

***The DRAFT of the  
UPDATE AND CONTINUATION  
OF  
The Financial Sustainability Plan  
Positioning Eastern Oregon University  
for  
Mission Fulfillment***

***Presented by:***

***Robert O. Davies, President***

***Stephen R. Adkison, Provost***

***Jay Kenton, Interim President***

***and***

***Sarah Witte, Interim Provost***

***April 30, 2014***

## EOU 2014 Sustainability Plan Update (DRAFT)

### *I. Introduction and Executive Summary*

This is the third update to the Sustainability Plan for Eastern Oregon University. Over the last five years, our University Community has gone through considerable change and reflection as we, as a community, have dealt with what I initially referred to in my 2010 State of University address as the “Confluence of the Three Rivers of Change.” These changes include: significantly declining state and federal revenues; increased calls of accountability at all levels; and, changes in the competition of universities through advances in technology and other means. This year, we can add a fourth river that represents the shifting demographics served by regional universities and especially by Eastern as well the role of governance structures within our State. All of these factors have, and will continue, to exert immense pressures—fiscally and operationally—on our university.

This past year, while we charted a viable and valid fiscal plan for our University, we experienced—and continue to experience—an unprecedented decline in student enrollment. This year, as previously reported in my memorandums to the university we are seeing a decline of nearly 11 percent in student credit hours. [To view these communications, go to: November 14, 2013 at [http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2013/12/Sustainability-Plan-memo\\_11-14-131.pdf](http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2013/12/Sustainability-Plan-memo_11-14-131.pdf); February 21 at [http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2014/03/Enrollment-update\\_2-21-14.pdf](http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2014/03/Enrollment-update_2-21-14.pdf); and March 21 at [http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2014/04/Enrollment-update\\_3-21-14.pdf](http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2014/04/Enrollment-update_3-21-14.pdf)] And while I would hope to say that this is a one-year phenomenon, I do believe that it is prudent to expect that this trend will continue for at least one more year. This projection is based on 1) the number of applications to EOU for next fall; 2) the number of deposits made by potential new students; 3) the projected freshman retention rates; 4) the size of our 2014 graduating class; 5) the trends of returning students over the past two years; and 6) the ending Spring Term enrollment counts. All of these factors lead to an initial projection of at least an additional 10 percent decrease in student credit hours for the forthcoming academic year. This means that we will be retreating to our historical average of attendance prior to the student enrollment boom that started in 2009. With that said, we are projecting a leveling off of enrollment after next academic year (not a significant increase in students, but not declining either.) This projection is based on the fact that our large freshman and transfer classes that we had from 2009-2012 will have worked their way through to graduation. As a result, while we won't have historic high numbers of graduates—as we have had the last three years—and our freshman and transfer class have been more in similar sizes, we will not be dealing with the significant swings in our student populations. As such, we must reset our university staffing and faculty to match these levels of enrollment.

As we are a tuition-dependent university, these sharp decreases—especially over a two year time period—have a dramatic impact on our fiscal conditions. As I have stated in my updates to the University in the Fall and Winter terms regarding enrollment, we will need to make significant reductions in our costs structures to account for these declines in revenues. Additionally, a significant proportion of our costs, as a percentage of revenues, are personnel expenditures. Therefore, in order to address our fiscal issues and

constraints, we must focus many of our reductions in our staffing levels as well as developing strategies on how we utilize the time of our faculty and staff.

For this upcoming year, in part due to the accounting adjustment we were forced to take last fiscal year and thus lowering our starting fund balance, but also due to our declines in enrollment, we will end the year with a negative Education and General (E&G) fund balance of 1.6% of operating revenues. This does not mean we are insolvent as we do have a positive cash balance; however, it does mean we have a long way to go to reach a level of fiscal stability currently defined by the OUS Board as +5% to +15% E&G fund balance. As we have discussed as well, it is more prudent to look at multiple measures of fiscal condition with a primary one being the difference between total revenues and total expenditures—or net revenues. As we have modeled this plan, it is of primary importance to have positive net revenues at a level that will: A) return EOU to a positive fund balance approaching 5 percent within 3 years; B) provide a financial cushion that will absorb changes in revenues streams or unexpected costs increases; and C) provide funds that can be used for strategic reinvestments in programs that will add value to EOU.

Given our current and projected student enrollments, including investments from the state, and our current expenditure rates, we have concluded that over the next two years, we must develop a recurring cost reduction plan of nearly \$4 million. At this level of reductions, we will have a financial foundation that will achieve these three objectives.

There are several assumptions in this plan that are based on conservative revenue projections. For example, this plan does not rely on any additional state funding and, as mentioned above, a reduced student population (and corresponding student credit hours). Both of these assumptions limit the revenues of our University. While I am hopeful, and somewhat confident, that increased state funding will occur—both on a per student basis as well as in total—I believe it would not be responsible to build these increases into the plan as this is an unknown variable over which we have little to no control. Similarly, we have utilized a very conservative approach to forecasting our enrollments and headcounts in the plan.

This plan addresses the next three years, with reductions occurring in the first and second year, (2014-15 and 2015-16), so as to position the university to plan for investment in mission critical areas by the third year, for implementation in the fourth, or 2017-18. The following chart indicates assumptions, forecasts and ending fund balance for each of those years.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Projected Enrollment Increase/Decrease	-10.40%	-11.10%	0.50%	0.50%
Projected Revenues	\$33,756,000	\$33,361,000	\$33,389,000	\$35,174,000
Projected Expenditures	\$34,817,000	\$34,104,000	\$32,450,000	\$33,216,000
Change in Fund Balance	\$(1,061,000)	\$(743,000)	\$939,000	\$1,958,000

Ending Fund Balance	-1.60%	-3.80%	-1.00%	4.60%
---------------------	--------	--------	--------	-------

As we developed these recommendations, we focused our efforts to have the greatest fiscal impact while minimizing, as much as possible, the negative effects of reductions. Building on the progress made with EOU's 2011 Sustainability Plan and the 2013 Plan Update (NOTE: these plans and associated/subsequent documents may be found at the bottom of the President's Budget and Planning webpage, <http://www.eou.edu/president/budget/>), the five primary strategies aimed in EOU's 2014 sustainability update, focus on the following:

1. Reset of instructional workload release;
2. Elimination of concentrations within degree programs;
3. Academic program reductions and program eliminations;
4. Further reduction of administrative positions;
5. College administrative restructuring;

Each of these strategies and the corresponding recommendations are discussed in this, the first draft of the update to our Sustainability Plan.

