

AGENDA**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 6**

Wednesday, 23 March 2005, 3:00 p.m.

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Sally Dresdow, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Kenneth J. Fleurant

1. CALL TO ORDER**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5
FEBRUARY 16, 2005** (attached)**3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT****4. CONTINUING BUSINESS** – presented by Greg Davis, Chair of University Committeea. Voting status of ex officio members on committees, second reading. (attached)b. General Education Council proposal for changes to the writing emphasis requirement
(attached)**5. NEW BUSINESS** –

a. Requests for Future Senate Business

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith

7. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Presented by Professor Gregory Davis, Chair

8. OPEN FORUM: Joint discussion of mutual interests with Student Senate and the
Academic Staff Committee.**9. ADJOURNMENT**

MINUTES 2004-2005
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5
Wednesday, February 16, 2005
Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Office: Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Speaker

Parliamentarian: Kenneth J. Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

-

PRESENT: Greg Aldrete (HUS-UC), Scott Ashman (ED), Denise Bartell (HUD), Angela Bauer-Dantoin (HUB), Forrest Baulieu (ICS), Joy Benson (BUA), Peter Breznay (ICS), Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Andrew Fiala (HUS), Scott Furlong (PEA-UC), Regan Gurung (HUD-UC), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Derek Jeffreys (HUS), Timothy Kaufman (ED), Harvey Kaye (SCD), Michael Kraft (PEA), Mimi Kubsch (NUR), Judith Martin (Soc. Wk), Steven Meyer (NAS), Steve Muzatko (BUA), Tom Nesslein (URS), Debra Pearson (HUB), Ellen Rosewall (COA), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Christine Style (COA-UC), Rebecca Tout (COA), Bryan Vescio (HUS), David Voelker (HUS).

NOT PRESENT: Michael Draney (NAS), Tara Reed (NAS), William Witwer (COA).

REPRESENTATIVES: Rachel Abhold (Student Government Association), John Landrum (Academic Staff Representative).

GUESTS: Lucy Arendt (BUA), Interim Dean Fergus Hughes, Dean Fritz Erickson, Registrar Michael Herrity, Scott Hildebrand (University Communication), Kumar Kangayappan (URS), Associate Dean Joyce Salisbury, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Larry Smith (SCD), Assistant Dean Michael Stearney, Brian Sutton (HUS).

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Dresdow called the Senate to order at 3:04 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 4, December 15, 2004.

The minutes were approved without change. (For the record, the January Senate meeting was cancelled.)

3. Chancellor's Report. General Education discussions for February were deferred because of budget concerns, but will be rescheduled for March. At their last meeting, the Board of Regents reemphasized a strong commitment to increasing diversity in the UW system. This is not made easier as budget cuts force curtailment of student services, but our campus holds this as a high priority (see report on plan 2008 later in meeting)

Budget: The numbers have changed since the initial proposal (the situation is not as bad as initially believed) and they are not expected to change much now. On the positive side: 200 new faculty –of which our share could be estimated at 3 FTE based on our usual 2.4% of System total. They would be available in the second year of the biennium. Decisions on where they go will be made through the open processes for budgeting, setting campus priorities, and position approval. The governor included in his budget a “star faculty retention fund” (\$2.4 M) that was not part of the System request (which proposed greater consideration of competitive salaries in general). The star system can backfire by encouraging many to think of going elsewhere while few are enticed to stay, thereby encouraging more flight rather than less. \$2.5 M doesn't go very far if it would take \$100 M, as System has suggested, to offer the competitive salaries necessary to keep this from happening. We're not even sure any “star” dollars would reach our campus.

The real challenge now is where cuts will come from. There are three sources: student tuition, GPR increases, and internal reallocation. In reality 4 of 5 dollars will come from increased tuition and internal reallocation. Essentially we are being asked to cut positions across the System to pay for increased operating costs such as heating. The expectation is that we will find what they call “enterprise savings,” meaning that we find ways to increase efficiency (by way of example, have a private entrepreneur run parking lots). We are not planning on someone in System coming up with \$30 M of enterprise savings. The more likely source for finding dollars is through position cuts. The Governor believes we have “too much administration, too much non-instructional background.” Non-instructional positions are where we took the last cuts and are where we are expected to make reductions this time.

