



DATE: October 23, 2018

TO: Academic Deans and Chairs/Directors

FROM: Jon Harbor, Executive Vice President and Provost 

SUBJECT: Detailed Responses to Instructional Staffing Plan Questions and Concerns

As happens with any bright group engaged in creative problem solving, unanticipated ideas have come up in the context of instructional staffing planning. As deans and chairs work together with faculty in this challenging planning process, it is also understandable that misconceptions may arise that need to be corrected, and that other situations emerge that were not specifically addressed in [the memo that described the process](#).

I have heard some questions and concerns voiced about details of current instructional budget planning. The purpose of this memo is to address these questions and concerns, and share them with all deans and chairs so that **everyone has the same information**. Below is a summary of the questions and concerns that have been brought to my attention, along with my detailed responses:

1. In some cases, draft instructional plans include projections where a faculty member's salary could be partially funded by sources other than state funds, for example external funds or summer or online program income. **There is concern about whether a faculty member might be in danger of not receiving their full pay if these external sources do not materialize by 2021.**
 - **This is absolutely not the case.** The university has a contractual obligation to pay a faculty member the FTE specified in his or her contract. Chairs should check with their deans before including part of a faculty member's support sources like external funds or summer or online program income as there needs to be strong plausibility that these funding sources will indeed be available for this to be included in a unit's instructional staffing plan.
2. In some cases, faculty have voluntarily reduced their FTE or opted to end their employment out of concern that otherwise, junior colleagues' positions would be at risk. **Some are worried that, having done this, funds in their department's instructional staffing plan budget target may be diverted to another department, putting their junior colleagues at risk again.**
 - **This is absolutely not the case.** I will not approve any instructional staffing plan in the current process that recommends retrenchment or loss of junior or probationary faculty, or loss of existing instructors in a department where a) faculty have voluntarily reduced their FTE or opted to end their employment in that department and b) these reductions are sufficient to bring that department's budget within the instructional planning budget target they were assigned.

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

3. In some cases, units had one or more faculty members on full-year sabbatical in FY18, and so not all of their salaries were covered on the general fund instructional budget. **These units are wondering how to deal with this while planning to meet their FY21 budget targets.**
 - For the FY21 plan, full salaries should be included, but the plan can include a projected sabbatical leave savings – for example in CHS they are using the average number of full-year sabbaticals in a department for the last few years and using the average salary in the calculations. The intent is not to put a unit that had full-year sabbaticals in FY18 at a disadvantage.
4. In some cases, units have projections of instructional costs that are below their instructional staffing budget target. **How should units address this?**
 - With the approval of their dean, units may propose future additions of adjuncts, lecturers, or tenure-track faculty, based on teaching needs or strategic priorities, and/or units may propose partial or full support of faculty in other units. I expect deans and chairs to work together on instructional staffing plan recommendations; this process is not intended to change the current role deans have, in working with chairs and units, within the schools/colleges deans administer.
5. In some cases, units have projections of instructional costs that are below their instructional budget target. **Some units want to use the difference between the projected instructional costs and the budget target to support non-instructional needs.**
 - This is not permitted.
6. **A question arose as to whether funds that are designated for graduate assistants can be used instead to support faculty instructional costs.**
 - This is not permitted. Funds for graduate assistants are not part of the university's instructional budget and are only for use to support graduate students.
7. In some cases, reorganizations and realignments may result in a faculty member moving from one unit to another. **Can a faculty member's move from unit A to unit B be counted as a reduction in unit A's FY21 staffing plan?**
 - Simply shifting a person to another unit (no matter whether in the same school/college or between schools/colleges) does not save the university money overall and thus does not contribute to reaching the overall budget target. If a person moves from unit A to unit B, then their FY21 cost moves from unit A to unit B along with the equivalent amount in the FY21 budget target. Only if unit B is willing to pick up the cost of all or part of a person within unit B's FY21 budget target can be a reduction against unit A's FY21 budget target be counted and an equivalent expense added to unit B's. Transfers like the one described do not directly reduce overall cost to the university, but may be effective in achieving other reorganization goals.

If you are aware of other questions or concerns that I have not addressed in this memo, please bring them to my attention as soon as possible so that I can respond in a timely manner.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.