

Zero-Based Budgeting Decision Package

for the

Salt Lake Community College English Department

Submitted to:

SLCC Informed Budget Committee

Date:

April 1, 2010

Submitted by:

Stephen Ruffus, Chair, SLCC English Department

In collaboration with:

English Department Zero-Based Budget Ad Hoc Committee

Andrea Malouf, Chair

Lisa Bickmore, Louise Bown, Stephanie Dowdle, Allison Fernley, Tiffany Rousculp



Executive Summary

This Zero-Based Budgeting Decision Package for the SLCC English Department provides an analysis of department priorities and their funding levels. Four budget scenarios are outlined in this package: 1) the current department budget: 2) a “100% of Optimal” budget that would provide full funding to meet the department’s priorities, 3) an “80% of Optimal budget” and a “110” of Optimal Budget.”

This analysis demonstrates that the English department currently is operating well below Optimal funding in several areas, specifically in personnel and professional development.

The benefits of optimal funding of the department’s priorities include excellent quality teaching for SLCC students. To sustain such teaching the department must provide adequate professional development to cover faculty needs. With optimal funding faculty are better able to advance their knowledge of teaching and learning through various means, such as assessment design, scholarship in the field, and attendance at regional and national conferences. Also, optimal funding would bring the department closer to compliance with student/teacher ratios recommended by professional organizations in the field. Finally, optimal funding would help reduce the full-time to part-time faculty ratio, yet also allow us to more effectively hire, schedule, and train needed adjunct faculty thus improving quality control over our curriculum. From a budget management standpoint, optimal funding would reduce or eliminate the constant need for budget transfers from within the department or from the school to support department goals and allowing for better goal-setting and planning given existing resources.

We believe that this report reflects a department deeply committed to the vision, mission, and goals of the college. Thank you for giving your attention to it.

Comparison of Four Budget Scenarios

	Current Budget	100% of Optimal	80% of Optimal	110% of Optimal
Personnel				
Administration	79,741	79,741	79,741	79,741
Admin. Benefits	35,182	35,182	35,182	35,182
Full Time Faculty	1,021,578	1,578,787	1,263,030	1,736,666
FT Fac Benefits	504,537	779,509	623,607	857,460
Full Time Staff	31,000	31,000	24,800	34,100
FT Staff Benefits	24,522	24,522	19,896	26,974
Adjunct Faculty	454,863	612,480	489,984	673,728
Adj. Fac. Benefits	45,487	61,248	48,998	67,373
Hourly Staff	26,117	134,200	107,360	147,620
Hourly Benefits	2,612	13,420	10,736	14,762
Total Personnel	2,225,639	3,350,089	2,703,334	3,673,606
Current Expense	84,354	85,575	68,460	92,983
Travel In	200	0	0	0
Travel Out	6,500	45,000	36,000	49,500
Equipment	45,000	25,000	20,000	27,500
Total Budget	2,361,693	3,505,664	2,827,794*	3,843,589*

*These figures are not exactly 80% and 110% of the Optimal Budget due to constraints in expenses that cannot be reduced or increased by that specific amount. These details are outlined in the chapters that follow.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1—Departmental Goals.....pp. 5-15

Chapter 2—Personnel Expenses, Budget Narrative, and Review of Current Budget to Budget Scenarios.....pp. 16-18

Chapter 3—Non-Personnel Operating Expenses, Budget Narratives, and Review of Current Budget to Budget Scenarios.....pp. 19-21

Chapter 5*—Final Thoughts.....pp. 22-23

*Chapter 4 (Review of Current Budget to Budget Scenarios) was consolidated into Chapters 2 and 3.

CHAPTER 1

Departmental Goals

Introduction

The English department offers introductory and intermediate course emphasizing reading and writing in an effort to promote critical literacy for personal, work-related, imaginative, and academic purposes. We define critical literacy broadly as the ability to use language in the exercise of human agency. Critical literacy helps individuals to flourish in society and is key to sustaining a healthy democracy. The ability to read and write at a critical level is increasingly important for students today given the constant shifts in the local and global economy and society as a whole. Reading and writing courses help students to prepare for careers and for active participation and service in communities. Our courses are taught as intellectual inquiry intending to engage students in diverse and challenging reading and writing tasks. These tasks are designed to help students “acquire knowledge and critical thinking skills, develop self-confidence, experience personal growth, and value cultural enrichment...in the spirit of respectful and vigorous dialogue” (SLCC Mission Statement).

