



## CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

September 20, 1993

**TO:** Tactical Innovations Committee (TIC)  
**FROM:** University Senior Administrators  
**SUBJECT:** Response to TIC Preliminary Report

We are providing written comments in response to your encouragement to do so.

We commend the Committee's commitment and effort. We appreciate the magnitude and difficulty of the Committee's charge. We believe that your report over all contributes to the forward movement of the University.

The Preliminary Report is clear and positive in its recommendations and objective in tone and tenor. Your cover letter, however, seems otherwise. The tone is deeply disturbing. It seems insensitive to the feelings of good colleagues. It is divisive to single out one segment of the University community, administrators, as culprits. The various constituencies have endured the past bad times by working together, not by identifying scapegoats.

One segment in particular seems unnecessarily negative and divisive and in our view does not contribute to the report. That segment, "A widespread campus sentiment....," diminishes the considerable cooperative, positive working relationships between all of the University constituent groups which were established over a three-year period of hardship. All constituent groups worked together and sacrificed together for the good of the University. The largest personnel cuts occurred among staff and administrators, reflecting our important consensus that instruction was our highest priority.

The questionable statements made in that segment were inessential to the report and do not appear to be substantiated. A general, vague, phrase like "widespread campus sentiment" provides an opportunity to make unattributed comments, however unfair and unfactual they may be. There are over 600 full and part-time employees and almost 6,000 students at this University. There is a difference between anecdotal inferences and validated widespread sentiment.

On this campus, academic administrators regularly teach. An analysis of four administrators' course enrollments in ALS showed that they generated 1.8 faculty positions in 1992/93, representing a substantial savings to the University. This Academic Year, administrators are scheduled to teach 25 WTU's. Additionally, several administrators are mentors in the Faculty/Student Mentoring Program working with 6-8 advisees each on an ongoing basis. School Deans regularly serve as faculty advisors to students.

The appointment books of senior administrators will confirm that most of our time is spent meeting individually with faculty, students, and staff, or spent with committees, most of which have

faculty, student and staff representatives. Very little time is spent in meetings with administrators only. Many faculty, staff and students can confirm their utilization of the opportunity for drop-in visits with administrators. There are fewer administrative and staff persons and positions today than there were in 1985, even though enrollments have increased by 40% over that time and the faculty has increased by 15%. Some administrative offices are routinely congratulated and thanked for being available and responsive to the needs of all constituencies.

Your statement about the inefficiency of the overly-large College of Arts, Letters and Sciences is inconsistent with productivity data. For example, during the academic year 1991/92, ALS generated 8.2 positions more than available for instruction. In 1992/93 that number increased to 15.6, an 89% increase. This represents a tremendous contribution and evidences the exemplary dedication of the faculty.

We are surprised that certain members of the TIC did not readily recognize the inaccuracy of the statements that curricular changes in ALS are difficult, if not impossible, and that there is a lack of academic collaboration among related disciplines.

In 1992/93 Cognitive Studies was started and the MSW and Masters in TESOL were finalized for start-up this Fall. Criminal Justice became a major in 1984 and as a result, that curriculum underwent considerable revision. Programs which have been revised include: Child Development, Environmental and Resources Minor, BA in Organizational Communications, BA in Drama, Psychology, and Chemistry. A feasibility study for the BFA in Art was approved, and 65 courses were reviewed, of which 50 plus were new courses.

Mandated reviews were submitted on time for: Child Development, Criminal Justice, Social Science and Sociology. ALS initiated and submitted the following resolutions to UEPC: Challenge Examination, Individual Study (both approved by the Academic Senate), and Required Enrollment in Areas A1, 2, 3 and B3.

Entire programs, centers, institutes and departments in ALS are completely interdisciplinary. They involve faculty from different departments in ALS and the Schools of Business and Education. Examples are Liberal Studies (the largest major), Ethnic and Women's Studies, Cognitive Studies, Honors Program, Social Sciences, Institute for International Studies, and Child Development Center. Three important projects which continue to make significant contributions to teachers in our service area epitomize academic collaboration: The California Literature Project, the California Mathematics Project, and the Great Valley Writing Project. Departments routinely share faculty resources. For example, Chemistry faculty teach Computer Science, Drama faculty teach English and Communication Studies, Modern Languages faculty teach Humanities and Linguistics. Moreover, during 1992/93 faculty were recruited to teach in more than one department. Examples are new hires in Anthropology/Ethnic Studies, Political Science/History, and Geology/Geography.

