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Date: January 28, 1982

To: University Faculty

From: Donald F. Pabst, Chairer of the Agenda Committee and Faculty Vice-President

Subject: WINTER QUARTER GENERAL FACULTY MEETING - Tuesday, February 16, 1982, 3:30 to 5:00 p.m., Medical School Auditorium (120 Medical Sciences Building)

Agenda:

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Fall Quarter Faculty Meeting, November 17, 1981

III. Reports:

A. Faculty Vice-President - Donald F. Pabst

B. President - Robert J. Kegerreis

C. Provost - John R. Beljan

IV. Old Business - None

V. New Business:

A. Academic Calendar for 1983-84 - See Attachment I

B. Recommendation from the University Budget Review Committee and Academic Council to revise the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws (Section 10.B.e.) as follows: Add representatives from the School of Medicine and School of Professional Psychology to the voting membership of the University Budget Review Committee.

C. Resolution received by petition from members of the fully-affiliated faculty - See Attachment II

VI. Special Reports:

A. Andrew P. Spiegel, Chairer of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Retirement

B. Lilburn P. Hoehn, Chairer of the University Budget Review Committee

VII. Adjournment
I. The Winter Quarter General Faculty Meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by the Vice-President of the University Faculty, Donald F. Pabst.

II. Motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the minutes of the Fall Quarter General Faculty Meeting as written.

III. Reports:

A. Report of the Faculty Vice-President, Donald F. Pabst:

1. Budget Crisis: Faculty governance and the faculty vice-president have spent considerable amounts of time on the budget crisis which will have an impact on the fiscal year ending June 30 and the 1982-83 fiscal year. Faculty input will be provided to the Ad Hoc Budget Task Force which has been expanded to include the University Budget Review Committee and the Council of Deans. In addition, the University Budget Review Committee has been meeting weekly on a wide range of budget topics.

2. 1982 Summer Salary Policy: A draft of the proposed policy was discussed by the Council of Deans on February 11. Since then, the University Budget Review Committee and Steering Committee have discussed the policy. The UBRC has been asked to meet February 17 to formulate recommendations to be presented to the Council of Deans on February 18.

3. Proposed Changes to the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws: The Rickert Committee has held open hearings and received considerable input. The committee is considering major and minor revisions to the document and has set a new target date of April 5 to report to the Academic Council.

4. Possible Conversion to the Early Semester Calendar: The Calendar/Elections Committee will soon present a formal report to the Steering Committee.

5. Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Retirement: Andrew Spiegel, Chair, will make a report later in this meeting.

6. Proposed Planning Council: This council has been proposed by the administration to replace the Planning Task Force after the important work of the group has been completed. The proposal will be reviewed by the Steering Committee and UBRC with recommendations forwarded to the administration.

7. Terms of Employment: This topic has received substantial attention by the Faculty Affairs Committee with additional input from the Steering Committee and the Calendar/Elections Committee. It now appears that the issues involved will soon be resolved to the satisfaction of the faculty and administration.

8. Subcommittees of the University Budget Review Committee: These groups are working on a wide range of topics applicable to salaries and fringe benefits. Their reports will be made to UBRC late this quarter or early spring quarter.

9. Faculty Input: Faculty input is welcomed by the various faculty governance committees. Such input can be provided to the committee chair or any committee member, or the faculty vice-president.

B. Report of the President:

President Kegrebeis gave a slide presentation of the budget situation in Ohio and described the present situation as one of "inactivity." This presentation was an Ohio picture (July 1, 1981 thru June 30, 1983). The revenues available for this biennium were thought to be $12.7 billion. The appropriations that have been made are nearly $13.5 billion. An economic upturn in Ohio did not take place last fall. The legislature then enacted new taxes, the chief piece of which was a 12% increase in the state sales tax. The Office of Budget Management has determined the state of Ohio needs additional funds. A $1 billion deficit is projected for the remainder of the biennium. The state of Ohio must cope with this deficit directly since the constitution of the state does not permit an unbalanced budget. Ohio must either reduce expenditures or raise revenues, just as Wright State University must do. The first proposal since the revelation of this deficit on January 14 was to solve the problem entirely by reduction in expenditures. Wright State had to attempt to make up for subsidy reductions of $2.5 million in the remaining five months of this fiscal year and $6 million for the next fiscal year. That meant that Wright State University would have to make up $9 million for the biennium, either by increasing student fees or other revenues or reducing expenditures, or a combination of these.

