Academic and Instruction Review Workgroup

Report IV

The "Second" Interim Report

January 29, 2009

Charles L. Baum II Associate Professor of Economics Economics and Finance Department P. O. Box 27 Middle Tennessee State University Murfreesboro, TN 37132

W: (615) 898-2527 F: (615) 898-5596 cbaum@mtsu.edu

Contents

I.	Introduction	page 1
II.	Primary Proposed Cuts	page 2
III.	Smaller Proposed Cuts	page 3
IV.	Criteria to Prioritize Academic Programs	page 5
V.	Longer-Term Strategies	page 10

I. Introduction

Tennessee's state budget in 2008-2009 is \$27 billion. Revenue shortfalls mandate this budget be reduced by \$900 million, requiring cuts of 3.3 %. Nevertheless, the state has charged MTSU with reducing its budget by as much as \$19 to \$20 million, which is a 20 % reduction in state appropriations.

The university should expect a portion of reduced state appropriations to be offset by a tuition increase. To recommend cuts that do not account for a corresponding tuition increase would seem unnecessary. For example, some employees would learn that their jobs are to be eliminated when, in fact, revenue from a tuition increase would make at least some corresponding cuts unlikely.

If MTSU were to receive authorization to raise tuition by 8 %, then revenue from tuition could increase by \$360 per full-time student (based on annual tuition of \$4,500 per full-time student). Were roughly 23,000 students to pay \$360 more in tuition, then this would raise \$8,280,000 additional dollars, and \$20 million in cuts would then be \$11,720,000 (net of tuition increases). Of course, this assumes enrollment would remain constant, but past experience suggests enrollment often increases during economic downturns.

Academic affairs would likely not be expected to absorb all of these costs. Assuming academic affairs comprises roughly 70 % of MTSU's budget, then the AIR workgroup desires to offer proposals to save at least \$8.2 million.

To achieve this amount of savings, the AIR workgroup offers two primary proposals, discussed in the next section (section II). The workgroup also endorses a couple of additional proposals that would save smaller amounts, described in section III. Section IV provides criteria to be used prioritizing departments, majors, and programs, in the event MTSU's administrators seek more targeted cuts. Longer-term strategic initiatives that may increase efficiency and save money but that are unlikely to be implemented in time to comply with contemporaneous cuts are outlined in the last section (section V).

II. Primary Proposed Cuts

The AIR's first primary proposal is designed to cut temporary faculty in departments whose average faculty teaching load for tenured and tenure-track faculty is below a common level, such as 10.0 adjusted credit hours (ACH) per faculty member until all department ACH averages are above 10.0 (see formal proposal attached below). As illustrated in an attached spreadsheet, this would result in the elimination of 43 temporary positions, saving \$2,236,000 (assuming the average full-time temporary salary plus benefits is \$52,000). Under this proposal, if a department's ACH is already at least 10.0, then no temporary positions would be cut.

This proposal can be made more aggressive by successively eliminating temporary positions as long as any effected department's ACH average does not exceed 11.5. This would result in the elimination of 65 temporary positions, saving \$3,380,000.

One of the advantages of this proposal is that it does not cut tenured and tenure-track faculty positions. However, at least some in the group are concerned that the proposal only credits faculty for teaching (specifically, for the number of student credit hours taught) rather than for research, public service, grant-funded release time, administrative release time, etc.

Ultimately, this proposal received a majority of votes from the workgroup.

The second primary proposal suggests the university furlough one day per month employees earning more than \$25,000 per year (see the action formalized in an attachment below). This would be temporary: the proposed furlough, for example, could span the next fiscal year, beginning July 2009 and ending in June 2010. Although a furlough should ultimately be "graduated," where someone otherwise earning just over \$25,000 (say, \$25,200) wouldn't be worse off under the furlough than an unaffected employee earning exactly \$25,000, if no other adjustments are made, then the proposed action would save an estimated \$5,200,000.

