides a 2-square grid of participating faculty's proposed ground rules for sustaining academic quality and established procedures in reorganization.

**SECTION I:**  
***FACULTY PROPOSALS FOR POTENTIAL REORGANIZATION***

The proposals appear in the four-square matrix below according to the following categories:

- Low Difficulty/High Impact
- High Difficulty/High Impact
- Low Difficulty/Low Impact
- Low Difficulty/High Impact

*Points of clarification:*

**“Difficulty”** indicates nature of implementation or possible negative consequences for the University.

**“Impact”** indicates fiscal savings or potentially positive fiscal income for the University.

**Bolded items** indicate faculty proposals mentioned more than once at the Town Halls.

The Task Force recognizes that a number of these items may be placed in multiple categories; but made every effort to place proposals in accurate categories reflecting the definitions of “difficulty” and “impact” above.

The items are listed in no particular order; place in the list does not indicate any judgments regarding priorities.

## TASK FORCE SUMMARY OF FACULTY PROPOSALS: IMPLEMENTATION DIFFICULTY AND BUDGETARY IMPACT

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Low Difficulty/High Impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Downscaling of Summer Quarter programming</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Reduction of freshmen class and increased emphasis on transfer students</b></li> <li>➤ Maintenance or increase of academic standards for admissions</li> <li>➤ Utilization of Concord and/or Oakland Campus for self-support, STEM Center, or professional and graduate programs</li> <li>➤ <b>Combination of related health and professional programs into a fifth college</b></li> <li>➤ Reassignment of faculty between departments</li> </ul>   | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>High Difficulty/High Impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Conversion to semester system</li> <li>➤ <b>Closing of Concord Campus</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Closing of Oakland Center</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Conversion of Summer Quarter to self-support</b></li> <li>➤ Assigning of regular faculty to teach freshman courses</li> <li>➤ Reductions of numbers of remedial courses</li> <li>➤ <b>Reduction of numbers of lecturers</b></li> <li>➤ Evaluation of enrollment capacities for on-ground instruction</li> <li>➤ Golden handshake and other retirement incentives for senior faculty</li> </ul> |
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Low Difficulty/Low Impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creation of large research methods courses in related disciplines</li> <li>➤ <b>Evaluation of cost-effectiveness of on-line versus on-ground instruction</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Evaluation of strategies/efficiency of self-support</b></li> <li>➤ Cross-listing of courses and incorporation of multiple extra-departmental academic offerings into Majors</li> <li>➤ Creation of University-wide Council of Chairs for programmatic consultation</li> <li>➤ Creation of Council of Graduate Coordinators and/or Chairs for greater synergies and efficiencies in graduate education</li> <li>➤ Cross-College teaching assignments</li> <li>➤ Removal of office telephones</li> </ul> | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>High Difficulty/Low Impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Merging of programs based on disciplinary synergies</li> <li>➤ Merging of departments</li> <li>➤ Decrease in number of course redundancies</li> <li>➤ Decrease in number of colleges</li> <li>➤ Elimination of department structures</li> <li>➤ Introduction of large courses with T.A. , Reader, and/or technical support</li> <li>➤ Branding of select University assets</li> <li>➤ Reassignment of faculty between departments</li> <li>➤ Incentives for faculty to teach large sections</li> </ul>                              |

**SECTION II.**  
***PROPOSED GROUND RULES FOR SUSTAINING ACADEMIC QUALITY AND ESTABLISHED PROCEDURE***

Faculty stated concerns, in some cases very deep concerns, regarding the Task Force’s charge and work, and proposed various “ground rules” necessary to any reorganization process. These are reported in no particular order. The numbers for items are provided strictly for ease of reference.

**TASK FORCE SUMMARY OF FACULTY PROPOSALS FOR GROUND RULES: ACADEMIC QUALITY AND ESTABLISHED PROCEDURE**

| <b>GROUND RULES FOR ACADEMIC QUALITY</b>  | <b>GROUND RULES FOR ACADEMIC PROCEDURE</b>  |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establishing of criteria for programmatic changes.</li> <li>2. Determination of multiple measures for contributions of programs, beyond size of the major.</li> <li>3. Recognition of critical role of tenure-track faculty in reputation and future of the University.</li> <li>4. Requirement that programmatic and/or departmental combinations be pedagogically and disciplinarily meaningful.</li> <li>5. Equity among Colleges for budget cuts.</li> <li>6. Consideration of long-term as well as short-term student needs.</li> <li>7. Maintaining a multi-disciplinary campus with diversity of academic programming.</li> <li>8. Maintaining commitment to student and faculty diversity.</li> <li>9. Development of statement of core academic values by the Academic Senate.</li> <li>10. Recognition and protection of disciplinary integrity.</li> <li>11. Recognition that academic quality is central for the future success of the University.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Due deliberation, to avoid permanent damage from overly hasty decisions.</li> <li>2. Assurance from the Administration that Task Force Report will not be used to select cuts without further faculty consultation.</li> <li>3. Initiation of a review of the Office of Institutional Research to correct inaccurate and out-of-date data on academic programs.</li> <li>4. Approval of all reorganization and programmatic changes by the Academic Senate.</li> <li>5. Explicit recommendations to be made by ExCom based on Task Force’s Report.</li> <li>6. Provision of detailed breakdown of the CSUEB budget covering all units at the University.</li> <li>8. Transparency for all discussions and proposals for academic change.</li> <li>9. Revision of Academic Senate Policy on Suspension of Programs to include Senate oversight.</li> <li>10. Quarterly faculty review of CSUEB budget by the Academic Senate.</li> </ol> |

The members of the Academic Reorganization Task Force respectfully submit this Report to the Executive Committee of the CSUEB Academic Senate. The Task Force has made every effort to faithfully report and categorize the content of the discussions at the four Town Halls and of submitted proposals.