A draft of the process for making the reductions, along with other documents and communications relative to the budget, are available through a link on the campus home page. The Provost is meeting with appropriate governance groups, reviewing guidelines and principles. Everyone is invited to suggest improvements for the process at any time. The basic idea is to get it done fast since too many people in non-instructional areas are worried that their positions are on the line, and to act in a manner that has the least impact on occupied positions. The process has begun with the Chancellor and the two vice chancellors brainstorming possible ways of coming up with the money. The great challenge is to create as open a process as possible

without the damage that comes from hypothetical conversations at the early stages. Results from the closed hypothetical discussions will then be presented to the Cabinet level before being publicly shared with the campus community and opened to discussion among the governance groups.

The Chancellor invited comments. There were none. The Chancellor said he was hoping for patience with the process and expressed confidence that, as painful as this will be in some areas, the UW will continue to be a strong educational institution.

4. Report on Campus Diversity Plan 2008. Presented by Assistant Dean of Enrollment and Academic Services, Michael Stearney. A complete report is available at <http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/diversity2008/index.htm> . A report on Phase two of the plan that Stearney addressed is available at <http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/diversity2008/phasetwo/index.htm> The Assistant Dean gave the following snapshot of progress toward the diversity plan's major goals regarding students of color:

- a. Applications, admission and enrollment trends are moving upward particularly for new freshman applications from students of color—from 96 applications in 1997 to over 300 most recently.
- b. Total enrollment of students of color has fluctuated but moves up overall in spite of a number of years where it did not. The Chancellor pointed out that it remained steady but did not increase during the years the campus adjusted to having a full-time student body. There was a higher percentage of students of color among part-time students who were more numerous in earlier years.
- c. Goals include a renewed focus on local, as opposed to statewide, recruitment; an improved application completion rate so there are fewer incomplete applications and a greater follow through with the application process; more aggressive recruiting of transfer students.
- d. Retention trends for white students and students of color are parallel, moving in the right direction although there is still a gap between them to be narrowed.
- e. The most work remains to be done in the area of graduation rates where the gap between white students and students of color is disturbingly large (six year graduation rate is 46% for white students and 22% for students of color). Chancellor Shepard noted that we could narrow the gap by not taking the risks we do with admissions. But this is not something we should do.

Regarding Workplace (faculty, staff) diversity. Between 1997 and 2004 there has been an increase of only seven faculty and three staff of color. The report recommends more hiring flexibility and accountability, annual reporting and careful attention to job postings, including attaching a curricular needs analysis to position requests. Senator Kaye asked how the latter relates to workplace diversity. Stearney deferred to the Chancellor who spoke to the need for more broadly defined positions to allow for more flexible consideration of strong minority candidates. The Provost added that we have had some success getting a broader pool of candidates by using position descriptions that are not based on specific courses but on more broadly-defined academic needs.

The report recommends a greater infusion of minority studies into the curriculum. In response to a question about the term infusion, the Provost explained that this meant not assuming that minority studies are some other academic unit's business. They have become a part of many different academic areas.

Following the report, Senator Kubsch suggested that we need to recruit beyond the local area which does not have a large enough minority pool. She suggested that we not underestimate the potential of online courses for adding diversity that enrich at least the students in those classes, if not all students on campus. Senator Aldrete said there was a lot of attention paid to hiring minority faculty, but there seemed to be less energy spent on retaining them. The Chancellor noted that this is a draft plan and that he and the Provost would appreciate comments, suggestions and advice.

-
5. New Business

a. 2005-06 slate of nominees for faculty elective committees. Presented by Forrest Baulieu, Chair of the Committee on Committees and Nominations, who reminded the Senate that additional nominations can be made by petition of three members of the faculty with the consent of the nominee within the next ten days. _

