

THE CHRONICLE

of Higher Education

Run Your Campus

[Home](#) [Advice](#) [Run Your Campus](#)

October 5, 2009

The Unkindest Cut of All

By Gary A. Olson

Over the last year or so, the various online discussion groups devoted to academic administration have been abuzz with chatter about how to manage state-mandated budget cuts. Deans and provosts asked one another for advice about how to handle wide-ranging—and in many cases, unprecedented—rescissions.

As might be expected, each state-supported institution approached the budget crisis from a different perspective on how to maintain—or at least not impair—its mission. Some institutions announced across-the-board pay cuts. Others instituted mandatory furloughs. Still others dismissed or "nonreappointed" adjuncts and full-time temporary faculty members. A few even cut some tenured and tenure-track positions.

A new dean who had never faced state "givebacks" before desperately asked the online group how to go about determining exactly what to cut. Clearly frustrated, she wrote, "We have so little to begin with, everything we have left is important. I can't see how we can prioritize when we have already been cut to the bone."

Another dean replied with what I found to be singularly unhelpful advice. "Simply pass on to your departments the obligation to cut their areas at whatever percentage your state is requiring," she advised. "This places the real responsibility where it belongs—on the individual units."

I agree that when faced with state budget cuts, individual colleges, departments, and units should participate in determining their priorities and recommending what should be eliminated from their own budgets. However, enforcing the same level of cuts across the board is counterproductive. Requiring your very best and most productive programs to be reduced at the same rate as your least productive areas shows a lack of imagination and an absence of strategic thinking.

A more strategic approach would be to analyze which areas of the university are contributing least to its mission and which are

helping to propel it forward. When an institution approaches the process from that perspective, it is even conceivable that some areas might gain funds at the very moment that other areas are being trimmed or eliminated.

As you can sense from the frustration of the neophyte dean asking for advice, any budget-cutting process is a fraught time, not only for those experiencing cuts in their departments, but also for those charged with overseeing the reductions. It is painful to eliminate programs, lay off people, or require furloughs. That's why so many institutions take what seems to be the easy way out by imposing across-the-board cuts, as if spreading the pain evenly would somehow mitigate it.

Perhaps more difficult but potentially more rewarding is to make budget reductions disproportionately. While each institution has its own specific priorities and challenges, some general principles are worth considering. Here are a few:

- **Protect the revenue generators.** One college I know always experienced robust summer-school enrollment, which generated much-needed revenue for the institution, yet it chose to eliminate its summer-school budget in a recent round of cuts. The administration was attempting to avoid making other unpleasant cuts, but by eliminating its summer budget it effectively eliminated a source of revenue.
- **Protect and even nurture your principal programs.** Especially protect those that bring national visibility to your institution or help define its distinctiveness. If you must reduce or eliminate programs, it's better to cut ones that are duplicates of those at other institutions than to cut the very areas that set you apart from the pack.
- **Protect core faculty members.** Cutting everyone's salary may seem egalitarian, but it disadvantages the very people who you hope will help move the university forward after the cuts. At my own university, we chose last year to protect the jobs of core faculty members (including clinical faculty members), and instead to eliminate a number of vacant positions and not renew the contracts of a sizable number of full-time temporary faculty members. That was not an easy decision to make. We understood that some of those "temporary" faculty members had actually been employed for many years and had developed close relationships with many people on the campus. But given the university's mission and position as a doctoral research university, our decision to focus the cuts on temporary employees seemed the most reasonable.
- **Eliminate nonessential personnel and programs first.** Careful analysis is likely to demonstrate that any organization employs a number of people whose role is peripheral to the key functioning of the organization. In tight times, those positions should be the terminated first. Close down unproductive centers, institutes, and other ancillary enterprises. Many institutions tend to accumulate a surfeit of such enterprises over time, and it is necessary (and healthy) to ask periodically, "Do we really need this center, or has it lost its usefulness?"
- **Reduce departmental commitments.** Just as institutions tend to accumulate centers and other ancillary enterprises that have long since lost their usefulness, some departments accumulate an overabundance of programs. Reducing underperforming majors and minors, for example, can both save money and free up faculty members to engage in more central activities.
- **Consider mergers.** Some departments and programs might thrive if joined together while also saving the university money by eliminating redundant administrative overhead. It might make sense, for example, to combine several small departments into one unit rather than let them limp along as separate entities. An added advantage might be increased collaboration among faculty members.
- **Seek to reduce the number of administrators when possible.** Administrative posts

Institutions tend to grow in an ad hoc fashion, sometimes spawning new programs, employees, and administrators indiscriminately. But the fact that an institution has grown in a certain way does not mean that it must remain that way.

If the budget-cutting exercise of recent months has any silver lining, it is that an institution can pay focused attention to its priorities and potentially emerge leaner but stronger in the end. The "unkindest cut of all" is the one that slices evenly and indiscriminately across all programs without any attention to priorities.

Gary A. Olson is provost and vice president for academic affairs at Idaho State University and co-editor, with John W. Presley, of the newly published "The Future of Higher Education: Perspectives From America's Academic Leaders" (Paradigm). He can be contacted at golson@isu.edu.

Copyright 2009. All rights reserved.