22 October 2009

Appendices:

- Appendix A –
  - Focus Questions,
  - web announcement sent to faculty the first week of classes and
  - the email reminder, sent by the Senate Chair on 10-2-09
- Appendix B - Town Hall Minutes/Notes
- Appendix C – Feedback from faculty on this report

## *Appendix A*

### FOCUS QUESTIONS

At the Town Hall meetings, faculty may address changes both within and between programs, departments, colleges, and campuses. We wish to have as many faculty as possible participate in what we believe is an unprecedented opportunity for faculty to shape the future of academic organization at CSUEB.

Please consider the following questions when planning your brief presentation:

1. What potential structural and/or programmatic realignments do you envision that could create or enhance **synergetic relationships** between academic programs?
2. What are some **models of operation or best practices** that could increase the efficiency, effectiveness, or lower the overall cost of academic programs without decreasing educational quality or services to students?
3. Are there opportunities or options for **short-term changes** that would lead to fulfilling **long-term goals**?

# **ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING IMPORTANT TOWN HALL MEETINGS**

## **Hayward Meetings:**

**October 7, 2009 at 4PM in LI 2250**

**October 8, 2009 at 9AM in LI 2250**

**October 9, 2009 at 11AM in LI 2250**

## **Concord Meeting:**

**October 7, 2009 at 4PM in Oak Room**

At its annual retreat in early September, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate decided that faculty input is essential for the constructive consideration of the ways in which CSUEB can address our fiscal crisis while maintaining academic quality.

To this end, the Executive Committee has appointed an ad hoc faculty task force comprised of representatives from the Executive Committee, Senate Standing Committees, and other key faculty constituencies from each of the colleges. The goal of this Task Force is to serve as a reporting agency to the Executive Committee of the Senate regarding ways in which the University might restructure its academic organization for more effective as well as more efficient education of our students. The members of the Task Force will compile and synthesize comments and suggestions from the faculty and present these to the Executive Committee of the Senate; they will neither vote on nor decide between different ideas in the formulation of their report.

Faculty are encouraged to attend one of four Town Hall meetings to be held in Hayward and in Concord to express their ideas, both large and small, short term and long term, for improving the CSUEB academic organizational structure. Each faculty member will have 3-5 minutes to present their ideas re: potential academic restructuring aimed at creative use of our limited resources to encourage and promote effective instruction.

At the Town Hall meetings, faculty may address changes both within and between programs, departments, colleges, and campuses. We wish to have as many faculty as possible participate in what we believe is an unprecedented opportunity for faculty to shape the future of academic organization at CSUEB.

Please consider the following questions when planning your brief presentation:

1. What potential structural and/or programmatic realignments do you envision that could create or enhance **synergetic relationships** between academic programs?
2. What are some **models of operation or best practices** that could increase the efficiency, effectiveness, or lower the overall cost of academic programs without decreasing educational quality or services to students?
3. Are there opportunities or options for **short-term changes** that would lead to fulfilling **long-term goals**?

Faculty who are unable to attend one of the Town Hall meetings are welcome to send email suggestions to the Academic Senate Office ([jackie.alnor@csueastbay.edu](mailto:jackie.alnor@csueastbay.edu)). These suggestions as well as the suggestions gathered from the Town Hall meetings will be thoroughly reviewed by the Task Force for inclusion in the report.

We look forward to seeing you and hearing from you.

Dianne Woods, Chair, Faculty Task Force on Academic Reorganization  
Susan Opp, Chair, Academic Senate



Reminder email sent by the Senate Chair on 10-2-09

Dear Colleagues,

Next week we will have our first Academic Senate meeting for 2009-10, from 2-4pm in South Science 143 on Tuesday, October 6<sup>th</sup>. While only members of the Senate may vote at these meetings, the meetings are open, and all faculty are welcome to come. Senate meetings are a good way to learn more about how your university runs, the role of the faculty in the functioning of the university, and changes that are or may be occurring.

The Academic Senate has a Sharepoint site that is open for all faculty to view. You may access this by going to the faculty tab on our university website and clicking on "Sharepoint" in the Faculty Tools section. (When logging in to Sharepoint, don't forget to put ad\ in front of your NetID.) Once you enter the site, click on Academic Senate, and you will see a link for the "First Senate Meeting". You can see the agenda, as well as electronic copies of the materials for this meeting. Also, please note that under "Web Links" to the upper right side we have a link to the Statewide Academic Senate Meeting Summary from September 2009. Here you can read about the issues that CSU faculty are working on at the statewide level – a great way to stay informed!

Finally, I want to remind you that next week we will hold a series of Faculty Town Hall meetings on Weds, Thurs and Friday to discuss the potential restructuring of our academic organization (see attached announcement). ***These are extremely important meetings!*** Please consider attending one or more of the meetings, if at all possible. The budgetary challenges we face will require all of us working together to find ways to maintain the quality, breadth and depth of higher education we provide our students. ***Let's play an active part in finding solutions!***

Department Chairs, please forward this announcement to your lecturers.

Thank you, and I hope to see you next week.

Sue Opp  
Chair, Academic Senate

## Town Hall Minutes

### Reorganization Town Hall Meeting Notes

Wednesday, 10/ 7/ 09 Hayward Campus

In Attendance: Nan Maxwell, Denise Fleming, Dee Andrews, Jennifer Eagan, Eric Sues, Jim Murphy, Khal Schnieder, David Stronk, David Larsen, Aline Soules, Colleen Fong, Jeff Seitz, Mike Hedrick, Rita Liberti, Toni Fogerty, Kim Geron, Tom McCoy, Eric Helgren, Iliana Holbrook, Doris Duncan, Rainer Bauer, Meiling Wu, Carl Stempel, Sarah Nielsen, Susan Gubernat, E. Maxwell Davis

Nan shared the statement on Enrollment with the group.