Legislators were incensed that they had had no earlier warning of this large deficit and that the taxes which they had just passed were not effective. The Office of Budget Management and the governor's office produced a proposal to the legislature to meet this $1 billion deficit. This proposal includes:

1. Continuation of trigger tax, a tax applied if the economy declined. If those taxes were to continue, they would contribute $100 million.

2. Reduction in subsidy of $300 million (a combination of a 3% cut this year and 6% next year). This is a sharp reduction from the drastic cuts introduced for the University a few weeks ago. Wright State's necessary reductions would decline and the need to increase fees would decline if this package were adopted.

3. Another 12% sales tax which would begin March 1 under this proposal would produce for the ensuing 16 months of the biennium $542.5 million.

4. A delay of the scheduled pay increase for state civil service employees which was to take place July 1 to December 1, a savings of $10 million.

5. Voluntary hour reductions which would result in $2 million.

6. Travel/equipment reductions as they apply to state agencies administered in Columbus would mean $7 million savings.

These remedies, the chief two being the reductions in appropriations to agencies and institutions and the additional 12% increase in sales tax, would produce $1 billion and effectively eliminate the $1 billion deficit.
President Kegerreis said that it is unlikely that the additional 1% sales tax will begin on Jan 1. There is not an agreement among the senators and legislators as to what is going to happen and he does not anticipate an agreement until there is a restoration of the legislative confidence in the estimates of the Office of Budget Management. An election year will further delay the passing of any new taxes.

President Kegerreis is not optimistic that the governor's package will be adopted in time to produce the effect portrayed.

If new taxes are enacted, there is inherent in this a $300 million reduction in appropriations for state institutions and agencies, and Wright State would have to bear its share. That is the most conservative, positive perimeter, and the original estimate by the Office of Budget Management is the upper perimeter for planning. If the measures taken at Wright State during the remainder of this fiscal year should somehow produce a surplus because of a late term enactment of new taxes, that surplus would be applied 100% to the problems to be faced in the next year.

President Kegerreis reviewed the Trustees declaration from their February meeting:

1. A determination to maintain the quality of education
2. Minimize damage to students' aspirations for higher education
3. Establish program priorities
4. Intensify study of support and nonacademic programs
5. Intensify energy reduction and other cost reduction programs
6. Utilize personnel and other resources to increase productivity

C. Report of the Provost:

Mr. John Beljan assured everyone that this budget crisis is indeed different from previous budget crises, that there is no magic solution, and that the University can plan on budgetary constraints for the next several years. It is critically important to keep separate the academic planning process that is ongoing and our immediate strategies for cost reduction in the University. Over two years ago, the President and John Murray and others were instrumental in preparing a structured plan so that the University could determine where it is going academically and could have a broad overview of the University's mission and its academic programs and have the mission and programs reviewed by the total University in a very structured and meaningful way. That process, now under the direction of Mr. George Kirk, is ongoing, extremely effective, and may be expedited by the current budgetary problems. The University has been charged to address the strategies for cost reduction regarding the shortfall of $2.5 million between now and June 30 and $6 million in the next fiscal year. The President established a Budget Task Force chaired by Mr. Beljan; this task force will be in business for the remainder of this year and will probably phase out because its activities can be assumed by the established committees in the University. It is planned to use the existing structures in the University - the UBRC, the Council of Deans, and others. The Task Force is currently looking at strategies that specific groups will then study and bring back to the larger groups for recommendations and reactions.

Rubin Battino questioned whether the administration has considered abolishing or diminishing the intercollegiate athletic programs. President Kegerreis responded that the administration has considered this and that cuts have been effected in the athletic program with two varsity sports eliminated in the past year. Wright State's intercollegiate athletic budget is the smallest in the state system.

