

Case Study: Methodological Approaches to Austerity in CAS

Faculty and staff at UM-Flint have been acutely aware for some time that the campus's budget has a great deal of influence over what is possible in a given academic year. On April 26th we had the opportunity to hear from executive leadership on accomplishments and future plans for their units. Now would seem like a good time to review some key issues regarding budgeting across and within the campus. The complexities of the budget often make it difficult to ascertain when and why certain things are happening. This is not unique to UM-Flint; the national AAUP has advocated for many decades that faculty must have a role in budgeting and access to information (fortunately for U of M faculty the Board of Regents agreed). The Senate Assembly also agreed with this principle when it passed the "Open Governance Resolution" in 2012 applying to all 3 campuses. In times of fiscal strain it is especially important for faculty to be active participants in budgetary decisions. There are two primary principles that AAUP endorses, which are that 1) the faculty must have access to the information necessary to determine whether fiscal strain exists, in order to make sure that decisions related to budgetary matters are based on actual data; and 2) that if indeed fiscal strain can be shown to exist and require action, then administrative costs are cut before academic expenses (resources for faculty and students). To do otherwise is to undermine the university's mission.

Over time the campus has been working towards increased transparency. Expenditure reports are regularly shared with and reviewed by the Chancellor's Advisory Committee for Budget and Strategic Planning (CACBSP) members. But expenditures are only one side of the story. Without being able to see the annual budgets that have been allocated to individual offices, college/schools, departments, and programs, the expenditures only tell half the story. After the beginning of each fiscal year (July 1), each school/college, administrative office, department and program is allocated a budget for the year. This is broken down into funding sources, and shows carry-over funds from the prior year. It is these documents that are often of greatest importance to transparency and the work of the faculty, because the annual budgets show whether departments/programs within a unit are being equitably funded, and whether they are projected to be given the fees and other revenues that will sustain them for that year. The latter are usually projected, since these revenue sources accrue over the fiscal year and then, in theory, are transferred before June 30th. Also important is access to the administrative office and college/school annual budgets of the executive officers, because only these documents would show how much of a unit's resources are being applied to administrative overhead. From the perspective of preserving academic quality, one would hope to see in times of fiscal strain that administrative funds are reigned in as much as possible before resources are taken from those parts of the budget that fund academic quality (professional development, faculty/student travel and research, instructional costs, equipment/lab resources, etc.). At this time, faculty have access to the budgets of senior executive officers outside of the schools and college. But, in some school/college units faculty are struggling to access the information that they need to do their jobs, which includes making important decisions about resources for their disciplines. Not all deans release unit annual budgets. Such lack of access to information is not in keeping with the university's legal obligations as a public institution. Such inaccessibility also breeds distrust, and makes accountability of the administration to the faculty and students virtually impossible.

So what should faculty members do if they need information that they cannot access? Although it is always better to give an office the opportunity to provide the information upon request, and to give a reasonable timeframe for this to happen, one can request budgetary information from the Freedom of Information Act Office at the University of Michigan.¹ However, having to FOIA documents on budgetary information is neither ideal nor a productive use of faculty (or administrator) time.

Former national AAUP President Cary Nelson provided useful guidelines on how to respond to claims of budgetary strain when used to enact changes in academic matters. He advises the following:

¹ To file a FOIA request go to: <https://foia.vpcomm.umich.edu/>

‘Be skeptical about claims of financial crisis. Many large institutions have reserve funds or lines of credit to deal with cash-flow problems. Some administrators exaggerate financial difficulties so that they can reallocate money for unneeded building projects or for disciplines they believe can generate income.’
[<https://www.aaup.org/article/faculty-agenda-hard-times>]

‘Pursue detailed information about campus budgets and finances, including foundation accounts and internal subsidies of sponsored research, by every means possible. Identify and publicize the invisible costs of administrative demands and initiatives. Track the transfer of costs from institutions to individuals. Submit Freedom of Information Act requests, if applicable. Compare budgetary planning documents with five years of previous financial statements reporting actual expenditures. Demand financial transparency—few campuses really practice it.’ [https://www.aaup.org/article/faculty-agenda-hard-times]

