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Preamble

On September 1, 2006, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) presented the faculty of the College with a five-year financial and hiring plan (the “Five-Year Plan”) designed to correct a several-million-dollar-budget deficit. This plan, constructed with limited faculty involvement, outlined a series of initiatives to align the “missions and resources” of the College (CLAS 2006). In response, the College Assembly created two elected faculty committees: one to investigate the causes of the deficit, and a second standing Faculty Finance Committee charged to advise the CLAS Dean on general budgetary and financial matters. This report describes the Faculty Finance Committee’s findings on the impact of the Five Year Plan and recommends possible responses to the operating shortfall.

Contained within the Five-Year Plan is a three-year financial plan (the “Three-Year Plan”). This Three-Year Plan was constrained by three conditions imposed by the UF central administration: (1) the CLAS budget must be balanced without the prospect of new recurring funds within three years; (2) any program cuts should not be across-the-board; (3) the spending cuts could not reduce the student credit hours generated by CLAS. With these constraints, it was inevitable that any plan would entail large cuts in almost all categories of CLAS operations. The central administration agreed to cover the accumulated debt from prior years, fund the annual shortfalls for the three-year period until the budget was balanced (years 1 and 2), and work with the College to meet previous commitments to newly-hired faculty.

After the plan was presented, the central administration indicated a willingness to hear alternative viewpoints. Consistent with the principles of shared governance embraced by the UF Board of Trustees, this report offers a response from a committee elected by CLAS faculty. We cover two topics: the general allocation of funding to CLAS and the measurable impact of the three-year plan and proposed alternative plans on CLAS. Our central finding is that the Three-Year Plan will harm the operation of the University’s largest teaching unit and undermine the long-term financial health of the College. Both of these outcomes will impair the capacity of UF to meet the ambitious goals sketched out by President Machen in his work plan for the University of Florida (Machen 2007).

We do not mean to understate the complexity of the current CLAS financial predicament. We recognize that the College bears some responsibility for the current deficit and needs to manage its resources more effectively. It is also true, however, that allocation decisions made outside the College resulted in a structural deficit that cannot be fixed through simple and temporary cuts in operating expenses. The interim CLAS administration has already implemented budget changes and we stand ready to assist with suggestions and insights, recognizing that the central administration alone possesses the authority and resources to mitigate the worst aspects of the Three-Year Plan.

Background

Because the origins of the deficit matter in our recommendations, we emphasize the following findings of one of our subcommittees (the report and tables upon which this summary is based
may be found on the Finance Committee website, http://www.clas.ufl.edu/gov/comm/finance.html):

- Since UF ended the system of mission-based budgeting inherent in the "UF Bank" of 1990's, budgetary decisions at UF are incremental, so that a college’s budget allocation for year N is based on its budget allocation for year N-1 plus an increase. The increase is not clearly tied to mission and allocations vary widely from college to college and year to year. (See Table C in the subcommittee report.)

- Incremental budgeting contributed to the current financial shortfall in CLAS. From 1995 to 2005 (the last year for which we could obtain data), CLAS’s budget allocations increased by 59%. In that same period, the allocations for the eleven other colleges whose instructional and research funds come from the Education and General (E&G) budget increased, on average, by 66%. Small annual differences in allocations may compound to produce large budget problems later. (See Tables C & D.)

- CLAS’s less than average increase did not reflect its growth in that period. From 1995-2005 CLAS was one of four colleges in the E&G sub-budget that saw its UG Ratio decline by more than 15%. This meant those colleges increased their proportion of graduate students to undergraduates. (The other three colleges were Health and Human Performance, Fine Arts, and Journalism—see Table D. A fifth college, Continuing Education, also saw its UG Ratio decline by more than 15%, but since Continuing Education had no graduate FTEs before 2004, and had less than 2 graduate FTEs in 2005, we did not include this shift in our calculations.) In that same period, those four colleges saw their average expenses increase at a rate above the average rate for the eleven colleges in E&G, presumably because graduate education is more costly (Table F). Yet while HHP, Fine Arts and Journalism saw their allocations increase by more than the average of the eleven colleges in E&G from 1995-2005, CLAS’s average allocation increased far below the average rate.