Discussion followed concerning the $2.5 million reduction in subsidy for the remaining five months of this fiscal year. President Kegerreis said that if the governor's package were adopted, which seems unlikely, that $2.5 million reduction could diminish to $700 thousand. President Kegerreis said that there is no possibility of the legislature passing a law saying that the budget need not be balanced because that would mean the constitution would have to be changed which requires a constitutional amendment being placed on an election ballot.

Discussion followed concerning the $2.5 million reduction in subsidy for the remaining five months of this fiscal year. President Kegerreis said that if the governor's package were adopted, which seems unlikely, that $2.5 million reduction could diminish to $700 thousand. President Kegerreis said that there is no possibility of the legislature passing a law saying that the budget need not be balanced because that would mean the constitution would have to be changed which requires a constitutional amendment being placed on an election ballot.

Norman Anon stated that this faculty is a mature faculty and will respond and pull together in this crisis but that it is important that administration exercise universitiess who have suffered these same problems have been consulted as to what they have done. Some suggestions that have been made are:

1. Voluntary approach to employment contracts for classified and unclassified staff. Explore the possibility of 9-month contracts.
2. Look at summer sessions differently.
3. Look at energy and building utilization.
4. Establish committees to look at clusters of these suggestions so that those that seem to be most productive in terms of cost containment and protective of the University integrity might be adopted.

This is a total University and all elements must be looked at in order to protect its programs. Mr. Beljan gave assurances that there are no "hidden agendas" or preconceptions. The dean is not only the advocate of the faculty to the administration but also the interpreter of the administration to the faculty.

Plans for handling the summer session have been discussed on at least two occasions with the Council of Deans and will be discussed again on February 18. Mr. Beljan urged faculty with questions concerning their particular college, to consult their dean regarding the background of those deliberations. The Provost stressed the important role of the deans in the interaction with their faculty.

The floor was opened to questions. George Hess questioned the first guideline provided by the Trustees that the University will maintain the quality of education while taking substantial budget cuts in that it implies to the state government that cuts can be made as they wish and the University still can do the same job. Mr. Hess preferred a statement to the effect that the University will minimize the degradation of education quality while suffering budget cuts.

President Kegerreis offered the interpretation that the Board of Trustees felt that they would rather do less but do it well than do everything the University is now doing at a deteriorated level.
V. New Business:

A. Academic Calendar for 1983-84 (Attachment I to the agenda of this meeting). Motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed calendar. Question was raised concerning eleven meeting times on Wednesdays during the fall quarter. Louis Falkner, member of the Calendar/Elections Committee, responded that the eleven meeting times would be beneficial to the student body. Motion to approve the proposed calendar passed.

B. Recommendation from the University Budget Review Committee and Academic Council to revise the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws (Section 10.6.e.) as follows: Add representatives from the School of Medicine and School of Professional Psychology to the voting membership of the University Budget Review Committee. Motion was made and seconded to approve the subject recommendation. Discussion. David Sachs questioned whether the Medical School and the School of Professional Psychology are budgeted separately from the University. Mr. Beljan responded that both those units are integral parts of the University and included in the overall University budget; both are considered to be essentially self-contained. Their expenditure budget is expected to meet their income statement. It was noted that there was a reorganization in the structure of central administration last fall and this change would be consistent with the new organizational structure; it would be appropriate to include representatives from those units. A considerable number of University policies are not only applicable to the existing units that were represented but also to the School of Medicine and the School of Professional Psychology. Mr. Pabst said that this is a transitional year for UBRC, Steering Committee recommended it be put on the agenda of Academic Council since it is a revision. Motion to approve subject recommendation was put to a vote by secret ballot. It was determined there was a quorum present. This is not a change to the constitution and requires a majority vote. Results: YES: 65. NO: 47. Motion was defeated.

