

## Academic Senate Guidelines for Responding to Budget Cuts

### Senators:

In response to the unprecedented decisions that the college needs to make regarding cuts due to the budget, the officers have assembled the following document for you to read, review, and distribute to the faculty in your division. We ask that you use this as a guide to inform and lead faculty in deliberating about the budget.

This comprehensive document provides background information and explanations of how shared governance, budget, and instructional offerings interact. This document can be divided into several sections.

The first section (pages 2-6) describes two aspects of shared governance for budgetary decisions: the nature of decisions made and the feedback loop.

The second section (page 7) is a written form of the Vice President's directive to the division deans to develop reduction plans for each division. Most division deans have already engaged their faculty in discussion about these reductions, and the deans will be directed by Vice President Espinosa-Pieb to inform their divisions of the final plans submitted after faculty feedback regarding the cuts (as agreed to in IPBT on November 17, 2009).

The third section (pages 8-9) contains information regarding the concept of enrollment management, which is how colleges manage enrollment when resources are not limitless. It is vital to understand this last section because this forms the basis of a college's policies not only in the nature of courses, programs and degrees offered, but also in student access to, and success in, them.

Lastly, if any of aspect of this document is not clear, *please do not hesitate to contact any of the Academic Senate officers*. We appreciate the time and effort you have been willing to give to address this topic.

Best,

The Officers of the Academic Senate

- Anne Argyriou, President
- Cynthia Lee-Klawender, Vice President
- Paul Setziol, Executive Secretary-Treasurer

## Academic Senate Guidelines for Responding to Budget Cuts

### Senators:

As stated in the Senate meeting on November 16, 2009, it is not the function of the Senate to indicate to the divisions which areas should be preserved and which areas should be cut. Given the varying nature of the many degree, certificate, and other programs we offer, it is the *faculty in each of these departments (or programs) and divisions who need to make these decisions.*

### Shared Governance Process – Nature of Decisions for Various Committees

[Same information on chart in the next two pages]

#### Department or Program Level

At this level, faculty should identify the students whom their classes or programs serve. This information can be found in the data reports used in the Program Reviews.

Then the faculty should examine the reduction target (number of sections to be cut), to see:

- Are there expenses in your programs that could be reduced instead of cutting sections?
- Which programs could sustain those cuts without threatening the program's viability?
- Which cuts would prevent their target populations from enrolling into, or completing, the program?
- Do courses overlap or cover similar content?  
Ideally, everyone should be able to identify a clear distinction between those courses, so that a program is not "competing against itself" for students.

#### Division Level

At this level, the various programs and departments within a division report what cuts they could handle, and more importantly, which cuts they could not, and the effects of those cuts.

- How would these cuts affect students in the program? division? college?
- How would these cuts affect the integrity of these programs?
- What would be the ramifications of those losses – both temporary (short term) and permanent (long term)?
- Also, are there any duplication of courses/programs?
- Considering all of these questions, should any of the cuts be shifted to other areas?

## Academic Senate Guidelines for Responding to Budget Cuts

### Instructional Planning & Budget Team Level

At this level, IPBT will review the proposed cuts in an overall way to see how they would affect the campus.

- Would any group of students benefit or be harmed? Would any programs that are valuable to the community be too badly compromised due to cuts?
- Is any one division supporting priorities that are not defensible (such as duplicating services)?

IPBT then develops a recommendation regarding the overall impact of proposed cuts across the area of instruction.

### College Council Level

At this level, the Council reviews the recommendations of all three PBTs to determine the overall impact of the cuts on the college. In doing so, the College Council should preserve the College's ability to fulfill its primary mission: offering courses and programs of instruction, while providing both the support students need and the necessary infrastructure and staff to maintain a well-run campus.