‘Treat program closures, abolition of the faculty senate, and termination of tenured faculty members imposed without full faculty review and approval as cause for strikes, civil disobedience, legal action, and votes of no confidence.’ [https://www.aaup.org/article/faculty-agenda-hard-times]

Cary Nelson, (former) AAUP President

In light of AAUP and the Regents governing principles requiring that faculty be included in budgeting, it is important in times of fiscal strain, such as that seemingly occurring in the College of Arts and Sciences, to ensure that measures impacting an academic mission are both transparent and actually necessary. It may very well be that all of the austerity measures below are necessary to keep CAS afloat. It may also be that other solutions were both possible and preferable. It is certainly the case that the solutions should be adopted in concert with the faculty. As the CAS Dean notes in the message below, she has ‘consulted’ the Executive Committee (EC). The governing faculty have a right to know if such consultation included full disclosure of the college’s annual budget, expenditures and administrative costs, because otherwise any recommendations of the EC would not have been adequately informed. The governing faculty also have a right to know if ‘consulted’ fulfills the EC’s charge to assist the Dean with her duties (which requires meaningful influence on final decisions, usually through voting or documentation of consensus), to ensure that budget decisions represent the needs of faculty and students. From the “Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance,”² which applies to all 3 campuses: “Budgetary policies and decisions directly affecting those areas for which the faculty has primary responsibility such as, but not limited to, curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, admission of students and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process shall be made in concert with the faculty.”

The austerity measures described below directly impact instructional and research resources, faculty status (i.e. raises, promotion...) and the educational process. The purpose of this article on austerity is to help faculty throughout the campus to think about governance best practices that come into play with academic budgeting. Due to the preponderance of recent austerity measures within one unit, which may very well be justified, it is the responsibility of the college’s governing faculty to ascertain justification, to ask questions, and to provide accountability so that their representatives appropriately prioritize academic resources in times of fiscal strain, if such strain can be shown to exist.

From the CAS Dean, e-mail to CAS faculty 31 August 2017:

‘Central administration has again provided some relief for the College but is expecting the College to engage in cost-saving measures in return. I have consulted with the Executive Committee and Associate Deans, as well as had our Budget Analyst, Dana Evans, run multiple scenarios to determine how best to undertake various cost-savings measures at the College-level. The Associate Deans and I spent considerable time this summer evaluating a wide range of cost-savings options, including those sent to us as suggestions by faculty and staff. We will continue to evaluate various options as we progress through this academic year.’

² <https://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/Principles.pdf>

EXPANDED ARTICLE CONTENT:

1) Student fees to support department resources taxed by CAS administration:³

In the summer of 2014 Interim Dean Albert Price, in preparation of setting up de-centralized budgets for departments in CAS (budgets that could be overseen by the department's faculty and allow for more departmental independence in budgeting), asked certain units that had many lab fees to consider switching to prefix (also known as credit-hour) fees.

Proposals for prefix fees and lab fees go first to the CACBSP. If approved there, the requests are included in the annual budget request process. In order to secure prefix fees, arguments had to be made about how exactly those fees would be used (departmental faculty draw up descriptions of how the fees will be applied). In Fall 2014 when the new prefix fees in CAS went into effect, the departments who had them enjoyed (some for the first time) had appropriate funding. This was no longer the case by August 2016, when staff from the then Dean's office explained to at least one department that DEEP revenue, OEL fees, prefix fees, and tuition revenue would be taxed that year because "the Dean's office was under-funded by the Regents."⁴ As per the Dean's e-mail of 31 Aug. 2017, 30% of all prefix fees would thereafter be used to pay for faculty salaries in CAS. Next, the Dean's office (starting August 2017) told chairs and directors that departments and programs would thereafter be responsible for paying for their own contingent lecturer salaries, although in at least a few cases the necessary increase in the department's budget to cover those salaries was insufficient, putting some programs/departments in deficit, intentionally. This was a troubling return to the pre-2014 days when departments did not have independent budgets, and often operated indefinitely on deficits, causing them to have to ask for dean approval on almost all expenditures. It is concerning that such deficits (even if created through the bookkeeping of the Dean's office rather than from actual increased spending) closely preceded rumors and even mentions by executive officers that programs would begin to be reviewed for viability and success. What will happen to those programs that have been forced to go into deficit this year? Will they be threatened with closure? If the deliberate under-funding is not corrected, will courses for lecturers be cancelled? Will the appearance of debt be used to claim the programs are not viable? The CAS faculty need to know how these deficits will be viewed, and why departments are being asked to return to a budget model of dependence on a dean's office.