C. Resolution received by petition from members of the full-affiliated faculty concerning administrative reviews (Attachment II to the agenda of this meeting). Motion was made and seconded to approve the subject recommendation. Discussion. Clyde Schrickel asked what has been done since the formal reviews of last May. President Kegerreis responded that the current activity of the administrative review process is that the chairpersons of the most recent actual review committees, together with the chairman of the original advisory administrative committee, have met with the President and a memo circulated and responses are being received as to the procedure that should be followed in deciding whether there shall be a University administrative review process and if yes, what form it should take. After studying the recommendations of the original advisory committee, there are many disagreements about the process and at least four experimental reviews last year, and it has been attempted to consolidate a proposal to the University community. One area of debate is whether chairpersons should be subject to a uniform administrative review across the campus. The committee composed of chairpersons and the President are exchanging ideas as to what elements of the process constitute reasonable consensus, what elements of the process should be submitted for further discussion to the University community, and how decentralized should the process be.

Sherwin Klein suggested a non-renewable fixed term for all administrative positions held by tenured faculty which could be frozen by the President in special circumstances. This would permit a continuous infusion of new leaders with fresh insights and ideas in college management positions.

Motion to approve subject resolution was put to a vote by secret ballot. It was determined there was a quorum present. This is not a change to the constitution and requires a majority vote. Results: YES: 29. NO: 71. Motion was defeated.

D. Lawrence Cross made a motion to place on the agenda for consideration at the next General Faculty meeting the following proposal: The motion is made that the Wright State University faculty support the following statement: "To improve national and international security, the United States and the Soviet Union should stop the nuclear arms race. Specifically, they should adopt a mutual freeze on the testing, production, and development of nuclear weapons and missiles and aircraft designed primarily to deliver nuclear weapons. This is an essential, verifiable first step toward lessening the risk of nuclear war and reducing nuclear arsenals." Motion was seconded. This proposal will be considered at the Spring Quarter General Faculty meeting.

E. Emil Knmetc commented on the interpretation of the Governance Bylaws. Mr. Knmetc stated that the UBRC does make recommendations to the administration as spelled out clearly in the bylaws. However, the Council committees are subject to the Council so it takes precedence of priority over what any of the committees do. Mr. Knmetc expressed concern that budgetary questions were not thoroughly discussed at the Academic Council meetings before a vote was taken. Mr. Pabst reported that standing committees do report at each Council meeting and reports are open to discussion. Some items move completely through the faculty governance process, depending upon the issues, to the Academic Council. Mr. Pabst noted that the constitution and bylaws are not specific on the routing of items.

Mr. Beljan was asked to explain the summer school proposal. Mr. Beljan said that for the past several years the summer school has been operating under a policy which established certain minimums for summer courses so that the University does not subsidize summer offerings. Summer school has become an opportunity to create funds to assist the University in the rest of the fiscal year. This policy has
been subject to various interpretations in the colleges and schools. The proposal was that there should be minimum class size based upon the level of class being taught and that the course would proceed if minimum enrollment was met. If minimum enrollment was not met, the course could be cancelled unless the professor opted to continue that course on a proration of his/her enrollment for that course offering. The proposal, in order to insure that one would have the opportunity to offer courses, recommended that no budget caps be placed on the colleges this year. It was tentatively agreed in this proposal that the minima would be adjusted where certain maxima had been established by tradition or course requirement. There were also special treatments to be permitted for exceptions to the minimum enrollment, at the dean's discretion, for courses that impact on a given degree program or courses that are offered only in the summer. The only differences that have occurred:

1. Implementation of what has been considered reasonable minimal section enrollment.
2. There was discretion involved.
3. The opportunity existed to look at course offerings so that smaller enrollment, lower student/faculty ratio courses this summer in lieu of the fall could be considered. There would be no capping of the colleges' budgets in terms of absolute dollars so that there would be the opportunity of offering additional courses if supported by the enrollment.

If courses were offered at the minimum enrollment, there would be no impact whatever on the faculty income. If the minimum enrollment was not met, there would be a proration based upon the number of students in that class offering. The initial enrollment would be considered and not the figures at the end of the term. The view was expressed that this might present some element of competition among faculty.