Although it is after the fact, the TIC process might have benefited from utilizing appropriate resource persons prior to the issuance of the Preliminary Report to check for factual inaccuracies, incomplete information or data, and misinterpretations. It is a method that accreditation bodies use prior to making any document public. Truth and accuracy are maximized. At the very least, persons responsible for areas identified for major changes should have been asked about the impact of these changes. In some cases they might have been asked to explain their duties and responsibilities to the Committee. How could the Committee confidently conclude that positions could be eliminated and responsibilities reassigned with little or no negative impact or that functions were largely duplicative without interviewing the responsible administrator? Because job descriptions, budget documents and reports are often misunderstood and misinterpreted, an

intensive interview of an experienced, informed person is a critically important source of information.

Attached is a response to the substantive concerns raised in the TIC Preliminary Report. These comments are provided to enhance dialogue and contribute to a future basis for our deliberations.

Attachment

cc: (w/attach)  
Campus Community

SIGNED:

Horace A. Judson

Michael L. Perkins  
Donald W. Lowers

Cal Coffey

[Signature]

John Amherst

Brian Mayer Demetrius

[Signature]

Jay P. Christofferson

John P. Mayer

W. L. Fish

Del Abreitztefa

[Signature]  
Richard B. Conrad

# A CONTEXT FOR PLANNING

## CLARIFICATION AND COMMENTS ON THE TIC REPORT

### Introduction

Before we discuss the report of the Tactical Innovations Committee, we should review the context within which University planning has occurred in recent years. This context should help us understand why we are in as good a position as we are now.

### Context for Planning

Since 1986, the University has grown dramatically. There has been more than a 40% increase in enrollment. The University has been mandated to respond to numerous State and Federal regulations, and to absorb many responsibilities that were formerly carried out by the Chancellor's Office or other State agencies. In addition, the new emphasis on campus autonomy has brought with it an increased campus workload without recognition of the need for additional staff to carry out the additional work.

Earlier decisions, including the elimination of more than one hundred positions, yielded a considerable financial windfall, which benefits us this year. As a result of mandated reductions for 1992/93, the University was required to reduce its workforce and cut \$4.3 million from its 1992/93 budget. By June 30, 1992, the University had reduced management positions by eight (-16%) and support staff positions by 119 (-35%). During the same timeframe, faculty positions increased by 25.

These reductions in management and support staff occurred during the period of the most rapid growth in enrollment that this campus has known. Today, there are significantly fewer non-teaching staff and administrators than there were in 1985. Fewer people are called upon to do more, and more varied work than ever before.

In Fall 1992, late action on the State budget yielded substantial resources that we had not planned for in our worst-case scenario. As a consequence, President Kerschner informed the UPRC in November that the University had unallocated assets of \$3.1 million. It is because the University had planned for the worst case in 1992/93 that we are now able to avoid further layoffs and any program reductions.

Through all of the hard decisions on budget, instruction has been the highest priority of the University. Where possible, cuts have come from non-academic personnel and programs. Efforts have been made to maintain the faculty. More than \$100,000 in additional resources was reallocated in 1992/93 from administrative support to instruction; recent allocations have given high priority to the acquisition of academic equipment and to library acquisitions.

Long range financial planning provided the cushion to avoid further trauma in 1993/94.

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS CONCERNING RECOMMENDATIONS

As discussion begins, it is important that the factual information be accurate and the full range of informed opinion be presented. Some of the comments which follow are intended to correct factual errors or oversimplifications in the recommendations. Other comments represent alternatives which we believe deserve consideration. Comments on the possible restructuring of the College and Schools have purposely been omitted. It is assumed that there will be many

lengthy deliberations on the matter in various campus committees and bodies, primarily in the Academic Senate. At that time, administrators will have an opportunity to voice their opinions, along with other campus constituencies, most obviously the faculty. For that reason too, there is no response to other recommendations, including possible elimination of the Associate Dean position in ALS.

**Recommendation A.6** - California State University, Stanislaus shall adopt a policy which eliminates the current and historical practice of red-circling salaries of employees who are demoted or reassigned to less responsible positions within the University.