- CLAS felt the effect of the budgeting process in other ways. Since 2002 CLAS has had roughly the same proportion of undergraduates to graduate students as Journalism (Table D). Yet between 2002 and 2005, Journalism had an average allocation per student FTE of more than $8200, while CLAS had an average per student FTE of $6290 (Table D). This difference of nearly $2000 per FTE seems to have resulted from incremental budgeting: Journalism had a higher proportion of graduate students than CLAS in 1995 (Table D) and incremental budgeting reinforced that difference even after CLAS came close to matching Journalism’s balance of graduate/undergraduate students in 2002-2005.

- CLAS was not unique in having a deficit. In the period 1995-2005 several colleges and units had deficits, though in that period some of those colleges and units were able to shift funds from one sub-budget to another, avoiding an overall deficit. Because CLAS does not receive funding from more than one sub-budget, it did not have this option. Yet even so, CLAS’s budgetary woes were not unique. In FY2003, 2004, and 2005, several colleges and units in the university spent more than they were allocated (see Table E). In
addition, from 1995-2005 at least one of the three sub-budgets for the university had a deficit at the end of every fiscal year (Table B).

- CLAS actually delivers instruction less expensively than other UF colleges. From 1995 to 2005 the average allocation per student in the colleges in E&G was $8520. The average allocation per student in CLAS for that same time period was $6290, a difference of more than $2000 (Table D).

With a better understanding of the strategic environment that generated the CLAS budget shortfall, we now evaluate the Three-Year Plan.

**The Three-Year Plan**

While the annual and projected deficit of CLAS is large in real dollars (projected to be $3.6M for FY2006/07), it represents only 3.5% of the College’s entire budget. However, 85% of the College’s expenditures are for contractually committed faculty and staff salaries and benefits, 11% of the budget is committed to fund graduate teaching assistants, and the balance is in general operating expenses. There is little room for cost-cutting without seriously affecting the College’s capacity to meet its teaching and research mission.

The Three-Year Plan provides a schedule of annual cost reductions that aim to balance the CLAS budget by the end of the 2008-9 academic year. These include cuts in operating expenses, staff reductions, staff hiring freezes, the elimination of some programs, and most significantly in financial terms, a virtual halt in faculty hiring for a three-year period. Indeed, in dollar terms the deepest cuts involve a reduction in the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty through retirement and other attrition. There is simply no other source of funds sufficient to achieve balance in the CLAS budget under the terms imposed by the central administration.

This strategy will result in downsizing CLAS, the core teaching unit of the University of Florida. It is not simply a short pause in an upward trajectory by which CLAS reached 651 full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty members by fall, 2006. Rather, failing to hire new faculty amounts to a permanent reduction in the size of the College. Each year, the College loses from 7 to 27 faculty members to retirement and another 12 or so through other forms of attrition. Hiring new faculty annually is necessary to keep CLAS at its current size. If these vacant positions are not filled by newly-hired tenure-track faculty, then there will be fewer permanent faculty members in CLAS. This strategy will make it harder to meet the administration’s goal of maintaining student FTEs at current levels.

Although the Three-Year Plan will damage the College and University in many domains, we focus only on two measurable consequences of the severe cutback on CLAS hiring of permanent faculty—the long-term financial consequences and the impact on the teaching program. By concentrating on these two areas, we do not wish to suggest that they alone constitute the costs of the Three-Year Plan. However, they are the most easily quantifiable.

To assess the consequences of the reduction in faculty hiring, we first need to establish a baseline. From AY 2003 to 2005, in response to the effect of DROP and enrollment growth, CLAS hired an average of 55 new faculty members per year. Although this pace of hiring may
have been difficult to sustain, we assume that the College would have at least maintained
equilibrium had the deficit not developed. Hence, we will make the assumption that equilibrium
is maintained with 45 tenure-related faculty hires per year, for a total of 135 hires over AY 2006-
2009. This figure would barely offset the losses in faculty from retirement and resignation.\(^{11}\)

Against the 135 new hires needed to maintain stability, the Three-Year Plan allows just 31
tenure-track hires during the three-year hiring cycle beginning in AY 2006-7.\(^{12}\) If fully
implemented—and current data suggest even less hiring is likely—it would reduce the CLAS
tenure-track faculty by 101, representing a 16% cutback in permanent faculty from the beginning
of AY 2006 (OIR 2006, Table III-3).