As in the past, the leadership of the University analyzed all sectors and staffing levels. It must be noted too that Jay Kenton—in his role as Vice Chancellor and Interim President—has been heavily engaged in the process, as has Interim Provost Sarah Witte, to provide this draft update. Over the past five years, we have grown as a University community in all employment classes—classified, administrative faculty and faculty. And, as predictable and appropriate, the largest growth has been in faculty. At the same time, when we have had to reduce costs in the past, we have first looked at non-instructional activities and staffing levels and reduced there first. Therefore, in initial Sustainability Plan and its update attempted to protect our academic core as best as possible and many of the reductions were seen reductions in administrative areas. As a result, as many duties still must be accomplished, we have combined many functions and placed responsibilities and duties in a few offices. For your review, it maybe helpful to review EOU's current organizational chart located on the web at <http://www.eou.edu/hr/files/2014/02/Org-Chart-2014.pdf>. As a result of this effort, and the significant decline in students, we are at a tipping point. While we are recommending reductions in non-instructional areas, there are, in fact, not a lot of administrative levers remaining to be pulled. We already have many individuals performing multiple duties and have a very thin bench—to the point that continuation of operations and adequate internal controls are becoming a concern to our internal auditors and other external agencies.

As a consequence of past efforts to protect our academic core, we have reduced our administrative capacity to minimal levels and further reductions will critically inhibit the university's ability to fulfill its fiduciary responsibilities let alone serve students outside of the classroom. Therefore, many of the recommended reductions deal with our academic capacity and rightsizing our academic resources appropriate for the size of our University. This includes not only the numbers and types of faculty members, but also the program offerings.

In addition to these reductions, with the impending departure of several administrative faculty members, we are analyzing how best to reorganize these positions to more effectively reach our desired results. An example of this is the resignation of the Director of Information Technology and consolidating this unit with Information Services and using the salary savings to expand and hire much-needed programmers and others who provide direct service to end users—our faculty, staff and students. Other directors are also ingrained in their own restructuring to provide additional savings and creating efficiencies. In addition, I know Interim President Jay Kenton will be thinking about our administrative organizational structures. Based on his assessment, he will be initiating and conducting the appropriate dialogs to further refine and focus these efforts which may lead to additional savings and efficiencies throughout the year.

In determining the recommendations for the reduction or elimination of program offerings, great energy was expended to analyze past, current and future enrollments, graduation rates, support for other programs and connection and service to the community as well as a direct tie to our three core themes and mission.

None of the recommendations made within this document were easy and the implementation of these recommendations will likewise not be easy. However, as stated by the Budget & Planning Committee, and in multiple forums across campus, we have built into this plan reductions that go beyond what may be necessary to simply balance the budget. This will ensure that our plan is conservative in the event that projected savings are not actualized or revenues fall below the levels now being conservatively estimated.

Our goal, in the development of these recommendations, is to provide a clear pathway forward for the University to focus on a distinct set of core programs and activities and to direct our limited resources to what is most desired by our students and the regions we serve. We have grown and expanded into many ventures, and in this time of consolidation, we must focus our energies on those efforts that will provide the greatest value and return to our students and other stakeholders.

We know that the recommendations will not be accepted by all and that a great deal of debate and second-guessing will commence with this release. We hope that each of you will take this opportunity to reflect on these recommendations and provide alternative solutions and ideas. As in the past, we do hope that ideas are generated that will provide new solutions and avenues to pursue. The Provost and I, along with our successors, will be holding multiple forums (with faculty, staff and students), you can always send an email, or call either one of us to discuss your ideas and thoughts. The academy is built on a foundation of asking questions and presenting new ideas in a civil and professional way and it is our desire and hope that that will occur with the release of this, a draft plan and recommendations.

We will accept your suggestions and alternatives up through May 28, 2014. After that time, we will prepare and finalize the update to be released to the University Community the following week.

*Bob Davies, President*

## ***II. Goals and Guidelines for the DRAFT Plan***

As noted in President Davies' Fall 2013 progress report on our Sustainability Plan Update of last June <http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2013/06/Sustainability-Plan-Update-2013-Final.pdf>, the three key goals of our instructional and program management were articulated as follows:

1. Programs structured to support student entrance, retention and completion, regardless of location.
2. Programs structured to reflect sustainable faculty staffing levels, both regular and fixed term, relative to benchmarked faculty FTE data from comparable programs.
3. Programs structured to reflect sustainable faculty workload assignment, avoiding reliance on regular and fixed term overload.

As we discussed in the plan update, the key broad strategy areas for our instructional programs focused on 1) Management of low-enrolled courses; 2) Management of instructional load and overload, and 3) Management of instructional release time and service load. We have come to understand that while all three of these broad areas possess distinct dimensions, these dimensions interact constantly in very profound ways; ways which mark the underlying financial health and long-term sustainability of our academic enterprise, and thus of our institution.

To date, our efforts to focus on better managing the first two of these three areas—management of low-enrolled courses and management of instructional load and overload—have kept us solidly on track with the planning accomplished last spring in our Sustainability Plan Update. Over the course of this year, we have implemented a common practice of cancelling low enrolled (defined as under 11 students) that are in-loaded classes unless they are required for graduation or these courses could be run as over-load or taught by an adjunct. Given the combination of all of our efforts to manage load, the revised pay scales for adjuncts, overload and course management of balancing and overload and inload, we have seen very positive early results that demonstrate we are tracking on the projections set forth in the 2011 Sustainability Plan and the 2013 Update.