**Response:** The recommendation regarding the red-circling of employees has serious implications which need to be explored prior to acceptance of the recommendation. In fact, it may not be possible for the campus to agree unilaterally to such a policy without being in violation of established policy.

**Recommendation B.2** - Move all campus budget functions into the University Budget Office which reports to the Vice President for Administration. Reorganize the University Budget Office by assigning a budget analyst to each of the four main organizational divisions of the campus: president's office, administration, academic affairs, and student affairs.

**Response:** The reorganization of the Budget Office suggests the establishment of budget analysts for each of the four main organizational divisions of the campus without identifying the resource implications of providing the analysts in the Budget Office to carry out those functions. Presently budget functions carried out within the areas are handled by individuals who have multiple assignments and perform other functional accountabilities within their organization. This item could have substantial additional cost implications for the University.

Presently, the Academic Affairs Division has 78% of the budget; the Office of the President has 2%; and the Executive Vice President has 13%. With your recommendation, Academic Affairs would have 65% and Student Affairs 13%, with the other two areas unchanged. Since the differences in size and complexity among areas are so broad, ranging from 2% to 65%, what is the rationale for providing each area with one budget analyst?

**Recommendation B.3** - Transfer Receiving and the Stores operation from Facilities Planning and Operations to Administrative Services. Change the name of Administrative Services to FISCAL AFFAIRS and the director's title to Director of Fiscal Affairs.

**Response:** Receiving and Stores were combined with warehousing to achieve economy of scale in the utilization of personnel from multiple small offices. This organizational adjustment was made in response to mandated reductions. The present arrangement provides for backup and consistency of function as well as oversight of centralized receiving rather than maintaining warehousing and receiving activities under different administrative offices. The separation of purchasing and receiving provides checks and balances consistent with sound operating procedures. It may be more economical to address the communications problems the committee identifies than to change an organizational structure (which has space and facilities implications for the units as they are presently configured). This information should be factored into further discussion.

**Recommendation B.4** - The OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (OIT) shall report to the Office of Vice President for Administration instead of the Office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**Response:** In the main, placement of the Office of Information Technology in Academic Affairs was the result of continuing requests of the faculty. Its location is likely to be of little significance. For the record, however, it should be noted that of 20 people in OIT, 7 directly support the teaching and research mission of the University, 8 directly support administrative computing activities, and 5 are divided between the two support areas.

**Recommendation B.5** - The OFFICE OF PUBLIC SAFETY shall report directly to the Vice President for Administration.

**Response:** The Executive Vice President or, under the new proposal, Vice President for Administration, will continue to serve as the University's emergency operations executive. The Department of Public Safety continues to have direct access to the Vice President. In fact, the department is expected by operating procedure to communicate directly with the Vice President on all matters of public health, safety and campus access as appropriate. Because of the close operating relationship between physical plant and public safety in maintaining an open and safe campus, the current organizational arrangement has facilitated communication and eliminated barriers to effective service from these areas. This information should be factored into further discussion.

**Recommendation B.6** - The position of FOUNDATION DIRECTOR shall be eliminated and the management of the Foundation be transferred to the Vice President for Administration. Elimination of this position will save \$51,420.

**Response:** The University's Foundation is a private 501(c)3 corporation with an independent board to whom the Foundation Director reports. It is a complex corporate structure handling in excess of \$8 million in business a year. The suggested recommendation would pierce the corporate veil of the Foundation, creating liability issues for the University and perhaps eliminating the flexibility which the Foundation provides to the University. This information should be factored into further discussion.

**Recommendation CI** - Academic Affairs

**Response:** The Director of the Stockton Center reports to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**Recommendation CI-1** - Eliminate the position of ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC RESOURCES AND FACULTY AND STAFF RELATIONS (AVPAR/FSR)

**Response:** The underlying premise of these recommendations is that after the university has experienced a 35% reduction in staff and a 16% reduction in administration that elimination of additional positions, decentralization, and further dispersion of workload to areas already overburdened can be done with increases in efficiency, more expeditious delivery of services and enhanced manageability. This premise is not substantiated in reality. Loss of programs, reductions in services, erosions in quality, curtailment, delays, and loss of efficiencies which affect the entire university community have been the results of reductions in staff and funding.