Estimating the costs of this downsizing requires one further assumption. CLAS hires are
apportioned among three divisions—Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Social and Behavioral
Sciences, and Humanities. How would the 135 hires have been allocated among these sectors?
We use two different models. The first allocates the hypothetical new hires from 2006-2009
according to the proportional division of actual new hires in AY 2003-2006 and the second uses
the proportion of actual CLAS faculty by division in the 2004-5 academic year. The raw
numbers are presented in Table 1.

In the remainder of this report, we will use the numbers in Table 1 to estimate the costs of the
downsizeing to the College’s capacity to meet its mission. Our cost estimates will be based on the
two models that assume different distributions across subdivisions, producing two sets of figures.
The data we employ on budgetary consequences come directly from the CLAS budget officers
while the information on the teaching program is derived from information provided by both
CLAS and the Office of Instructional Resources.

**Budgetary Consequences: Reduced Grant Funding**

Having fewer tenure-track faculty members results in fewer external research grants. This cost of
the Three-Year Plan is the reduction in hiring of permanent faculty in the Natural Sciences and
Mathematics.\(^{13}\) According to our estimates (see Table 2), the Three-Year Plan will reduce the
number of newly-hired faculty in the Natural Sciences and Mathematics by either 28 or 37
compared to what CLAS would have done in the absence of a deficit.\(^{14}\) To translate these
cutbacks into costs, we calculate the average external grant funding per faculty and then we
multiply that figure by the number of faculty who will not be hired because of the Three-Year
Plan.

Tables 2 to 4 demonstrate, respectively, the likely costs of this strategy in terms of total grant
dollars, funded graduate research assistantships, and indirect costs. These indicators represent
some—but not all—of the benefits generated by these grants that will be lost.

In AY 2005-6, CLAS faculty generated approximately $41.4 million in grant funding from all
external sources. The vast majority of these grant funds were generated by the laboratory
sciences (including Psychology). With almost half of CLAS’s full-time tenure-track faculty in all
the science departments and Psychology, this represents an average of more than $125,000
generated per faculty per year. **With the projected downsizing of the science faculty over**
three years, CLAS will sustain losses from external research support in the $1-2 million range per year with the total funds lost over the three-year hiring cycle likely to amount to $4 to 5 million (see Table 2).

Tables 2-4 actually understate these losses. By averaging all science departments, we have diluted the average grant funding that will be lost as a consequence of downsizing CLAS. The loss of faculty from attrition has been acute in some of the departments where grant funding is most heavily concentrated—Chemistry and Psychology to name but two. As a result of these faculty losses, CLAS will be unable to fund a sizable share of the activities that are intended to raise UF’s national status through President Machen’s work plan.

Table 3 reveals that downsizing the faculty will also reduce the number of graduate and undergraduate research assistants. In AY 2005-6 (Summer, Fall, and Spring), external grants provided funding for a total of almost 700 semester-long research assistantship appointments. That averages to 2.23 appointments per science faculty. As Table 3 shows, the reduction in the science faculty will translate into a loss of 20-30 single-semester research assistants per year for a total loss of 60-80 over the three-year hiring cycle covered by the Plan. Although these numbers may seem small, their impact is sizable. In the sciences, graduate students are recruited and paid for out of both state funds—which are reserved for teaching assistants—and grant funds. Fewer grant dollars mean fewer graduate students will be admitted to UF. Those students would have taken courses that are funded at the highest rate by the Florida Legislature. UF has already failed to meet its target graduate enrollments in these “corridors” and has consequently had to return funding to the state. The Three-Year Plan will exacerbate the problem, further undermining President Machen’s plans to build up UF’s national reputation by enhancing its scientific resources.

Indirect costs represent funds generated by grants to cover expenses that cannot be separately quantified and are typically returned to the Principal Investigator (PI), the PI’s department and college, and the central administration. The downsizing of the science faculty will reduce the amount of Indirect Cost funding earned by around $300 to $400 thousand per year over the next three years for an accumulated loss of $1.0 to $1.3 million. The actual loss will not be evident right away because it typically requires 3-6 years for a faculty member in the sciences to generate the averages. This is a conservative estimate because science hiring ceased during the 2005-6 AY, a direct result of CLAS’s financial problems, so the actual loss will almost certainly be larger than the estimate in Table 4. The loss of these funds will create problems for CLAS since it uses the money to cover start-up costs for new faculty, fund research initiatives, provide dissertation support for graduate students, and other crucial activities.