The section below outlines the English Department’s Priorities, Objectives and Activities within Optimal, 80% of Optimal and 110% of Optimal situations. Rationale for the above are articulated as are benefits and consequences of funding or lack thereof.

To provide a larger picture of the Department Goals, we note the Priorities and Objectives first, then go on to their specific application within the budgetary situations.

SLCC English Department Priorities and Objectives

PRIORITY 1

The English Department promotes student access to quality instruction in writing and English Studies. The department also ensures student access to learning support and consistently reliable advising and faculty support.

Objective 1a:

Students will receive quality classroom instruction and writing center support that adheres to national standards.

Objective 1b:

Students in composition classes will receive quality instruction through class sizes that adhere to national standards because of the direct correlation between class sizes and retention.

Objective 1c:

Students will receive access to quality teaching supported by comprehensive administrative support and infrastructure.

Objective 1d:

Students will have access to high quality and reliable advising throughout their student careers at SLCC.

PRIORITY 2:

The English Department maintains quality curriculum and teaching expertise in order to provide excellent instruction to SLCC students.

Objective 2a:

All English Department courses will undergo regular and rigorous assessment to keep pace with the plan for College-wide assessment.

Objective 2b:

All faculty, Full-time and Adjunct, will receive regular opportunities to maintain currency in the fields of composition and English Studies in order to provide quality teaching experiences for SLCC students.

PRIORITY 3:

The English department fosters access to engaged writing instruction and learning across the curriculum and within the larger community. To achieve this priority, the English department has the following objectives for 2010-2011:

Objective 3a:

Support and maintain the mission of, and programming at, the SLCC Community Writing Center.

Objective 3b:

Promote the new SLCC Writing Certificate to students and industry.

PRIORITY 1

The English Department promotes student access to quality instruction in writing and English Studies. The department also ensures student access to learning support and consistently reliable advising and faculty support.

Objective 1a:

Students will receive quality classroom instruction and writing center support that adheres to national standards.

Rationale: Student retention is improved significantly when a proportion of the courses are taught by full-time faculty. An overreliance on part-time faculty clearly has a negative effect on course retention and college completion rates. The English department supports President Bioteau’s eventual goal of a 50:50 ratio to ensure student opportunity and success, as per recommendations from Northwest. Composition courses in particular are critical to student success given their gateway and service function in relation to the college as a whole.

	80% of Optimal	100%	110% of Optimal
Activity 1a1— Improvement of FT: Adjunct Ratio	The English Department will add 6 FT faculty (for a total of 27).	The English Department will add 12 FT faculty (for a total of 33) to get close to the 50:50 FT/Adjunct Ratio, based on 665 course sections per academic year.	The English Department will add 18 FT Faculty (for a total of 39).
Activity 1a2— Student Writing Support in Writing Center	80% of FT faculty will maintain contact in the Writing Centers, providing 40% of student tutoring.	80% of FT faculty will maintain contact in the Writing Centers, providing 45% of student tutoring.	80% of FT faculty will maintain contact in the Writing Centers, providing 48% of student tutoring.
Total Budget	\$1,263,030	\$1,578,787	\$1,736,666
60000—Salaries	\$1,263,030	\$1,578,787	\$1,736,666

Current Budget for 1a Activities	\$1,021,578
Percentage of Optimal Currently Met	65%

Benefits of 1a Activities	Consequences of 1a Activities Not Met
More full time faculty will allow more full-time coverage of our large enrollment core requirement courses such and ENGL 1010 and 2010. It will also allow more faculty to teach other English courses critical to the literacy development of SLCC students.	As enrollment increases, the English department must increase its reliance on part-time faculty thus increasing the need for ongoing adjunct training.

Objective 1b:

Students in composition classes will receive quality instruction through class sizes that adhere to national standards because of the direct correlation between class sizes and retention.

Rationale : According to the “Statement of Principles and Standards for the Post Secondary Teaching of Writing” published by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), improving a “student's writing requires persistent and frequent contact between teacher and student both inside and outside the classroom. It requires assigning far more papers than are usually assigned in other college classrooms; it requires reading them and commenting on them not simply to justify a grade, but to offer guidance and suggestions for improvement; and it requires spending a great deal of time with individual students, helping them not just to improve particular papers but to understand fundamental principles of effective writing that will enable them to continue learning throughout their lives. The teaching of writing, perhaps more than any other discipline, therefore requires special attention to class size [and] teaching loads....”

