

**CSU STANISLAUS  
UNIVERSITY BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 28, 2014**

**SUMMARY NOTES  
(Approved April 4, 2014)**

Present: Mr. Carl Whitman, UBAC Associate Chair/AVP; Professor David Lindsay (FBAC); Professor Paul O'Brien/via phone (Sociology); Professor Stuart Wooley (Biology); Ms. Mariam Salameh (ASI President); Mr. Marvin Hooker (ASI Vice President); Alissa Aragon (Staff/Campus Life); Ms. Lori Phillips (Staff/CAHSS); Dean James Tuedio (CAHSS); Director Julia Reynoso (Facilities Planning); Budget Manager Michelle Legg (non-voting); Ms. Julia Fahrenbruch (non-voting/volunteer). Not Present: Ms. Eileen Hamilton, UBAC Chair.

Associate Chair Whitman called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. Action: It was moved and seconded to approve, as distributed, the draft March 21, 2014 summary notes. The motion passed unanimously.

**UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT 2014-2015 BUDGET PRIORITIES**

Vice President Shirley Pok reviewed the 2014-2015 preliminary budget priorities for University Advancement as outlined in the document distributed to UBAC prior to the meeting.

*Priority 1: Base Funding for Director of College & Athletic Development.* VP Pok reported that last May the stage was set for this position to come on campus; the recruitment was conducted and the person started on December 2. She pointed out that this new position is currently funded with one-time money and they want to move it to base funding. As background, she said that this past year University Advancement has been working on building good relations with the Deans and the Athletics Director. The Director of College & Athletic Development serves as liaison to the colleges and athletics, and has contact typically on a weekly basis and conducts standing monthly meetings. VP Pok said that the UA team wants to gain a better understanding of the needs of the colleges and athletics, and also communicate that they can depend on UA for more communications support for events and meetings, for private funding support (volunteer fundraising groups and advisory boards), and for alumni/ae engagement and data base access.

In response to Professor O'Brien's inquiry, VP Pok clarified that this full-time Director position is not on a contract; there is no end date. The purpose of this request is to move the existing position to base rather than one-time funding support.

*Priority 2: Communications & Advocacy Campaign.* A well-prescribed communications and advocacy campaign will incorporate strategies designed to address current campus needs and priorities. In reviewing the purposes, VP Pok emphasized that while the specific communications vehicles have yet to be identified, University Advancement is looking to accomplish the following:

- Communicate with and grow our advocates—prospective students, including parents and family members; alumni/ae engagement; regional partnerships (including individuals, families, small businesses, and corporations); donors; and elected officials.
- Develop a series of strategic initiatives, or placeholders, to the communications and advocacy plan—strategically determine in a thoughtful and timely way what we are going to do, so that each step of the way know what the time triggers are and who is responsible. The communications plan will help to broaden visibility with prospective students and families, who may then become our advocates. The advocacy plan will allow us to have people in place if, for example, legislation is coming forward and we need support to jump in and write letters, send emails, make phone calls, etc.—we build support through advocacy and ultimately donations.

- Campaign implementation—the UA team is working purposefully with each of the Deans and the Athletics Director and is in the process of implementing an annual giving plan, rebuilding the alumni/ae program, and recruiting for the vacant position of AVP for Communications and Public Affairs, whose responsibilities include writing the communications and marketing plans.
- Develop a two-year planning process to carry out the measures identified—UA is developing a year-one plan and also developing out year-two. The first phase begins during this May through October when the plans will be created. What comes next will be identified during the next phase; November through June.
- Build an advocate base—need to know who our friends are and need the community behind us. In building an advocate base, the first step is to be as inclusive as possible; broaden and involve as many people as possible and be very diverse. Make sure our students enter with the mindset that they have made a fabulous decision to come here, have a great experience, and leave here fully prepared to get a job and enter their career path. The University needs to be able to tell its story and proactively build its reputation in the eyes of its students and partners in the region.
- Assessment—the new AVP would be the person charged to do a formalized assessment and conduct public perception surveys. Once that position is in place, UA will formulate how to do that assessment and develop the communications and marketing plans. An implementation plan to carry out each step over the next two years is also necessary, but it would be premature to identify those vehicles without the plans in place. A marketing plan involves branding and identifying ways to unify and get the University messages out through direct marketing (exhibits, displays, direct mail publications), traditional media outlets (newspapers, radio, TV), and electronic media (email and social media on the Web).