Relative to the program-specific recommendations, with respect to both the specific recommendations and to the broader curricular recommendations, we have seen an enormous amount of committed effort devoted to facilitating the necessary discussions by program faculty across all three colleges. However, these collective efforts have been accomplished in the face of continuing fiscal challenges connected to our declining enrollments, both on- and off-campus. In light of our current enrollment trends which are outlined above, perhaps the greatest gains we can yet realize relative to the goals we developed for our Sustainability Plan Update center on our handling of faculty workload release and on the three follow-on operational areas noted at the end of the Broad Instructional Review and Recommendations in our 2013 Update.

As has been previously articulated, over time these practices would further streamline and bring greater efficiencies to our academic enterprise. These operational areas and accompanying practices are bounded by the general principles discussed in the Spring 2013 Update, updated and added to, as follows:

**1. Program completion streamlining & access for students at-a-distance.**

- a. Eliminate hidden prerequisites for all program areas; clearly list prerequisites for program requirements on program checksheets.
- b. Avoid bi-annual/annual/term scheduling conflicts for program requirements both within programs and across closely connected programs.
- c. Maintain close control of the total number of required major and minor credits. Generally speaking, for students graduating with 180 credits, a major should require generally 65-70 credits. (The ability to partake of general electives, particularly at the mid- and upper-divisions lies at the very core of liberal arts institutions.)
- d. Take care that alternate year courses—especially program requirements and even more especially program requirements that are sequenced—maintain student access reflected by the prevailing need in those course areas.
- e. Drop DFL (Deficient Foreign Language) Requirement for transfer students.

**2. Resource-based approach to curricular management and scheduling.**

- a. “Add one/drop one” approach to curricular development.
- b. Minors should be subsets of majors, not separate curricula with differing requirements.
- c. Eliminate all concentrations within a given program area. Concentrations include emphases, groupings, tracks, or any other disciplinary specialization that segments and diffuses student enrollment in lower- and upper-division coursework.
- d. All courses offered in a program area in a given term should be part of that program area’s major/minor.
- e. Adhere to schedule blocks & utilize ENTIRE instructional day, not just “prime-time” in the middle of the day.
- f. Scheduled class meeting times align with the number of credits carried by the course.

**3. Program marketing and communications planning.**

- a. Develop both university-level and program-level communications strategies focused on university and program strengths, aka undergraduate and graduate success.
- b. Highlight the successes of our students and tie those successes to their program-specific experiences.
- c. Develop more specific resources at the college and university levels for faculty support with program area web development and maintenance.
- d. Further extend efforts and dialogue aimed at more robustly and more frequently connecting prospective students with program area faculty.

In concert with continuing and further efforts in these areas, however, our current and projected enrollments suggest the wisdom of not only pressing as far with these efforts as possible--we also need to prepare for further reducing and streamlining our program-level curricula as we seek to better match our program mix with our enrollment levels and student needs.

**4. Determination of Sustainable Scheduling of Disciplinary Curricula**

Disciplines will maintain the number of credits required for graduation, but will no longer offer elective courses beyond the required total for degree completion.

- a. Each program will identify the set list of courses from their check-sheet to be scheduled during the following year and any interim period required by sustainability efforts.
- b. Service course offerings, defined as courses needed for institutional requirement at EOU (Gen. Ed., DPD, UWR), will be balanced by program needs, and meet both on-campus and online needs.
- c. All courses offered will be part of the major, embedded minor, or the stand alone minor, as pre-requisite or required courses, or institutional service courses.

### **5. Course Offerings by Frequency and Demand for Multiple Sections**

Each course will be offered as needed based on program size and number of majors. This could mean that certain classes will be offered every term, others only once a year. It could also mean for smaller programs that selected courses will be offered once every other year.

- a. Based on enrollments trends and with particular attention to 2014-15 enrollments, those courses needing to be offered with greater than annual frequency will be identified and determined in the schedule based on enrollment outlook for on-campus and online offering.
- b. Multiple sections of course offerings will be opened as needed, with extra sections listed in the schedule as suppressed. Advising staff will be consulted on the optimal time schedules to aid flexibility in students' planning.
- c. Disciplines with service course obligations requiring multiple sections may need to schedule required courses in the degree program in alternating year scheduling in order to maximize instructional and enrollment capacity.
- d. Courses that are not part of a major or minor, do not serve another major on campus, or are not EOU graduation requirements should be eliminated from the schedule at this time.

### **6. Institutional Determinations and Outcomes**

Substitutions or waivers to accommodate curricular shifts and/or teach outs may be necessary, and will be requested at the Discipline program level as a first priority.

- a. Catalog determination of a minor consisting of 15 lower division and 15 upper division credits may be applied where there is no expectation of Capstone work by the student.
- b. Expected outcome of sustainable scheduling of disciplinary curricula and institutional service courses as listed above: Students will select courses from broader disciplinary areas, as they will not have additional courses beyond requirements within a given major or minor.

These goals and the curricular and operational principles that underlie them will help us to ensure not only that we have an appropriate mix of academic programs, but the resources to sustain them over the long-term as well.

With regard to these resources, it remains highly unlikely that we will enjoy the level of State support and tuition revenues that would allow us to maintain our current slate of programs and our current regular instructional staff. Nor can we continue to add more adjunct faculty through maintaining or even increasing our current online adjunct/overload levels without deep damage to the high quality of teaching and learning that our students currently enjoy.

The answer, then, must lie in reviewing our current academic program mix to ensure that what we are offering matches regional and student needs and does so in ways that reflect long-term sustainability relative to the resources we have available to support those programs and to maintain the instructional integrity and quality that are our hallmarks at EOU. We cannot continue to be all things to all people and must seek to focus on doing what we need to do and doing it well.