Accordingly, CCCC recommends that writing courses should be capped at 20 and further specifies that no instructor should have more than 60 writing students in a given term. Writing courses at SLCC have been capped at 25 for decades and faculty routinely teach more students than recommended by the national organization. Therefore, the English department proposes budgeting to reduce the course cap to 23.

	80% of Optimal	100%	110% of Optimal
Activity 1b1— Composition class size meets national standards.	Composition class sizes will be larger than 23 students per course section year-round.	Composition class sizes will adhere to 23 students per course section year-round (with optimal 33 FT faculty, estimating 445 sections based on average of 410 sections of 25 students over past years).	Composition class sizes will adhere to 23 students per course section year-round.
Budget	\$1,606,854	\$2,008,567	\$2,209,424
60000—Salaries	\$1,263,030	\$1,578,787 (198 sections)	\$1,736,666
61000—Hourly Teaching	\$343,824	\$429,780 (247 sections)	\$472,758

Current Budget for 1b Activities	\$1,588,738
Percentage of Optimal Currently Met	84%

Benefits of 1b Activities	Consequences of 1b Activities Not Met
Having fewer students enables a faculty member to devote more attention to the writing of an individual student, thus enhancing that student’s learning significantly. Further, this would be a demonstration of SLCC’s commitment to quality writing instruction.	The English department would be concerned about its ability to sustain the level of success we have had with students in our classes over time if the trend toward more students with differing levels of preparedness were to continue.

Objective 1c:

Students will receive access to quality teaching supported by comprehensive administrative support and infrastructure.

Rationale: The English department is the largest at the college, possibly larger than some divisions, and is actively involved in a number of ongoing projects and initiatives. At the same time, it also maintains a heavy reliance on part-time faculty, placing ever greater scheduling demands on the chair and administrative assistant. The department would therefore budget for an associate chair for the purpose of assisting the chair with the complex task of scheduling adjunct faculty, planning department goals, and representing the chair in various venues and committees, both within and outside the college.

For such a large and complex department with a core responsibility to promote student linguistic proficiency, ever increasing demands are placed upon the chair and the administrative assistant. An associate chair would better guarantee that all faculty and staff will have the support necessary to fully and successfully conduct department activities and projects.

	80% of Optimal	100%	110% of Optimal
Activity 1c1— Management of Department Mission, Goals, Activities	A department chair and associate chair will effectively lead the department in all areas.	A department chair and associate chair will effectively lead the department in all areas.	A department chair and associate chair will effectively lead the department in all areas.
Activity 1c2— Administrative Support of Departmental Activities	A full-time administrative assistant will provide support to all department activities.	A full-time administrative assistant and part time lab aides will provide support to all department activities.	A full-time administrative assistant and part time lab aides will provide support to all department activities.
Activity 1c3— Operations Resources	FT and adjunct faculty, administrators and staff will have most resources necessary to conduct department activities.	All full-time and adjunct faculty, administrators and staff will have the resources necessary to conduct department activities fully and effectively.	All full-time and adjunct faculty, administrators and staff will have the resources necessary to conduct department activities fully and effectively.
Activity 1c4— Publication Center Operations	The English Department Publication Center will be mostly functioning to provide students and faculty members with learning and professional development opportunities.	The English Department Publication Center will be fully functioning to provide students and faculty members with learning and professional development opportunities.	The English Department Publication Center will be fully functioning to provide students and faculty members with learning and professional development opportunities.
Budget	\$207,981	\$238,301	\$253,461
60000—Salaries	\$79,741 (Chair) \$24,800 (Administrative Assistant)	\$79,741 (Chair) \$31,000 (Administrative Assistant)	\$79,741 (Chair) \$34,100 (Administrative Assistant)
61000—Hourly Teaching	6,960 (Associate Chair 40% reassigned time)	\$6,960 (Associate Chair 40% reassigned time)	\$6,960 (Associate Chair 40% reassigned time)
62000—Hourly Non-Teaching	\$16,000 (PT Lab Aides in English Lab) \$320 (Training Student Writing Center Peer Tutors in Publication Center systems)	\$20,000 (PT Lab Aides in English Lab) \$400 (Training Student Writing Center Peer Tutors in Publication Center)	\$22,000 (PT Lab Aides in English Lab) \$440 (Training Student Writing Center Peer Tutors in Publication Center)