-
b. Voting status of ex officio members on committees. First reading presented by Speaker Dresdow. The purpose is to clear up ambiguities in code where it is not always clear whether ex officio membership on a committee carries voting privileges or not. There is an additional recommendation that the academic deans be given non-voting, ex officio Senate seats. Senator Kaye said that he considers it unacceptable to include on the Senate people who serve at the pleasure of the Chancellor and Provost. Senator Gurung said the feeling was that many academic issues would benefit from discussion that included the academic deans in a non-voting role rather than relegating them to visitor status at the back of the room. Senator Kaye retorted that the Senate would be more effective if no administrators at all were allowed to sit on the Senate unless requested for specific occasions. He is astonished by the sheepish nature of Senators, often junior faculty, who say nothing in the presence of administrators. Voting or non-voting, he believes it unwise to increase the number of people on the Senate who do not represent units. This can only make a bad situation worse. There were no other comments. The proposal will return for a second reading.

c. General Education Council proposal for changes to the writing emphasis requirement. Presented by Speaker Dresdow. The proposal was previously distributed along with comments by GEC Chair Howe. Senator Kaye asked the chair to call on Representative Abhold to speak on behalf of the Student Senate. She said that the student senators unanimously oppose the proposal believing that it will make a complicated process more complicated. Senator Kubsch suggested that writing should be infused across the curriculum to supplement course offerings by writing faculty. She continues to be concerned by the lack of student writing skills and believes something needs to change. Senator Meyer would not include essay exams in the word total for required assignments in writing development courses, believing them not to be a good measure of writing skill due to time limitations. Senator Gurung noted that there was some sentiment on the UC for eliminating the campus-wide WE requirement in favor of an effort to genuinely infuse writing across the curriculum. He requested that any members present from the GEC be asked to speak to the proposal. Committee member Brian Sutton said that in theory infusion sounds ideal but that infusion does not preclude a separate writing development requirement. He pointed out that the intent of the GEC proposal was to make the requirement more student friendly by offering a wider range of choices (e.g, 4 WE courses rather than 2 UL and 2 LL courses, and a system designed to encourage more teachers to make their courses WE).

Senator Rosewall suggested that there needs to be more guidance to new faculty regarding writing expectations, procedures and policies. Senator Voelker argued in favor of inclusion of essay exams—they do demonstrate control of many writing skills. He also pointed out the limits of writing assignments in large classes. Senator Aldrete has no quarrel with a writing requirement although we must realize that it is ultimately so minimal as to be meaningless. We need either to make the WE requirement truly stringent and meaningful or eliminate the requirement in lieu of writing across the curriculum. Senator Furlong noted that there is nothing in the requirements about quality, only quantity. Units need to include writing skills in their assessment outcomes. Representative Abhold is not convinced that the proposal would create more choices for students and believes it uncertain that additional faculty will agree to make their courses WE. Infusing writing development in all majors should be sufficient to assure attention to writing skills.

Senator Kubsch suggested we need a full faculty discussion of writing. Nursing has noticed that transfer students from Oshkosh and Eau Claire come with better writing and research skills than students who start here, and the Program is infusing training of its own in these areas. Professor Sutton responded to the suggestion that our students were not prepared by suggesting that because they do not remember how to cite, for example, does not mean they were not taught those skills. The Provost suggested that we could benefit from bringing to campus a nationally recognized expert in rhetoric and composition to help us address the issues being discussed. Senator Gurung noted that just having a WE designation does not guarantee compliance with the requirement and there is

currently no way to check. The Chancellor added that in his experience if an instructor makes clear that everything students write will affect their grade, they make the extra effort to write and cite with greater care.

d. Requests for Future Senate Business. No requests were made. Speaker Dresdow noted that the UC is working on addressing a previous request for a joint meeting with the Student Senate—possibly to coincide with the March meeting.

6. Provost's Report. Provost Hammersmith distributed a written report at the meeting (attached) including documents highlighting portions of the Governor's budget pertaining to UW—Green Bay and hiring guidelines in response to the budget situation. Further information on the budget can be found at <http://www.uwgb.edu/chancellor/budget/index.htm>. The Provost underscored that in this round of budget cuts, the cuts would not be made across the board as they were last time, and she asks faculty and staff in areas that report to her to consider this question: If we assume all we do is of high quality and worthwhile, but cuts must nonetheless be made in non-instructional programs, what functions could be eliminated or reduced with minimal impact on you? She is looking for creative ways to change the way we function that will reduce the impact of budget cuts on people, and she is more optimistic we can do it this time than during the last budget. Comments can be sent to Deans, Provost, Division Heads, and the Provost has an anonymous e-mail box (see <http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/>) for anyone wishing to use it.