Student fees are controversial when it comes to the campus's public image—they are raised judiciously because of concerns about the costs of higher education. They are, effectively, a tuition increase, and are not intended to go towards salaries, which normally come from a unit's base budget. So, when the CAS Dean shifted lecturer salary responsibility to the departments and programs, the result was in a way a substantial increase to the CAS administrative budget, essentially paid for by students. Moreover, students are paying for this a second way in that roughly 1/3 of the lab and instructional supplies, equipment, and other academic resources funded by the prefix fees are no longer available to them. Because departments are not allowed to have both prefix and lab fees, they cannot cover the deficit caused by a 30% tax to the Dean from their instructional resources. The shift in use of the prefix fees breaches the commitment made by Interim Dean Albert Price to departments that they would keep %100 of the fees and be able to use them for essentially any expense that could improve student learning. Nevertheless, the shift in resources was approved by the Vice-Chancellor for Business and Finance. The student response to their funds being used to supplement CAS administrative resources, and the corresponding impact on the quality of their education, has yet to be known.

³ Per Dean Gano-Phillips' e-mail of 31 Aug. 2017: "Utilization of Prefix fees to cover costs of disciplines receiving these fees – Programs which receive prefix fees (a per credit hour fee to support program operations) will be expected to utilize 30% of these fees to support the salaries of the professional staff and increased faculty costs for their programs. In FY17, these programs contributed 10% of these fees for this purpose."

⁴ This is a quote from a staff-member of the Dean's office who gave a presentation to a CAS department about its annual budget, explaining why it looked like it would be getting less than half what it was allocated the year prior, even though its enrollment had increased. Because this staff-member only presented to one department (he/she was filling in for someone else) the department and staff-member are not being named in order to protect his/her identity).

2) Salary cuts for some CAS faculty in spring/summer IGS courses:

In summer 2016 CAS faculty leading study abroad had their salaries capped at \$6500, instead of earning the normal 1/9 salary for a 3-credit course that has been paid to CAS faculty teaching summer classes since 1968 (according to former Provost Renata McLaughlin). Unlike some of the schools CAS does not support study-abroad courses by bringing costs down for students (i.e. paying for instructor travel or letting departments use their own funds to offer additional scholarships beyond those through IGS). Many students count study-abroad courses as the high point of their educational experience.

3) Removal of Dual Enrollment Educational Program (DEEP) revenue from the departments offering DEEP:

In 2017 oversight of DEEP revenue was transferred from the DEEP staff to the deans of the units that offer DEEP, so that more of the revenue generated could go to academic expenses.⁵ Immediately upon gaining oversight for the distribution of DEEP revenue, the CAS Dean removed the DEEP shortcodes in department budgets for those offering DEEP and directed all DEEP revenue to CAS's budget (where it goes after that is unknown). Some low-funded departments/programs had been relying on DEEP revenue to cover basic costs. The decision was also retroactive in that culling DEEP revenue had already started in 2016 if not sooner, so DEEP funds for the prior year were not fully transferred either. Any departments that had DEEP funds from prior years that they planned to carryover may have found the funds fully swept on July 1, 2017. DEEP revenue was important because departments could use it for almost any academic spending, greatly assisting with support for faculty and students.

The shift in allocation of revenue also breached the commitment made by Interim Dean Price to the units offering DEEP when the opportunities were being developed (roughly 2013-15). It was supposed to be the case that all revenue transferred to units offering DEEP would go to their departments. Many programs then did the intensive work of recruiting, collaborating, and organizing to offer DEEP classes. For many departments what had once been an important source of revenue now costs them money. Without access to the college budget, the departments in question do not know why the commitments between their programs and the dean's office were breached, how the revenue that they are generating is being spent, or whether such a measure might have been needed.