The Chronicle of Higher Education 1255 Twenty-Third St, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037

THE CHRONICLE

of Higher Education

Do Your Job Better

[Home](#) [Advice](#) [Do Your Job Better](#)

November 2, 2009

Fight Your Own Battles

By Gary A. Olson

From time to time over the decades, I have witnessed what I consider to be one of the more disgraceful practices that we as academics can engage in: using students to further our own personal and political ends.

That dishonorable—not to mention unethical—practice takes many forms. It's mobilizing students to spread damaging gossip about a colleague. It's enlisting students in a campaign to unseat your department chair. It's encouraging them to contribute to a blog devoted to embarrassing the university's president. It's organizing them behind the scenes to write letters to the editor of your local or campus newspaper about a policy, colleague, or administrator you disagree with—and, in many cases, actually writing the letter for them.

A dean of liberal arts told me about one such incident in her college. A popular professor was denied tenure based on his weak record of scholarly productivity.

His department tenure-and-promotion committee had warned him in several successive annual evaluations that he was in danger of not making the grade and that he needed to ramp up his research activity. He had been counseled similarly by his department head.

The professor apparently did not listen and was denied tenure, with a letter informing him that he could continue working for the university for the coming year, but after that would no longer be on the payroll.

"He actually thought that he could pressure the university to reverse its decision," the dean told me. "He convinced his students to stage a protest on the quad, complete with placards and bullhorns. The students had been convinced that the university had done him some grave injustice, but they just didn't have the facts."

The dean explained that the protest petered out after a long weekend and had no effect on the tenure case, but by enlisting

students in his personnel cause, the professor had succeeded in generating substantial ill will, both among his supporters and among those who supported the university's decision.

"It would have been understandable if the students had spontaneously chosen to express their support," the dean added. "But the fact is that our disgruntled professor stage-managed the entire event, even to the extent of helping to paint protest signs."

I witnessed a different situation in which a professor was determined to destroy a rival in his department. He lobbied graduate students to avoid taking his rival's courses, and constantly told students stories about the rival's lack of support and sympathy for graduate students and his general unfitness to serve on the graduate faculty. Before long, the rival was unable to attract graduate students to his courses and was relegated to teaching undergraduates, despite the fact that he was a gifted graduate teacher. "It's unfair," the victimized professor told me. "If [the professor who engineered the attack] had a problem with me, he should have come and talked to me about it. Instead, I woke up one morning and found that the damage was done—all based on lies and innuendo!"

An extreme form of misuse of students for personal or political objectives is to enlist them to participate in academe's newest, and clearly its lowest, level of uncollegiality: mobbing. This is the practice of savaging a faculty member in a no-holds-barred onslaught from multiple colleagues. Deans and department heads are reporting increased incidents in which faculty members have conscripted students to help in mobbing a professor. "It's a new nadir for the academy," one senior professor told me. "If we as a professoriate lose our collegiality, we lose our soul."

Perhaps equally reprehensible is organizing students to support your favorite political cause, whether in local or national politics. One research university was engaged in an impassioned debate over the ethics of animal research being conducted on the campus. A group of faculty members vehemently opposed all use of live animals in university research projects. Three of those professors organized a protest rally to be held, not on the campus, but on the steps of City Hall in the municipality where the institution was located.

While the organizers invited all faculty and staff members to participate, they concentrated on students, urging entire courses to

descend on City Hall at the appointed hour. In several cases (and in direct violation of university policy), students were offered extra credit in their courses if they participated in the protest, regardless of the relevance of the course's subject matter to the issue of utilizing live animals in university research projects. The organizers were most interested in turning out large numbers of people and apparently had little regard for their own students.

Such efforts to "instrumentalize" students, to cast them as pawns in a political drama, are unprofessional and inappropriate on any number of levels. First, faculty members who use their students like that have lost sight of the fact that the power differential between students and professors makes the relationship inherently unequal. Our students may well be adults, but when a faculty member—especially one they respect—urges them to join a cause, they are in a precarious situation; their consent to participate can never be purely one of free will.

That unequal power relationship is not unlike that in romantic relationships between a student and faculty member. They both may be consenting adults, but the difference in power between them attenuates the student's ability to say "no" without complications.

So using students to aid in your own pet causes is deeply demeaning to students because it infantilizes them. It positions them as incapable of independent thought and asks them to act on behalf of "the one who knows better"—their surrogate parent, the professor.

What's more, that phenomenon is, in effect, a form of anti-intellectualism: careful consideration of the facts, reasoned debate, and a search for understanding and "the truth" are all sidelined in exchange for uninformed heated exchange and anonymity shielded by blogs and student surrogates.

It is, as well, an act of intellectual cowardice: When you hide behind your students, you never have to own up to your actions and positions given the cloak of anonymity they provide.

Interpersonal relationships can be difficult in any workplace, but we in academe supposedly have an advantage over those in other workplaces: We all have committed ourselves to the life of the mind, to careful investigation of facts, to faith in rational disputation, to critical thinking, to argumentation based on facts and evidence, and to collegiality. Deploying students as our surrogate warriors violates everything we stand for as a professoriate.

Gary A. Olson is provost and vice president for academic affairs at Idaho State University and co-editor with John W. Presley of the newly published "The Future of Higher Education: Perspectives From America's Academic Leaders" (Paradigm). He can be contacted at golson@isu.edu.

Copyright 2009. All rights reserved.

The Chronicle of Higher Education 1255 Twenty-Third St, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037