We need to take a hard look at the totality of the courses we offer and how each one of those course offerings relates to program requirements, program electives, and university and general education requirements. The course inventory data and tool at <http://www.eou.edu/provost/eou-course-inventory-data-as-of-april-2014> demonstrates our initial effort at this very granular undertaking. Slicing the course inventory data according to coding identify those courses which are not immediately identifiable as either program requirements or university/general education requirements results in a huge number of courses that are offered outside of the program requirements.

These courses are identified in both summary form and detail in the spreadsheet at <http://www.eou.edu/provost/eou-course-inventory-data-as-of-april-2014>. As the spreadsheet data illustrates, there are roughly 1,820 course credits tied to the courses in the list, though not all courses can be eliminated, as some may be appropriate for general education requirements, general electives etc. Having noted that, though, many of the courses on the list should be eliminated as these courses diffuse enrollments from other required (and often low-enrolled) courses. Please note that the list excludes courses such as practicum, capstone, thesis, etc.

Building on the progress made with EOU's 2011 Sustainability Plan and the 2013 Plan Update (NOTE: these plans and associated/subsequent documents may be found at the bottom of the President's Budget and Planning webpage, <http://www.eou.edu/president/budget/>), the five primary strategies aimed at this, EOU's 2014 sustainability update, focus on the following:

1. Reset of instructional workload release.
2. Elimination of concentrations in degree programs.
3. Academic program reductions and eliminations.
4. Further reduction of administrative positions.
5. College administrative restructure.

Discussion of each of these strategies and associated DRAFT recommendations follow in the Strategies section.

### **III. Strategies and Recommendations**

#### **1. Reset of instructional workload release.**

The Spring 2013 Update recommended that the academic dean of each college will conduct a case-by-case review of all assigned instructional release time. This academic year, the amount of instructional workload release granted across all three colleges, exclusive of those two faculty positions which are articulated as having administrative duties (Writing Center Director and Art Gallery Director) and of the reassignment associated with our current half-time associate deans totals 179 credits or 4.0 FTE (assuming 45 total workload credits) or 5.0 FTE (assuming 36 instructional workload credits). This workload release is distributed as follows:

- 41 credits in the College of Arts & Sciences.
- 27 in the College of Business.
- 111 in the College of Education.

While the total hours of release time in the College of Education total 111, not all of these are non-instructional. Given the structure of Education curricula, many of these release hours are in actuality instructional duties related to the program, though served outside of more typical course/class boundaries. Examination of these workload release hours in Education have aimed at distinguishing between those granted for instructional vs. non-instructional reasons. The first pass suggests approximately one-half of those hours are for non-instructional purposes, consistent with the inflated costs structures demonstrated by the program relative to program peers.

This recommendation focuses on suspending all current instructional release time granted for non-instructional duties for the 2014-2015 academic year. The suspension/elimination of instructional workload release across all three colleges should result in the reduction of the need for **3.0 FTE**, primarily in the overload/adjunct category.

On a case-by-case basis over the next year, the deans will review (subject to provost's approval) the need for instructional release time, according to the following general principles:

1. Instructional release time granted should be tied to specific duties and/or tasks that are clearly articulated and connected to the time frame for which the instructional release is granted. Duties or tasks which cannot be articulated should not be granted instructional release time. To do otherwise may not be fair to the larger program area faculty and may, in fact, harm the program's health and vitality over the longer term.
2. The college dean, in consultation with the faculty member, will make every effort to load non-instructional duties or tasks as service load or other load in a given year before actually granting additional load credit as instructional release time. If instructional release is inloaded as service/other workload credits, care should be taken to maintain workload space to support ongoing commitment-to-discipline. Such space is key to the quality of our teaching and learning across our academic programs and must not be compromised. Similarly, care should be taken to maintain space in service load for service to the institution, particularly with respect to

shared governance participation. In order to maintain ongoing commitment to discipline for our faculty, no more than 6 load credits of the 9 total beyond the 36 for instruction (tenured and tenure-track faculty) should ever be loaded for service in lieu of release time. There should always be load space in a given year available for ongoing commitment-to-discipline and/or shared governance. It should be up to a given faculty member to make those choices in terms of how he/she prefers to balance non-instructional load credits in a given year, so that the appropriate dean may assign workload accordingly.

3. Similarly, the institution (at the program, college, and institutional levels) should remain mindful of realistic expectations for service/other work-loading. It may well be that choices to engage in non-instructional service duties or tasks may preclude participation in other university service for a given timeframe and vice versa.

As instructional workload release is reinstated case-by-case, consistency for such release must be maintained both across program areas as well as across colleges.

**3 FTE = \$165,000**

## **2 . Elimination of concentrations in degree programs.**

The broad recommendation in this section of the draft plan entails eliminating all concentrations in major/degree program curricula—including emphases, groupings, tracks, or any other disciplinary specialization that segments and diffuses student enrollment in lower- and upper-division coursework—and moving all programs institution-wide to a set number of courses for each major or minor with only selected elective courses.

EOU's academic program curricula, as has been noted in both the 2011 Sustainability Plan and the 2013 Plan Update, have expanded over past decades in all areas while contracting in relatively few (until the 2011 and 2013 plan actions). Climbing student enrollments somewhat masked the effect of this curricular sprawl; off-campus enrollments in particular covered declining enrollments in on-campus programs. A curricular reset will occur across the curriculum through the elimination of separate concentrations, emphases, groupings, or tracks in EOU's degree programs which will have the dual effect of focusing faculty instructional workload more tightly AND of focusing student pathways to completion and eliminating the diffusion of students across multiple courses within and across program areas. While the reductions related to the elimination of degree programs will primarily reduce the need for large numbers of online adjunct and overload instructional FTE (cost estimates are being developed), it is worth noting that almost HALF of EOU's student credit hours in any given year are generated through online adjunct/overload instruction. The savings related to the reduction of these FTE will be primarily reductions in online adjunct/overload FTE.