4) Cuts to some faculty salaries in spring/summer courses:⁶

In an e-mail to the CAS faculty of 31 Aug. 2017, the CAS Dean announced that the 40+ year history of paying CAS faculty the 1/9 salary for summer courses (the same as that required in the SPG to be given to faculty on the Ann Arbor campus) will be capped at \$7000, which impacts many Associate Professors and Professors. Historically, salaries have not been cut unless it could be shown that less work was being done. This change seems to relate directly to the efforts to increase CAS's base budget. For the past two years Chancellor Borrego has been negotiating and securing budget increases for the college, which, the CAS Dean confirmed at the September 2017 CAS governing faculty meeting, had to that point totalled \$2.1 million. Although the Dean was not asked to match the funds in cuts, according to the Vice-Chancellor for Business and Finance the increases (already in effect), came with a request to look for ways to increase efficiency in the college. One of the ways that CAS reportedly offered to increase efficiency was in spring/summer course scheduling. It is unclear if there is a connection between that promise and the cuts, but the CAS Dean's announcement that CAS faculty spring/summer salaries would be capped at \$7000 per course (which amounts to a salary cut for many), may be the way in which she is demonstrating efficiency. It is not known if alternative cuts, such as to administrative expenditures or salaries, were considered or implemented. According to the "Principles of Faculty Involvement..." document that applies to all three campuses at U of M "The faculty shall participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing compensation of faculty."⁷ The CAS governing faculty should ascertain whether this salary cut inequitably targets tenured faculty, and how exactly the faculty participated in this decision regarding compensation. Did the EC vote on this measure and approve it? If so, do the CAS governing faculty feel that the EC is acting in their interests?

⁵ As shared by Chancellor Borrego in the 13 Sept. 2017 CACBSP meeting.

⁶ From Dean Gano-Phillips' e-mail to faculty on 31 Aug. 2017: "Spring/Summer salary cap – Faculty members will be paid a maximum of \$7000 per 3 credit hour course taught during Spring 2018 or Summer 2018 semesters. Courses with varying credit hours will be paid in a commensurate fashion at a rate of \$2333.33 per credit hour. This cap will affect some, but not all, of our instructional faculty."

⁷ Part A.4.

Can the EC and Dean's office demonstrate whether this cut to faculty salaries, which targets only certain faculty, was fiscally necessary?

5) CAS faculty receive lower merit-pay raises than the schools for the second year in a row.⁸

At UM-Flint, all units are required to give the same average merit-pay rate. Each person's merit pay can deviate from the average, as long as the rate overall averages out. So, to give one faculty member more than the standard %2, another faculty member has to be given less. The relationship between rewarding one person and having to punish another means that if your unit does not have a clear procedure to recommend merit pay (such as a rubric, review committee, etc.), these allocations have the potential to be impacted by privilege, favoritism, retaliation, and other unpredictable factors.

For the past two years the CAS Dean has deviated from the standard merit program followed by all of the other deans by setting a lower internal rate for CAS's merit pay program. In 2016 an e-mail sent by the CAS Dean to all governing faculty explained that she was reducing the standard rate in order to have funds to pay for equity raises.⁹ Since the college's annual budget was not shared with the faculty, it was not possible to determine if such measures were necessary, or if cuts could have been made elsewhere. The CAS Dean indicates in that e-mail that she anticipates giving the same rate as the rest of the campus for 2018-19. But, for 2017-18, CAS chairs were told by representatives of the Dean's office that like 2016-17 CAS would only be getting %1.7 on average instead of the %2. This time the difference was needed, it was explained, to cover post-promotion raises, which have since been eliminated indefinitely (the inference is that their elimination is needed in order for CAS faculty to share in the same merit program as the schools). Again, dissemination of the college's annual budget would help to ascertain whether either the lower merit program or the elimination of post-promotion raises were necessary. As a major change to how faculty performance is reviewed, which is the purview of the CAS governing faculty, the cancellation of post-promotion raises should have been voted upon by the faculty.