The rationale for the furlough is that it would preserve jobs otherwise lost. This, in turn, would demonstrate that employees at MTSU are part of a larger community willing to sacrifice for members.

The proposed furlough passed a workgroup vote by a comfortable majority.

When combined, these two proposed actions could save MTSU almost \$8.6 million, although overlap between the two might make this total somewhat less.

III. Smaller Proposed Cuts

The AIR workgroup has voted to "send up" (recommend that the executive committee adopt) a couple of proposed actions that would save smaller amounts. Although smaller sums, when combined, the next six proposals to be discussed next are estimated to save roughly \$1,300,000.¹

The first proposal is designed to encourage senior, tenured faculty to retire and begin post-retirement teaching. In practice, the proposal's encouragement takes the form of allowing faculty to select post-retirement teaching now but then soon suspending the program for a time (a couple of years). Suspending the program is designed to encourage qualified faculty to take advantage of post-retirement now, before the window of opportunity closes. Perhaps this proposed action could be viewed as a variation of a state higher education retirement buyout plan.

The proposed action potentially saves money because it would be cheaper to teach halfloads for half-pay than full-loads with research and reassigned time for full-pay (because post-retirement faculty are not paid for research time and service), although no estimate of savings is currently available. Of course, it might instead be even cheaper to teach courses with adjuncts than post-retirement faculty, but adjuncts would not necessarily possess a terminal degree. Furthermore, some may already be planning to choose the post-retirement teaching program, so any real cost savings would derive from marginal changes or the *increase* in the number of faculty who select the post-retirement teaching program.

Next, the workgroup recommends MTSU suspend overtime pay for clerical employees. Of course, employees must by law receive compensation for overtime work, so the proposal in effect suggests MTSU limit employees to standard work schedules. If additional clerical work is needed, then it could be assigned to available, under-utilized clerical staff via a "clerical pool." Estimates suggest that if compensation for clerical overtime were eliminated, then the university could save a bit over \$600,000 in clerical compensation.

Our third smaller proposal is to temporarily defer faculty sabbaticals. Eight such sabbaticals have already been granted for the 2009-2010 academic year. Were these eight temporarily deferred, and the eight to be awarded in the 2009-2010 academic year for 2010-2011 not awarded, then this could save as much as \$126,000.

¹ Potentially of note, the workgroup also discussed merging (or re-aligning) departments. Absent cutting faculty positions, merging departments would seem to save money by eliminating a department secretary (or two) and eliminating the teaching release time of one of the two prior department chairs. The workgroup concluded that this benefit (in terms of cost savings) would be swamped by corresponding costs such as physically moving department offices and faculty opposition. Of course, were faculty positions to be cut during the merger, then more money could be saved. However, faculty might rather face equivalent positions cuts without mergers.

Much like the third, our fourth smaller proposal is to temporarily defer (*i*) faculty research grants, (*ii*) faculty development grants, (*iii*) public service grants, and (*iv*) instructional and evaluation grants. New grants in these areas should not be issued during the 2009-2010 academic year, since grants approved in 2008-2009, once deferred, would be next to be funded. This proposal would save \$280,000.

Fifth, the workgroup recommends by majority vote that low-enrollment summer school courses be canceled. Low-enrollment summer courses in summer 2008 cost the university \$334,266. Had these particular courses been canceled (if low-enrollment summer courses are canceled in summer 2009), then MTSU could have saved (could expect to save) over \$300,000.

Last, the workgroup recommends MTSU consider moving to a four-day class schedule, with classes to be held either on Mondays and Wednesdays or on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Advantages include reducing energy costs. Furthermore, if some offices are closed, the four-day schedule could reduce payroll costs as well.