Tables 2-4 document that under the Three-Year Plan short-term savings will translate into significant shortfalls in the future. This is, we emphasize, only one part of the picture because it focuses largely on dollars generated by the laboratory sciences. If the CLAS research mission is significantly curtailed by downsizing, there will be equal if not more severe consequences for the teaching mission, as we demonstrate below.
Budgetary Consequences: Teaching Program

“We’re tired of not getting the classes we want. We’re tired of not being taught by the professors” (Follick 2007).

--Jason Lutin, External Affairs Director, UF Student Government

As undergraduate enrollments continue to climb, the demand for CLAS courses and seats will increase and will have to be met somehow. This undergraduate growth, combined with the strategy of faculty attrition, will impair the critical tracking program that requires UF to provide enough seats to meet graduation requirements. As has already been reported (DaSilva 2007), the Associate Dean for Academic Advising has noted that UF students are finding it more difficult to register for needed classes offered by Liberals Arts and Sciences outside their majors. The restricted access policies implemented by departments insure that their own majors will be able to graduate but shut out students with secondary majors or outside concentrations required by other departments. Moreover, hiring fewer tenure-track faculty means that more UF students will be taught by temporary faculty—graduate teaching assistants, lecturers, adjuncts, visitors, etc. While temporary faculty teach well and play critical roles in UF’s teaching mission, their impermanence is itself a problem. Non-tenure-track faculty typically do not have research programs or sponsor students in research; they may be unable to advise students, write letters of recommendation for students seeking graduate or professional education, supervise student theses, or otherwise sustain the undergraduate experience. Complaints from UF students have already prompted legislators to consider capping the use of adjunct faculty at levels below what is already common at UF (Stripling 2007). Yet the Three-Year Plan, by balancing the budget through the attrition of permanent, tenure-track faculty, relies on precisely this mechanism.

How will the attrition of tenure-track faculty affect the quality of undergraduate and graduate instruction in CLAS? The CLAS Dean’s Office compiled a section-by-section spreadsheet of student headcount and the instructor of record for courses offered in the Fall 2006 semester. From these data in Table 5, we have been able to determine the percentage of students instructed by tenure-track versus non-tenure-track faculty (the latter includes graduate assistants, adjunct professors, visiting faculty, staff, fellows and postdoctoral appointments). Over half (57%) of students enrolled in CLAS courses were taught by non-tenure-earning instructors. Students enrolled in lower-division undergraduate courses are most likely to be taught by someone other than a tenure-earning faculty member (88% of students in Humanities courses, 67% in Behavioral Sciences, and 63% in Natural Sciences). For upper-division undergraduate courses, over 40% of students in Behavioral Science and Natural Science courses are taught by non-tenure-track faculty; for the Humanities this figure is 30%. Even at the graduate level, where one might assume that instruction is solely provided by tenure-track faculty, other faculty and staff (29% of students in Behavioral Sciences are taught by non-tenure-track faculty, compared to 19% in the Humanities and 15% in the Natural Sciences) teach a significant portion of graduate students. To summarize, while entering undergraduates are unlikely to have tenure-track faculty teaching their courses, it is not unusual for graduate students to be taught by instructors who are not tenured or on the tenure track.

These figures raise troubling issues: First, the Three-Year Plan will inevitably increase practices that students and legislators have criticized—the use of adjuncts and other temporary faculty.
Second, the heavy reliance on temporary faculty for upper-division instruction means that majors do not fully benefit from the expertise of the faculty, a trend that is highest in some of the departments that produce the most majors, as in Psychology and Political Science. (These data are set out in a report on the Finance Committee web page.)

**Options Considered and Rejected**

The costs summarized in the previous section will impair UF’s capacity to reach the top tier of public universities or even to satisfy the most minimal definition of UF’s mission. What is to be done? In the absence of clear information about how other units have solved similar budget deficits, we considered a wide range of budgetary strategies. Although we outline these seemingly viable strategies below, we cannot endorse them because each presents major problems under the constraints outlined at the beginning of this report.