	\$960 (Faculty stipend for training other faculty in Publication Center Equipment	systems) \$1,200 (Faculty stipend for training other faculty in Publication Center Equipment	systems) \$1,320 (Faculty stipend for training other faculty in Publication Center Equipment
65000-Salaried Benefits			
70000-Current Expense	\$79,200 (Equipment, Network, Telephone, Supplies, Computers, Software, Copies, etc.)	\$99,000 (Equipment, Network, Telephone, Supplies, Computers, Software, Copies, etc.)	\$108,900 (Equipment, Network, Telephone, Supplies, Computers, Software, Copies, etc.)
90000-Travel			

Current Budget for 1c Activities	\$168,974
Percentage of Optimal Currently Met	71%

Benefits of Activities	Consequences of Activities Not Met
Students will be the beneficiaries of a faculty and department staff receiving full resources and support to accomplish its mission.	The English department is at a disadvantage in terms of how it may serve faculty and students compared with divisions which have coordinators as well as a full-time administrative assistant to address the needs of its teaching force and the students they serve.

Objective 1d:

Students will have access to high quality and reliable advising throughout their student careers at SLCC.

Rationale: Demands on the English department have increased while its organizational structure has remained the same. In particular, there are ongoing challenges connected with recruiting, scheduling, and assessing adjunct faculty performance. Further, there is a greater need for in-department advising of students given that it is the department that best understands its benefits to students and is in the best position to speak to them persuasively. All of the above tasks are assumed by the department chair. With an associate chair, the department could enhance its ability to provide quality instruction and advising for students.

	80% of Optimal	100%	110% of Optimal
Activity 1d1— Associate Chair advises students in English Department	The English Department's Associate Chair will advise students in the English department.	The English Department's Associate Chair will advise students in the English department.	The English Department's Associate Chair will advise students in the English department.
Budget	\$5,568	\$6,960	\$7,656
60000—Salaries			
61000—Hourly Teaching	\$5,220 (30% reassigned time)	\$6,960 (40% reassigned time)	\$6,960 (40% reassigned time)

Current Budget for 1d Activities	0
Percentage of Optimal Currently Met	0%

Benefits of Activities	Consequences of Activities Not Met
Appointing an associate chair will help improve communication in a department with a large number of full-time and part-time faculty spread out over multiple sites. It will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the task of scheduling and will allow for more concentrated, discipline-specific advising of students.	Scheduling will continue to dominate the chair's time, drawing off limited energies that could be devoted to other value-added activities and initiatives. Also, advising of students taking composition and other English courses will still lack the perspective of the discipline itself.

PRIORITY 2:

The English Department maintains quality curriculum and teaching expertise in order to provide excellent instruction to SLCC students.

Objective 2a:

All English Department courses will undergo regular and rigorous assessment to keep pace with the plan for College-wide assessment.

Rationale: The English department has long been engaged in ongoing assessments of its composition courses. Now that the college has developed an institutional plan for assessing student learning outcomes, it is imperative that sustained efforts toward assessment be made at the department level. Resources are necessary for assessment, particularly the kind involving direct assessment of student artifacts and electronic portfolios.

	80% of Optimal	100%	110% of Optimal
Activity 2a1— Periodic, reliable and rigorous assessment of all English courses.	Each composition course will be assessed annually. Eleven English Studies course will be assessed every other year.	Each composition course will be assessed annually. Each English Studies course will be assessed every other year.	Each composition course will be assessed annually. Each English Studies course will be assessed every other year.
Budget	\$43,200	\$54,000	\$59,400
62000—Hourly Non-Teaching	\$9,000 for composition courses (1,000 per assessment team member, 3 per team) 33,000 for English Studies courses (1,000 per assessment team member, 3 per team, 11 courses per year)	\$9,000 for composition courses (1,000 per assessment team member, 3 per team) \$45,000 for English Studies courses (1,000 per assessment team member, 3 per team, 15 courses per year)	\$13,500 for composition courses (1,500 per assessment team member, 3 per team) \$45,000 for English Studies courses (1,000 per assessment team member, 3 per team, 15 courses per year)

Current Budget for 1d Activities	\$3,000
Percentage of Optimal Currently Met	5%

Benefits of Activities	Consequences of Activities Not Met
The English department will become an important player in the college’s plan for assessment. The resources for the department’s assessment will allow us to develop a credible and valid design and sustain it over time.	The English department will know far less about student learning and about how instruction may be improved to best meet student needs as learners and citizens in the 21 st century.

