

April 2026 FACB Report

The FACB convened as part of UBAC on March 30, 2026. The first part of the meeting reviewed a proposal from the Senior Leadership Team (Chancellor and Vice-Chancellors, plus Academic Deans) to achieve the majority of the expense reductions necessary to achieve a balanced budget for Fiscal Year 2026-27.

Here’s the spreadsheet showing **where the reductions in the Senior Leadership Team Foundational Base Reduction plan would be taken:**

College/Division	Unallocated	Vacancies	Operating	At Will	Other	Total
VCAF	\$480,511	\$1,382,546	\$186,063	\$334,899	\$0	\$2,384,018
LAS	\$420,000	\$937,281	\$176,000	\$88,695	\$360,000	\$1,981,976
COB	\$0	\$350,423	\$0	\$415,733	\$75,000	\$841,156
NHS	\$332,353	\$70,616	\$94,411	\$78,728	\$200,556	\$776,664
KFL	\$0	\$250,114	\$99,886	\$0	\$150,000	\$500,000
COE	\$174,955	\$180,753	\$18,408	\$0	\$0	\$374,116
EAS	\$87,314	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	\$216,161	\$373,475
EMSA	\$39,600	\$80,090	\$8,220	\$222,172	\$0	\$350,082
UA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$305,000	\$0	\$305,000
AA	\$162,370	\$80,000	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$282,370
VCSICS	\$0	\$104,494	\$29,000	\$73,000	\$0	\$206,494
CPS	\$55,700	\$96,690	\$39,300	\$0	\$0	\$191,690
Chanc	\$5,266	\$0	\$23,152	\$75,000	\$0	\$103,418

Before I start working across the columns explaining what each one is, I want to point out one feature of this plan that isn’t obvious from looking at the table. If you look at the Chancellor area and go straight across on that row to At-Will Positions, you will find an entry for **\$75,000**. However, this isn’t actually a position. Instead, **it represents a permanent base reduction in the chancellor’s compensation**, something faculty have been requesting. **Chancellor Sobanet is voluntarily reducing her compensation by**

\$75,000. No part of that is to be restored until such time as all employees receive base (permanent) salary increases.

Now, let's look at each of the columns. **The first column is labeled 'Unallocated Base.'** If you're like me, you are probably thinking, "Yes, we should check the couch cushions first, but how much can that really be?" Well, it turns out it is **\$12 million out of a \$193 million expenditures budget.** I know what you're thinking, "Oh good, problem (the needed \$11.7 million reduction) solved without any pain!" Actually, I'm sure you knew better (after all, there's a whole table of stuff here). **This \$12 million is "unallocated" but it is not uncommitted.** Instead, it is all being used for important things, like lecturer pay, faculty stipends, overloads for faculty, summer teaching pay, research support, student hourly, and so forth. It's just that our budgeting system is such that only the finance admins in the colleges and divisions know what it is really "allocated" to. Nevertheless, the chancellor, VCs, and deans came up with about \$1.6 million of reduced expenditures from this source. [Vice Chancellor Greene: "reminder to self, fix budgeting system"]

The next column, Vacant Positions, represents about \$5 million. Of that, **about \$3.5 million worth of positions that would no longer be under consideration for re-filling. At this point we are not 100% sure if any of these positions have been authorized to search, but we do know that many have not been.** We will keep trying to find out more. You can read down to see how much different areas contributed to this total.

Operating is all the office supplies, subscriptions, travel, etc. each unit has. Already thin from previous rounds of cuts, **about \$700,000 is being trimmed from this category.**

Now we come to the part we have all been dreading: people losing their jobs. **'At-will'** characterizes **all the University Staff** (but not classified staff) **and IRC faculty without a multi-year contract** (but not tenured or pre-tenure faculty). It's impossible to know just how many people we're talking about here, but **\$1.6 million is clearly more than a few people.** Each person being laid off will be notified in late April, before even the number of positions being ended is released. Twelve-month employees can remain on the job through June. Nine-month faculty on nine-pay-twelve will, of course, be paid through mid-August; others will receive their final paycheck at the end of May. All those losing their positions will be eligible for severance pay and other benefits. You can see the details on Slides 12-13 of the April 1 Town Hall [presentation](#).

'Other' is just that, other **places individual units found to reduce expenditures that together constitute over \$1.1 million in reductions.** This category includes different things in different units, so you may want to check with your unit to find out what's

included. In the library, for example, it would be from the collections budget, which is separate from the other categories in this chart.

The next table shows what percentage of each unit's base budget is being used to achieve the \$8.6 million dollar expenditure reduction.