One alternative to faculty attrition is to cut entire academic departments or centers. There is no sound academic or financial rationale for this option. Departments offer basic education for UF undergraduates and serve a large number of majors. Moreover, CLAS should reflect the academic breadth and depth befitting a fine university—we should embrace the College’s diversity, and not seek to curtail it. Abolishing centers does little to affect the budget because many are self-supporting and, in any case, are composed of faculty with tenured appointments in CLAS departments who would remain on the UF payroll. The savings from this option are trivial.  

We also dismissed the idea of a college-wide freeze on faculty hiring. Because of lack of discretionary income in the budget, this drastic measure would not bring the College's finances into the black in one year. Nor, given the current condition of the College's budget, would rebuilding be possible. Instead, the freeze would result in an immediate and permanent downsizing of the College, which would harm those departments and units that have already been hit hard by retirements, as well as those that lose faculty in key areas over the next several years.

Some have suggested that the deficit could be resolved if CLAS faculty taught more classes. While appealing in its simplicity, this plan ignores a number of salient facts. First, increasing the teaching load would impair the capacity of CLAS faculty to generate resources in the form of grant dollars and to produce the scholarship that will propel UF to higher standing. Second, in many cases increasing the teaching load is physically impossible because of limited classroom space. Third, if the faculty teaching load is out of line with peer and Top Ten institutions, we will lose faculty to other institutions and it will be harder to recruit outstanding new faculty.

Still others have suggested that adding more televised or online classes may be the solution to CLAS’s problems. We recognize that in some circumstances classes of this sort have a value, but we also believe that their efficiency can be overstated. Since courses of this sort raise significant issues relating to intellectual property and quality control, and are only pedagogically appropriate or possible in limited circumstances, we cannot endorse this as a general solution to the CLAS budget deficit.
Recommendations

We offer the following recommendations for addressing the CLAS budget deficit:

(1) **UF must develop a rational and transparent policy for allocating resources across units.** As noted in the background section, UF now uses an incremental funding model. Therefore, funding decisions are not clearly related to teaching and research missions. Had CLAS simply received the average percentage increase in E&G budget given to the eleven other colleges we looked at from 1995-2005, and if its expenditures had remained the same, there would be no CLAS deficit today. A half-percentage error, compounded over ten years, can grow to produce a shortfall.

(2) **In allocating resources across units, UF must fund mandated changes in mission.** As we discovered, some of the CLAS operating deficit was accrued by units in response to mandates from the central administration without a commensurate increase in funding. For example, CLAS was repeatedly told to increase its graduate enrollment and to offer more undergraduate sections, mandates that required departments to hire more graduate teaching assistants. Yet the funding that chairs and directors were promised to accomplish this aim materialized haphazardly, if at all. Another source of disparity between mission and resources arises because curricular changes adopted by other units raise costs for CLAS. For instance, a decision by the College of Business Administration to drop one of its own statistics classes in favor of another course taught by the Department of Statistics further burdened CLAS resources. Many CLAS departments could cite similar examples. As far as we know, these curricular changes were never priced out and reflected in corresponding shifts in allocations. Since approximately 60% of the credit hours generated by CLAS already come from students who are not CLAS majors, this problem is acute.

(3) **Relying on faculty and staff attrition is just as irrational as imposing an across-the-board cut.** There is no College-wide master plan to cope with attrition and the extremely limited number of new hires envisioned by the Three-Year Plan will not mitigate the effects of attrition. Indeed, since attrition is unplanned, some departments will be put in an untenable position and find it difficult to carry out their research and teaching missions. A Provost's committee is studying the problems of university-wide allocations: we ask that committee to consider the issues raised in this report and in the other documents on our web page. We also urge the CLAS administration to work with future finance committees to develop a mission-based budgeting model.

(4) **Recognizing that these structural changes will take time to implement, we recommend in the interim that the UF administration relax one of its constraints, allowing CLAS to formulate an alternative plan.** The UF administration should extend the time allowed CLAS to fund the annual deficit, provide permanent new money to eliminate the deficit as a recurring problem, or accept a decline in student credit hours generated by CLAS. Any of these options taken alone could solve the deficit without the losses that are the unavoidable consequence of the current Three-Year Plan.
How do we move forward? If the three-year time limitation is removed, for instance, we would have the time to examine the proportional impact of the loss of tenure-track faculty on various departments in CLAS. We could then determine some guidelines for addressing faculty attrition, thereby mitigating the hardships placed on units that have seen a disproportionate loss of faculty or staff. We would also have the opportunity to develop a transparent, mission-based budget model for the College that would insure good stewardship of scarce state funds, while addressing the varied teaching and scholarly needs of the College.