Professor Wooley expressed his understanding that Priority 2 (Communications and Advocacy) is really an increase in University Advancement's budget for that particular purpose (i.e., operating funds, rather than personnel); once the current search for the AVP position is completed, UA would have the personnel to address that priority. He asked if the request involves a combination of one-time and other funds? VP Pok responded that the request is for base funding, as these are on-going efforts, but also noted that some things may not be repeated in future years and base funding might be reduced. Professor O'Brien asked for clarification regarding the reference to partnerships that advance regional development under Priority 2; does this include other people in higher education? VP Pok responded that this refers to the development of CSU Stanislaus partnerships within our entire service region, not just Turlock and the surrounding area. She noted that we already have partnerships with the other educational organizations and the regional relationships we now have, and are building, would be ongoing. Commenting that this priority is more fluid than a particular line item, Professor Wooley asked if they thought they could do this job effectively without this priority? VP Pok said UA would not be able to carry out these initiatives without the budget to develop and implement the plans.

In response to Professor O'Brien's question regarding electronic outreach to alums, VP Pok said that their social media outreach does have a budget attached to it and it is very cost effective.

In response to Dean Tuedio, VP Pok said that the first six months (May-October) will involve assessment and development of the plans and the next phase (November-June) will begin the implementation. Noting that one-time funding might be more readily available than base for allocation in the current year, Dean Tuedio asked if there would be a way to get this through to June with one-time rather than base funding? VP Pok said that as long as they know funding would be available to start implementing they could move forward with confidence. She pointed out that much of this work requires spending before you actually see the end product, which is also why it is a two-year process; many things are invoiced before you actually see the deliverables.

ASI Vice President Hooker asked what kind of advocacy campaign and rebuilding of alumni/ae relationships are proposed? VP Pok responded that the building of alumni/ae relationships should really start in year-one, when students enter campus. Students need to see that they are getting a great experience and also are exposed to what the alumni/ae relations program offers. We need to draw students into those programs throughout their four years on campus, so that after graduation they become members of the Alumni Association. VP Pok noted that last year, for the first time, the Alumni Office reached out to students immediately after graduation and invited them to join the Alumni Association free of charge. In addition, the Alumni Office is hosting an alumni/ae reception on April 24 and, for the first time, every single member in the database will be invited; invitations were more limited in the past. Students also will have their own section in the alumni/ae advocacy and marketing plans.

### **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS 2014-2015 BUDGET PRIORITIES**

Provost and Vice President James Strong reviewed the 2014-2015 preliminary budget priorities for Academic Affairs, and the specific consultation processes used to develop those priorities, as detailed in the document distributed to UBAC prior to the meeting. He reported that the intermediate document developed as a result was reviewed with the Provost's Advisory Council, as well as at a meeting of the Deans and Department Chairs, and in three separate meetings with all direct reports to discuss and fully vet what they were requesting. The document also describes how the recommended priorities fit within the University's Strategic Plan and related planning documents. The priorities were specifically linked to the 26 strategic actions in the Strategic Plan.

*Priority 1: Additional Support for the Administrative and Leadership Duties of Department Chairs.* In spring 2013, a group of department chairs wrote to the Speaker of the Academic Senate describing the difficulty of meeting expectations with the amount of assigned time provided. A committee of deans studied the matter and subsequently created an assigned time rubric for allocation of assigned time consisting of 13 factors (listed in the document) that create workload to help decide how much assigned time a chair in a certain department would receive. The rubric, which yielded 95 WTUs in assigned time, was vetted with various stakeholders and received broad support. Noting that one-time funding was initially provided during this semester for those chairs that had time to take advantage of the opportunity, VP Strong said they would like to move to base funding support for the next semester.

*Priority 2: Hire Additional Staff.* A lot of staff positions were lost during the period of budget cuts over the last several years. Some staff positions were restored last year, but we need to focus on replacing or adding staff in priority areas as the organization moves forward. The need for additional staff to meet the mission was identified as a very important and frequently requested item. VP Strong emphasized that this does not mean every request will be granted, but the need to strategically add staff is important to meeting the University mission. In response to Professor O'Brien's question about how many staff might be hired, VP Strong said that although specific numbers were derived from the spreadsheets developed by the colleges and units, he does not have that information with him at this time.