We are overenrolled in 09-10, need to reduce enrollment by 10-12% by next year.

Nan emphasized that we are talking about structural change not programmatic changes.

Where does the cost savings come from?

Department chairs, staff, deans (salaries, stipends, assigned time)

This is a serious question.

Things are happening too fast. MLL is being asked to merge curriculum and with another department and has been asked to make a proposal fast. Pedagogical reasons should have priority. There should be concrete cost savings attached to all structural changes. Departments will lose identity, and disciplines should have integrity. Diversity in the pool of lecturers may not come back if we lay off lecturers. We should not move to separate the functions of majors versus service, creating two tiers of students, those that can pay more (referring to self-support?). Collaboration in courses is not the same as merging disciplines. We should get money back for the students we serve. We need more time to consider the implications.

Look at one happened when Anthropology and Sociology merged; merging is not always ideal. They had to be pulled back apart. CLASS is a huge college. Taking some of the professional programs out of CLASS and creating a new college would get our colleges more in balance in terms of size and function. Let's revisit the switch the semester system. It's cheaper to run a semester system.

Some say that we need to remove remedial students to save money. We accept students that need remediation. Can we ask these students to take an admission test in advance to see if they need remediation in advance of taking them? This would help save money. Why are we are turning away qualified students in favor of less qualified ones? This is relevant if we are reducing enrollment by 11%.

Back to creation of a professional college. In CLASS there is incompatibility between liberal arts and professional programs, aims and allocation of resources. Grad students have different needs, and professional programs need resources to usher students into these professional fields.

Miscommunication and lack of coordination occur as a result of size and lack of focus and attention.

Accreditation for professional programs suffers due to the size of CLASS. PUAD lost accreditation in part due to these structural problems. No leadership at the college level to facilitate accreditation processes that are particular to disciplines. Professional programs have the possibility to create new programs and certificates out of existing programs and get self-support money.

This whole process [of giving consent to reorganization plans] may be a little misguided. Are we using right-wing scare tactics, like loss of programs, to get us to do something we don't want to do? Admin. are only focused on the size of program and not SFR, SCU, quality, funding or service to the community or by any other measure. We only get old and inaccurate from IRA and from Peoplesoft, so we can't get accurate info on majors, etc. Is the admin. looking to eliminate programs and should we be focused on how to save them? Is this process a distraction?

The CLASS Dean proposed a massive reorganization and it behooves us to create our own plans. Geography and Anthropology used to be together at CSUEB, and may be again. Cal Poly and Stanislaus and LSU have joint Anthro/ Geog departments. Cost savings from reduction of assigned time for chairs and for staff, and for shared courses both electives and core courses. This would also help save the Master's programs. Philosophy may join in to, to save itself. CLASS may be looking at a lecturer-less college in 2010-11, and we have to figure out how to offer degrees with only regular faculty.

We're doing the admin's work for them. If we're trying to creatively come up with solutions to save money, can we think beyond mergers? Is there some middle ground between this drastic talk and what we need to do?

The talking points seem constraining. Ethnic Studies has been asked to submit a written proposal for a merger, and no other departments in CLASS have been asked to do the same thing. The deans and admins. have to be fair and give people the same deadlines and information. They agreed to an administrative merger, and it has turned into a curricular merger. It's a horrible process. The Dean is trying to divide and conquer faculty. It's already happened for in MLL and ES. Issues of equity are at stake. An administrative merger would save \$200,000. There is more going on besides cost savings, and it's unacceptable.

MLL and Ethnic Studies are complimentary but not the same.

The notion of a lecture-less university seems completely crazy. Programs would not survive without lecturers. A blanket lecturer cut would be catastrophic to departments who are down in tenure track faculty. This has to be done proportionally. Extremely irrational! Where is this notion coming from?

From what this person has seen in CLASS, departments that are being reduced the most are the ones with more lecturers. Is getting rid of lecturers a strategy? Is this the purpose? This is not about money, but about power. The administration doesn't want to deal with faculty, and this is about the erosion of self governance. CLASS has fended off reorg. plans by going to the upper admin. This process is an attempt to get our own consent to our own demise. Financial crises come and go, giving up departments and increasing workloads never gets fixed and doesn't get undone. We should just say no to the admin. We have the power to turn this back. They can't do what the faculty does not want to do. They need our consent. We run this University in the real sense.

Large numbers about the budget cuts are being thrown out by the admin. The whole campus is being cut by 25%. Cutting us in terms of salaries and programs is obviously the biggest pot of money. Why is this being balanced on the back of AA? These are small tweaks compared to the overall budget and we have to fend off cuts to AA, and make sure that others take their share of the cuts.

Consider realigning the fundraising group Advancement, and get them into the Colleges to look into the external funding side. Selling naming rights to courses? This could be a short-term idea leading to longer term goals. We should be looking for finding sources instead of trying cut.

Yes, we should resist silly ideas. But, the budget situation really is that bad. The base budget of CLASS used to be 16.5 when Dave Larsen was Dean, and that was when we had fewer regular faculty and lower salaries. The budget for CLASS is projected to be 11.6 million dollars in 10-11. Regular faculty salaries alone are 10 million dollars. That's why we're looking at a potentially lecture-less college. We are all vulnerable.

In the 70s there was a crisis of similar magnitude, we didn't have many lecturers, and there were not enough students. In order to avoid layoffs, faculty were assigned to teach in other disciplines to save faculty jobs. A key problem will be serving freshmen, and we'll need to staff those classes. We could teach across disciplines. In this crisis, no one was fired and no programs were eliminated.