College/Division	E&G Budget	Reduction	Percent
UA	\$1,367,223	\$305,000	22.3%
VCAF	\$16,280,000	\$2,384,018	14.6%
CO	\$727,640	\$103,418	14.2%
KFL	\$4,221,336	\$500,000	11.8%
COB	\$9,696,093	\$841,156	8.7%
JBEL	\$8,889,562	\$776,664	8.7%
VCSICS	\$2,402,561	\$206,494	8.6%
LAS	\$26,870,893	\$1,981,976	7.4%
COE	\$5,836,688	\$374,116	6.4%
AA	\$5,232,876	\$282,370	5.4%
CPS	\$3,988,708	\$191,690	4.8%
EAS	\$8,576,690	\$373,475	4.4%
EMSA	\$12,575,000	\$350,082	2.8%

There was some discussion of **why the percentage cut for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs was noticeably lower than other units**. According to VC Hanenberg, professional organization standards and peer comparisons show that staffing per student in many EMSA offices is below those standards. Much of the funding EMSA is relying on is from reserves and expiring or soon-to-expire system funding. The division has already gone through an exercise to reduce the amount of replacement base funding they will receive.

None of the expenditure reductions above will be painless, but I think it is useful to review the Direct Operational Impact statements from each unit, which can be found on slides 19

though 30 in the [UBAC Slides for 3.30.2026](#). **One common theme across colleges is the potential for reducing seats in high-demand courses.** I am sure we can rely on the colleges to mitigate this particular impact as much as they are able, **but to the extent such seat reductions occur, they are very likely to impact our future growth negatively.** As we examine the options below, **we should keep in mind that the source for sections on the margins** (meeting higher-than-unanticipated demand) **has largely been in Unallocated Base.**

As mentioned above, **this part of the plan accounts for \$8.6 million.** Since new revenue covers about \$500,000 of new mandatory costs) this is actually **more than is needed to cover the \$8.9 million in new mandatory costs for next year.** This brings us to a question a lot of people have been asking, **“Why do we need to cut \$11.7 million if we can break even by cutting \$8.4 million?”** The answer is that **we appear to only have about \$10.8 million in uncommitted reserves to fund the glide path** (AKA, the reason we don’t have to cut \$15 million for next year (FY 26-27) as spending rolls off system grants and the reserves currently being used to fund ongoing costs are being depleted). **Leaving institutional student aid**, which is what has been identified to move from reserves onto the base budget (in part because other things currently funded by reserves might be subject to future reductions), **on reserves would cause us to have to cut \$8-9 million again for FY 27-28** (as opposed to the projected \$5.3 million). In short, **we are already spreading the pain over four years** and cutting less now will mean cutting more later.

The remainder of the UBAC meeting focused **four options for coming up with the remaining \$3.1 million needed to reduce expenditures for FY 2026-27.** The four options **consist of different configurations of three sources for the additional reductions.** None of these options are settled. Other options can be brought to the next UBAC meeting for discussion.

One of those sources could be **making more of the existing Vacancies permanent.** Doing so **would require not filling some vacancies that were previously authorized to be filled.**

Another possible source could be **additional cuts to Unallocated Base.** In addition to the **risk of more high demand sections being cut**, we would likely see **further reduction of service (including reduction of hours) in the library**, and more generally, **fewer student employees on campus (which is a positive indicator for retention).**

The final possible source is one the SLT did not include in its plan, **base salary reductions.** These would not be **furloughs in the traditional sense because** they would not be temporary in a literal sense. Rather **they are permanent cuts in salary until** our budget

rebounds from increases in enrollment/revenue . Only after the additional base funding has been achieved will we get our salaries restored. There is no way to predict if that will happen in 3-4 years, it could be sooner or later. The amounts of the **possible salary reductions could range from an average .96% reduction, to a 1.92% reduction, to a 3.84% reduction.** As you can imagine, there were strong objections to having existing salaries reduced when faculty and staff have not received raises in 2-3 years, while experiencing steady inflation. Campus leaders responded by saying they had, in fact, received numerous recommendations for such reductions from one of the surveys earlier this academic year (the available [report](#) on the survey does not cover individual recommendations). They also pointed to the severity of the consequences of cutting any of the already identified categories sufficiently to reach the reduction target.

The proposal would be to distribute the salary reductions on a sliding scale. **The two approaches to doing so (Options A and B) are shown side-by-side here** for 1.92% reduction.

Salary Range	Option A 1.92%	Option A Savings	Option B 1.92%	Option B Savings	\$ Change
< \$60,000	0.00%	\$0	0.50%	\$61,984	61,984
\$60K-\$100K	2.00%	\$1,040,000	1.72%	\$894,400	-\$145,600
\$100K-\$130K	2.40%	\$268,000	2.72%	\$304,173	\$36,173
\$130K-\$160K	3.00%	\$161,000	3.40%	\$182,650	\$21,650
> \$160K	3.80%	\$192,305	4.31%	\$218,098	\$25,793
TOTAL		\$1,661,305		\$1,661,305	

Option A fully protects those with the lowest salaries and uses a gradual progression across salary levels (those with higher salaries lose more, but not dramatically more).