Following the second instance of CAS receiving less than the campus rate, inquiries were made by faculty to the Vice-Chancellor for Business and Finance, who explained that he deemed CAS to be compliant with the %2 merit-pay average, because he was allowing the CAS Dean to count equity and post-promotion raises as part of the %2. According to past Executive Committee members, prior CAS deans seem to have reserved portions of their budgets to pay for equity and post-promotion raises separately from the merit-pay program. It is questionable whether merit and equity raises are comparable in purpose and should be funded from the same source.

By giving CAS faculty less merit pay, inequity between the college and school faculty increases. CAS faculty are already receiving lower salaries than some faculty in the schools (with the exception of SEHS, which tends to be the lowest paid unit). So, when raises also lag behind, the inequitable difference in salary also impacts things like retirement contributions. At present it is not clear which exceptions to giving the full merit rate are allowed now or in the future, and which are not, but CAS is the only unit not abiding by the equitable standard established for all units.

6) CAS tuition revenue funding swept from new programs:

Every time a new program is established its faculty have the opportunity to request a special tuition revenue agreement in order to do things like recruit, purchase equipment, provide instructional resources, create discipline-specific scholarships, train faculty through research and professional development, etc. CACBSP considers these at the time of the program's approval at the campus level. Depending on the program, revenue funds can be substantial. It is intended that at the end of each year for the program's launch (4-5 yrs) up to %80 of its revenue

⁸ See 31 Aug. 2017 e-mail from Dean Gano-Phillips: "Suspension of optional post-promotion review program for tenured faculty – this program, initiated in 2009, is self-funded and has allowed the College to address salary compression issues in the associate and full professor ranks while recognizing strong faculty performance. As CAS is the only college/school utilizing such a program on the Flint campus, and given our current fiscal situation, the college cannot continue this program. As noted in the merit letter received last week, the College has had to reduce the overall merit program for several years from the university-announced program to fund this program, and I believe it best to use the full merit program for its intended purpose next year."

⁹ Ibid.

will be available to grow the program. After that time, in theory, the program receives a %60 return on revenue after its expenses are paid. Funds are usually transferred at the end of each fiscal year (before June 30th).

Unfortunately, according to anecdotal faculty accounts and examples from certain units, it has been a longstanding problem that funds are not always transferred or available as expected, which makes it impossible to grow the programs and provide the services that students need when joining a new academic program. For one program (names are not being listed to protect from possible retaliation), only %5 of the revenue generated has been allowed to be used on actual program growth and expenses. The rest (totalling roughly \$200,000 over the past few years) has been swept by the CAS Dean. Funds are usually not deposited until the end of the fiscal year (May-June), and then only a few weeks later they disappear, even when carry-forward plans have been submitted to indicate need. For some programs this means that equipment and instructional content necessary for students to receive quality learning are not being offered. From a governance standpoint, when the faculty decide to approve a program, which includes allocating resources to it, but administrative intervention essentially de-funds the initiative, the administration has failed to meet its obligations towards the institution's academic mission. It is the responsibility of the governing faculty to ensure that the administration and its representatives act in keeping with its decisions.¹⁰ Budgeting is just one area where such diligence is needed—post requests can also be used to disregard recent and longstanding curricular decisions of the faculty, by essentially starving a faculty-established program of instructional staff to the point of its collapse or to make it appear that a viable department is failing. In the case of tuition revenue, the governing faculty need to ascertain in how many academic units such revenue is coming in, and whether or not they are getting to keep the funds, or are experiencing obstruction when they try to use the funds.

7) CAS faculty encouraged to give up office phones:

At the 13 Sept. 2017 CAS governing faculty meeting Dean Gano-Phillips explained that as part of the fiscal constraints facing the college it would assist CAS for faculty to give up their office phones.¹¹ This, of course, is voluntary, but does pose problems like potentially expecting faculty to subsidize university functions by using personal phones, etc. It is not clear that the funds saved would be kept by departments.