The course inventory data tool [http://www.eou.edu/provost/?attachment\\_id=523](http://www.eou.edu/provost/?attachment_id=523) and summary spreadsheet [http://www.eou.edu/provost/?attachment\\_id=532](http://www.eou.edu/provost/?attachment_id=532) strongly support the proposition that we have enormous room to further focus our program curricula through the elimination of both extraneous courses and concentrations in all major programs.

**Overload and adjunct savings across colleges = \$1 million**

### **3. Academic program reductions and eliminations.**

Similar to the proliferation of concentrations in degree programs, EOU has seen expansion in numbers of degrees over past decades whose low enrollments and/or graduations were masked by rising student enrollments. EOU's enrollment decreases have underscored the need to reduce some majors to minors and to further streamline some of our existing minors. These efforts will entail the reduction in force of regular, bargained faculty positions, (the recommendations were developed, through the use of an extensive course-level data tool and are embedded in the recommendations regarding faculty reductions.)

Some EOU programs are either no longer viable or were not originally structured in a sustainable manner. These programs will be eliminated outright, and will also entail the reduction of regular faculty positions. The specific recommendations are detailed in the section pertaining to program reductions and eliminations.

The data sources used for the following recommendations are available in Section IV of this document (Data Sources).

#### **Program Reductions and Eliminations:**

In concert with the institution-wide elimination of concentrations,\* the following program reductions and/or eliminations are proposed to best position EOU and our overall academic enterprise for long-term sustainability amidst both continuing enrollment and external challenges.

*\*Concentrations throughout this section of the document include emphases, groupings, tracks, or any other disciplinary specialization that segments and diffuses student enrollment in lower- and upper-division coursework.*

#### **A. Anthropology/Sociology**

The anthropology / sociology program has been recommended for a more focused curricular design for the major and minors in anthropology and native American studies. The major should be mostly defined by a required set of courses that streamline and focus the major, along with two electives aimed at differentiating between two fully embedded minors (anthropology and native American studies). When recommended curricular revisions are in place, the need for adjuncts will be re-evaluated.

#### **B. Art**

The art program has been recommended for reduction due to historically low graduation rates (an average of 7 students/year over the past five years) and under-enrolled upper-division courses. 4.0 FTE will remain with the program, for a savings of 2.0 FTE realized through the retirement of one faculty member and elimination of one tenure-track position. If the major cannot be sustained in a more focused streamlined manner, it should be reduced to a robust minor, along with general education courses, with reduced FTE. The major would be taught out accordingly in 2014-15.

#### **C. Biology**

The biology program has been recommended for elimination of concentrations that have led to low enrollments in the organismal biology courses that are part of the ecological and organismal biology concentration. A streamlined and focused biology major and minor will

be retained utilizing 5.0 FTE, with savings realized from elimination of adjuncts and a 1.0 fixed term FTE position.

#### **D. Business**

The business program has been recommended for an elimination of all concentrations within the business degree towards a more focused general business major, plus accounting, until an accounting major is developed. It is recommended that overload MBA courses be inloaded. In addition there will be the elimination of 1.0 FTE in business at MHCC and reduced adjunct costs with a faculty retirement.

#### **E. Chemistry/Biochemistry**

The chemistry program has been recommended for reduction due to historically low graduation rates and under-enrolled upper-division courses and labs. The chemistry major, which has graduated an average of 3 students a year in the past five years, will be reduced to a minor curriculum and general education CHEM offerings, which serve the needs of EOU's general population of students. The Biochemistry major will be retained. 4.0 FTE will remain with the program, for a savings of 2.0 FTE realized through the retirement of one faculty member and the elimination of a tenure-track faculty position. The major will be taught out during 2014-15.

#### **F. Computer Science**

The computer science program has historically low graduation rates and low-enrolled upper-division courses. Lower-division courses enroll at an acceptable level, but ETIC funding going forward is uncertain unless leveraged into base funding. There is potential to retain a streamlined major with 2.0 FTE, but the major must be redesigned with a focus on the needs of the software employment sector as well as integrative needs across the disciplines. Without ETIC funding, the recommendation is that 0 FTE remain with the program, for a savings of 2.0 FTE realized through the elimination of two tenure-track faculty positions. The major will be taught out during 2014-15 if ETIC funding is not available for continuation of a major.

#### **G. Education**

The education program has identified savings through restructuring practicum/lab courses and the elimination of a .49 FTE position at MHCC.

#### **H. English/Writing**

The English / writing program has been recommended for elimination of concentration/emphasis areas with the aim to streamline and focus the major with the minor curriculum fully embedded. The program will retain the online Interdisciplinary Writing and Rhetoric minor. A streamlined major, embedded minor, and online IWR minor will utilize 7.0 FTE and result in the elimination of 4.66 FTE, which includes .66 FTE due to resignation, 1.0 FTE due to retirement, and 3.0 fixed term FTE.

#### **I. Fire Services Administration**

No recommendations to the Fire Services Administration program are made at this time.

#### **J. General Education**

With reference to the March 12, 2014 slate of [General Education recommendations](#) from the Academic Futures Taskforce workgroup, it is recommended that an EOU team of faculty and

administrators attending the 2014 AAC&U Institute on Integrative Learning and the Departments return to campus in fall with the following:

- a clear understanding of integrative learning,
- a concept map for general education curriculum at EOU that emphasizes 21<sup>st</sup> century learning outcomes consistent with EOU's GEC learning outcomes,
- curriculum design options and associated review criteria that intentionally integrate GEC offerings in breadth and skill areas with information literacy and first- and second-year experience curricula.
- a communication plan for vetting options with faculty, an implementation plan, an assessment plan and cycle, and a recommendation for infrastructure needed for greater faculty oversight of the management, assessment, and reporting of the quality of student learning in the general education learning outcomes.

### **K. Geography**

The geography minor is recommended for elimination. The programs to which geography courses previously contributed have been eliminated. Well-enrolled lower-division geography courses serve the general education needs of students in both the on campus and online environments. 1.0 FTE will remain with the program to teach well enrolled on-campus and online general education courses, for a 1.0 FTE in savings realized through the elimination of an online adjunct position.