## Shared Governance Process – Nature of Decisions for Various Committees

[summarized in chart format]

Group & Level	Nature of Decision	Guiding Questions
<b>Department or Program Level</b>	<p>At this level, faculty should review the group(s) of students whom their classes or programs serve. This info can be found in the data reports used in the Program Reviews.</p>	<p>Then the faculty should examine the reduction target (number of sections to be cut), to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which programs could sustain those cuts without threatening the program’s viability?</li> <li>• Which cuts would prevent their target populations from enrolling into or completing the program?</li> <li>• Do courses overlap or cover similar content? Ideally, everyone should be able to identify a clear distinction between those courses, so that a program is not “competing against itself” for students.</li> <li>• Are there other types of expenses in your programs that could be reduced instead of cutting sections?</li> </ul>
<b>Division</b>	<p>At this level, the various programs and departments within a division report what cuts they could handle, and more importantly, which cuts they could not, and the effects of those cuts.</p>	<p>What would be the overall mix of offerings from the division?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who (which students? faculty?) would lose what?</li> <li>• What programs or areas would be lost?</li> <li>• What would be the ramifications of those losses – both temporary (short term) and permanent (long term)?</li> <li>• Also, are there any duplication of courses/ programs?</li> </ul> <p>Considering all of these questions, should any of the cuts be shifted to other areas?</p>

## Shared Governance Process – Nature of Decisions for Various Committees

[summarized in chart format]

Group & Level	Nature of Decision	Guiding Questions
<b>Instructional Planning &amp; Budget Team</b>	<p>At this level, IPBT will review the proposed cuts in an overall way to see how they would affect the campus.</p> <p>IPBT then develops a recommendation regarding the overall impact of proposed cuts across the area of instruction.</p>	<p>What would be the overall mix of instructional programs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would any one particular group of students benefit at the expense of another? Would any programs that are valuable to the community be too badly compromised due to cuts?</li> <li>• Is any one division supporting priorities that are not defensible (such as duplicating services)?</li> <li>• Has any one division been negatively affected to a greater degree than the others?</li> <li>• Should then, any of the target amounts be shifted elsewhere?</li> </ul>
<b>College Council</b>	<p>At this level, the Council reviews the recommendations of all three PBTs to determine the overall impact of the cuts on the college.</p> <p>The College Council would then make a recommendation to the College President.</p>	<p>The idea would be to determine how the cuts would shape the College:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• whom the College would serve,</li> <li>• whom would it not,</li> <li>• what services would be reduced,</li> <li>• how would that affect the College’s ability to function, to fulfill its primary mission: offering courses and programs of instruction, while providing both the support students need and the necessary infrastructure and staff to maintain a well-run campus.</li> </ul>

**Notes or Questions:**

## Academic Senate Guidelines for Responding to Budget Cuts

### Shared Governance Process – Reduction Amounts & Feedback

[This info is not on the charts]

Essentially, what happens is a bottom-up type of budget deliberations:

- The Senior Administrators (College President and VPs) determine a “target” amount for each area (Instruction, Student Services, and Finance) to reduce. The target amount may be stated in dollars, FTES, FTEF, or positions.
- Those proposals are vetted through Campus Budget.
- Then the Vice President of each area divides the cut in as equitable a manner as possible within that area.
- At the division level, ideally, the dean would present the division with the target amount and should then ask departments to come up with a share of the amount in some manner that is equitable .
- Faculty then should analyze those target amounts to determine whether the target amounts for reduction would harm their programs, and provide feedback to their deans and to the Academic Senate about their analysis.
- That feedback goes to Instructional Planning & Budget Team, which then deliberates on the cuts suggested.
- All of the Planning & Budget Teams share their compilations with College Council, which then reviews the final plans, and presents its recommendation to the College President.

## Academic Senate Guidelines for Responding to Budget Cuts

### Senators:

The previous five pages described the processes and deliberations at a shared governance level.

The following three pages contain fundamental guidelines for faculty who are discussing how to best deliberate on cuts in the area of instructional offerings (courses, programs). Please ask faculty in your divisions to consider these questions when discussing various possible reductions.

First, though, is the specific request from the Vice President to the division deans. Next are some criteria for determining the severity of a cut. Last are some basics about enrollment management, which faculty need to know because it influences the curricular and programmatic offerings of a college.

### VP Instruction's Request to Divisions Fall 2009

To date, the Vice President of Instruction has requested divisions to develop cuts at three different levels.

