

To whom it may concern:

I am submitting a proposal to the Faculty council that outlines two faculty financial sustainability measures and an overload policy. My intention is to promote conversation among the faculty about how to pursue financial sustainability. I believe that by initiating the conversation at the faculty level, we are better positioned to use these measures as a tool to stabilize our educational mission and not as a blunt instrument to create profits at all costs.

It is my request that after reviewing the proposal, the Faculty council refer the proposal to the Committee on Finance, Faculty Compensation and Work Related Policies (CFCP). After amending the proposal to incorporate feedback from the Faculty Council and CFCP, it is my request that a committee be tasked to work with Todd Bruce and other relevant administrators on customizing these measures to each department's particular needs.

In this cover letter, I want to highlight several reasons why I feel a faculty led conversation is necessary for the issue of financial sustainability.

- 1) **Academics and curriculum must remain the purview of the faculty.** While financial sustainability affects all aspects of the university, when financial pressures influence curricular and academic matters, the faculty is the only competent body to address the financial situation while maintaining our Jesuit, Catholic identity and our liberal arts foundation so as to deliver an education that develops men and women to understand themselves and the world around them and to pursue the common good in their professional and personal endeavors.
- 2) **The three metrics proposed by EAB do not serve our needs** as well as the metrics contained in the Faculty Financial Sustainability Measures Proposal.
 - a) Instructional Capacity Gap - The EAB metric measures the number of sections we should be teaching depending on the size of our faculty. This metric assumes that full time faculty are teaching a course load of 4 courses per semester. As we are a balanced institution it is more realistic that we assume that faculty are teaching a course load of 3 courses per semester. Also, the metric is to advise on the use of adjunct faculty. JCU has excellent adjunct faculty but the curriculum is designed and academic quality is maintained by full-time faculty. The metric suggests adjunct faculty are the key to financial sustainability.
 - b) Student credit hours - the EAB measure suggests a flat 360 credit hour per faculty member. This would suggest that the teaching load in Boler would be the same as it is in CAS. Historically, that is not the case. Larger sections are needed in Boler to maintain financial sustainability. The EAB measure suggests that CAS must support Boler.
 - c) Course releases: The EAB data just reports on funded vs unfunded course releases. The vast majority of course releases are unfunded and the two major types of unfunded course releases are research and chair. It appears that EAB presentation suggests eliminating 73. If that understanding is correct it would

eliminate all chair, director, faculty council, and core committee releases. While maintaining research and associate dean releases. Obviously this would have an impact on curriculum and on academic quality and therefore faculty must lead this conversation.

- d) Lastly, it is suggested in the EAB presentation that 167 is the right faculty size and a 20 person reduction in the faculty is suggested. This would impact curriculum and academic quality and faculty must lead the discussion.

I remain willing to serve the University as we evaluate our financial situation and make decisions to move towards financial sustainability. Therefore I submit the Proposal for Financially Sustainable Faculty Measures.