Objective 2b:

All faculty, Full-time and Adjunct, will receive regular opportunities to maintain currency in the fields of composition and English Studies in order to provide quality teaching experiences for SLCC students.

Rationale: As a teaching institution, our very credibility is predicated on a teaching force with the most up-to-date knowledge about teaching and learning. Further, professional development opportunities help faculty to network with colleagues outside the college and maintain a more balanced perspective on the nature of their work.

	80% of Optimal	100%	110% of Optimal
Activity 2b1— Adjunct training and support	100% of adjunct faculty will receive 8 hours of training per semester and on-going mentoring from course leaders.	100% of adjunct faculty will receive 10 hours of training per semester and on-going mentoring from course leaders.	100% of adjunct faculty will receive 12 hours of training per semester and on-going mentoring from course leaders.
Activity 2b1— Professional Development Opportunities for FT faculty	72% of faculty will have access to professional development opportunities in their respective specialties, including journals, conferences and seminars.	All FT faculty will have access to professional development opportunities in their respective specialties, including journals, conferences and seminars.	All FT faculty will have access to professional development opportunities in their respective specialties, including journals, conferences and seminars.
Budget	\$70,400	\$88,000	\$96,800
62000—Hourly Non-Teaching	\$20,000 (Payment to 50 adjunct faculty to attend training, 16 hours/\$25/hour) \$12,000 (RFPs of \$2000) per semester per course leader)	\$25,000 (Payment to 50 adjunct faculty to attend training, 20 hours/\$25/hour) \$12,000 (RFPs of \$2000 per semester per course leader)	\$30,000 (Payment to 50 adjunct faculty to attend training, 24 hours/\$25/hour) \$12,000 (RFPs of \$2000 per semester per course leader)
70000-Current Expense	\$2,400 (journal subscriptions, publications, and conference registration)	\$6,000 (journal subscriptions, publications, and conference registration)	\$5,300 (journal subscriptions, publications, and conference registration)
90000-Travel	\$36,000 (1500 x 24 FT faculty)	\$49,500 (1500 x 33 FT faculty)	\$49,500 (1500 x 33 FT faculty)

Current Budget for 1d Activities	\$55,336
Percentage of Optimal Currently Met	63%

Benefits of Activities	Consequences of Activities Not Met
Students will benefit by faculty who are aware of new developments in their respective fields and appreciative of best teaching practices.	Students at SLCC receive important foundational knowledge within the disciplines we offer. They must carry that knowledge into the workplace and to transfer institutions. Failure to invest in the professional development of faculty will result in less certainty that their knowledge is reliable and certified, and thus less certainty of the reliability of the knowledge that students carry into the workplace and transfer institutions.

PRIORITY 3:

The English department fosters access to engaged writing instruction and learning across the curriculum and within the larger community. To achieve this priority, the English department has the following objectives for 2010-2011:

Objective 3a:

Support and maintain the mission of, and programming at, the SLCC Community Writing Center.

Rationale: At one time the salary for the CWC Director position was provided by the college. The English department therefore realized salary savings from the Director’s faculty position, which the department used to hire adjunct faculty. In 2009, the budget for the Director’s position was removed from the CWC budget, requiring that the English department fund it. The department is responsible for providing reassigned time for the position.

	80% of Optimal	100%	110% of Optimal
Activity 3a1— Reassigned time for Director	The English Department will provide 80% reassigned time for the CWC Director.	The English Department will provide 80% reassigned time for the CWC Director.	The English Department will provide 80% reassigned time for the CWC Director.
Activity 3a2— Reassigned time for Associate Director (if from English Department)	The English Department will provide 20% reassigned time for CWC Associate Director).	The English Department will provide 50% reassigned time for CWC Associate Director).	The English Department will provide 60% reassigned time for CWC Associate Director).
Budget	\$18,096	\$22,620	\$24,959
60000—Salaries			
61000—Hourly Teaching	\$17,400 (Adjunct Faculty for reassigned time)	\$22,620 (Adjunct Faculty for reassigned time)	\$24,360 (Adjunct Faculty for reassigned time)

Current Budget for 3a Activities	0
Percentage of Optimal Currently Met	0%

Benefits of 3a Activities	Consequences of 3a Activities Not Met
As the CWC reflects a core mission of the English department—the promotion of written literacy and its relation to civic democracy—the department should support the Director and Associate Director with sufficient reassigned time. The CWC is an important outlet through which the department gives community expression to its educational philosophy.	The English department will have far less access to developments in the community that have direct bearing on its projects, curriculum, and teaching.