### **L. Geology**

The 2013 sustainability plan recommended elimination of the minor with a focus on only those courses for which there is demand and for those modalities in which the demand is reflected. It is recommended that the 1.0 FTE dedicated to geology courses be eliminated, with notification to OSU that their GEOL 201 curricular requirement be changed accordingly. This reduction results in the loss of a 1.0 FTE tenure-track position.

### **M. History**

It is recommended that the history major and fully embedded minor utilize the current envelope of resources at 3.0 FTE, with an additional recommendation to eliminate curricular groupings for a more tightly focused prescribed curriculum with two elective options. Should any x10's be identified for inclusion in the prescribed curriculum, they need to be converted to permanent course numbers.

### **N. Liberal Studies**

The Liberal Studies capstone has become unsustainable and problematic in terms of financial and human resources required to manage and oversee the quality of the capstone in its current form. Removal of the liberal studies capstone as a barrier to completion will become effective summer 2014, and students should be advised to take an additional 400-level elective in lieu of a capstone. In the absence of the capstone requirement, and until such time as a single culminating capstone course may be designed to serve all majors, it is imperative that care be given in the design of the minors so that measures of quality and rigor, along with strengthened academic oversight, are in place and that the minors are regularly assessed in accordance with the NWCCU recommendation. Savings in capstone overload costs have already been factored into overall savings in adjunct and overload across the colleges.

## **O. Library Science**

No recommendations to the Library Science program are made at this time.

## **P. Mathematics**

The math program will retain the major and fully embedded minor, but it is recommended that concentrations be eliminated in order to streamline the program and that a strong applied mathematics piece be put in place to enable a 4 + 1 MAT model. Examine student population in online courses and delete those courses from the schedule that do not serve EOU students. At least .5 FTE from the physics area will be reassigned to the math program, with 0.5-1.5 FTE savings in adjunct and fixed term positions.

## **Q. Media Arts/Communication**

Growth in the media arts/communication major and minors over the past two years have been primarily in the communication area. Over the past five years, the media arts minor in film production (eliminated last spring) has yielded only 1 graduate in 2012-13. The newly approved media arts minor is also recommended for elimination. In light of the new curricular direction of the communication program and low enrollments in several upper-division multimedia courses, continuation of the multimedia and media arts curriculum is not sustainable at this time. 3.0 FTE will remain with the communication major and fully embedded minor. 0 FTE will remain with the media arts minor, for a savings of 1.0 FTE tenure-track position in media arts.

## **R. Modern Languages**

In the modern languages program, German and the Spanish minor are recommended for elimination due to lack of enrollment in upper-division courses and little demand. It is recommended that the MODL curriculum be eliminated and the first- and second-year Spanish curriculum be paced appropriately for non-transfer students seeking satisfaction of the DFL requirement and/or two years of a language. 0 FTE in German and 1.0 FTE in Spanish will remain with the program, for a savings of 2 tenure-track FTE positions and adjunct/fixed term FTE associated with MODL and online courses.

## **S. Music**

The music program has been recommended for reduction due to low graduation rates and unsustainable under-enrolled upper division courses. The major, which has graduated an average of 6.6 students a year—including a single year with 15 graduates in 2008-2009—should be streamlined as a BA major to function with 4.0 Faculty FTE, rather than a BM, or should be reduced to a minor program. In any case, 4.0 FTE should remain with the program to serve the cultural engagement needs of the university and regional communities. There will be a savings of 1.0 FTE tenure track position plus fixed term, hourly, and adjunct positions affiliated with the music program. The bachelor of music will be taught out during 2014-15.

### **T. Physical Education/Health**

The PHYSH program has been recommended for an inloading of PES seminar/capstone credits and reducing overload costs by shifting courses to lower cost adjuncts.

### **U. Physics**

The physics minor has been recommended for elimination due to low enrollment in the minor—an average of 1 student a year over the past five years has graduated with a minor in physics. The recommendation is to eliminate the calculus-based physics sequence and to offer only an introductory sequence that satisfies the physical science majors and minors. The FTE no longer required for the physics program will be reassigned to mathematics. This results in the elimination of any adjunct/fixed term position(s) and an 0.5 FTE tenure-track position associated with the physics program.

### **V. Philosophy/Politics/Economics and Public Administration**

With the creation of the economics major, the PPE major and the PA major have been recommended for elimination. The economics major will retain a fully embedded economics minor; the political science minor will be retained; and the philosophy minor will be eliminated. The PPE / PA majors and minors will be taught out during 2014-16.

### **W. Psychology**

No recommendations to the psychology program are made at this time.

### **X. Religious Studies**

The religious studies courses will no longer be part of EOU curricular offerings. 0 FTE will remain, for a savings of 1.0 FTE.

### **Y. Theatre Arts**

The theater program has been recommended for reduction due to low-enrolled upper-division courses and ongoing low graduation rates. The major, which has graduated an average of 6 students a year in the past five years, should be structured to be sustainable with 3.0 Faculty FTE or be reduced to a robust minor, along with general education courses which serve the needs of EOU's general population of students. 3.0 FTE will remain with the program, for a savings of 1.0 FTE realized through elimination of 1.0 FTE tenure track faculty positions. If the major cannot be streamlined sufficiently, it will be taught out during 2014-15.

Assuming that the aforementioned program-specific recommendations can be accomplished both soundly and expeditiously, we should be able to realize the following targeted savings by June 2015:

**College of Arts and Sciences reductions/eliminations = \$1,549,274**  
**College of Business and Education reductions/eliminations = \$171,149**

However, should we not be able to realize these actions and their associated savings, or if enrollments continue to decline beyond those levels already projected, then we will need to be prepared for further program reductions/eliminations.