Maybe freshman aren't that important for our University. What if we eliminated or severely restrict the upcoming Freshman class for next year?

Who decides who merges and who can teach in another discipline? We should be thinking pedagogically and the groupings are coming from the Dean don't make the most pedagogical sense.

We need to keep the pressure on what the rest of the University is up to and spending money on besides AA and offering courses. There has been administrative growth in the past few years.

Where do we get that data? COBRA is supposed to get the data on what's being spent where. Why isn't that data more readily available?

There should be demonstrable equity across the different colleges regarding these cuts. This faculty member would like an explanation for why the cuts are not proportional. We want data on the allocation of funds to colleges.

TED used to have 40 TT faculty and no lecturers, and now has 20 regular faculty and over 100 lecturers, but now we bring students in that we can't serve, and lecturers are the soft spot to cut.

Are these discussions going on in other colleges?

Some faculty expressed concern about the nature of the report. Will it be just an unweighted laundry list that will give the admin fiat to do whatever they want since we're not a united front? The report should be unified and substantive.

Some faculty didn't understand what this process is about. But, it makes no sense to talk about structural change without talking about programmatic change. Maybe there are fits for undergraduate and graduate programs. It's hard to know what's going on in other programs.

Faculty don't get information from chairs and colleges. Some faculty were hearing new information coming out at this meeting. Some are just finding out about merger proposals and the loss of lecturers. Secret processes are not productive for getting quality input.

The reality is that we need to save money. But we don't have the numbers in front of us.

Town Hall meeting – Concord 10/07/09 4pm

Dianne Woods – facilitator

Susan Opp – note taker

Enrollment of lower-division students (freshmen and sophomores) should be reduced and our emphasis should go back to upper-division and transfer students, in part to reduce the necessity for remediation. We should also raise admission standards and enforce that remediation be completed at the community college level before students can transfer to East Bay. We should cut and/or cap enrollment in remediation courses but not eliminate remediation.

We should take a serious look at the cost of keeping open the Concord Campus. In particular, if we are going to continue cutting courses and student services offered to students at Concord, we need to examine if we are really appropriately serving our role. Are we disadvantaging students who are at Concord compared to Hayward.

We should examine consolidation of research courses in the social sciences, nursing, health, education, etc. to see if fewer sections may be taught and savings achieved. We should look for courses taught in different disciplines that have similar goals and approaches to see if they can be consolidated or if students can take courses taught by different departments.

We should examine the potential to combine public administration and business in a single college/school to avoid overlap or repetition.

Online courses that have enrollment caps of 30 are wasting resources from proliferation of sections when the same courses on-ground could have caps of 50-60. We should examine carefully the movement of courses online to see if fewer separate sections could be offered on-ground.

We need to examine models of online instruction and self-support instruction from other institutions like U. Phoenix and Saint Mary's College where they teach online courses with lower enrollment caps. The goal of online for many of these other institutions is to reach a different group of students or a different market. We need to examine whether or not we have appropriately or adequately targeted and marketed our online programs, particularly those on self-support. Without careful planning, moving programs/courses online and on self-support is ill-advised and may end up harming programs or costing more money rather than saving.

We need to conduct thorough needs assessments and market research before moving programs to self-support but it is not apparent this has been done. We are harming our future if we move programs to self-support without adequate planning and preparation.

If we want to be effective in online education, we need to look at our method of delivery (a long-term goal). Students are unhappy with many of our online courses, with availability of support, with lack of contact with faculty, with poor quality of online teaching, etc. Everything is not necessarily better when moved online. Faculty need more training for teaching online.

We need to examine the utility, level of usage, etc. of the Oakland Professional Center. If we plan to keep it, we need to increase what we are doing there and plan how to increase usage, or consider closing it.

We should examine whether or not faculty need office telephones or whether adequate communication can occur via email.

The nursing program continues to grow and demand support courses, but nursing grads can't get jobs. In addition, teachers can't get jobs so now the education program is shrinking. We seem to be in the wrong parts of the cycle for the programs we're trying to grow. We need to increase our emphasis on proactive and forward planning, rather than reacting to current job trends that may be short-lived.

We need to examine the commitment of the university to graduate and professional programs vs. undergraduate programs. We need a way to improve communication and efficiencies in our professional and graduate programs, for example by having a council of graduate and professional program chairs.

We need to examine our dedication to providing a summer schedule. What are the costs vs. benefits of moving the summer (in whole or in part) to self-support?

In general, need to look at refocusing our efforts on doing fewer things that we can do well and do efficiently instead of trying to be all things to everyone and not doing them well. We are stretching ourselves too thin by constantly chasing new ideas when we are facing decreasing enrollment and budgets.

We need to look at what differentiates us from SFSU & SJSU in terms of what we do better and capitalize on those things and not try to be like the bigger campuses.

If we need to teach more large classes, we need to look at ways to provide support personnel and how to ensure the quality of those support people (like TA's).

Summary of responses to Town Hall talking points on Academic Restructuring,  
October 8, 9-11am, Hayward campus.

Moderator: Eric Suess, Note-taker: Michael Lee

Relax course requirements to permit satisfying options by taking courses from other departments (with or without cross-listing) so as to progress that program's degree completion while supporting other programs (has advantages when one department's majors cannot get classes due to their being filled while other departments courses have room for further enrolment and/or may be at risk of cancellation).

The administration must recognize that lowering costs will likely produce reductions in the services offered to students and the quality of their education and explicitly state this, not try to hide it.

A \$10 million budget shortfall for 09-10 is a major problem and will undoubtedly require faculty layoffs and reduced services to students. Academic realignment means the elimination of programs. However, we should not consider eliminating any program as a short-term budget-balancing measure; rather this should be based on a long-term consideration of student needs and quality of instruction, taking a minimum of a 10 year perspective. If we cut programs, this means less choice for students, many of whom do not have viable alternatives to coming to CSUEB for their education. This must be considered carefully against the mission of the university. Elimination of programs must be the last resort.

