

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES ASSEMBLY  
Minutes  
Meeting of 18 March 2003  
OAKLAND ROOM, OAKLAND CENTER

Attendance

Members Present: *Wallis Andersen, Robert Anderson, Dikka Berven, Art Bull, Ronald Butzlaff, Jane Eberwein, Jerrold Grossman, Fay Hansen, Abdi Kusow, Tamara Machmut-Jhashi, Karen Miller, Ingrid Rieger, Darrell Schmidt, Jill Zeilstra-Ryalls, Xiangqun Zeng*

Ex Officio Present: *David Downing, William Macauley, Mary Papazian*

Members Not Present: *Peter Bertocci, Mary Eberly, David Garfinkle, Elysa Koppelman, Paul Kubicek, Rose Letsholo, Emmett Lombard, Barbara Mabee, Mark Metzler, Michael Mitchell, Sean Moran, Irwin Schochetman, Jack Tsui, Susan Wood*

Guests: *Nancy Joseph*

Dean Downing called the meeting to order at 3:35.

1. Approval of minutes from the meeting of February 18, 2003.

***Moved to approve the minutes from February 18, 2003*** (Jane Eberwein). Supported.

The minutes were modified by removing the sentence before Dean Downing's response under #6, Good and Welfare, regarding the STEP.

Approved unanimously as corrected.

2. Good and Welfare

***Moved that the Assembly requests the Dean to meet with those faculty members in the College primarily involved with the secondary education program at Oakland University for a discussion of the serious problems that face the credibility of this program, and that he take whatever steps are necessary to effect an open dialog and cooperation with the School of Education and Human Services about all aspects of secondary teacher certification at the University, and that the Dean report to the April Assembly meeting on the results of these actions*** (Jerrold Grossman). Supported.

After extensive discussion as outlined below, the vote was called and the motion approved unanimously.

Concerns and comments:

••The STEP program is certified by the Michigan Department of Education; Oakland undertook an extensive self-study, looked at the DOE standards and determined what courses OU required that would meet these standards. OU has certification majors and minors. SEHS has had an MAT on its books for at least 20 years, but was not offering certification in such areas as English, mathematics, or history in the recent past. SEHS started offering certification in those areas recently. The standards that CAS students meet for the STEP program are different from the standards required of students who attempt to achieve certification through the MAT program. For example, 48 English credits are required for STEP; in the MAT program students can achieve that certification with 30 hours. The college faculty involved in STEP believe that the College can collaborate with SEHS in terms of helping them decide the courses they should be

requiring their students to take to meet the certification requirements. OU has a very good reputation in the surrounding school districts in terms of the secondary teachers we prepare, based on the fact that students are taking this optimum number of content-area courses.

- Who certifies? The university recommends students to the state for certification; the university says, “this student has met the requirements that you, the state, have approved for us, Oakland, to offer.” CAS faculty believe that the only approved program, so far as research with DOE shows, is the STEP program that was accredited a few years ago. SEHS “on its own” is deciding that students have met the content area requirements in English and math and is instructing the registrar to recommend them for certification to the state.

- The STEP program has “optimal” requirements for the content areas; SEHS’s position is that students who meet “minimal” requirements should be certified.

- State DOEs across the nation are being pressured to reduce the requirements so they can produce more certified teachers.

- The state does have a minimum number of credits for certification; no university can certify with fewer than 30 credits in the content area. It’s up to the school to determine how many credits (and what courses) students must take to meet state standards. For example, in history and social sciences, students must demonstrate an ability to do research in secondary and primary sources and to write up their research in formal English. To that purpose, the History Department requires students to take two courses specifically designated as “research courses.” To date, History has received no information about how the MAT students are being evaluated on meeting this research standard.

- Who has made the decision on which 30 credits will count for the MAT program? The content areas have not been consulted.

- MLL is also concerned about using “competency credits” to satisfy part of the certification.