7. University Committee Report. Deferred until the next meeting.

8. Open Forum: Campus Climate Committee's Class Schedule Proposal. Senator Kaye believes that the proposal needs to be put into perspective. He is not opposed to it but feels that it is more of a clerical act than a solution to climate problems and that the designation of university time isn't all that clever and is unlikely to change much. Senator Martin sees the proposed schedule creating problems for Social Work which requires large blocks for field work. Senators Rosewall and Tout convey the almost unanimous opposition of COA because of problems created for the artistic disciplines. Reducing the semester by a week creates problems both for scheduling events in limited facilities and the physical development of musicians. Senator Meyer added science labs as another academic area for which the proposal was problematic. Senator Bauer-Dantoin says Human Biology is concerned about the impact of the change on their intro courses for which there would be too few time slots. Nonetheless HB did like the idea of a time for all-faculty meetings. Representative Abhold passed along concerns of student government: The time suggested for university time is considered a prime class time by students; more 8 a.m. classes or late afternoon classes would be necessary, an idea that finds little favor with students; they are disappointed that students had no input into the proposal since there were none on the committee that recommended it.

Senator Rosewall inquired about the process required to implement any schedule change. Although the Handbook doesn't provide any clear guidance, the Provost believes that the UC and the Senate would need to weigh in on any changes. The Chancellor noted that the CCC is a committee of the UC and Senate. The Speaker reminded the Senators of the limited charge to the committee, whose report will soon be heard. They are still receiving feedback to their proposal and could modify it, of course. She feels that proposals for change would need to return to the Senate before being implemented. Senator Kaye hopes that along with the negatives that have surfaced today, the advantages of the proposal will also be considered. The Provost would like to know how other UW campuses schedule classes, which led to a broad response. A moment of levity brought a weighty agenda to a welcome close as Senator Kaye made a good-humored, speculative connection between Oshkosh's 14 week semester and Senator Kubsch's perception that students from that campus had better writing skills.

9. Adjournment. At 4:50 p.m. the Speaker received a motion to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Faculty Senate Continuing Business (4a), 3/23/05

Specification of Ex-officio voting status

52.02 MEMBERSHIP OF THE FACULTY SENATE

(Two membership alternatives proposed for Senate action).

A. Ex Officio Members. The Chancellor and Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, shall be ex officio (**non-voting**) members.

- OR -

A. Ex Officio Members. The Chancellor, Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, **and Academic Deans** shall be ex officio (**non-voting**) members.

LIBRARY AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

UWGB Faculty Senate Approved 11 December 1985

UWGB Faculty Senate Revised 16 March 1988, 18 April 1990, 16 September 1998

2. The Library and Instructional Technology Committee is advisory to the ~~Chief Information Officer and University Librarian~~ **Associate Provost for Information Services, the Director of the Cofrin Library, and the Technology Council** on policy matters pertaining to instructional technology and library automation. The ~~Chief Information Officer Associate Provost for Information Services and University Librarian~~ **the Director of the Cofrin Library** ~~is an~~ are ex officio (non-voting) members of the Committee.

HONORARY DEGREE COMMITTEE

UWGB Faculty Senate Approved 19 October 1988

University Committee Approved 14 December 1988 and 27 December 1989

Board of Regents Approved 8 September 1989

1. The Honorary Degree Committee is composed of the faculty members on the Awards and Recognitions Committee and the Chancellor. The President of the University of Wisconsin System is an ex officio (**voting**) member. The committee will elect its own chairperson at its first meeting.

Date of effect: Immediate

Faculty Senate Continuing Business (4b), 3/23/05

University of Wisconsin-Green Bay
Department of Natural and Applied Sciences
2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54311-7001

-

Memorandum

To: Gregory Davis, Chair
University Committee

From: Bob Howe, Chair
General Education Council

cc: General Education Council
Joyce Salisbury, Associate Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Date: 8 February 2005

re: Revised General Education Writing Policy

Attached is a modified proposal for revising the Writing Emphasis Policy at UW-Green Bay based on our discussion at the 22 December University Committee meeting. The rationale for this change in UW-Green Bay's Writing Emphasis Policy can be presented to the Faculty Senate as follows:

During the past two years the General Education Council has sought to improve the Writing Emphasis Requirement at UW-Green Bay. A recommendation submitted by GEC Chair Jeff Entwistle in his 2003-2004 Academic Year Summary was revised by the 2004-2005 GEC; this proposal was modified further after comments by the University Committee on 22 December 2004.

