Carol,

I appreciate input from you and the Curriculum Council. I wanted to share a few observations regarding the comments and suggestions listed below:

- Cost reduction is and should be a process transparent to the campus community. However, there are specific guidelines for the process when the FCG is engaged in the program reduction process. Under these circumstances, the process needs to be consistent with the FCG guidelines.

- The degrees recommended by the Advisory Council were all low enrollment degrees, and adjustments were made based on conversations with academic deans (who consulted with faculty in the process.) While I understand that some of those degrees build on other degrees or courses, I do not buy the argument that there is no additional overhead costs of delivering those degrees. For one, someone is spending time to recruit students into those degrees and advise them during their tenure at OSU. Perhaps the savings are limited, but the thinking of the Advisory Council was that a set of small savings put together may not be insignificant.

- Regarding organization of departments, this is the conversation we will be having over the next 4-5 months. I hope that faculty will actively engage in suggesting changes and realignments that will advance the university.

- Your suggestion regarding unique electives is a good one, logic that can be extended to options/majors within a degree. Perhaps the Curriculum Council can suggest guidelines in this regard.

I have appointed an initial committee to provide the oversight for the cost reduction process. I appreciate your volunteering to help in this process, and I am sharing your offer with Becky to call upon your help as needed in this process.

Sabah

---

At the last Curriculum Council meeting the membership expressed dismay at not being able to provide me with input regarding the proposals that are being reviewed by the FCG. They asked that I contact you so that they can provide feedback to me to bring to the FCG for future program cuts. Two program cuts were specifically noted as valuable programs that will save NO money by being cut. It was pointed out that if I had been able to share the proposed list of cuts with the Curriculum Council this information would have been available to the FCG for our discussion. The programs are:

**Mathematical Sciences Major:** This program is 1/3 Math classes, 1/3 statistics classes and 1/3 computer science classes. There are no unique classes included in this major thus there will be NO direct cost savings from eliminating it other than the slight (or possibly not so slight, has anyone done an analysis to determine the incremental cost?) savings
from keeping track of one fewer unique major. This is a well designed major that allows breadth across three areas tailored to students with very specific goals.

**Environment Economics, Policy and Management Major:** This program also has no unique classes and thus NO direct cost savings from elimination. The program experienced a period of decline after the death of the lead faculty member in 2004. Enrollments have recently resurged with 11 new students this fall. This program has been in place about a decade and is well aligned with OSU's strategic vision and areas of interest. It was created (a) to attract more urban students into the AREc undergraduate program; (b) because it is complementary to our nationally ranked graduate programs in resource and environmental economics; (c) because, although similar to Environmental Sciences and Natural Resources, it provides more of the human dimension training not found in those programs; (d) because it was a low cost addition to the department.

It seems to me that if this information is already being shared with the deans and affected faculty members there is no legitimate reason for me not being able to consult with the *Curriculum Council* about the items on the list during the next round of cuts.

Additional concerns were raised regarding the clarity of the communications about what was being cut. The lists put out were not clear to faculty in general. I know we believe we have clearly communicated the information on cuts, however the recipients of our communications are not at all clear on what was communicated to them. I think for the next round the method of communication should be reconsidered. Perhaps a list with the associated codes would be clearer to the recipients of the information.

Further there is considerable anxiety about the reorganization of Colleges. Some faculty believe that it would be more beneficial to break down the walls around the College silos for this reorganization. For example, it was pointed out to me that matching AREc with *Economics* and *Ag Education* with the *College of Education* and *Bioengineering* with *Environmental Engineering*, would make more sense than the current proposal to create a department of *Economics, Education and Bioengineering* within the *College of Agriculture*. I know from the proposal we are currently considering within the *College of Business* to move the *School of Design and Merchandising* to our college that restructuring along different lines is possible. I think that the option of moving entire departments to other colleges needs to be more widely advertised and considered.

I have had one further thought on cost savings and how to achieve them. I think we should specifically look for majors that have too many unique electives with respect to the number of majors. If we really want to achieve economies of scale then we should have some guidelines for how many unique electives are appropriate to majors of different sizes. A major with only perhaps 20 students should not have any unique electives. A major with 40 students should not have more than one unique elective etc. Many faculty members have one class that they really enjoy teaching. In the absence of clear guidance faculty members will fight to keep "their" class and we will end up dropping sections of service classes and keep classes with borderline enrollments.

Lastly, I would like to volunteer to be on the committee that will review the budget information. My experience as a CPA and my expertise in accounting, budgeting, and cost analysis might be useful for that committee. I am not looking for more committees to be on but you really need to have an accountant on that committee. Accounting information can be difficult to understand and interpret even for those with accounting backgrounds and is easily misunderstood by those without any accounting training. If not me then choose another accounting faculty member (Larry Brown would be an excellent choice) or outside person with accounting experience.

Thank you for your consideration of these ideas. You have my permission to share this communication with all those you consider appropriate. Please let me know what I should report back to the *Curriculum Council*. 