8) CAS faculty prohibited from receiving more than \$2000 college support for travel in a given year:¹²

In an e-mail from the CAS Dean to CAS governing faculty new travel budget policies were announced. These included that faculty would no longer be allowed to receive more than \$2000 for travel per year for any funds paid through CAS (including their departments). Secondly, departments are prohibited from spending administrative resources on travel (in other words, from determining for themselves if unspent funds in general operating could supplement faculty travel). This is an especially harsh policy for programs, such as graduate and shared programs, where travel funds have not been provided at all. Thirdly, the CAS Dean announced in the new policy that she will now personally approve all faculty travel funding. Such a measure would seem to both undermine departmental governance decisions of the faculty regarding how to prioritize their resources (especially since travel is not as important to all disciplines), while undermining the role of chairs/directors and also chipping away at the intended degree of independence that departments were supposed to have when the de-centralized budget model was introduced in 2014. Since 2014 the travel funds have been a part of a department's annual budget, even if paid from a CAS shortcode; funding applied for from the college is as a rule no longer available. It is unclear why the Dean's office would find a cap on travel funding necessary, since the only way that it would benefit the college is if departments are to be prevented from spending all of their resources so that they can be swept at the end of the fiscal year. Other deans have in the past implemented caps on what they would fund per faculty member in a given year, but individual programs may still have been able to supplement the cap.

¹⁰ The "Principles of Faculty Involvement..." include that "Faculty must exercise diligence and provide oversight to ensure that its agencies act in keeping with its policies and recommendations, and that they are implemented in an appropriate manner." Part A. 8.

¹¹ Noted by Dean Gano-Phillips in her report at the 13 Sept. 2017 faculty meeting.

¹² Summarized in the 31 Aug. 2017 e-mail from Dean Gano-Phillips: "Travel caps – As announced in July, CAS has set a \$2000 limit for travel funding per person for FY18 from CAS general funds (for details, please see CAS Travel and Hosting Policy at <https://www.umflint.edu/cas/faculty-staff-resources/#tab-faculty>)."

9) Post-promotion raises eliminated for CAS Faculty:¹³

Per an e-mail from the CAS Dean to CAS faculty on 31 Aug. 2017, the longstanding tradition of post-promotion raises has ended in the college. CAS faculty struggle the most of those in any unit to be promoted from Associate Professor to Professor—the post-promotion raise afforded a modicum of equity correction. The struggle is not in being successful when applying, but rather in being able to apply at all. Please see f.n. 13 for data regarding the number of faculty at each rank. The ‘standard’ ratio of Assistant to Associate to full professors at U of M is 30%, 30%, and 40%. However, CAS has 48% at Associate Professors rank and only 22% at the Professor rank. It is unclear which impediments exist for CAS faculty that prevent them from obtaining Professor status. It seems that a replacement for the post-promotion raises is being considered, but it is not clear that it will be vetted as required by governing faculty approval.

10) Post Requests limited to those with Revenue:

For the past three years it has been increasingly the case that the CAS Dean is instructing the Executive Committee on post allocation priorities, which is primarily a purview of the faculty. A rubric is possibly used, but it is not shared with or approved by the faculty, who have purview over faculty appointments and CAS procedures. Minutes of the EC from fall 2015 state that the posts allocated are going to be those that generate the most revenue. Again, on 31 Aug. 2017, the Dean’s notice of austerity measures stated that posts in the future will be granted on the basis of enrollment, which equates to how much revenue they will be perceived to generate. Enrollment is interpreted most often as raw credit hours. The big departments get more posts because they have the staff to recruit students, while the small departments shrink with fewer and fewer faculty to cover the bases. The Dean’s decisions regarding post allocations underlie a decision-making process rooted in revenue, which does not seem to take into consideration prior commitments to programs, faculty, and students. Minutes of the EC also show that the members are instructed by the Dean not to consider how long a department has had to apply to fill a position, or whether the position is a replacement. Preserving the academic integrity of the core liberal arts disciplines of the college has therefore been eliminated as a priority. There will not have been a post in the arts or humanities in six annual post cycles. This makes it the third year in a row that CAS is practicing an effective faculty hiring freeze. The soonest one could be possible will be in 2020, but even though the faculty determination of post need should be the priority (as per the Regents’ Bylaws stipulating that hiring is the purview of the faculty) the Dean has