This position has been in existence on our campus since at least 1977 when Dr. Paul Harder was appointed Dean of Academic Resources. During this time there has also been an Associate Vice President position for Academic Affairs. This campus was much smaller then, and the CSU system more highly centralized at the Chancellor's Office. The campus has grown tremendously in enrollments and staffing and has become more complex. Over the years duties and assignments have changed according to administrative need. In 1981-82 the title became Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Academic Resources. In 1986 upon the death of Paul Harder this position remained vacant until the Fall of 1987 when the new Provost/Vice President filled the position first on an acting basis and then permanently in the Spring of 1988. Although sixteen years of history does not in and of itself determine that any position is indispensable, it does substantiate that several different vice presidents have over this period of time found it to be an essential position; it cogently argues that it fills integral university needs. The dispensability of this position cannot be determined simply by the argument: "This redundant position was not created (1) to manage, supervise, or administer any new programs, or CSU or legislative mandates or (2) to carry out any duties or responsibilities not previously administered, managed, or implemented by others." This may be said of almost any position on this campus unless the original appointee remained in his/her position since the creation of the college without any changes of duties. As

the campus grew, additional positions were needed to accommodate growth and workload, changes in organization and structure of the campus, additional changes in operations, transition to collective bargaining, implementation of state, federal and CSU regulations which provided additional complexity and increased workloads. Very few new positions have been added to the campus by legislative fiat.

**Assumption:** The heavy workload of duties and responsibilities of the AVPAR/FSR office can be off loaded to other administrative offices and become more manageable, more efficient in the operation and delivery of services and less expensive....

**Response:** The University now has eight fewer administrators than three years ago. The workload of these administrators did not just dissipate but had to be reassigned to others or discontinued. Duties and responsibilities that continued were reassigned to already heavily loaded administrators and staff. This has certainly made operations less manageable, less efficient and left things undone or delayed. Reallocations of heavy workloads to areas already heavily burdened cannot create more manageability and efficiency. Rather, one would expect less attention, less efficiency, more delay and more important things left undone. Reductions in staff positions exacerbate this condition.

**Assumption;** The elimination of the AVPAR/FSR position will save the University \$91,752.

**Response:** Elimination of this position is unlikely to save the university any money and will likely increase costs.

The incumbent's salary will remain at \$60,960 as an academic year full time professor. This reduces the expected university savings to \$30,792. The hiring of a single additional staff person to handle any of the workload transferred from the AVPAR/FSR office will eliminate any savings.

The current proposal recommends the creation of four budget analyst positions. This is likely to entail the transfer of one employee, reassignment of duties for another and will in all likelihood entail the appointment of two other staff. The dispersion of facility scheduling to two separate areas will require an additional staff appointment for external facilities scheduling, as there is no current staffing available to handle this additional, time-consuming load.

#### **Recommendation C-I- 1A - FACULTY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING (MOU UNIT 3) CONTRACT**

**ADMINISTRATION -** Throughout the Unit 3 contract, administrative compliance references the "appropriate administrator." Pursuant to past practices, in most pertinent areas of compliance the "appropriate administrator" is the school or college dean, and most grievances are handled at this level. In all other areas, the "appropriate administrator" is the President or his/her designee, usually the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs (P/VPAA). Contract (MOU) interpretation and advice for chairs and campus administrators are generally related to them by a responsible person in the office of the P/VPAA upon advice and counsel from the assigned employee relations representative from the CSU Office of the Chancellor. In most cases, this has been handled by a telephone call or FAX between our campus and the Chancellor's office. This function can be easily handled by a confidential employee in the Office of P/VPAA, with administrative responsibility vested in the P/VPAA.

**and Recommendation CI-IC - ACADEMIC PERSONNEL -** This long-standing, self-contained independent office is the repository for faculty personnel files and the working personnel action files for RPT. In addition, this office is responsible for the drafting and sending of appointment letters after the recruitment and selection process has ended. The recruitment process for faculty positions is normally initiated, processed, and completed at the department level with direct guidance and input from the dean. Other personnel functions such as leaves of absence, difference in pay leaves, sabbaticals, and part-time faculty recruitment and selection are also primarily handled by the departments and the Dean, with final approval by the P/VPAA. The primary thrust of this office is record keeping and processing. Supervision and administrative responsibility for the functions of this office are vested in the P/VPAA. Delegated responsibility shall be vested in the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVPAA). The elimination of the Office of the AVPAR/FSR in relation to this office will have little to no appreciable effect.