When assessing the value of a program, we must not simply use the number of majors as the yardstick, rather take a complete look at the number of majors, the service of the program to GE, the faculty contribution to governance, and the professional activities and revenues generated for the university (e.g. grants) (like an RTP process for the program).

We seem to be moving rapidly toward making changes and it is very important that faculty governance can respond to these changes. Mergers or eliminations of programs or departments seem to be on the horizon and this needs good faculty governance, especially by CAPR and CIC which need clear policies to guide them and roles to play.

We need to recognize that quality of our service has already declined due to past cuts, leaving us with a student body deficient in writing, reading and mathematics, requiring remediation. We need to review the WST in the light of this, perhaps requiring it be completed in the first quarter at CSUEB and making it a basis for students to be able to continue taking classes from the catalog i.e. GE and major classes.

Small programs being evaluated by majors alone is not appropriate. There appears to be a new vision that this institution is STEM-oriented but we must not forget the role played by programs and departments outside STEM. If we agree that indeed this is our vision/mission (and we should debate that broadly and fully), then we should also recognize the service of non-STEM programs to this goal. For this we need a clear set of standards and measures that enables an appropriate allocation of resources and ensures program continuity for STEM and non-STEM alike.

Faculty, in the years prior to this budget crisis, have operated in an atmosphere of collegial friendship, therefore pursuing drastic cuts may lead to division and infighting without clearly communicated standards on which to base any academic restructuring.

Any push to make changes in the short-term may be better viewed or received if it is clear that they are meant to be temporary with a clear commitment to reversing them contingent on a change in funding.

This will require some kind of contractual obligation that provides security that a change may be reversed if not considered to be desirable or beneficial in the long-term.

Professional and graduate programs need mechanisms for communication to determine synergistic opportunities for collaboration, to remove redundancies and overlaps, and to co-sponsor classes that meet multiple program needs.

One potential model that might bear looking at is the proposal to create a School of Arts, Media and Music within CLASS. This will allow for the saving of costs, for example by having a single Director but with individual Coordinators and through sharing of staff and facilities that can be better utilized. It can also preserve essential requirements such as software, technical support, media labs, etc. against further cuts since they will be more fully utilized. The new structure would allow for program integrity, maintain existing RTP arrangements, etc.

Chairs across colleges have little opportunity for information exchange. There are few opportunities for Chairs to meet without Administrators present. There should be an intra-university Council of Chairs to promote cooperation and synergy.

Faculty governance capabilities must be realigned to allow faculty decision-making to move as quickly as the university Administration.

The university Administration and Chancellor should be encouraged to fight more forcefully to restore adequate levels of funding for the CSU.

Administrative cuts along with cuts to student affairs have been timely and appropriate but need to be followed by cuts in university advancement with a shift in these duties to staff in the President's office. The administration of CSUEB is too packed with vice-presidents and other high-cost elements and these should be cut equal to (proportional to) expected cuts in programs and, where possible, before cutting programs which should be a last-resort measure.

Transparent accounting of administration expenses must be made available to faculty so that they can aid in identifying how and where administration reductions might be achieved.

Faculty need to discuss a comprehensive vision of curriculum for the campus as a whole.

We must consider the effect on lecturers of academic reorganization and the elimination, for example, of Chair positions. Program realignment with one chair where there were two or three may leave lecturers without advocates and thus needs to be taken into account – could affect issues of grievance, diversity, etc.

What models exist out there from similar institutions that have faced our challenges and have crafted responses – what can we learn, for example, from Louisiana State?

We should incentivize individual faculty who wish to help manage the enrollment problem by taking on larger class sizes over and above recognized norms and who still maintain the quality of their instruction – at present, there is no incentive to do so. Rewarding faculty, recognizing that all things being equal, this has reduced the cost for the university of hiring additional faculty, would be cost-effective and efficient.

Would running our summer program through self-support i.e. extension, result in significant cost-savings and/or revenue increases?



Is it cheaper, on a per-FTES basis, to educate a given number of students on a semester system than a quarter system and is this therefore a long-term consideration? What would the short-term implications be economically?

We should address the disparity between programs that have large numbers of majors and those that do not but rather provide service classes to the university with respect to advising loads.

We need policies and procedures that allow us to implement more student advising at the department level and reduce duplication with centralized advising. The point was made that many faculty are not actually implementing the advising for which they are being credited and thus there exists capacity to shift advising that is actually happening in the Student Center for Academic Achievement back to the departments without requiring more resources to be allocated to those departments.

Better systems for facilitating advisement i.e. People Soft, made available to faculty, would increase the ability to provide students with good guidance, leading to faster graduation with less unnecessary units taken and thus a greater throughput of students for a given number of class offerings, all things equal. Enrollment could thus remain higher for a given level of course offerings.

When we undertake any academic reorganization, we must bear in mind and look for negative feedback in which a short-term measure actually might lead to increased costs or decreased efficiency in the future e.g. cutting a particular service might lead to slower times to graduation and higher costs for the university.

**Reorganization Town Hall Notes**  
**Friday, 10/9/09, 11 am**

In Attendance: Nan Maxwell, Jen Eagan, Dianne Rush Woods, Holly Vugia, Michelle Pensky-Brock, Jim Murphy, Tom Hird, Bridget Ford, Vish Hegde, Felix Herndon, Julie Glass, Ken Kyle, Gilberto Arriaza, Vahid Fodar

Process questions:

Why are we only looking at AA?

Does the task force have any budget information about how to cut, salary and staff savings?