- Phase I – the least harm (some loss, but recoverable in the immediate future)
- Phase II – more harm (loss, and recovery doubtful in the short term)
- Phase III – the greatest harm (probable permanent damage to a program, no recovery)

In addition, the Vice President of Instruction also asked that divisions provide the following information for their proposed reductions:

- the rationale for those cuts
- the impact or effect of those cuts

The phrases added after the dashes are from the De Anza Academic Senate to help clarify the distinction between those phases. It is up to the divisions to determine what constitutes a cut at the each of the levels. What one division may consider a Phase I, a similar sort of cut may have implications on the level of Phase II for a different division.

While the rationale and impact were asked for regarding the division's overall cuts, each department or program should answer those questions for their own areas and provide that information as well, partly to educate others about the nature of their department or program, and partly to aid in their deliberations.

## Academic Senate Guidelines for Responding to Budget Cuts

### Negative Impact: Identify the course offerings necessary to a program.

Departments (or programs) will need to determine to what level courses, sections, and non-teaching personnel can be cut *without significant negative impact to the program*. Negative impact could mean (these are *examples only*, rather than a final, comprehensive definition) any part or combination of the following:

- students unable to complete program within 2 or 3 years (depending on the comprehensiveness or preparation needed)
- reduction in courses that are used/needed for programs in other disciplines (e.g. abnormal psych needed for criminal justice?)

This is a vital part of the process because the dollar amounts derived above may not be equitable in the terms of harm done to programs within a division. If that is the case, then the division would need to discuss whether to shift some part of the cuts to another program within that division better able to sustain that level of cuts.

### Limited Resources: Some basics about Enrollment Management

- **The total number of students is usually finite** (unless the State asks community colleges to “grow” or increase their enrollment beyond their usual number).
- This means that the number of students we can serve is pre-set; however, how those students are distributed across the departments and divisions is determined by each college.
- Usually that distribution of students is determined by a programmatic mix: basic skills, transfer/general education, career technical education, and lifelong learning. The proportions of these types of courses vary from year to year, but do not change dramatically unless we experience anomalous, extreme variations in funding or enrollment.
- The programmatic mix is determined by a consensus about the priorities of the college, division faculty, and department / program faculty. *See the following page for a framework to establish those priorities.*
- **Note: a finite number of students** means that **when departments add programs**, then the department will **need to reduce other courses offered** in that department.



### Academic Senate Considerations for Enrollment Management

The following is a set of questions to consider when contemplating Enrollment Management decisions. They are a follow up to the Enrollment Management information distributed at the July 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. Academic Senate will discuss in some detail in the upcoming July 27, 2009 meeting.

#### Role of Academic Senates in EM

##### Key role in defining EM decisions

- Philosophy – what groups of students should be most/least affected? Why?
  - Single course takers?
  - Summer students (from 4 year universities)?
  - Specific under-represented/targeted populations?
  - Basic Skills?
  - Transfer? [added 11-16-09]
  - Career – Technical Education students?
  - Certificate (non-degree, non-transfer) students?
  - Students who already hold a B.A. degree? Re-training?
- Process – when and how are EM decisions enacted?
  - What timeline is optimal for planning?
  - How can decisions be proactive – planned, thoughtful?
  - Who needs to be consulted? By when? Why?
- Criteria – what guidelines or measures do we use to determine what to reduce and by how much?
  - Productivity should not be the only factor
  - Core courses, electives, enrichment
  - To consider whether which are core courses:
    - program requirements (*certificates, external exams*)
    - major requirements, transfer requirements, GE pattern
    - pre-requisites, advisory courses, basic skills in English or Math, courses that prepare for college-level courses in subject area
    - external certification? external employer requirements?
  - Scheduling concerns – ensuring student continuity, success??
- Most importantly – curriculum needs to be paramount (comprehensive & balanced), while maintaining student access & success

These are based on Academic Senate for the California Community College papers on Enrollment Management. For more information, please review the following two links:

"The Role of Academic Senates in Enrollment Management" (1999)  
<[http://www.asccc.org/Publications/Papers/Role\\_enrollment.html](http://www.asccc.org/Publications/Papers/Role_enrollment.html)>  
"Enrollment Management Revisited" (2009) see Appendix J  
<<http://www.asccc.org/Events/sessions/spring2009/materials.html>>