Jim Walker expressed his support of the proposal if everyone would share in the sacrifice to be made. Mr. Beljan said the University would like to reduce the 12-month constant level of support activities on campus and make better use of University facilities. Activity during term breaks needs to be examined. Nine-month contracts need to be evaluated. Joseph Castellano noted that the proration was a positive step in that it allowed faculty to teach a course with proration rather than having the class cancelled. This policy allows for discretion on the part of the deans and the policy contains safeguards which were not previously there. Mr. Fabt reminded faculty the UBRC will meet on this issue on February 17 and invited faculty to provide input through members of the UBRC.

VI. Special Reports:

A. Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Retirement. Andrew Spiegel reported that this committee has formulated a position. Provost Beljan will study the proposal thoroughly and will be meeting with the committee soon.

B. University Budget Review Committee. This report was covered in previous portion of this meeting.

VII. Adjournment: A motion was made, seconded and approved to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.
The University Calendar/Elections Committee decided by a vote of 5 to 1 to recommend that Wright State University continue on a Quarter Calendar. The following report documents the procedure and ensuing reasons for this recommendation.

The 1981/82 Calendar Elections Committee was charged to conduct a thorough research into the various aspects of a potential switch from a Quarter Calendar to an Early Semester Calendar. Based on the 1980/81 Calendar Committee's study and survey, our Committee's task was to continue from that point and where possible, anticipate the total impact on the University as a whole. Following last year's recommendation to the Steering Committee, there arose specific questions which needed immediate attention. Using this list and adding several questions of our own, this year's Committee decided to direct these questions to each department in each academic unit. (See Attachment A, "Topics for Discussion.")

The initial expectation was that following this procedure would produce a basis for realistic examination of the Early Semester System's advantages and disadvantages for Wright State University. Looking at a new calendar from the specific perspectives of the various disciplines within the University would provide not only the basis for continued research -- the initial expectations projected a newly constructed survey tool, open hearings and the use of the Student Index group through the Office of Student Information Services -- but provide as well a perhaps more realistic index of the actual support a proposed calendar switch has at this University. Our sentiments, which echoed the charge from the Steering Committee as informally expressed were, from the beginning, that a proposal of such magnitude would have to clearly indicate evidence of a solid majority of faculty in support of a calendar switch.

The results of our initial inquiry, through the departments of the various academic units are as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Early Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College Tally

1. Business and Administration:
   Chairers are in support of an Early Semester Calendar.

2. Education and Human Services (undergraduate and graduate):
   83% of the faculty in support of retaining the Quarter Calendar

3. Liberal Arts:
   43% of the departments in support of an Early Semester Calendar
   22% of the departments in support of retaining the Quarter Calendar
   35% of the departments neutral

4. School of Nursing:
   33% of the faculty in support of an Early Semester Calendar
   34% of the faculty neutral
   33% of the faculty in support of retaining a Quarter Calendar

5. School of Medicine:
   Abstains (see Attachment B)

6. School of Professional Psychology:
   The Executive Committee was in favor of continued study.

7. Science and Engineering:
   75% of the departments in support of retaining a Quarter Calendar
   17% of the departments neutral
   8% of the departments in support of an Early Semester Calendar

*Neutral does not signify indifference as much as a divided vote, which means, in most cases, that the pros and cons are roughly equal, and do not outweigh the problems encountered by making the switch.

**It is significant to note that the largest colleges within the University, Liberal Arts and Science and Engineering, in their combined response average as follows: 25.5% in support of an Early Semester Calendar, 26% neutral, and 48.5% in support of retaining a Quarter Calendar.

These results indicate that, contrary to last year's survey results, no consensus exists at Wright State University which supports the Early Semester Calendar versus the Quarter Calendar. Major areas of concern are stated in the summaries of each academic unit accompanying this recommendation (see Attachment B). The major general findings can be briefly summarized as follows:

A. While it is quite difficult to objectively prove the pedagogical benefits or disadvantages of one calendar system over another, from the perspectives of individual departments, the perceived advantages or disadvantages appear related to the specific discipline. In other words, while some see clear pedagogical benefits, others see clear pedagogical disadvantages.
B. Taking into account the educational goals in each discipline related to the topics for discussion, several arguments arose which support retaining the Quarter Calendar System. The most significant examples, again further articulated in Attachment B, would be:

1. Projected decrease in flexibility of course offerings was generally considered negative in our rapidly changing world.