#### **4. Further reduction of administrative positions.**

EOU's administrative infrastructure has been continuously reduced and/or restructured over the past four years in such areas as enrollment management, advising, and other functional areas in all divisions across EOU. For instance, while the BART plans of several years ago resulted in the creation of the Division of Enrollment Services (DES), headed by a Dean of Enrollment Services, decisions both prior to and in connection with the original Sustainability Plan in the Spring of 2011 resulted in the division functions being decentralized, with the Financial Aid office being combined with Student Accounts as Student Financial Services (under Finance & Administration) and the Admissions office being integrated into the Advancement office, as University Admissions & Advancement. The Registrar's office, intake advising, and overall enrollment management coordination across offices was then combined under the Director of Enrollment Operations, and the Dean of Enrollment Services position was eliminated.

Similarly, these same efforts led to the decentralization of what had been, under DES totally centralized academic advising, with our current model of on-campus college professional advisors reporting through the appropriate academic deans, the off-campus professional advisors reporting through Regional Operations, and our single remaining intake/undecided advisor reporting through the Director of Enrollment Operations.

(For fuller details, review the two prior sustainability plan documents, as well as EOU's current organizational chart at <http://www.eou.edu/hr/files/2014/02/Org-Chart-2014.pdf>.)

In any case, despite the numerous restructuring and reduction efforts over the past four years, there remain a few areas where additional cost reductions are possible without unduly impacting the institution's core role and mission. As our latest round of administrative reviews suggest, these further reductions total approximately 7.0 FTE and are as follows:

- Eliminate director's position within Student Success and Engagement, **1.0 FTE**.
- Not restoring the Learning Center staffing levels saving **.5 FTE** of directors' position.
- Reassigned Human Resources Associate Director, **.5 FTE**.
- Reduced Liberal Studies Director position, **.5 FTE**.
- Closure of Baker County & Southwest Oregon Regional Centers, **2.5 FTE**.
- Eliminate OS 2 position at MHCC, **1.0 FTE**.
- Restructure OS 2 position at MHCC, **1.0 FTE**.

The director's position in Student Success and Engagement is the Director of Housing and Student Involvement, which has been vacant for most of this year. The duties associated with this administrative position have been reassigned to the Assistant Director of Housing and Residence Life and to the Assistant Director of Student Involvement. These two positions were upgraded to Director positions, thus relieving the Division of Student Success and Engagement of the need to refill the third position.

As a consequence of the restructuring of the Division of Student Success and Engagement, some of the Learning Center Director's position responsibilities were shifted to the Student

Success Operations Manager, thus allowing the ongoing reduction of the Director's position to a .5 FTE basis.

The Associate Director's responsibilities in Human Resources were shifted this past year to the Director of Human Resources, the Assistant to the HR Director, to the Payroll Operations Manager, and to a new classified data entry technician as the result of the incumbent leaving EOU for another position within the OUS. The temporary reallocation of duties has worked well enough to make it possible to make those shifts permanent, resulting in a savings of .5 FTE.

Similarly the retirement at the end of this year of our current Liberal Studies Director led to a series of discussions concerning both the past and ongoing needs of the program, as well as the tasks required of the institution relative to Liberal Studies as a result of our Year 3 review by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). The 1.0 FTE Administrative Faculty position supporting Liberal Studies, APEL, and ASL can be restructured as an Office Specialist 2 position dedicated to tactical support needed in the Vice Provost's office for all university-wide curriculum scheduling and assessment that underpins the Vice Provost's coordinating and oversight functions in Academic Affairs. The permanent savings for such a shift amounts to .5 of the original director's FTE. [NOTE: other discussions concerning Liberal Studies curricular management are articulated elsewhere in this DRAFT plan.]

Finally, declining off-campus enrollments combined with operational shifts in both the south coast area in Coos Bay and the Baker County area in Baker City suggest the closing both the Baker County and Southwest Oregon Regional Centers and shifting those students and duties to other regional advisors/directors. While this shift is certainly not an ideal solution, the impact of these closures can be absorbed with little overall negative effect on EOU's Regional Operations. The positions associated with these reductions total 2.5 FTE.

**Administrative Position reductions/eliminations = \$499,391**

##### **5. College administrative restructure.**

Though we explored the single dean model through the 2011 Sustainability Plan process and discarded it as suboptimal at the time, our current falling enrollments and other administrative efficiencies that have been captured over the past two years have led numerous people to suggest that the time is ripe to refocus attention on gaining further administrative reductions through such an approach. Given the larger leadership transitions at the institutional level, however, combined with the still-emerging governance and fiscal pictures at the State level, any concrete explorations or trials of a single dean model are just too risky right now to entertain. (See the College Task Force Deliberations Report at <http://www.eou.edu/provost/files/2012/04/EOU-College-Task-Force-Deliberations.pdf>)

As was originally articulated in the Provost's memo to the faculty dated September 9, 2011 <http://www.eou.edu/provost/files/2012/04/Provost-Task-Force-Memo-to-Faculty-9-29-11.pdf>, the functional responsibilities that a dean's office must address are clustered around four broad areas:

- Annual faculty evaluations.
- Course scheduling and curricular planning and management.
- Academic programming to serve our distant students.
- Academic advising.

In an effort to better meet these functional responsibilities, in 2012, EOU expanded its two-dean model to include a system of associate deans who oversee the scheduling, personnel evaluation, and day-to-day support operations in the colleges.

With the departure of our CAS Dean, however, it is opportune to reconsider the administrative structures in the colleges in the context of program reductions and eliminations that need to be realized during 2014-2015 and in order to ensure optimal maintenance of quality, stability, and sustainability through the duration and implementation of retrenchment procedures.

Retrenchment measures in the colleges will require careful management by deans who have sufficient authority to implement, oversee, and manage reductions, collaborations, curricular planning, and curricular implementation as set forth in the plan. The two-dean model will be retained for the duration of the implementation of retrenchment measures. Gaining administrative efficiencies while reducing administrative costs across colleges require a reduction in the associate dean structure from 3 FTE to 1.5 FTE, for a total savings of 1.5 FTE in administrative costs. Each college will retain an Associate Dean at 0.5 FTE, for a total of three 0.5 FTE Associate Deans to serve the needs of three colleges.