Dianne claimed that we want to talk about what we know (AA), and that we want to be proactive.

One faculty member suggested that we do a preemptive strike, that the Academic Senate develop a statement of core values that we must maintain to provide for academic programs, so that we can still be an academic institution and not a financial one. We are obligated to provide an academic institution for our students and community.

1) Science has found a way to teach a lot of GE students in one classroom. This presumably allows them to provide smaller classes in their programs. There could be opportunities for us to re-do GE to serve more students more efficiently in those kinds of classes so there would be left over \$ for programmatic classes. 2) CLASS has lots of departments of various sizes. Could we reduce the number of colleges? Would this create cost savings? Where do we put the programs that we have, and how could they work together? 3) 4 departments in CLASS have had some interesting discussions about synergy (COMM and the arts). They haven't found a lot of cost savings yet, but synergies are there. It may in the future be possible for us to do more with less.

There is a 2 step restructuring that would save money. 1) The Deans should look at department structure. This structure has a silo effect where no one knows what everyone else is doing in their College. ED has 5 departments, and they duplicate curriculum and even research. CEAS doesn't need departments. Getting rid of chairs and staff would have real savings. 2) Maybe we could consolidate Colleges. We could create more of a community of learners. 3) Look at the head of the organization and look at what is being duplicated, and reallocate personnel. VPs could go, we have way too many.

In terms of academic restructuring, what percentage of the money goes to AA? 1/4<sup>th</sup> really go to the Colleges? We need this information. If we close programs, what savings do we really get? These decisions should be data driven. 2) Centralization has pros and cons, just look at IT. A certain amount of marketing allows students to gain their identity from a program, but there could be some consolidation. We lose out on real educational quality if we cut programs, so they had better be worth it.

Best practices for increasing class sizes? We will need to manage workload. We could build in a service component for upperclass students to serve as TAs and readers and get academic credit and have educational merit. Similar to the Library model, we should have support for web design to get more services online, like for advising. Having a technical person assigned to each department for web help would make info and advising more efficient.

Dissolution of departments has a cost, but one faculty member claimed that they had experience of an erosion of departments leading to tyranny, loss of disciplinary and faculty autonomy, but cost savings.

The way efficiency is defined in AA needs to be reevaluated. Money savings in AA has costs to student welfare, this should be the focus of our discussion. If the change doesn't have educational merits for our students, then we shouldn't do it.

Communication is critical. Sometimes we don't let people know what we're doing and how great we are. If people don't understand why AA 25% of the budget, then make the admin tell us how the rest of the money is being spent. Deans could send faculty representatives to Mo and demand the numbers. We need to know the admin's priorities. We need transparency.

Dianne reported out an e-mail from a faculty member:

Please remember students of color, socio-economic class, and maintain our commitment to diversity and service to vulnerable populations. We need to think about how changes will impact access

Central admin has pressured us to go online and to continuing education. On-line is great, but not critical. It requires resources and is really more expensive. Both raise equity questions, higher fees and technology requirements. On-line is also more teaching and time intensive. However, online can be more accessible for some.

We need to protect our disciplines. They give structure to what students learn. Disciplinary integrity is how we organize knowledge. Students like the different approaches. Mushing everything together has costs in terms of knowledge. The diversity of disciplines on campus contributes to our students' learning. We still need to be a University and maintain the distinction between different lines of inquiry. The structure of knowledge in disciplines is enriching.

Departments are not the same as disciplines. We need to imagine new intersections and ways to preserve our integrity of the disciplines. But, we don't need departments to do this. We should try to prevent silos.

We don't want to lose our disciplinary integrity, which is not identical to departments.

If we were to eliminate every single department office, we still wouldn't save enough money to get us out of our budget hole. What could we propose besides just thinking about departmental and college structures? None of this tackles the real

We have been given a false charge, and it's frustrating. The budget situation is of a greater magnitude than this conversation merits. Faculty salaries is the only pot of money in AA big enough to make a difference, and no one wants to talk about that.

Freshman courses could be united under one umbrella, and take a complement of courses and regular faculty can take them on. Departments are organizing structures, but not programs. Programs need to be saved. Departments can contribute to curriculum more than courses.

We're looking at recommendations, and incremental changes. We're talking about deep and narrow cuts to programs. But there are other suggestions that came from other:

Shutting down the Concord Campus

Look at summer session

Budget town halls for transparency, ask Shawn to keep doing them

Get the financials online

You cannot look at structure without looking at culture. Cultural change is more meaningful and longer lasting. The structure is just an instrument, but we have to address the issue of culture. Let's establish a set of fundamental principles that will guide our actions. Don't let a crisis go to waste. Let's rethink the

ways that we work. Our culture is dysfunctional. The thrust of action should be cultural, and we need to put students at the center of our concern. Let's look at retention and graduate rates. We are one of the worst in the CSU. Let's see how we can improve these numbers. If the structure hurt our aims, then let's do away with it.

Interdisciplinarity is great, but we should beware that the admin. can do what they want and use this faculty forum as cover.

The boogey man is real. We have to make sure that this process doesn't lead to the admin using us to shoot ourselves in the foot. They are the enemy. We have to make sure that what comes out of this town hall, and the combining of programs doesn't lead to the elimination of faculty. We don't want our suggestions used against us or to be seen as an endorsement of what the admin eventually does. Admin wants to divide and conquer, and make sure that we're not squabbling over crumbs. Let's eliminate the Concord Campus, it's a big bite and not tinkering around the edges. Budget forums need to not be dog and pony shows. Shawn MUST take questions and answer them seriously.

Can students come first? Maybe the faculty come first! Without us, we couldn't be a University and we wouldn't have any students. Smushing everything together like CSUMB seems like a mess. Is radical reorg with it? Faculty is the sine qua non and should be preserved at all other costs.