Objective 3b:

Promote the new SLCC Writing Certificate to students and industry.

Rationale: The certificate is designed to prepare students to enter professions and transfer programs with strong written and electronic communication skills. It also offers industry a professional development program for their existing employees, addressing the needs of industry and community organizations to improve the writing abilities of their workforces.

	80% of Optimal	100%	110% of Optimal
Activity 3b1— Associate Chair advises students in Writing Certificate program.	The English Department’s Associate Chair will advise students in the Writing Certificate program.	The English Department’s Associate Chair will advise students in the Writing Certificate program.	The English Department’s Associate Chair will advise students in the Writing Certificate program.
Activity 3b2— Promotional Activities	The English Department will contribute to promotional materials for the Writing Certificate.	The English Department will produce, in collaboration with IM, promotional resources for the Writing Certificate.	The English Department will produce, in collaboration with IM, promotional resources for the Writing Certificate.
Budget	\$7,168	\$8,960	\$9,856
61000—Hourly Teaching	\$6,960 (40% reassigned time)	\$6,960 (40% reassigned time)	\$6,960 (40% reassigned time)
70000-Current Expense	\$208 (promotional materials)	\$2000 (promotional materials)	\$2896 (promotional materials)

Current Budget for 3b Activities	0
Percentage of Optimal Currently Met	0%

Benefits of 3b Activities	Consequences of 3b Activities Not Met
Since the certificate was recently approved by the Regents, it must now be actively promoted in order to build up student interest and sustain the certificate over time. For it to be successful, the English department believes it ought to be directly involved in these promotion efforts.	Without sufficient advertising and advising resources, the English department will be less able to link itself to industry and the community through the outlet of this certificate.

CHAPTER 2

Personnel Expenses

Personnel	Current Budget		100% of Optimal		80% of Optimal		110 % of Optimal	
	Number of FTE	Cost	Number of FTE	Cost	Number of FTE	Cost	Number of FTE	Cost
Administration	1	79,741	1	79,741	1	79,741	1	79,741
Admin. Benefits		35,182		35,182		35,182		35,182
Full Time Faculty	21	1,021,578	33	1,578,787	27	1,263,030	39	1,736,666
FT Fac Benefits		504,537		779,509		623,607		857,460
Full Time Staff	1	31,000	1	31,000	.8	24,800	1.1	34,100
FT Staff Benefits		24,522		24,522		19,896		26,974
Adjunct Faculty	261 sections	454,863	335 sections	612,480*	268 sections	489,984	370 sections	673,728
Adj. Fac. Benefits		45,487		61,248		48,998		67,373
Hourly Staff**	2 PT lab aides and RFPs for faculty for admin. Support	26,117	2 PT lab aides and RFPs for faculty for admin. support	134,200	2 PT lab aides and RFPs for faculty for admin. support	107,360	2 PT lab aides and RFPs for faculty for admin. support	147,620
Hourly Benefits		2,612		13,420		10,736		14,762
Total Personnel		\$2,225,639		\$2,737,609		\$2,703,334		\$3,673,606

Personnel Expenses Budget Narrative

As the largest department in the college, larger than some divisions, the English Department, with 21 full-time faculty and more than 70 adjunct faculty, has significant expenses in the personnel budget. While the Current Budget figures are mostly self-explanatory, there are two items in the Optimal budget that merit further explanation.

1. In the Optimal budget Adjunct Faculty figure, funds for part-time teaching makes up the bulk of the \$612,000. This is calculated on the objectives in Chapter 1 that has a target of adjunct faculty teaching 50% of all department course sections. In addition to this expense, this figure represents reassigned time for faculty members serving in other capacities:

a. The Community Writing Center director, a position that used to be funded by the college, but is now funded by the English Department.

b. The proposed English Department Associate Chair, a position with a 40% reassigned time load to support the department's mission and objectives as outlined in Chapter 1.

c. The CWC Associate Director, if that faculty member were located in the English Department.

