March 25, 2010

Subject: Summary Narrative to Accompany Budget Reduction Scenarios

The Budget and Planning Committee has committed many hours to the task of conjuring budget reduction scenarios in response to possible budget shortfalls in the coming academic year. Our instructions were to consult actively with chairs and program coordinators on how specific academic programs would manage impact from a cut of 5%, 10% or 15% to the college budget. After considerable analysis of program enrollments and budget resources, the committee developed scenarios for each level of possible reductions, taking care to track enrollment implications for all affected programs. Our highest priority has been to maintain a curriculum balance of major courses and general education electives to accommodate student demand and meet the overall enrollment target of the College.

If the college were to face a 5% reduction, we would recommend a range of cuts that would reduce our instructional base by 5 tenure-track lines (with salary savings used to staff essential courses) and $200K in lecturer allocations. These cuts would likely result in an overall FTES reduction of 164 FTES, 108 FTES more than our projected target reduction (56 FTES) for 2010-11.

If the college were to face a 10% reduction, we would recommend an additional range of cuts that would reduce our instructional budget by 1 tenure-track line, 1 full-time lecturer line and $275K in lecturer allocations. We would anticipate an additional enrollment reduction of 222 FTES from these cuts.

If the college were to face a 15% reduction, we would recommend an additional range of cuts that would reduce our instructional base by 5 tenure-track lines, 3 full-time lecturer lines and $35K in lecturer allocations. We would anticipate an additional enrollment reduction of 153 FTES from these cuts.

The cuts would impact general education program offerings across nine areas of GE electives: A1, A2, A3, C2, C3, D2a, D2b, F2 and F3. There would also be a reduction in courses serving the LIBS major (both core and elective requirements and Integrative Inquiry electives). And every program would experience a reduction in the scheduling of required and elective courses in the major. But only at the 15% level would these reductions impact anyone’s ability to deliver an existing program, with cuts at that level likely to require the elimination of one concentration in Agricultural Studies. While these various cuts would surely reduce the number of options available to students seeking to satisfy specific degree requirements, we do not anticipate any disproportional impacts on the general education program.

Under these scenarios, we have not identified any reason to insist on deep (or “vertical”) cuts to programs. We have been careful to distribute reductions to programs in a way that preserves key course offerings within each major and a balance of course offerings within the areas of general education and Liberal Studies served by our programs. In nearly all cases we have managed to secure minimal availability of essential courses that
students need to graduate but less frequent rotation of key courses will likely delay progress to graduation for a number of our students. While it may be possible in many instances to accommodate displaced students in existing sections of courses, the college clearly deserves to secure a proportional share of stimulus funding to close the enrollment gap caused by these reductions if we are serious about facilitating timely progress to degree. These stimulus funds will become increasingly essential the larger our reduction. No doubt our faculty will endeavor to manage these reduced base resources as effectively as possible, both to address student demand within programs and to meet the enrollment target assigned to our college. At the higher levels there would be significant impacts on access to the classes our students need for graduation.

The cuts projected here in our scenarios, especially at the 10-15% levels, will result in increased class size, reduced access to key classes, and diminished educational quality. These cuts will make it more difficult for faculty to pursue scholarly and teaching-related research, and to remain self-assured experts in their fields of study. Further cuts will continue to change the faces of the students we serve (reducing access and retention rates for targeted groups) and are likely to alter our university’s mission, as the students hit hardest will be economically disadvantaged and first-generation college students, a large percentage of whom are Hispanic. Prestigious outside agencies have recognized CSU Stanislaus for our success with a diverse population of students, and these accolades have enhanced our reputation nationally: The American Association of Colleges and Universities notes that we are one of twelve universities nationally that demonstrate exceptional performance in improving retention and graduation rates (over 80% for first-time freshman); and WASC notes that our strength lies in small class sizes and low percentage of student debt at graduation, doubtless factors that led the Princeton Review to name us one of the 165 best values in higher education. These hard-won laurels wither and fall away as class sizes increase, frequency of course offerings diminish, and students cannot be retained or get the classes they need to progress to graduation in a timely manner. In the process, the classroom becomes more and more the province of adjunct instructors and professors lacking sufficient time to produce scholarship and provide individual attention and mentoring to students. Reducing access, quality and diversity fly in the face our University mission, and should only occur under the most trying circumstances when all other available avenues to budget reduction have been implemented.

While we’ve quantified these cuts in terms of FTES and number of courses lost, the less tangible effects are severe.