¹³ See f.n. 5. The following UM-Flint data was provided in June of 2017 from the Office of Institutional Analysis:

Data on Faculty Status:

Ann Arbor approximate institutional percentage of tenure-stream faculty at different ranks (approximate):

Professor: %40

Associate Professor: %30

Assistant Professor: %30

UM-Flint:

Total number of tenure-stream faculty (does not include clinical or Lec IIIs or IVs): 209

Professor rank: %20.6 (43/209)

SOM:

Professor: %38 (10)

Associate Professor: %19 (5)

Assistant Professor: %42 (11)

SHPS: (still includes SON)

Professor: %12 (5)

Associate Professor: %18 (7)

Assistant Professor: %69 (27)

SEHS:

Professor: %0

Associate Professor: %35 (6)

Assistant Professor: %65 (11)

CAS:

Professor: %22 (28)

Associate Professor: %48 (61)

Assistant Professor: %30 (38)

already indicated that revenue will be the deciding factor, which leaves out of contention all of the small liberal arts disciplines, even if the enrollment that they generate already would more than cover a tenure-track post, and even if their enrollment has remained stable or has been increasing. It may be that CAS cannot afford posts at this time, or that it is still paying for under-funded posts created under Interim Dean Price, but it is concerning that hiring of administrative staff has continued (such as for professional advisors) while some academic programs lack enough faculty to serve their students. Moreover, there are actually some posts being allocated, but in at least 2 CAS departments the Dean's office seems to have given the post at a different rank or position than what the department requested, seemingly for the purpose of hiring chair positions that will prevent faculty in the department who have been elected by their colleagues for chairpersonships from taking leadership positions. Is it a good use of resources to pay the higher salaries of chairs when faculty posts are in such dire need, and when the rank being sought has not originated from the department's faculty?

11) All departments to receive a 5-8% cut in overall budget for the 2017-18 year (see August e-mail).

12) Changes to Staffing (budget neutral to the college, but a major budget increase for the Dean's office and a major budget decrease for CAS departments).

END OF EXPANDED ARTICLE CONTENT

Conclusion: The austerity measures in CAS have been shared with its faculty publicly by the Dean's office (with the exception of tuition revenue funds). What may remain unknown are the following questions:

- a) How many of these decisions were approved by vote of the Executive Committee and/or the governing faculty?
- b) Which austerity policies are intended to be permanent?
- c) Do these measures undermine budgetary independence that was intended for CAS departments when they were allocated annual budgets in 2014, and if so, are non-fiscal purposes at work in these policy changes?
- d) How much did each department/program contribute to the CAS deficits in the last two years?
- e) How much is each department/program contributing to the CAS administrative budget?
- f) Are these measures justified given actual enrollment?
- g) How do CAS faculty verify that their departments are only experiencing 5-8% budget reduction, since anecdotal evidence suggests that for some programs it is actually closer to a cut of 50-90%? Do all of the resources being shifted from departments and academic purposes match the anticipated deficits for which they are supposedly needed, or do the shifting allocations exceed what should be necessary?
- h) Given the seemingly unprecedented nature of these cuts (in number and scope), along with the way in which they centralize greater authority and resources in the CAS administration, it would seem to be a moral imperative that CAS faculty know exactly how much their departments are contributing to college debt and administrative agendas/expenses, how to access CAS' administrative annual budget, and how the annual budgets of the departments and programs compare (as a matter of equity). How can the CAS faculty know that all of these measures were necessary without seeing the college's annual budget, and especially that of the Dean's office?
- i) Has the Dean omitted administrative cuts from her announcements, or is it the case that faculty and resources for research and instruction are the primary (if not only) cuts implemented? It is only through a complete understanding of all resources that decisions about where to cut can be made responsibly and budgetary decisions can be made in concert with the faculty.

Answers to these questions are imperative when examining the resources of the largest instructional unit at UM-Flint, especially since in the past debts in CAS have had to be paid by contributions from the schools. Since almost all revenue streams in CAS departments and programs have been reduced or eliminated by the current administration, the faculty have a right to know how all of these funds are being used.