2. The Hourly Staff figure includes hourly wages for part-time lab aide staff, and also for RFPs for full-time faculty to engage in academic support work in service of the department. These objectives are outlined in Chapter 1 in detail.

Review of Current Budget and Budget Scenarios

Deficiencies in Current Budget Compared to Optimal

Perhaps the most notable deficiency in the English Department's personnel budget is the amount dedicated to full-time faculty. To reach the college-wide goal of a 50:50 ratio of full-time to adjunct faculty, the department would need to hire 12 full-time faculty. As noted in Chapter 1, currently, the budget is meeting only 65% of that goal. Composition courses are, as a Core Regents Requirement, critical to student success and thus the mission of the college. Writing ability is a gateway to further education and to a rich and productive life in general, particularly given complex nature of communication in the 21st century. Therefore, the department feels strongly that writing instruction is best offered by teachers who are fully invested in and understand the mission of the college and the department goals.

In addition, the English Department is comprised of highly active faculty members. Faculty in the department have led the way in many important areas, such as writing tutoring, program assessment, teaching with technology and online, electronic portfolios, and part-time faculty training. They engage in a variety of scholarly, research, assessment, and service projects. They participate in regional and national conferences and workshops as presenters and officers.

Further, the department spends large amounts of time supporting and mentoring the part-time faculty who teach at least 65% of our composition courses. Yet funding is not sufficient to support this level of professional activity, development, and department initiatives. To sustain such a department requires a meaningful investment in faculty to encourage their growth for their benefit and for the benefit of students. The English department is extremely collaborative and should be rewarded for delivering a first-rate education to students at a relatively low cost per FTE.

Finally, funding to provide reassigned time for the CWC director, a new expense in FY 10, has not been added to the English department's budget, thus putting further strain on the Adjunct Faculty budget.

Excesses in Current Budget Compared to Optimal

While the English Department is responsible for the computer lab in the Administration building, it will be necessary to continue funding the part-time lab aides who staff it as well as support the equipment there. However, if that lab were to be located in another reporting line, the department would no longer need the funding for those positions.

Chapter 3

Non-Personnel Operating Expenses

Current Expense Area	Current Budget	100% of Optimal	80% of Optimal	110 % of Optimal
Network Fees	6,700	8,000	6,400	8,800
Telephone	12,250	16,000	12,800	17,600
Copies	17,500	10,000	8,000	11,000
Postage	225	250	200	275
Luncheon/Refreshments /Food Service	725	725	580	798
Memberships	*part of Conference Registrations	1,200	960	1,320
Parking Fees	3,250	2,000	1,600	2,200
Books/Publications/Conf erence Registrations	7165	8,000	6,400	8,800
Non Capital Equipment	11,625	12,000	9,600	13,200
Reimburse Cell Phone		500	400	400
Mailing	214	400	320	440
Software Lease/Purchase	15,000	15,000	12,000	16,500
Supplies-Instructional	1,200	1,500	1,200	1,650
Supplies-Office	8,500	10,000	8,000	11,000
Total Current Expense	84,354 (E&G CE budget is \$32,166)	85,575	68,460	92,983
Travel In	200			
Travel Out	6500	45,000	36,000	49,500
Equipment	0			
Printers	0	15,000	12,000	16,500
Computers	45,000	10,000	8,000	11,000
Total Equipment	45,000	25,000	20,000	27,500

Non-Personnel Operating Expenses Budget Narrative

The English Department Current Budget figures are based on an analysis of expenses to date in FY10 and the final current expense budget for FY09. The largest expense for FY10 is for computers to equip the new Publication Center, and for software leases required for the curriculum taught within the center. Funding for the computer purchases was provided by the VPI budget.

Other significant expenses include updating of non-capital equipment, non-negotiable Network and Telephone fees, and the cost of paper and cost of copying. Office supplies and Instructional supplies also add to the figure. This is not surprising given the size of the English department and its level of activity. These costs break down to approximately \$80 per faculty member per fiscal year (including full-time and adjunct faculty).

In an optimal budget, the non-negotiable expenses and supplies would increase due to the increase in FT faculty members as outlined in Chapter 1. All other items remain fairly stable with the exception of Copy Costs and Equipment expenses. It has long been a mission of the English department to reduce reliance on paper copies; the Department agreed on several policies in the past year to achieve this goal. However, with such a large adjunct faculty, this remains a challenge. Many adjunct instructors do not have adequate training in electronic delivery of curricular materials, and thus rely on paper. However, additional training for adjunct faculty, including electronic pedagogies and curricular delivery, are included in our objectives in Chapter 1.