Maybe Concord needs to be used differently. It does entail access issues. Maybe it could house professional studies. And the same with the Oakland Center.

If we are a low performing campus, what does this mean? What part does AA play in this? Is it the case that we have more senior faculty? What are the measures and how can we improve our performance? And what is the role of academics in that?

Add a Golden Handshake, or other incentive for retirement.

Summarizing three points:

- 1) Granted, disciplines are not the same as departments.
- 2) What are the modes of efficiency? What are the opportunities to increase % of && going to the classroom?
- 3) Why ax programs? What are the savings? How will these be justified?

What are the measures of efficiency?

*Appendix C - Faculty Feedback via survey ending on October 30, 2009*

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| 10/23/2009 | i like it very much  |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 | It's understandable that faculty want to protect faculty and want to protect their own disciplines, but the town halls did not seem to generate the sorts of bold, transformative ideas that we need right now. Each program should be looking to justify its existence, in terms of numbers of students impacted (whether through majors, service courses, or GE), workforce preparation, cost efficiencies, etc. The faculty need to develop guidelines for program continuation, not just for program discontinuation. Sadly, this is the situation we are in right now, and it will not end any time soon.   |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 | <p>Closing the Concord campus seems obvious. But the political fallout in Contra Costa county may be severe.</p> <p>As distasteful as it seems, shuttering feel-good programs created since the crisis in the 70's seems to be the only way to save real money (by eliminating tenured faculty salaries).</p> <p>Another idea for potential cost savings may be to use more work-study students to do facilities and grounds maintenance.</p> <p>This University is known to the community for strong programs in Business, Teacher Education, and Music. Those programs should not be made to suffer lest we lose the support of the community. (I'm not from one of those departments)</p> |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 |  |

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 | An additional savings could be realized by combining the code requirement and Areas C and/or D in the GE program. Most/many other institutions already do this; our native students are held to a different standard than transfer students. By counting the code requirement in GE, the number of required courses for graduation would be reduced (and the cost associated with them).   |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 | <p>Why are all the cuts being proposed to faculty-intensive areas? Why do we need so many Vice-Presidents and Associate Deans? You could cut 5 administrative positions and fund 10 FTE tenure-track faculty plus some lecturers.</p> <p>Why isn't anyone looking at the move to Division II athletics? NOW is NOT the time. Anybody who believes that fees are funding the move is smoking wacky weed. The university HAS to do a transparent report for the NCAA; faculty leadership should look at it and realize the amounts going to a very small number of students (athletes) while greater numbers of students are underserved due to lecturer/faculty/course offering cuts.</p> <p>Administration is abusing this crisis to make fundamental changes that will break any pretense of shared governance. Decreased pay, increased workloads, and tyrannical power in the hands of the administration are the result. We will become drones doing as we are told, and will be told we should be glad to get what we get. Are we so terrified of our own future that there is nothing we will refuse to do? If so, we deserve what we get.</p> |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 | <p>In my opinion the best options are:</p> <p>Low Difficulty/High Impact</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Downscaling of Summer Quarter programming</li> <li>2. Reduction of freshmen class and increased emphasis on transfer students</li> <li>3. Increase of academic standards for admissions</li> <li>4. Reassignment of faculty between departments</li> <li>5. Combination and elimination of academic departments and degrees</li> </ol> <p>High Difficulty/High Impact</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conversion to semester system</li> <li>2. Closing of Concord Campus</li> </ol>  |

|            |  |
|------------|--|
|            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Closing of Oakland Center</li> <li>4. Conversion of Summer Quarter to self-support</li> <li>5. Assigning of regular faculty to teach freshman courses</li> <li>6. Reductions of numbers of remedial courses</li> <li>7. Reduction of numbers of lecturers</li> <li>8. Reevaluation of enrollment capacities for on-ground instruction</li> <li>9. Golden handshake and other retirement incentives for senior faculty</li> </ol> <p>Low Difficulty/Low Impact</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Creation of large research methods courses in related disciplines</li> <li>2. Evaluation of cost-effectiveness of on-line versus on-ground instruction</li> <li>3. Evaluation of strategies/efficiency of self-support</li> <li>4. Cross-listing of courses and incorporation of multiple extra-departmental academic offerings into Majors</li> <li>5. Creation of University-wide Council of Chairs for programmatic consultation</li> <li>6. Creation of Council of Graduate Coordinators and/or Chairs for greater synergies and efficiencies in graduate education</li> <li>7. Cross-College teaching assignments</li> <li>8. Removal of automatic long distance call privileges for office telephones</li> </ol> <p>High Difficulty/Low Impact</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Merging of programs based on disciplinary synergies</li> <li>2. Merging of departments</li> <li>3. Decrease in number of course redundancies</li> <li>4. Decrease in number of colleges</li> <li>5. Elimination of department structures</li> <li>6. Introduction of large courses with T.A., reader, and/or technical support</li> <li>7. Branding of select University assets</li> <li>8. Reassignment of faculty between departments</li> <li>9. Incentives for faculty to teach large sections</li> </ol> |
| 10/23/2009 | <p>Creating a College of Health and Human Services or College of Professional Studies/Programs and moving the graduate professional programs out of CLASS may be viewed as a costly step, the the cost of not having a more rational grouping of programs is even higher. Grouping like programs will allow the programs to share courses, create a true community of faculty/learners, and solve a number of the management issues that exist within CLASS. Health care is one the strongest areas for growth and a College of Health and Human Services has a very good chance of developing self-support degree and certificate programs. This would benefit the entire University since the University as a whole would take its "cut" of the generated "profits." Self-support offerings could help subsidize GE offerings.</p>   |