Last year, the Provost sought external reviews of several departments in CLAS. Those reports emphasized the extent to which faculty and students contribute to the reputation of the university. We think this point can be generalized to all the departments and units in CLAS. As a result, while we agree that the college has an obligation to work within its means, we urge the administration to help CLAS by providing it the means it needs.
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Table 1

Alternative Hiring Plans for CLAS
AY 2006-7 through AY 2008-9 (3 year hiring cycle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Hires</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model 1 - Assumes 2003-2005 hiring pattern by division**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Hires</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS**</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Year</td>
<td>Alternate Plans</td>
<td>2006-7</td>
<td>2007-8</td>
<td>2008-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS 3 Year Plan</td>
<td>Number of Hires in Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Number of Hires in Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference from 3 Year Plan</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lost grant $ per year</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td>$1,188,000</td>
<td>$1,188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Number of Hires in Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference from 3 Year Plan</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lost grant $ per year</td>
<td>$1,716,000</td>
<td>$1,584,000</td>
<td>$1,584,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Loss of Total Semester Research Assistantships
Under CLAS Three-Year Plan vs. Normal Hiring Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Plans</th>
<th>2006-7</th>
<th>2007-8</th>
<th>2008-9</th>
<th>Three Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hires in Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hires in Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from 3 Year Plan</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Assistantships</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model 1**

| Number of Hires in Sciences | 18 | 18 | 18 | 54 |
| Difference from 3 Year Plan | (13) | (12) | (12) | (37) |
| Lost Assistantships | 28.6 | 26.8 | 26.8 | 82.2 |

**Model 2**
Table 4

Loss of Indirect Costs (IDC)
Under CLAS Three-Year Plan vs. Normal Hiring Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Plans</th>
<th>2006-7</th>
<th>2007-8</th>
<th>2008-9</th>
<th>Three Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hires in Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS 3 Year Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hires in Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from 3 Year Plan</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost IDC per year</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hires in Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from 3 Year Plan</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost IDC per year</td>
<td>$455,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$1,295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.

Teaching by tenure-track and non tenure-track faculty for Fall 2006
Based on student headcount (not SCHs) from section enrollments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Students instructed by tenure-track faculty</th>
<th>Students instructed by non tenure-track faculty</th>
<th>% students instructed by non tenure-track faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Behavioral Sci</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG lower</td>
<td>Behavioral Sci</td>
<td>2359</td>
<td>4776</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG upper</td>
<td>Behavioral Sci</td>
<td>3569</td>
<td>2737</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG lower</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>9812</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG upper</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>6098</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Natural Sci</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG lower</td>
<td>Natural Sci</td>
<td>10060</td>
<td>17153</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG upper</td>
<td>Natural Sci</td>
<td>3656</td>
<td>3182</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 57.5% of students are taught by non tenure-earning instructors

Notes:

1. Psychology is moved to Natural Sciences.

2. Table excludes SLS (student life skills), IDH (interdisciplinary honors), IDS (interdisciplinary studies).

3. Tenure-track includes tenured + tenure earning all ranks.

4. Nontenure includes lecturers, all GAs, adjuncts, fellows, postdocs, staff, visiting faculty.

5. Source: CLAS (Mueller-068.xls)
Notes

1 The plan was implemented under a tight timeline. Those interested in the history of the plan should review Stripling 2006.

2 The CLAS Faculty Finance Committee, consisting of 6 elective and 3 appointive members of the CLAS faculty and a student representative, began meeting in November, 2006. CLAS faculty elected two-thirds of the committee from across the divisions, and the Dean appointed three members: Among its 9 members, the Committee counts 5 current or former department chairs, 2 current or former Center directors, and a former CLAS associate dean, as well as numerous undergraduate and graduate coordinators in departments; the Committee received considerable assistance from the CLAS Budget Director and the CLAS Assistant Dean for Research and Development. The members of the committee are intimately familiar with budgets and know the challenges of operating amidst an atmosphere of fiscal constraint. Minutes of the Committee’s meetings are archived at http://www.clas.ufl.edu/gov/comm/finance.html.