**\$182,000 (w/OPE)**

### **Non-Personnel Reductions**

Fee Remissions and Service & Supply budgets will be reduced by \$250,000. This will be achieved by a several methods, including: a revised cell phone reimbursement policy, the implementation of an electronic time and attendance system in Human Resources, planned restructuring in multiple administrative areas, centralizing additional functions, etc. Fee Remissions will be reduced by a minimum of \$100,00.

**\$250,000**

**TOTAL Savings = \$ 3,816,814**

Additional and long-term recommendations include the following:

- ❖ Fully consider the implementation of a “one-dean” model. This scenario was proposed in the first version of the Sustainability Plan and was analyzed through the Task Force in 2011. In addition, the President and Provost seriously considered recommending it again in this draft. However, while we both believe that this may in fact be a proper mode, we have reached the conclusion that given the inordinate amount of changes already in motion at Eastern, and the focus of attention on curriculum that will be required over the next year, it is more prudent to maintain two deans this year. At the same time, we believe that the notion of creating a “one-dean” model may be in the best interests of Eastern and as decisions are made over the next year, that a careful analysis and planning should be made to move in this direction. This model and study should include the consolidation and centralization

of support services for the dean, faculty, and the students within the various divisions. Furthermore, as integrative learning and programs will become more common, this model could be a catalyst for such exploration.

- ❖ Differential tuition for the College of Business. Many universities have a “tuition differential” for programs that have A) market demand and B) different cost structures based on personnel costs. Given the market demand for our business programs, both at undergraduate and the MBA levels, we recommend that Budget & Planning and the Tuition Committee analyze the feasibility of a “differential of tuition” on a per credit basis of up to \$10 per undergraduate business courses and up to \$20 MBA courses.
- ❖ Differential tuition for the Computer Science major if ETIC funding is leveraged toward base funding. Given forecasted growth in A) market demand for technology-based software employment and B) different cost structure based on personnel costs, we recommend that the Budget and Planning and the Tuition Committee analyze the feasibility of a “differential of tuition” on a per credit basis of up to \$10 per undergraduate computer science courses.

DRAFT

#### **IV. Conclusion**

These are difficult times for many universities across the country—especially small to mid-sized regional universities—as we deal with significant changes in our operating environment. This draft update to our Sustainability plan builds on the changes that we have made over the past four years. We have altered our administrative structures immensely and have been extremely creative in how we have combined functions and duties. We have, as well, initiated academic changes along the way. At the same time, we have proven to be innovative in meeting state-wide goals and objectives—the Eastern Promise is a primary example, as are the leading edge grant projects in our College of Education.

As we have monitored our efforts in holding down costs and implementing our plans, we have clear successes we can point to. However, a primary issue we are now dealing with is a significant decline in enrollments this past year as well as a continuing decline projected for next year. These declines will return EOU to pre-great recession enrollment levels. And, as momentous changes in our funding structures—moving from a “student credit hour” funding model to an outcome based model—we must make considerable cost reductions as well as restructure our program offerings to ensure a foundation to build from in the future.

As we, the provost and I, have discussed with many of you over the past six months as the need for reductions became evident, it is clear that we needed to recommend sweeping changes, beyond what will be needed to merely meet the fiscal needs of next year, but truly reposition Eastern for the longer-term. These recommendations represent that effort. We present these recommendations to you with the full expectation that you dissect them and propose alternatives. With each iteration of the Sustainability Plan, this process of providing a draft, seeking ideas, suggestions and alternatives have, in the end, produced better plans. Over the next four weeks, we need your creative and poignant insights so that when the final draft is released, during the second week of June, it needs to be the best effort for our University as it clearly will set the stage for the next era of Eastern. The next president, EOU’s first governing board, along with the initial reviews by the Higher Education Coordinating Council, will use it to gauge EOU’s success. More importantly, it will set the foundation for how we educate and serve the students, current and future, of our University. As always, thank you for your support and dedication to Eastern Oregon University and our students.

Very Respectfully,



Bob

## ***V. Data Sources and Links***

The data sources used for the Spring 2013 Plan Update:

<http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2013/06/Sustainability-Plan-Update-2013-Final.pdf>

<http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2013/06/Appendix-A-Instructional-Review-Program-Files.pdf>

<http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2013/06/Appendix-B-Instructional-Review-Common-Data-Files.pdf>

The Delaware Study data presented by OUS (Brian Fox) this past fall:

[http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2013/10/EOU\\_DCS\\_Full-Report.pdf](http://www.eou.edu/president/files/2013/10/EOU_DCS_Full-Report.pdf)

Our standing Institutional Research data dashboards:

<http://www.eou.edu/ir/historical-data/>

<http://www.eou.edu/ir/degrees-awarded/>

[https://isdepot.eou.edu/public/ir/enrollment/Term\\_Enrollment.html](https://isdepot.eou.edu/public/ir/enrollment/Term_Enrollment.html)

And the key data source is a course inventory tool and data, along with accompanying instructions:

<http://www.eou.edu/provost/files/2014/04/Course-Inventory-Definitions-Other-Required-Column.pdf>

The data and tool itself may be downloaded at:

[http://www.eou.edu/provost/?attachment\\_id=523](http://www.eou.edu/provost/?attachment_id=523)

For information on previous administrative changes, refer to the previous plans. Below is the link to the current Organizational Charts:

<http://www.eou.edu/hr/files/2014/02/Org-Chart-2014.pdf>

**[NOTE: The data and tool at the link above is v.1.0 and can be expected to be in need of correction in some areas. As was the case with our program-specific data last spring and the spring of 2011, please review the data carefully and send corrections to the Provost's Office at both [sadkison@eou.edu](mailto:sadkison@eou.edu) and [fsultan@eou.edu](mailto:fsultan@eou.edu).]**