**Response:** The complexity and workload of this area is severely underestimated and oversimplified in the report.

Responsibilities for Faculty Personnel and Faculty Collective Bargaining include all matters pertaining to faculty employment, administration of faculty personnel policies and procedures: monitoring tenure track

hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion for adherence to procedures, supervision of recommendations for all other faculty personnel actions; oversight of the faculty recruitment process; coordination of various faculty development programs; administration of the collective bargaining agreement for faculty; processing faculty appointments and changes in personnel status (tenure, promotion, leaves of absence, etc.), maintenance of the official faculty personnel files and of the Faculty Affairs Information and Reporting System (FAIRS) database. Responsibilities as Faculty Employee Relations designee includes: serving as the University's principal interface with the faculty union as well as the CSU System's Office of Employee Relations, advising on interpretation and applications of faculty bargaining agreements; providing assistance, information, and training to faculty, chairs, and deans; responding to internal and external requests for information about the faculty and university policies and procedures; facilitating informal resolution of faculty complaints whenever possible; representing the campus on faculty grievances, disciplinary actions and arbitration, working with CSU legal counsel, and assisting counsel in arbitration, disciplinary actions and allegations of misconduct; advising the Provost on academic personnel issues and assisting other appropriate administrators; serving as liaison with the Chancellor's Office of the California State University and with the other 19 campuses in the CSU system on matters relating to faculty affairs.

The number of faculty appointments exceeds the combined number of staff and MPP appointments. The recommendation to eliminate the MPP position which handles these responsibilities and transfer them to the Provost is similar to recommending that the director of personnel position be eliminated and transferring all functions and responsibilities to the senior administrator. The complexity and scope of Unit 3 continues to increase; now includes faculty, librarians, academically related counselors (previously Unit 4) and Continuing Education faculty.

The rules, regulations, and procedures which apply to faculty personnel are extensive, encompassing, and binding and they cover more than half of the CSU Stanislaus employees. They cover everything from pre-employment activities through appointment, retention, promotion, grievances, arbitration, faculty development, working conditions, benefits, layoffs, and so forth.

Almost without exception, CSU campuses have an MPP person other than the Provost/Vice President who has responsibility for Faculty Affairs. "Dean of Faculty Affairs," "Associate Vice President for Faculty and Staff Affairs," "Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel," etc., are titles that identify management personnel who are assigned these responsibilities and report to the Provost/Vice President. These are usually people with Ph.Ds and faculty experience. The complexity, impact, and workload of this position generally requires a full-time administrative position dedicated to these responsibilities.

The Chancellor's Office has been downsizing and decentralizing, resulting in additional workload for the campus. In the past, individual campuses assumed greater responsibility for their faculty personnel actions. Campus presidents designate "Employee Relations Designees" for faculty and for staff. These are the campus contacts for bargaining unit contract issues, grievances, arbitrations, etc. The administrator assigned this responsibility must have in-depth knowledge and understanding of faculty collective bargaining, faculty personnel criteria and procedures, and work effectively with Deans, Department Chairs, individual faculty, CFA and the Chancellor's Office.

**Recommendation CI-1B** - Budget - Vest the budgetary administration, dissemination, and decision making responsibility for the academic area of the University with the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The position responsible for assisting the P/VPAA in the data gathering, analyzing, report structuring and preparation of the budget data shall be an assigned budget analyst from the University Budget Office (see Rec. B2).

**Response:** The assumption that greater efficiency, easier manageability, and effectiveness will be derived from relocating the budget specialist to an area farther away from the Provost/VP with a different supervisor who determines workload, assignments and priorities than having the person work directly for the Provost's Office is not substantiated either by past experience or logic. The greater number of obstacles introduced into a situation, the greater the separation in space and time, the greater the number

of priorities, the less efficient and effective will be the operation. The extraordinary amount of time involved in dealing with budget matters, developing the yearly budget plan, working with each of the budget areas, identifying mandated reductions, dealing with constant changes, monitoring all of the Academic Affairs budgets year round, as well as the size of the budget, the diversity of budget areas and the assistance each budget area requires, all indicate the inadvisability of reassigning this staff position and its responsibilities away from its current location. The operation is working much more effectively and efficiently than under previous organizational structures. This position is essential where it is currently located as it provides more information, better analysis and more timely information, more accurate expenditure projections and greater assistance in developing and managing the Academic Affairs budget. This position now provides substantial assistance to every major Academic Affairs budget area. It effectively integrates the diverse and complex Academic Affairs budget information within the requirements of the University budget office. This effective integration provides for appropriate cooperation and functional support for both the Provost and the Budget Office.