IV. Criteria to Prioritize Academic Programs

The AIR workgroup has identified seven criteria to be used prioritizing departments and academic programs at MTSU. The workgroup has made an effort to identify criteria that are objective (i.e., student credit hours [SCHs]) rather than criteria that are more general and vague (i.e., mission centrality, areas with opportunity for distinction). The list is designed to provide MTSU's administrators with measurable factors that are potentially important as MTSU positions itself for the future.

Criteria for Ranking Departments and Academic Programs

- 1. Number of Majors (note that Educational Leadership is not a major)
- 2. Student Credit Hours within the Department
- 3. Department Cost and Revenue (i.e., grant funding, money raised for scholarships)
- 4. Low Producing (in terms of graduates)
- 5. Doctoral Programs
- 6. Master's Programs
- 7. Uniqueness

The following table (Table 1) provides department information on five of these seven criteria (all except criteria three and seven). Note that departments with doctoral programs are shaded in dark blue (and have a capital "X" in the column for doctoral program); departments with proposed doctoral programs are in light blue (and have a lower-case "x" in the column for doctoral program); and departments offering Master's degrees are shaded in yellow. Numbers of majors and SCHs by department in the spreadsheet are five-year averages.

Table 2 sorts departments by number of majors and Table 3 sorts departments by SCHs.

		SCH by	Low	Doctoral	Master's	
Department	Majors	Department	Producing	Program	Program	
Aerospace	641	4,660	M.S.		Х	
Agribusiness/Agriscience	346	2,825				
Biology	388	13,918		Х	Х	
Chemistry	858	10,453		Х	Х	
Computer Science	240	3,286			Х	
Engineering Tech & Ind. St	684	4,760	M.S.		Х	
Mathematical Sciences	147	17,321	M.S.T.	Х	Х	
Military Science	N/A	274				
School of Nursing	956	4,510			Х	
Physics	40	3,169				
Accounting	468	8,360			Х	
Bus Comm & Entrepreneurship	279	4,240	B.B.A.		Х	
Computer Information Systems	233	6,862			Х	
Economics and Finance	365	10,025		Х	Х	
Management and Marketing	1,587	13,455			Х	
Criminal Justice Administration	384	3,999				
Educational Leadership	N/A	3,819		Х	Х	
Elem & Special Education	823	5,646		Х	Х	
Health and Human Performance	510	12,879	B.S.	Х	Х	

Table 1: Department Information on Criteria for Ranking Departments and Academic Programs

810	6,744			Х
664	16,742		Х	Х
305	6,152			
364	22,735		Х	Х
124	6,260			Х
56	5,492			
259	16,103		Х	Х
304	7,949			Х
36	2,722	B.A.		
455	5,508			
199	2,243			
153	6,831	M.A.		Х
308	12,536			
1,316	4,213			
N/A	5,544			Х
1,227	8,004			Х
	664 305 364 124 56 259 304 36 455 199 153 308 1,316 N/A	664 16,742 305 6,152 364 22,735 124 6,260 56 5,492 259 16,103 304 7,949 36 2,722 455 5,508 199 2,243 153 6,831 308 12,536 1,316 4,213 N/A 5,544	664 16,742 305 6,152 364 22,735 124 6,260 56 5,492 259 16,103 304 7,949 36 2,722 B.A. 455 5,508 199 2,243 153 6,831 M.A. 308 12,536 1,316 4,213 N/A 5,544	664 16,742 x 305 6,152

Table 2: Department Rank by Number of Majors

Department	Number of Majors
Philosophy	36
Physics	40
Geosciences	56
Foreign Languages & Literatures	124
Mathematical Sciences	147
Sociology & Anthropology	153
Social Work	199
Computer Information Systems	233
Computer Science	240
History	259
Bus Comm & Entrepreneurship	279
Music	304
Art	305
Speech & Theatre	308
Agribusiness/Agriscience	346
English	364
Economics and Finance	365
Criminal Justice Administration	384
Biology	388
Political Science	455
Accounting	468
Health and Human Performance	510
Aerospace	641
Psychology	664
Engineering Tech & Ind. St	684
Human Sciences	810
Elem & Special Education	823
Chemistry	858
School of Nursing	956
Recording Industry	1,227
Electronic Media Communication	1,316
Management and Marketing	1,587