2. Disciplines which rely heavily on two-quarter sequences within their curriculae would have difficulty adjusting to a semester (1/2 or 1 year) plan.

3. Several disciplines teach courses which directly integrate into the Medical School, the Miami Valley Hospital, and various co-op opportunities. Teacher practicums relate to this general area as well. The vast majority of departments which do articulate with areas inside and outside the University state that the Quarter System allows a more fluid integration than the Semester.

4. Summer offerings - several departments have summer school enrollments and offerings which are truly a fourth quarter. Reduced offerings would cut into programs.

5. The added flexibility provided by the quarter system is better suited to the needs of part-time and non-traditional students.

6. The Quarter System is more effective in allowing students in cooperative education programs maximum industrial exposure.

7. Field oriented courses work better on a Quarter System because of a higher probability of favorable weather in the spring.

C. Although the majority of colleges listed the problems anticipated by changing the academic calendar, a few also included the perceived benefits. The major reasons for supporting the conversion included:

1. Students are provided greater time for integration of the subject.

2. Faculty would have a reduced number of preparations.

3. Administrative tasks would be simplified.

4. Personal preferences for the Semester System.

As well as collecting data from the academic units within Wright State University, the Committee sought information from regional institutions which have recently switched calendars or have undertaken a study on the matter. Questions similar to those above were addressed to six area universities, as well as inquiries into the procedure in making the decision. The following universities were contacted: Miami University, The University of Akron, Kent State University, Ohio University, Bowling Green University, and Wayne State University.
In general, very similar items or categories were researched within these institutions. Included in Attachment C is a summary of the documents we received from these institutions. The complete documents will remain on file in the Registrar's Office with the other related materials. The various institutions which made the switch to an Early Semester Calendar, did so, broadly speaking, in response to pedagogical inclination expressed by the majority of their faculty and, in most cases, following a directive from their administration or Board of Trustees.

The most complete itemizing of various rationales used in making the decisions come from Miami University and Kent State. We should point out that these particular institutions are residential campuses. It is especially interesting to note that both of these institutions came up with almost equal pros and cons on each calendar proposal, highlighting the inability to prove that one calendar is pedagogically sounder than another. The Report of the 1975 Academic Calendar Study Commission from Kent State University makes the following comment:

"The University of Chicago, for example, has maintained the highest standards of educational programming for years utilizing the quarter plan; likewise, Harvard University has done the same using the semester model. One would be hardpressed to say that the output from these two institutions varies as a function of calendar. Thus the choice of calendar seems to rest more upon the relative weight given to non-educational parameters than upon educational viability per se. The Commission members drew this conclusion from their own experiences with a variety of calendar plans as well as from the documents examined."

Given these major points and accompanying details, along with the realization that only one academic unit within the University showed a majority in support of an Early Semester Calendar, we make our recommendation to remain on the Quarter System. It is the general consensus of the Committee that further research, open hearings, questionnaires to students and faculty will not produce significantly different results. Our procedures brought the question, along with attendant discussion topics, directly to the faculty, within the context of the department. That context has traditionally been the forum for curricular discussion and development at Wright State University. It seems futile at this point, to continue with our initially projected plan to use a reconstructed survey/questionnaire and open hearings, tools whose effectiveness, especially in light of the difference between last year's survey and this year's findings, are highly questionable.

DL
March 1982

Attachments
Attach A - Topics for Discussion
Attach B - Summary of Dept Responses
Attach C - Summary of Responses from Six Institutions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Retirement Policy</th>
<th>4 month faculty</th>
<th>Medical School</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
<th>Other 12 month contracts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential cost in the first 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost reduction resulting from the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data available before implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual cost before suspension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>