This revised policy addresses two issues. First, the new policy places a greater emphasis on writing development by explicitly designating writing development (WD) courses and by encouraging students and instructors to use resources made available by the Writing Center, including UWGB's previously approved general writing standards. Second, the proposal aims to encourage more instructors to participate in the writing emphasis program by creating a second category of courses (WA or "writing advanced" courses), where the existing requirement for feedback before the end of the 4th week of classes is eliminated. This new category should have the effect of increasing the number of writing emphasis courses, thereby making it easier for students to fulfill the requirement.

We hope encourage the continued use and development of general campus-wide writing standards and writing-improvement resources like the Writing Center. In addition to the campus-wide standards, individual faculty members are encouraged to articulate their own specific writing expectations. A web site developed by the Writing Center provides additional resources for students who need help.

In order to implement the new policy, we propose that all current writing emphasis courses be automatically designated as WD courses. Instructors will then submit requests for designating new courses or re-classifying existing courses in either the WD or WA category.

Writing Requirement Policy (Revised 17 January 2005)

Purpose: The Writing Requirement is to provide all students with structured opportunities to practice and improve their writing skills across the curriculum. The Writing Requirement recognizes three levels for writing development: 1) Basic competency demonstrated by ACT scores or taking specific writing courses, 2) Practice in a developmental way that gives students feedback early and often throughout the class. These courses will be identified as WD (Writing Development). 3) Advanced practice in which students apply their writing skills to courses in their major or minor programs or in other upper level courses. These courses will be identified as WA (Writing Advanced).

Writing Standards: The UWGB Writing Policy and Criteria for Evaluating Writing will be made available at [URL] on the UWGB web site.

Requirement: Students must complete at least **four** Writing Courses prior to graduation. At least **one** must be a Writing Development course (identified in the Schedule of Classes by the abbreviation "WD" as part of the course listing), and at least **one** must be a Writing Advanced course (identified in the Schedule of Classes by the abbreviation "WA" as part of the course listing). Students who successfully complete four courses identified as "WD" or "WA" (with a minimum of one from each category) will fulfill the UW-Green Bay Writing Requirement.

Required Assignments in WD courses:

1. Three or more "public discourse" writing assignments must be included as part of the course requirements. "Public discourse" means the work is written for someone other than the writer (i.e., journals and diaries are not considered to be "public discourse" assignments.) These assignments may include in-class work or essay exams as well as out-of-class work.
2. Public discourse writing assignments must **total a minimum of 2000 words** and must constitute at least **25%** of the grade for the course.
3. **One** public discourse assignment must be evaluated and returned to the student with feedback on the writing before the end of the **4th** week of class. (This allows students to seek help with their writing early in the course.) If appropriate, students will be referred to the UW-Green Bay Writing Center or web resources for additional help with writing development.

Required Assignments in WA courses:

1. Writing assignments must **total a minimum of 2500 words**.
2. Public discourse writing assignments (see definition above) must **total a minimum of 30%** of the grade for the course. These assignments may include both in-class and out-of-class work (including essay exams, papers, reviews, etc.) as long as some feedback on the writing is provided.

Class Size: All WD courses shall be capped at 45.
All WA courses shall be capped at 35.

Report to the Faculty Senate March 23, 2005

Submitted by Sue K. Hammersmith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

I. PLANNING AND BUDGET UPDATE

As you know, the Governor's proposed budget for the 2005-07 biennium calls for significant and substantial reductions in non-instructional costs across the UW system. As a result, UW-Green Bay has had to plan for a budget reduction of **\$843,500**. Of this amount, \$602,500 is targeted as permanent, base-budget reductions to be achieved over two years, and \$241,000 is designated as a one-time reduction to be taken during the first year. We also were given a target for administrative FTE reductions that had to be achieved by the end of the biennium.