Table 3: Department Rank by SCHs

Department	SCHs By Department
Military Science	274
Social Work	2,243
Philosophy	2,722
Agribusiness/Agriscience	2,825
Physics	3,169
Computer Science	3,286
Educational Leadership	3,819
Criminal Justice Administration	3,999
Electronic Media Communication	4,213
Bus Comm & Entrepreneurship	4,240
School of Nursing	4,510
Aerospace	4,660
Engineering Tech & Ind. St	4,760
Geosciences	5,492
Political Science	5,508
Journalism	5,544
Elem & Special Education	5,646
Art	6,152
Foreign Languages & Literatures	6,260
Human Sciences	6,744
Sociology & Anthropology	6,831
Computer Information Systems	6,862
Music	7,949
Recording Industry	8,004
Accounting	8,360
Economics and Finance	10,025
Chemistry	10,453
Speech & Theatre	12,536
Health and Human Performance	12,879
Management and Marketing	13,455
Biology	13,918
History	16,103
Psychology	16,742
Mathematical Sciences	17,321
English	22,735

V. Longer-Term Strategies

Finally, the AIR workgroup would like to recommend a couple of longer-term proposals designed to increase efficiency and better position MTSU for the future.

First, the workgroup recommends MTSU consider holding three semesters during the year. The rationale for this is that the two semester program is a holdover from an agrarian society with little to recommend it other than tradition. The tri-term program seeks to make maximum use of facilities and human resources, reduce time to graduation, and provide flexibility in scheduling. The following details were discussed:

- Three 14-week terms, with breaks between each term
- Maximum enrollment 15 credit hours (4-5 courses)
- 120 hours can be completed by a full time student in 8 terms or 2 years and two terms.
- 120 hours can be completed by a student averaging 12 credits per term in 3 years and 1 term
- Faculty could contract, with appropriate compensation, for two or three terms per year with some flexibility in the choice of terms
- Classes would meet 60 minutes three times a week, 2 hours twice a week, or 3 hours once a week

Typical schedule (using 2009 calendar)

- Winter Term January 7 to April 14 (14 weeks)
- Spring Break April 15 to April 28 (2 weeks)
- Spring Term April 29 to Aug 4 (14 weeks)
- Summer Break Aug 5 to Aug 18 (2 weeks)
- Fall Term Aug 19 to Nov 24 (14 weeks)
- Fall Break Nov 25 to Jan 6 (6 weeks)

Next, the workgroup suggests that MTSU allow courses to be offered in 6 week minisessions to be offered each fall and spring (see proposal 10, amended below). The minicourses would meet once a week for 4 hours and would have a web-assisted component. This would help recruit adult, working students and would potentially make better use of existing facilities.

Last, the workgroup recommends the Department of Geosciences be moved from the College of Liberal Arts to the College of Basic and Applied Sciences (see proposal 11). This move could increase department visibility and collaboration, ultimately enhancing effectiveness.



Strategic Work Group: Academic and Instructional Review

I. Title of Recommended Action:

Eliminate some temporary positions in departments with low ACH averages.

II. Keywords used to identify or classify action:

ACH, temporary, faculty, RIF, targeted, reduction

III. Description of action:

Reduce the number of temporary faculty in departments whose average faculty teaching loads for tenured and tenure-track faculty are below an actionable target.

IV. Rationale for action:

It is better to cut temporary rather than permanent faculty, and this proposal targets positions that can be eliminated without affecting the university's ability to deliver courses, which is our primary responsibility to students. Much of the non-funded reassign time allotted to faculty involve duties as directors, schedulers, and coordinators; these responsibilities could be assigned to a few fulltime administrative personnel.