3 The conditions under which the Three-Year Plan was implemented were sketched out by the Provost in a meeting with chairs and directors in CLAS in late July 2006. But some questions lingered: in September 2006, the then Dean of CLAS, Neil Sullivan, admitted he was not sure that start up costs promised new faculty could be paid. Ultimately, these obligations were met, but in some cases it was not clear until January 2007 that would happen. Since July 1, 2006, the central administration has provided to CLAS in excess of $10 million to cover operating debts and to meet start-up obligations to newly-hired faculty.

4 Throughout this report, and in reports from our subcommittees, we refer to student FTEs. Student FTEs are derived from the more familiar Student Credit Hour record. The Faculty Senate SCH Calculator provides data in both FTE and SCH form; 40 undergraduate SCHs is equal to one undergraduate FTE, and 32 graduate SCHs is equal to one graduate FTE.

5 The academic year differs from the fiscal year so we indicate which basis we used in our calculations.

6 This emphasis on faculty hiring is not meant to disregard the real costs—educational and personal—of cutting back on graduate student enrollment, staff reductions, and expenses. While these are small cuts in dollar terms, they do considerable damage to both people and UF objectives.

7 During the first year of the Three-Year Plan, CLAS has identified and is implementing a total savings of $2,154,512. (Liberal Arts & Sciences, “2006-2009 Budget Summary,” 3 April 2007). Approximately $1 million of these savings come from faculty attrition. The two next largest categories, staff attrition and expense cuts, account together for most of the other $1 million in Year 1 savings. However, because CLAS has been thinly staffed and expense reductions are already cutting into bone and muscle, there are no further cuts planned in staffing or expenses. This means that virtually all of the savings needed for Years 2 and 3 (AY 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, respectively) will have to come from additional faculty attrition.

8 The 651 figure for permanent tenure-track faculty, derived from OIR data (Office of Instructional Resources. 2006), differs from CLAS’ internal calculation of 645.

9 For example, CLAS is slated to lose 7 faculty members to retirement and has already received resignations from another 17 faculty at the end of the 2006-7 AY. Additionally, there are another 36 faculty expected to retire during the 2007-08 year. It would be necessary to hire 50 new tenure-track faculty to maintain equilibrium yet the College is expected to make just 10 new tenure-track hires by the end of the 2006-7 academic year. The College will thus be smaller in 2007-8 with at least 40 fewer faculty. The lower bound of the number of losses due to retirement is based on the current estimated retirements by the end of AY 2006-7 and the upper bound indicates the number of faculty who have already indicated they will complete the DROP program by the end of AY 2007-8.

10 Because it called for downsizing of specific departments and the closure or deemphasis for graduate programs in specific areas, much of the internal discussion among CLAS faculty has concentrated on the Three-Year Plan’s consequences for departments. However, our concern here is with the global consequences of the Plan for CLAS as an institution. Any specific cutbacks remain to be discussed and debated.
In AY 2003, CLAS hired a total of 50 faculty but this actually represented a net loss of 12 due to the large number of retirements occasioned by the DROP program. CLAS has yet to make up this loss of faculty in key departments.


In 2005-6, CLAS faculty in the Natural Sciences and Mathematics generated 72% of the grant funds earned by CLAS faculty. Adding the Department of Psychology (see note below) raised the percentage to 87%. By ignoring the grant funds generated by faculty outside this division, we are once again offering a conservative estimate.

Because it is a laboratory science that earns major grant dollars, we included the Department of Psychology as part of the Natural/Physical Science division for the calculations in this section.

The $35,000 estimate is based on the total Indirect Cost generated by CLAS faculty in 2005/2006 divided by the number of permanent, tenure-track faculty in the Natural & Mathematical Sciences (including, as noted, Psychology).

They are unlikely as well to conduct or supervise research projects, assist in the governance of the institution, or perform the myriad tasks that occupy permanent faculty. Because we are concentrating on the educational consequences for undergraduates, these lacunae will not be addressed here.

For this analysis, unlike the discussion of external support, Psychology has been grouped with the Behavioral and Social Sciences rather than the Natural and Physical Sciences.

For example, CLAS did abolish the Center for Gerontological Studies as part of the deficit reduction strategy for AY 2006-2007. The savings, $71,711, constitute less than 3% of the total reduction implemented during AY 2006-2007. Over the three-year life of the Plan, that is little more than rounding error.