- Students (and some faculty) don’t understand why OU’s program requires so many more credits than other institutions’. *response:* OU does have a good reputation; all 10 English STEP graduates last year found teaching jobs in the area. But students don’t always understand that. The MAT issue is causing the STEP program to lose some ground.

- The STEP program is a post-baccalaureate program; students have a bachelor’s degree; the MAT is a master’s program. *response:* MAT faculty/advisers without appropriate content knowledge are making determination of which bachelor’s courses meet certification requirements (e.g., engineering graduates applying math credits toward MAT). Further complicating matters is school districts’ pay system; those with master’s degrees are higher up on the salary scale. What is recommended with master’s programs is that students wait to finish their last class until they have a teaching job.

- The MAT clearly has master’s level pedagogy courses. But its 36 credits include nothing the CAS departments have acknowledged or endorsed in the content areas.

- The MAT deserves to exist; it’s intended to streamline the process for people who are having career changes. The program, however, needs to recognize and address content-area concerns.

## 2. Budget Update

*(Ed. note: most numbers are rounded)*

Using transparencies, Dean Downing noted the total reduction for FY03 (this year) was 3.5%, \$1.8 million for OU. OU's enrollment was up, but not as much as budgeted, with 170 FYES shortfall (approx. \$1.2 million). The Board authorized \$600,000 from the prior year's "rainy day fund" for FY 03, so the total reduction for OU was some \$2.4 million; Academic Affairs is 69% of the institution, \$1.7 million; CAS is 33%, or \$552K.

how CAS covered FY 03 shortfall:

- return operating base increase (\$20,000)

- undistributed FY 01 & 02 sp/su profits

- faculty salary savings from VPAA

- return of FY 02 ICR (indirect cost recovery) pulled back from departments (no pull-back exceeded the amount already in the department's accounts; i.e., none were decreased)

- Research Excellence Fund's repair/maintenance (funds still remain)

- college and department non-general funds (relatively small amounts)

- undistributed new program budgets (MALS implementation delays)

In the process, the College was able to spare department operating budgets completely other than the \$20,000 operating base increase and ICR pullbacks.

In all of the cutbacks, nothing was "zeroed out" (e.g., REF)

One of the flexibilities was that one-time money could be used for the cuts for FY03, to avoid any major impact on the overall system.

The FY 03 aggregate cut: 22.7% reduction on the CAS base of \$27,161,432.

OU's revenues: 43% came from state, 54% tuition and fees, 3% miscellaneous.

Dean Downing's summary: it was a difficult exercise, but not a devastating set of cuts.

Next year will be different—6.5% reduction on "then current" levels of funding, so an aggregate of 10%. OU's reduction is approximately \$5.2 million.

The initial planning does not factor in tuition increases. At a retreat last week the deans, vice presents and president talked a lot about ways to offset the deficit, including tuition increases, enrollment increases, and incentive programs. Consensus: OU can probably generate revenue increases of \$2.5 million. Non-discretionary expenditure increases are approximately \$7.3 million, bringing the entire deficit to \$10 million. The CAS's pro-rated share is \$2.27 million. (note: this is the guess that people are using, but it is just a guess based on the governor's proposals).

In FY04 OU moves below 40% state support, which has never happened as far as Dean Downing can recall; this trend is not encouraging.

comments/concerns:

••reducing state support for universities is “a national trend”; where is OU relative to peers in state? *response:* OU is approx. 3/4 down the ladder in FYES funding. OU has moved up a bit in the past years, but still low. Further, Michigan is still low nationally in supporting state institutions.

Dean Downing, showing a “nightmare” chart evenly spreading the reduction percentage across the general fund budgets of departments, assured the Assembly that such across-the-board cuts will not be the approach. Dean Downing has extended the challenge to the chairs to think creatively about what we can do more effectively/efficiently. We have to really look at our mission. Some 94% is salary. One possibility is to not hire for new searches.