V. Quantitative cost savings calculations/estimate:

Cutting temporary positions to bring all department averages above 10.0 ACH affects 43 positions **(\$2,236,000)**. Proposing to eliminate all temporary positions, but not allowing any effected department's average to exceed 11.5 ACH, would effect 65 positions **(\$3,380,000)**. The estimated average full-time temporary salary of \$40K plus 30% benefits totaling \$52K/position was provided by the office of the provost.

VI. How action positions MTSU for future:

Tenured and tenure-track faculty take more responsibility for teaching in the department, but have fewer administrative duties, and less unfunded reassigned time.

VII. How action impacts personnel and/or AMP:

Up to 65 temporary positions would be eliminated to achieve maximum cost savings. The savings could be partially decreased if administrative positions are created to accomplish some of the responsibilities once assigned to faculty.

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY Instructions:

ACH Study for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty, Fall 2008

Columns B thru F represent current data and should not be altered. The two values in the dotted box labeled "Assumptions", and values in the two dotted columns labeled "Temps Cut" can be changed.

							<10 ACH			<10 ACH		
Assumpti	ons:										1	
Average Temp A	Average Temp ACH 15.00						\$\$ Savings	;	\$\$ Savings			
Average Temp Sa	Average Temp Salary \$52,000						\$2,236,000		\$3,380,000			
				Current			>= 10 ACH			ACH <= 11.5		
	Dept. A	VG		10.03			10.77			11.08		
	Inst. A	VG		9.69			10.59			11.06		
	Total (Cut	0			43			65			
				ACH	ACH	1 '_	ACH	ACH	* !	ACH	ACH	
	# Faculty Tenured	π	Temp	AVG T&TT	Total T&TT	Temps Cut	AVG T&TT	Total T&TT	Temps Cut	AVG T&TT	Total T&TT	
BASIC & APPLIED												
Aerospace	9	5	2	9.70	135.80	1	10.77	150.80	1	10.77	150.80	
AgribusinessAgriscience	7	2	3	12.03	108.27	0	12.03	108.27	0	12.03	108.27	
Biology	30	5	7	10.13	354.55	1	10.56	369.55	3	11.42	399.55	
Chemistry	24	1	5	10.23	255.75	1	10.83	270.75	2	11.43	285.75	
Computer Science	12	1	1	8.97	116.61	1	10.12	131.61	1	10.12	131.61	
Engineering Tech & Ind St	14	4	4	11.31	203.58	0	11.31	203.58	0	11.31	203.58	
Mathematical Sciences	26	7	12	7.54	248.82	6	10.27	338.82	8	11.18	368.82	
School of Nursing	9	6	12	11.91	178.65	0	11.91	178.65	0	11.91	178.65	
Physics	8	2	2	11.42	114.20	0	11.42	114.20	0	11.42	114.20	
College			48			10			15			
BUSINESS						1			1	 		
Accounting	16	7	3	8.74	201.02	2	10.04	231.02	3	10.70	246.02	
Bus Comm & Entrepreneurship	9	4	3	9.73	126.49	1	10.88	141.49	1	10.88	141.49	
Computer Information Systems	15	3	3	9.37	168.66	1	10.20	183.66	2	11.04	198.66	
Economics and Finance	19	6	3	8.18	204.50	3	9.98	249.50	3	9.98	249.50	
Management and Marketing	24	13	3	9.50	351.50	2	10.31	381.50	3	10.72	396.50	
College			15			9			12			
EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCI.									• 1 •			
Criminal Justice Administration	5	1	3	10.42	62.52	0	10.42	62.52	0	10.42	62.52	
Educational Leadership	13	6	3	8.41	159.79	3	10.78	204.79	3	10.78	204.79	