Option B spreads the reductions across all salary levels and uses a greater progression across salary levels (those with higher salaries lose more than with Option A). **UBAC is also asked to make a recommendation regarding these two options on April 8,** assuming we end up recommending an option with salary reductions.

Now that we understand more about the possible salary reductions, **we are ready to look at the four options for getting closer to our target for FY 26-27.** Each option **builds on the SLT Foundational Base Reduction:**

- **Option 1 adds a 1.92% salary reduction**
- **Option 2 adds a smaller .96% salary reduction, a substantially larger reduction in unallocated base (an additional 7.5%), and a \$1 million additional cut to vacant positions**
- **Option 3 adds the 1.92% salary reduction, a smaller additional cut of 5% to unallocated base, and a \$900,000 additional cut to vacant positions**
- **Option 4 adds a 3.84% reduction to salaries**

Component	SLT Foundational Base Reduction	Option 1 <i>SLT + 1.92% Salary Reduction</i>	Option 2 <i>SLT + 0.96% Salary Reduction, 7.5% Unallocated, Add'l \$1M Vacancies</i>	Option 3 <i>SLT + 1.92% Salary Reduction, 5% Unallocated, Add'l \$900K Vacancies</i>	Option 4 <i>SLT + 3.84% Salary Reduction</i>
Unallocated Base	\$1,758,069	\$1,758,069	\$2,668,116	\$2,364,767	\$1,758,069
Position Vacancies	\$3,603,007	\$3,603,007	\$4,603,007	\$4,503,007	\$3,603,007
Operating Savings	\$714,440	\$714,440	\$714,440	\$714,440	\$714,440
Other Expenses	\$1,001,717	\$1,001,717	\$1,001,717	\$1,001,717	\$1,001,717
At Will Filled Positions	\$1,593,227	\$1,593,227	\$1,593,227	\$1,593,227	\$1,593,227
Salary Reduction		\$1,661,306	\$830,653	\$1,661,306	\$3,322,612
Total	\$8,670,460	\$10,331,766	\$11,411,160	\$11,838,464	\$11,993,071

UBAC is being asked to make a recommendation on these four options, or others that emerge from discussions between now and April 8. For example, our faculty chair suggested a fifth option, simply removing the salary reduction from Option 2. You may

have noticed that the four options above are arranged by the total savings they produce (in conjunction with the SLT plan) and that two options do not total to \$11.7 million.

- **Option 1 reflects a gamble the campus would be taking that our reserves will end up being sufficient to cover an additional \$1.4 million in reserve spending and, essentially, that enrollment would be flat rather than down 2%.** If we are wrong, the cuts for FY 27-28 to FY 29-30 would end up being bigger than currently projected. David Havlick's Option 5 would result a slightly higher total expenditure reduction with no salary reduction.
- **Option 2 reduces that risk to about \$300,000.** If the state cuts our funding more or our enrollment falls more than 2%, we could still be in bigger trouble. Removing the salary reduction (AKA, Option 5) further increases that risk.
- **Options 3 and 4 give us a (very) little wiggle room.** If things go a little worse than expected, we would still be OK. If they go much worse, we would have a head start on dealing with the financial fallout. Since the UBAC meeting, additional options have been published. You can find them [here](#). Spoiler alert, these all also contain salary reductions.

Let your voice be heard, in this case through your UBAC reps [list below]. Let them know what you think about the overall approach, Options 1-4, and Options A and B, as well as come up with other ideas for closing the remainder of the gap. Remember, UBAC is making recommendations, so the reasons for choosing among options are as important as the preferences themselves. Any brilliant alternatives to the salary reduction would be welcomed by one and all.

Please note, since FACB has approved releasing our reports on both Faculty-I and Staff-I, we have included the staff representatives on UBAC, as well.

Faculty Assembly

David Havlick dhavlick@uccs.edu Faculty Assembly Chair

Chair of Faculty Budget Committee

David Moon cmoon@uccs.edu At-large

Faculty – (3 Year Term)

Dylan Harris Dharri14@uccs.edu LAS

Joel Tonyan	jtonyan@uccs.edu	KFL
Pat McGuire	pmcguire@uccs.edu	EDUC/COE
Jacqueline Berning	jberning@uccs.edu	Johnson Beth-El
Kirk Danielson	Kdaniel8@uccs.edu	BUS
Jenna McCullom	jmccullu@uccs.edu	ECE
Jon Caudill	jcaudill@uccs.edu	CPS

Staff Council

Ryan Wong	Rwong2@uccs.edu
Deann Barrett	Dbarrett@uccs.edu

Classified Staff

Kim Uhl	kuhl@uccs.edu
Yvonne Weeres	yweeres@uccs.edu

University Staff – (3 Year Term)

Alex Baker	abaker@uccs.edu
Chelle Martinez	Rmarti33@uccs.edu
Sarah Long	slong@uccs.edu