Following discussions and consideration of alternative approaches within our respective areas, the Chancellor's Cabinet agreed to a set of recommended reductions which were forwarded to the Chancellor. These recommended reductions had to meet two primary conditions:

1. Our reductions were not to reduce direct instructional positions and services.
2. Our reductions had to come from "GPR" state-support funds (102, 105, 115, 402). Large segments of the University are not supported by these funds and hence could not be considered in this exercise. For example, only 18% of Student Affairs is GPR-supported; only 12% of Outreach and Adult Access; none of the Weidner Center budget, bookstore, or residence halls.

Within the Provost's area, we sought reductions that would have the least direct impact on our students, faculty, and academic programs. We also referred to the goals identified by our divisions and by the Academic Affairs Planning Committee during our planning discussions earlier this academic year.

The Chancellor announced the Cabinet's recommendations at a public forum on Friday, March 11, 2005, and invited input, feedback, and alternative suggestions to be submitted or voiced over the next two weeks. The Chancellor's entire slide presentation can be viewed at:

<http://www.uwgb.edu/chancellor/budget/budgetforum%203.11.05.htm>.

I subsequently met jointly with the Senate Standing Committee on Planning and Budget and the Academic Staff Committee to discuss the recommended reductions, the criteria by which we arrived at those recommendations, and to solicit additional feedback and possible alternatives we may not have thought of. The Chancellor and I also will be meeting with some interested community members.

The base budget reductions which were recommended by the Cabinet and presented by the Chancellor at the public forum are summarized in Table 1. Again, feedback and additional input are requested by no later than Monday, March 28. The Chancellor will make his final decisions after that time.

II. FACULTY NEWS

Cliff Ganyard, Assistant Professor of Humanistic Studies (History) has been awarded a Sasakawa Fellowship from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. This Fellowship will support Cliff's participation in the National Faculty Development Institute on Incorporating Japanese Studies into the Undergraduate Curriculum at San Diego State University this summer.

Rosemary Christensen, Assistant Professor of Humanistic Studies (American Indian Studies) has been selected to receive the 2005 University of Wisconsin Women of Color in Education Awards. The University of Wisconsin System honors one award recipient from each campus each year. Dr. Christensen will be honored in Madison on April 16th.

Ray Hutchinson, Professor of Urban and Regional Studies (Sociology) has been awarded a UW System Institute on Race and Ethnicity Award for a project entitled "Cultural Change and Continuity in the Hmong Culture."

Please join me in congratulating your colleagues. Accomplishments and honors such as these reflect well not only on the recipients but also upon their colleagues who provided the kind of environment and support that encouraged such achievement.

If others have received special recognition not mentioned here, please let me know.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue H.

Sue K. Hammersmith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Provost's Report to the Faculty Senate, 3/23/05 (cont.)

Table 1. UWGB Budget Reduction Recommendations as of March 11, 2005

Reduction	Savings*
Eliminate the Financial Specialist position in the LAS dean's office	\$35,358.
Eliminate the half-time Interim Director position in the Institute for Learning Partnerships and reorganize leadership function	63,705.
Reduce the non-personnel budget in the Institute for	26,559

Learning Partnership	
Reorganize the administrative support functions and resources of the graduate programs office; eliminate the part-time Associate Dean's position	58,672
Reduce non-instructional graduate assistantships from 17 to 11	70,233
Reduce library support for the government depository and for a 24/7 virtual reference service	6,000
Reassign the SOFAS office non-governance-related functions (e.g., visa assistance) and eliminate a half-time clerical position	37,243
Reduce and reassign staff support for CLEP and test-proctoring service	4,927
Reduce non-personnel budget in Extended Degree Program	4,700
Shift portion of Athletic Director's salary from state support	24,623
Reduce personnel costs in Office of Planning and Budget	13,284
Reduce non-personnel support budget in Chancellor's Office	13,181
Reduce state funding for support of student computing lab	22,970
Reduce state support for Government/Community relations position	28,508
Eliminate state funding for Grants Accounting position	53,130
Eliminate the position of Internal Auditor	57,356
Reduce support for mail, package delivery	28,227
Restructure Human Resources Office	7,224
To be determined (temporary contingency fund reduction)	48,108

* Savings for eliminated positions include both salary and benefits.