	11	7	3	11.05	198.90	0	11.05	198.90	0	11.05	198.90
	16	10	8	8.55	222.30	3	10.28	267.30	5	11.43	297.30
Human Sciences	10	6	5	11.96	191.36	0	11.96	191.36	0	11.96	191.36
CANCHOLOGY INITYERSITY	35	8	4	9.40	404.20	2	10.10	434.20	4	10.80	464.20
			26			8		i	12		
LIBERAL ARTS					1			I		:	
Art	11	4	9	12.54	188.10	0	12.54	188.10	0	12.54	188.10
English	46	9	33	8.57	471.35	6	10.21	561.35	10	11.30	621.35
Foreign Languages & Literatures	14	5	5	10.20	193.80	0	10.20	193.80		10.99	208.80
Geosciences	8	2	3	12.17	121.70	0	12.17	121.70	0	12.17	121.70
History	27	6	10	8.27	272.91	4	10.09	332.91	7	11.45	377.91
Music	24	5	4	10.52	305.08	0	10.52	305.08	2	11.55	335.08
Philosophy	6	1	0	11.29	79.03	0	11.29	79.03	0	11.29	79.03
Political Science	9	4	1	11.82	153.66	0	11.82	153.66	0	11.82	153.66
Social Work	8	2	1	8.10	81.00	1	9.60	96.00	1	9.60	96.00
Sociology & Anthropology	12	7	2	8.62	163.78	2	10.20	193.78	2	10.20	193.78
Speech & Theatre	19	4	17	11.62	267.26	0	11.62	267.26	0	11.62	267.26
College			85			13	•		23	1	
MASS COMMUNICATION											
Electronic Media Communication	16	1	2	11.03	187.51	0	11.03	187.51	0	11.03	187.51
Journalism	11	10	2	9.07	190.47	2	10.50	220.47	2	10.50	220.47
Recording Industry	17	10	1	8.73	235.71	1	9.29	250.71	1	9.29	250.71
College			3		1	3		1	3		
ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT			9					;		1	
Walker Library			1								
GRAND TOTAL	540	174	366		6918.83	43		7563.8	65		7893.8

*Excludes faculty on leave of absence. Geier Fellows counted as adjunct faculty.

**Adjunct count includes coaches contribution to instruction.



Strategic Work Group: Academic and Instructional Review

I. Title of Recommended Action:

One Day Per Month Employee 'Furloughs'

II. Keywords used to identify or classify action:

Employee Furloughs

III. Description of action:

Employees would take one day off work each month without pay beginning July, 2009, and ending no later than June, 2010. The effective dates of this action could be modified by the President as economic conditions demand. Employees with salaries less than \$25,000/yr. would be exempt from this action.

IV. Rationale for action:

The cash savings for the University would be significant and should preserve jobs for some employees. Furthermore, it would demonstrate the community/family aspect of MTSU to its employees and the community.

V. Quantitative cost savings calculations/estimate:

Approximately \$ 5,200,000 (Adjustment for faculty on 10-month contracts would decrease this amount.)

VI. How action positions MTSU for future:

This action would help preserve the university's work force and enable MTSU to continue to meet its primary mission. Base salaries would remain intact for the future when the economy improves and annual pay raises can again be given, benefiting employees directly as well as MTSU's salary comparisons to its peers.

VII. How action impacts personnel and/or AMP:

Jobs would be saved, although most personnel would see a reduction in their paychecks for a while. More faculty and staff would be available to teach and otherwise serve our students than would be the case if positions were eliminated. Student-to-faculty ratios would be preserved.



Proposal 3 (Papini)

Strategic Work Group: Academic and Instructional Review

I. Title of Recommended Action:

Suspension of Post-Retirement

II. Keywords used to identify or classify action:

III. Description of action:

Suspend awarding of Post-Retirement agreements effective end of the Spring 2009 semester indefinitely or for a three-five year period.

IV. Rationale for action:

Suspension may encourage qualified faculty to take advantage of the Post-Retirement option before the window closes. In the absence of state assistance it becomes a very meager buyout plan.