Review of Current Budget and Budget Scenarios

Deficiencies in Current Budget Compared to Optimal

The English Department's Current Expense Budget has remained at or near \$32,000 for the past five fiscal years. As demonstrated by the budget above, and by the Five-Year Budget Analyses provided by the Budget Office, this is clearly a deficiency in funding. Each year, funds must be transferred to cover shortages in the CE budget, either internally from English Department funds or from other sources (such as the Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences). Until FY 10, the funding in the faculty line that was held by the Community Writing Center director, (outlined in Chapter 1), allowed the English Department to meet these overages internally. Now that the CWC director is paid through the English Department, this funding is no longer available eliminating salary savings that in the past had been used to hire adjunct instructors. In short, Current Expense remains underfunded.

Excesses in Current Budget Compared to Optimal

As noted above, the English Department is committed to reducing copy costs within its current expense budget. The goal is a \$7,500 reduction in an optimal budget. In addition, the one-time

costs of computers in the Publication Center would not be ongoing, yet funding to replace equipment in the center and provide materials and supplies as necessary is required.

Chapter 5

Final Thoughts

Improvement of Process

Those involved in the zero-based budget process need resources to assist chairs in developing zero-based budget documents, specifically, accountant specialists for departments not familiar with such detailed accountancy requirements.

The zero-based budgeting process will additionally benefit by clearly defined objectives and benefits of the zero-based budget-process as it relates to specific departments and the institution. The discussions of the pros-and-cons of zero-based budgeting helped in the pilot-project meetings, as did the outline of the document provided by the budgeting office. However, a clear purpose for instituting this budgeting philosophy should more fully incorporated into future processes.

Benefits of Process

The zero-based budget process was a departmental effort. The full-time English faculty identified departmental objectives and appointed an ad-hoc committee that would further define the priorities for departmental review. This process included several ad-hoc committee meetings and one-on-one drafting of the document by Stephen Ruffus and Tiffany Rousculp. The ad-hoc committee then served as editorial-content reviewers, and the full-time faculty signed off on the final project via electronic ballot on March 26th.

Because the department articulated priorities, objectives and activities that it will use as a planning document for future departmental growth, department, the faculty further helped to identify where the departmental budget is lacking and demonstrated that we have a long way to go to achieve our many goals (as do many departments).

The process has allowed the English Department to further clarify the departmental mission as it relates to fiscal budgetary concern. Through this process faculty have become more aware of budgetary matters and have taken greater ownership over it. If this process leads to different, more innovative and more responsive means of engaging in the informed budget process, then these efforts will have been successful. As this is a pilot, those outcomes are still undetermined until response to this document is available.

Concerns/Difficulties of Process

The zero-based budget process is very complicated, and in this initial incarnation appears to have added layers of complication with its “optimal,” “80%” and “110%” requirements. While justifying budget needs as they relate to department and college goals is obviously a good practice to undertake, this year’s process has been challenging. Perhaps the purposes of this pilot could have been met through simply comparing an “optimal” budget to a current one.

We caution against implementing a zero-based budgeting process college-wide using the protocols of this pilot. The skills necessary to the process are not typically possessed by college faculty chairs (unless they are accounting faculty). We imagine that in the corporate world, program directors have the assistance of accountant specialists to do such work. Additionally, the time required for the process is rather burdensome when added to the existing responsibilities of faculty and chairs. Collectively, the English Department faculty and chair have spent between 100-120 hours in producing this document.

We understand and appreciate the potential benefits of the concept of zero-based budgeting to “level the playing field,” as it were. However, we are not entirely clear about the timing of the pilot right now given our current fiscal situation. Also, zero-based budgeting as we understand it stems from a critical need for accountability. While we embrace the need for accountability, it seems to us that the college has already taken measures to accomplish it through recent cost-cutting measures. Finally, it is unclear as to how this process will fulfill the objectives the Faculty Association had in mind by calling for it.

Zero-based budgeting would constitute a radical departure from the informed budget process as we have known it. We believe a full-scale implementation of it across the college could result in significant frustration and create atmosphere of competition for shrinking appropriations.