**Recommendation CI-IE** - Faculty Development - Primary responsibility for faculty developmental training and other related events and activities is vested in the Faculty Development Committee. The functions of the AVPAR/FSR in relation to Faculty Development now consists primarily of serving as an ex-officio member of the committee and acting as liaison between the committee and the P/VPAA. This limited role can be performed by the AVPAA.

**Response:** Prior to extensive budget reductions a full-time administrator and a secretary handled the responsibilities for faculty development. In response to the severe University budget crisis these two positions were eliminated and responsibilities were reallocated to the AVPAR/FSR.

The duties are varied and include: Coordination and support for various faculty development and instructional development programs and activities with deans, Faculty Development Committee, and Provost, and support for: Outstanding Professor campus recognition and CSU competition, annual Faculty Recognition activities, Faculty Development Grants (Faculty Affirmative Action Development), the budgetary component of faculty Research, Scholarship & Creative Activities grants, new faculty orientation, campus coordination for the CSU Teacher/Scholar Summer Institute for faculty, and liaison with the Chancellor's Office for CSU faculty development activities.

**Recommendation CI-IF** - Faculty Workload - Faculty workload and academic master curriculum were previously maintained by an administrative operations analyst (AOA) II. Upon her retirement the work was bifurcated and assigned to clerical employees in the Offices of the Associate Vice Presidents. Currently all curriculum changes, modifications, new courses, new programs, new concentrations within existing programs, and the management of academic master scheduling are handled by the office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVPAA). In order to improve efficiency, all of the functions that are currently bifurcated can be vested in the office of the AVPAA. The responsible staff employee will work in conjunction with the Coordinator of Class/Facility Scheduling and Catalog.

**Response:** The workload previously maintained by an AOA II which included Faculty Workload, Academic Master Curriculum and coordination of student evaluation of teaching was redistributed to existing staff in response to the elimination of this staff position. If the Committee envisions reallocating a staff position from the Associate Vice President for Academic Resources to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs in support of this function, then no savings are likely to be realized. If the "responsible staff employee" is the existing staff member in support of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, she has already assumed 0.5 of the responsibilities of the retired Administrative Operations Analyst. Therefore, it is rather unlikely that the person will be able to absorb the additional responsibilities of faculty workload analysis, monitoring, and reporting. The unification of these responsibilities as recommended by the Committee would likely result in the hiring of additional staff.

**Recommendation CI-IG** - Catalog, Schedule of Classes and Facilities (Classrooms, faculty offices and events)

**Response:** The following responsibilities are also a part of the AVPAR/FSR office: assessment of need for classroom space, faculty offices, space alterations; assessment of space utilization; initiation and coordination of moving efforts; locating (renting) additional faculty, classroom and lab space as needed; and furnishing classrooms and faculty offices. In addition, the AVPAR/FSR works with Plant Operations

in any campus changes which affect Academic Affairs, including Campus Planning, Minor Capital Outlay projects, some special Repairs, new building planning and development for the academic area.

**Additional Major Areas of Responsibility for the Office of AVPAR&FSA.** Additional major areas of responsibility include: University responsibility for the campus lottery budget and Lottery Endowment Interest; assuring compliance with regulations in allocation and expenditures; serving as liaison with the Chancellor's Office for this program, compiling and submitting the annual comprehensive year end report on lottery expenditures for all programs; and assisting with the development of University lottery development plan. The use of lottery funds is restricted to instructional related purposes.

**Instructionally Related Activities.** The AVPAR is the President's designee with principal responsibility for this program. Responsibilities include: serving as a member of the IRA Committee (ASB president serves as chair), coordinating and facilitating committee responsibilities, monitoring compliance with procedures and regulations, monitoring income and providing income and expenditure projections. These funds provide for instructional support for activities integral to an instructional area.

**Recommendation CI-3** - The Athletic Director's position shall be transferred from the Office of the Provost/VPAA to the Office of the President. On all matters affecting fund raising, the Athletic Director will coordinate such efforts with the Executive Director for University Advancement.