V. Quantitative cost savings calculations/estimate:

VI. How action positions MTSU for future:

This action would provide financial incentive for qualified faculty to retire thereby providing them with increased retirement revenue and the University with significant (depending on participation) salary savings.

VII. How action impacts personnel and/or AMP:

This is a mutually beneficial plan in that these faculty would still contribute to the instructional excellence of the University through classroom activities – sustaining academic excellence while at the same time reducing personnel costs.



<u>Strategic Work Group:</u> <u>Academic and Instructional Review</u>

I. Title of Recommended Action:

Eliminate or reduce paid overtime

II. Keywords used to identify or classify action:

Overtime Pay, Comptime Pay

III. Description of action:

Determine need for support staff to work overtime. Are administrative staff sensitive to the amount of overtime being approved in their area of responsibility, and are clerical staff being appropriately supervised during the time they are working outside the regular work day.

IV. Rationale for action:

The Payroll Office confirmed the following: In 2007 overtime in the amount of \$600,217.28 was paid for 35,237.7 hours. In 2008 \$579,523.89 was paid for 32,907.7 hours. Additionally, total comp time banked as of 6/30/07 was 6,187.8 hours with a value of \$79,688.66 and as of 6/30/08 6,763.95 hours were banked at a value of \$92,984.24. Control of overtime pay will significantly reduce University expenditure in personnel costs. Abolition of paid overtime should not simply be turned into banked comp time which would possibly continue significant expenditure if the employee retires/terminates and cashes out the accumulated comp time.

V. Quantitative cost savings calculations/estimate:

See above

VI. How action positions MTSU for future:

This will position University supervisors to monitor productivity during regular work hours and decrease expenditures.

VII. How action impacts personnel and/or AMP:

This action will reduce personnel costs.



Strategic Work Group: Academic and Instructional Review

I. Title of Recommended Action:

Defer sabbatical leaves (NIA Grants)

II. Keywords used to identify or classify action:

Sabbatical Leaves (NIA Grants)

III. Description of action:

Defer sabbatical leaves

IV. Rationale for action:

We cannot afford this program in our current financial situation.

V. Quantitative cost savings calculations/estimate:

\$126,600 if fully eliminated; however, 8 NIA grants have already been approved by the committee for FY 09-10. If these awards are honored in 09-10, then \$63,300 could be saved in 09-10 and \$126,600 could be saved in 2010-11.

VI. How action positions MTSU for future:

No significant impact.

VII. How action impacts personnel and/or AMP:

Reduces unnecessary adjunct positions temporarily.



<u>Strategic Work Group:</u> <u>Academic and Instructional Review</u>

I. Title of Recommended Action:

DEFER (1) Faculty Research, Development & Public Service Grants (2) Also, Instructional Evaluation & Development Grants

II. Keywords used to identify or classify action:

FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS; FACULTY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS, PUBLIC SERVICE GRANTS, & INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

III. Description of action:

Defer all such grants until the budget crisis is over

IV. Rationale for action:

To avoid cutting higher priority uses of scarce funds

V. Quantitative cost savings calculations/estimate:

Up to \$280,628, per Becky Cole

VI. How action positions MTSU for future:

Delays results flowing from such programs

VII. How action impacts personnel and/or AMP:

No permanent impacts expected



Proposal 7 (Rust)

Strategic Work Group: Academic and Instructional Review

I. Title of Recommended Action:

Eliminate/reduce low enrollment classes in summer school.

II. Keywords used to identify or classify action:

Summer School

III. Description of action:

Eliminate/reduce low enrollment classes in summer school. If a class does not meet the minimum class size by 2 weeks prior to classes beginning, it should be cancelled so that students have the opportunity to register for another course. This will eliminate classes in summer school that do not generate revenue.

IV. Rationale for action:

Allowing courses to be taught that do not meet the minimum enrollment numbers reduces summer school margin.