The eight values listed in the President’s March 18 e-mail to the faculty are being used to guide the planning:

- Managed growth/faculty support**
- Quality**
- Distinctive undergraduate programs/general education**
- Collaborations and partnerships**
- Capital campaign**
- Student services/retention**
- Graduate programs - grants and contracts**
- IT support**

The reduction planning for FY 04 has a tight timeframe: the CAS plan is due to the Provost on April 7, so budget planning must proceed on the information now available, bearing in mind that these target numbers are still a “best guess” at needed reductions.

comments/concerns:

••how does the money for enrollment in department courses come back to the College or department? *response:* The general fund budget is built on overall enrollment for OU. Department budgets factor in FYES generally, not specifically. Any excess in tuition generated goes into a broader location such as the “rainy day fund,” not back to the units. Further, any department that increases the number of credits it generates from its majors is probably displacing credits in another department, so for the university the credits remain the same. Opportunities exist, however, to generate incremental new revenue. Specifically, some programs could expand to Macomb University Center (as other universities move out): psychology and communication are current real possibilities.

••How can the Board approve a budget on June 4 when there is a very big unknown about faculty salary costs for next year?

••Is the president’s values list in priority order (graduate programs is number 7)? *response:* no, it’s not formal priority order, but the “distinctive undergraduate experience” is the focus point of the Capital Campaign/2010 vision. Departments certainly need to look at graduate programs closely, possibly to eliminate master’s programs with few students and dropping enrollments. However, upon examination if

such a program cross-lists with undergraduate courses, the graduate program may positively affect revenues.

••Question: one department will have to cut 12 part-time sections next year.

response: The chairs were told: we have to live within the budget, and thus will not be able to have as many sections next year because the number this year was above what was budgeted. The CAS overspent its part-time budget by \$365K; historically the College has had the flexibility to do that by asking the Provost to cover the deficits from “salary savings” (for retirements, unfilled positions, resignations late in the year, etc.). In FY04, the CAS will have to live within its budget.

••The departments will not be able to offer as many sections, which will reduce enrollments. Or, perhaps the departments could open many high-enrollment introductory sections. Why would the university want to cut back on part-time sections (unless really small sections)? Maybe everyone should cut back on the small enrollment, upper-level courses to optimize time of the full-time faculty. response: Departments can use part-time sections if they remain within the budget. Retaining the number of part-time sections budgeted for doesn’t mean we can’t be offering more sections. Fundamentally, the departments need to offer more higher-enrollment sections. One approach would be for faculty to move around what they offer and who teaches the courses. Departments could modify the pattern of offerings, for example, by scheduling elective major courses with low enrollments strategically to maximize enrollments. Such difficult discussions are going on with the chairs. The trend-line shows per-credit delivery by full-time faculty is down, by part-time faculty up. Part of the creativity is to figure out how to keep the student body at least the same size: if the FYES goes down, in the fall more budget cutting will be required.

••The faculty (at department level at least) lack incentives to increase course enrollments. response: The issues of patterns of offerings and number of students in classes, etc., are difficult conversations. Chairs have discussed them, and Assembly members also need to take the information back to their departments. Dean Downing wants us to have these conversations rather than having the Provost make the decisions.

••So much of our budget is personnel. How do we handle the issue of keeping/adding students and diminishing the number of people available to teach them? Quality is also a real issue, as is simple classroom space. response: Yes, it is very, very difficult; the issue are very real. The other side of it is what happens to us if we don’t change expectations; we have yet other reductions on top of the state’s.

••It will be hard to analyze which activities could be curtailed. response: Dean Downing believes that departments should determine their own directions if at all possible.

••For some departments, majors have increased but the number of full-time positions remains the same, which has meant increased part-time sections. response: Recent aggregate increases in full-time positions are clearly not what they should have been. However, we cannot get to \$2.7 million without not filling some positions we would have otherwise.

••How will the budget problems play out with AAUP bargaining? response: No answer is possible now.

3. ***Moved to adjourn the meeting*** (Arthur Bull). Supported.

Approved unanimously.