**Response:** The nature of our Division II Athletic Program is somewhat unique and may be best served in its present organizational setting. While many Division I programs are totally unrelated to the academic enterprise, all sports included in the CSU, Stanislaus athletic program are part of the academic curriculum and all student athletes earn academic credit for participation. Coaches have faculty status and our Athletic Program is a non-scholarship program. Athletics was transferred to Academic Affairs because its duality could be better accommodated there. Moreover, general funds comprise 67% of the Athletics budget. General funds and student fees together provide 78%.

The concern of the NCAA is that Athletics be controlled by the University and the President, and not by some outside organization or structure. Reporting to the VPAA is strongly consistent with the NCAA's philosophy. Athletes are students first and athletes second.

**Recommendation CII-1** - Academic Structure - Statement: "This structure eliminates one Associate Dean position saving \$78,000 per year..."

**Response:** The incumbent holds retreat rights into an ALS academic department. At least \$60,000 of projected savings would not be realized.

**Recommendation** - Organization of Colleges:

**Response:** Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Geology are generally not considered Applied Sciences. What is the basis for the location of International Studies and Mathematics in the School of Business and Public Policy other than equalizing the sizes of the Colleges?

**Recommendation DI** - Vice President for Student Affairs - Change the title of the Office of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs/Dean of Students to the OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS. Transfer the Office from the Office of the P/VPAA to the Office of the President.

**Response:** Nationally, two models of organization are common:

- 1) The VPSA reports directly to the President, ensuring clear communication of issues and concerns in the Cabinet.
- 2) The VPSA reports to the Provost, with regular communication to the President, ensuring communication and cooperation between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Both can work equally well depending on the circumstances of the University. However, a Vice Presidential position would require an increase in salary since the Vice Provost position is equivalent to an Associate Vice President position. It is likely that there would be some pressure soon from that division for appropriate reclassifications of personnel.

Initially the new division, as proposed, would be disadvantaged budgetarily. Some of the personnel support provided by Academic personnel would not be transferred and requests for budget supplements from Academic Affairs units to Student Service units would no longer be likely.

**Recommendation D3** - The OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES shall report to the Senior Director for Enrollment Services.

**Response:** Does the TIC recommendation refer (1) only the admissions functions of graduate studies, or (2) to the office of graduate studies as an administrative support unit, or (3) to graduate studies as an academic program? This is not clear as there is inconsistency of terminology in the report's narrative and organizational charts.

At CSU Stanislaus, graduate studies has matured over the years into an academic unit without portfolio (without a separate faculty). Through the Graduate Council it sets academic policy, determines program offerings and requirements, and assures the quality of programs. These are important academic responsibilities, not administrative functions. As a result, the most common national organizational model for graduate studies is a free-standing office reporting to an academic dean of graduate studies. Further, graduate offices typically offer one-stop shopping for new and continuing graduate students, thus the admissions and graduation functions of the office, but they are more accurately academic offices, much like departmental or deans' offices.

#### General Observations

1. A number of the organizational adjustments regarding reporting lines for Human Resources, OIT, and University Advancement, while worthy of further review, would simply return the University's organizational structure to its pre-1992-93 budget reduction structure. Organizational structures that may have been appropriate and useful at an earlier period of campus history may no longer be useful. These recommendations do not appear to be cost-saving nor is the gain in efficiency, effectiveness or manageability clear. It may be prudent to defer consideration of additional significant organizational changes during this transition period.
2. The report suggests savings of about \$322,000-346,000. The employment rights of identified personnel would present a continuing cost of \$122,000. Legal implications make the projection of the elimination of one \$51,000 position unlikely. Those alone reduce the projected savings from between \$149,000 to \$173,000. However, several of TIC's recommendations are very likely to increase costs, as well as eliminate some functions and services.
3. The alleged goal of the Committee to "avoid layoffs in all areas of the University" appears to be incongruous with Committee recommendations.

SIGNED:

Horace G. Judson  
Arvid L. Peterson  
John K. Ambler  
Richard L. Covert  
Donald W. Brown

John L. Woogren  
Cal. Off.  
Stan. Univ.  
Jay P. Christofferson  
Sch. of Graduate Studies  
[Signature]