V. Quantitative cost savings calculations/estimate:

Last year low enrollment courses that were taught cost the university \$334,266

VI. How action positions MTSU for future:

VII. How action impacts personnel and/or AMP:

Students may need a low enrollment course for graduation so this may delay them from completing degree requirements. Faculty may teach less hours in summer school because their low enrollment class cancels and this would reduce their summer.



Strategic Work Group:

<u>Academic and Instructional Review</u>

I. Title of Recommended Action:

4 day schedule

II. Keywords used to identify or classify action:

4 day schedule

III. Description of action:

Go to a 4 day a week course schedule

IV. Rationale for action:

Reduces energy costs. If some offices are closed can reduce payroll costs also.

V. Quantitative cost savings calculations/estimate:

Unknown

VI. How action positions MTSU for future:

VII. How action impacts personnel and/or AMP:



<u>Strategic Work Group:</u> <u>Academic and Instructional Review</u>

I. Title of Recommended Action:

Go to a 3 term system

II. Keywords used to identify or classify action:

Tri term

III. Description of action:

Replace semester/summer term with 3 full function terms

IV. Rationale for action:

Make full use of human and facilities resources. Shorten graduation time.

V. Quantitative cost savings calculations/estimate:

VI. How action positions MTSU for future:

VII. How action impacts personnel and/or AMP:



Proposal 10 (Rust)

Strategic Work Group: Academic and Instructional Review

I. Title of Recommended Action:

Implement accelerated degrees/courses

II. Keywords used to identify or classify action:

accelerated

III. Description of action:

Allow courses to be offered in 6 week mini-session (5 weeks of instruction/1 week for final exams). Two mini-sessions could be offered in fall and spring. Courses would meet once a week for 4 hours plus have a web-assisted component. After 6 weeks students would have a 1 week break and then repeat another 6 week mini-session.

IV. Rationale for action:

Classroom utilization would increase. Accelerated classes would help recruit adult, working students. At least one TBR school (RSCC) is offering an associate's degree program in this format.

V. Quantitative cost savings calculations/estimate:

By making better use of our existing facilities, we would reduce the need for additional facilities. Also accelerated courses are appealing to adult students and students who cannot make several trips to campus. This should increase headcount and tuition.

VI. How action positions MTSU for future:

Accelerated degree programs would help MTSU be more competitive.

VII. How action impacts personnel and/or AMP:

There would be some impact on administration to adjust policies and procedures. Classroom scheduling would be impacted.



Proposal 11 Academic and Instructional Review

I. Title of Recommended Action:

Realignment of Dept. of Geosciences from Liberal Arts to Basic and Applied Sciences

II. Keywords used to identify or classify action:

III. Description of action:

IV. Rationale for action:

In Spring, 2008, the only cultural geography professor in Geosciences left to direct the new MTSU Global Studies program. Consequently, cultural geography is no longer a point of emphasis in Geosciences. The Department's strengths and sub-disciplines of emphasis are geology and physical geography, both of which are more closely related to BAS disciplines. Moving Geosciences to BAS would result in:

- 1. Greater visible to students seeking a major in science, resulting in increase in majors.
- Greater collaboration with BAS faculty. For example, Geosciences operates geographic information system and analytical geochemistry labs, both closely related to BAS disciplines.
- 3. Higher visibility of Geosciences would allow MTSU to more competitively recruit quality undergraduate science majors.

V. Quantitative cost savings calculations/estimate:

This proposal falls under workgroup directive A: 'Review and make recommendations regarding academic unit/program realignment to enhance effectiveness. There are no definite savings to this action. Geosciences would remain in its current physical location, retaining all teaching, laboratory, and master classroom space as well as General Ed classes. Upon completion of the new science building, Geosciences would move to DSB as planned.

VI. How action positions MTSU for future:

This is an 'enhancing effectiveness' action, positioning Geosciences for growth and collaboration with related BAS disciplines.