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| 10/23/2009 | <p>I think that the faculty should hold the administration accountable for the cuts they are making. Courses should be the last thing to cut, and our campus is very top heavy. We haven't seen layoff at the top, but we have been talking about faculty layoffs. This is out of order.</p> <p>We need full budget accountability. Every dollar spent by all units online with quarterly updates.</p> <p>We need to consider taking a big bite rather than continuing to trim courses. Close Concord, cancel the building of the parking structure and stadium renovation, suspend Athletics. Courses and getting people to degree is our core function. Anything not directly contributing to this part of the mission needs to be cut to the bone.</p> <p>And for heaven's sake, we cannot cut programs! Each program offered on campus contributes to the overall mission of the University. Once cut, they won't come back and we'll lose diversity in terms of students, faculty, and ideas. Student choice and the well-roundedness of our offerings CANNOT suffer.</p> |
| 10/23/2009 | <p>Reassignment of faculty between departments is listed under both "high difficulty / low impact" and "low difficulty / high impact".</p> <p>The summary of faculty proposals is generally too broad to actually do anything.</p>   |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/23/2009 |  |
| 10/24/2009 |  |
| 10/24/2009 |  |
| 10/24/2009 |  |
| 10/24/2009 | <p>The Task Force should have been given a different charge that included consideration of programs and how they should be re-structured, combined, eliminated, etc. If we don't tackle the heart of the problem, we will be completely ineffective. Also, we need to move faster. Our faculty governance process is too slow compared to the decision-making processes of our administration. If we can't be more effective and faster, we will have no input into the outcomes.</p>  |
| 10/24/2009 |  |
| 10/24/2009 |  |
| 10/24/2009 |  |
| 10/24/2009 |  |



|            |  |
|------------|--|
| 10/24/2009 | Great job initiating discussion and seeking faculty input. I was upset that I was unable to attend the TownHalls, but I see that some good work was accomplished.  |
| 10/25/2009 |  |
| 10/26/2009 | <p>I think that lecturers really need to be cut, as much as necessary to protect tenure track faculty.</p> <p>Professional programs need to be protected and not viewed in the same manner as non-cohort undergraduate programs.</p> <p>The Concord campus could become a Saturday only or hybrid only program.</p>  |
| 10/26/2009 |  |
| 10/27/2009 | The report is not really a report. It is just a summary of a vast number of ideas, with no evaluation of the ideas and no proposals on how to move forward. It seems that this is only a beginning.  |
| 10/27/2009 |  |
| 10/28/2009 | <p>I think these are extraordinary times and it is not the administration's fault. We do need to think how to do things more effectively. After reading the feedback, I was struck with how hard people are working not to change rather than searching for solutions to real problems.</p> <p>This is not simply going away. Things are bad now but they are going to get worse before they get better.</p> <p>The University is in the business of educating students. It is not in the business of making sure professors get to do what they want to do. We need to keep the needs of the students in our focus. Students need to be educated. How best to do that is not necessarily how we have done it in the past.</p> <p>Comments made about online education are misinformed. Many online classes have 50 students in them as well. There are ways to make that work for both the students and faculty. Is it the preferred way to have online classes, no. But I venture a bet that not many faculty would opt for 50-150 student classes either.</p> <p>Online provides students who cannot come to campus (working more than one job, have a family with small children, are disabled, working shift work). Many of our students fall into this category.</p> <p>Online is succeeding because it meets a need. Is it right for everyone, no but it is right for many of our working students.</p> |
| 10/29/2009 |  |
| 10/30/2009 |  |

## Lecturer input

As a lecturer, I'd like to echo the comments on page 11 of the notes to the effect that efforts to eliminate lecturers are foolish. While it may be true that not all lecturers are as qualified as tenured faculty, many have all of the appropriate academic qualifications such as the Ph.D. and have many years of successful classroom experience. Not only that, it costs the University substantially less to employ lecturers than regular faculty so their use saves the University money and accordingly expands the number of classes the campus can offer to students. So, i too would like to know where the pressure to do away with lecturers is coming from. In any case, if the University really wants to reduce the number and/or proportion of lecturers in the faculty, there is a simple but radical solution: promote *academically qualified* lecturers to tenure track status.

.....

I have a few comments about this report.

First, I was very pleased to see that "Provision of detailed breakdown of the CSUEB budget covering all units at the University" was mentioned as a ground rule for academic procedure. Also, people brought up this broad issue a number of times at the Town Hall meetings. We really do need to focus on cutting in areas outside of Academic Affairs. It looks like nearly all of the cuts thus far have been to Academic Affairs. We need to keep pressure on the Administration to release this budget, and then to make cuts in appropriate areas there. We should have the budget already, and should have had it before the Town Hall meetings----As it was, we were operating in the dark in terms of figuring out what to cut.

Second, someone in the first Town Hall meeting mentioned looking for funding sources rather than trying to cut-----great idea.

Third, if we need to reduce instructional faculty, the focus should be on retirement incentives such as the Golden Handshake rather than cutting more Lecturers. Lecturers cost much less than senior faculty. Keeping Lecturers allows the University to offer more course sections in a more cost-efficient way. I don't understand why the Golden Handshake is listed as "high difficulty." It seems like it should be low difficulty. If it's because the Chancellor's Office is resistant, we should put pressure on the Chancellor's Office to offer these incentives. Additionally, we have already lost a lot of Lecturers at our campus-----between Fall 2008 and Fall 2009 we lost 17% of our Lecturers (headcount), and more have been told that they do not have work in Winter 2010 .

.....

1. Golden Handshake is a non-starter (Chancellor's against it and it costs a huge amount).
2. Removing telephones won't save money since we have our own PBX.
3. By emphasizing only AA, the committee enables the non-AA folks to determine AA total cut.

There should be a strong statement about preserving academics for students/faculty/mission/future above all.