

Subject: Preparation for Budget Reduction/Reorg Senate Discussion

Date: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 at 11:41:54 PM Pacific Standard Time

From: Isaac Escoto

To: Benjamin Armerding, Katherine Schaefer, Tracee Cunningham, Voltaire Villanueva, Kathryn Maurer, Natasha Mancuso, Micaela Agyare, Amber La Piana, David McCormick, Hilary Gomes, Jordan Fong, Donna Frankel, Mary Sunseri, Robert Cormia, David Marasco, Sara Cooper, Rita O'Loughlin, Don Mac Neil, Mimi Overton, Carolyn Holcroft, Kristy Lisle, Chelsey Nguyen

Good evening senate representatives,

Discussion at the academic senate has made it clear that concerns/questions/thoughts regarding the budget reduction/reorg proposal involve many different moving parts, however most feedback received falls into three categories: [existence of an instructional Hub](#), [Hub implementation](#), and the [process](#) of creating the budget cut proposal. Though the majority of feedback we've heard has been of a concerned nature, it's important to point out that we've also heard from folks that support the budget reduction/reorg proposal as is, and see benefits in the Hub idea.

To best help the academic senate take tangible action regarding the budget reduction/reorg at our meeting on February 4th, we ask that each division be prepared to select one of the following options that best represents the majority of their constituents in regards to the proposal.

Option 1: [Oppose](#) the creation of the [Hub](#), however [make up the funding](#) otherwise saved by consolidating division offices by [recommending](#) we [cut college programs](#), or [use SRP](#) (early retirement) savings to make up the difference (and not use funds saved from SRP to pay part time faculty to teach more course sections). Side note: these two alternatives to address budget reduction as related to the creation of the Hub are the most common we've heard discussed. If choosing this option, keep in mind we would need a specific mention of which choice a division would prefer to save funds (cut programs, or use SRP savings).

Option 2: [Approve](#) the creation of the "Instructional Hub," but [continue in discussions with our administrative colleagues](#) so as to best [recommend how the hub should function](#) in order to best [serve students, and address faculty concerns regarding access/connection with deans](#). Faculty would also be involved in [recommending](#) how best to [utilize division offices](#).

Option 3: [Approve](#) the budget proposal/reorg [as is](#), with [no recommendation](#) for further action.

Discussion regarding process, and how best to involve faculty voice in the creation of budget reduction proposals in the future is absolutely important, and will continue. However, the senate officers felt it important to simplify choices above, so as to move forward on the budget proposal itself, with the understanding that discussions of a procedural nature would continue.

It's understandable that choosing between three choices can feel limiting, however please keep in mind we are looking to both respond to the majority of what we've heard, and take tangible action.

We welcome discussion and feedback at our meeting on Monday. Have a great rest of the week.

In service,

Academic Senate Officers
Isaac Escoto

Ben Armerding
Katherine Schaefer