*Priority 3: Increased Operations (non-personnel) Funding to Support the Delivery of Instruction.* Similar to priority 2, the period of extreme budget cuts resulted in reducing operating funds to bare bones, as other choices would have been worse. Another frequently listed item in this process was the need for operating funds to support the delivery of instruction. This request involves moving the funding for the net cost of replacing faculty on sabbaticals to the base budget, or a more defined one-time funding approach entailing support from the University.

Professor Wooley asked VP Strong to elaborate on the reference to moving funding for the net costs of replacing faculty on sabbaticals. VP Strong responded that the number of sabbaticals have increased to be more in line with what other campuses award and with what the CSU-CFA contract suggests.

Additional funding is needed for that purpose. One-time monies resulting from faculty separations are currently allocated for that purpose, but the number of faculty separations can vary significantly from year-to-year. This request is to allocate some base funds to provide a more reliable source of support to supplement the part-time budget or, in this case, sabbatical costs. In response to Director Reynoso, VP Strong said the goal is to avoid using salary savings for sabbaticals, or at least not as much, and provide for more permanent allocations. In response to Ms. Phillips, VP Strong confirmed that this request is for both base and one-time funds. Dean Tuedio said there may be lab equipment and other one time needs, noting that some of the equipment requests in the sciences and the arts were aimed at a cluster of needs built up over time.

*Priority 4: Systematically Address the Uneven Distribution of the Loss of Faculty Across Departments.* Noting that this was priority number one last year, VP Strong pointed out that faculty lines were lost in an uneven fashion across departments, since separations happen in an unplanned way from the institutional perspective. For example, we might have three people retiring in one department and nobody retiring in another. To realize cost savings that would be applied to the budget deficit and required reductions, tenure track positions were sometimes replaced with part-time. This unfairly affected some departments that had unusual numbers of retirements or separations and we are now looking at rectifying that situation. Also, we are looking at how student demand for courses has changed and where the growth is relative to programmatic needs, majors and courses, so that resources are allocated to meet student needs. VP Strong reported that a number of faculty were hired last year and 30 searches are slated right now. He noted that this is still an important priority, but not quite as important relative to the first three.

*Priority 5: Support of Graduate Programs and the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.* The Graduate Council submitted a request to institute a Graduate Dean position. There is broad support for combining the Office of Graduate Programs and the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs under the leadership of one dean to bring focus to both programs. This structure is common in the CSU and across the country. VP Strong commented that additional staff (at least one) to support this structure will be needed to avoid doubling the workload. In response to Ms. Aragon's question regarding the number of positions for Graduate Programs and ORSP, VP Strong said that some funding is available from the separation of the Director of ORSP (this is not an entirely new position) and at least one staff person to assist in the combination of these two departments also would be needed.

*Sidebar: Combined Request from Academic Affairs and Student Affairs for Additional Academic Advisors.* (Advising also is listed as a University-wide priority.) This request builds on the advising strengths in Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and would create a hybrid model to more fully support student success and increase graduation rates. In response to ASI President Salameh's inquiry about hiring advisors, VP Strong said fund expenditures are yet to be determined. He said they should be able to come up with a spending plan to help improve academic advising on campus in a fairly reasonable period of time. Dean Tuedio noted that this is one example of an area where we have structures in place to support advising that cut across divisions (e.g., Academic Affairs departments as well as college based advising and the Student Affairs Advising Resource Center). The sidebar is an effort to raise the question of how we might be able to work together across divisions. Vice President Strong also noted that there are opportunities to use improved information systems relative to advising by making it more available and more real time to advisors for use in intrusive advising—if an advisor sees something coming up on a student's record they can react more efficiently and effectively in advising that student.

In conclusion, VP Strong expressed his preference to see a realistic budget as to what the needs are, even if we cannot fund it all. We should have a budget process that identifies all of the needs and begin thinking about other ways to deal with those. The University is still in a fairly lean funding situation, but we need to engage in those types of practices. VP Strong also pointed out that once support is received for these priorities, the divisions will have to go back and determine which budget lines will be funded within a given priority; final recommendations will be made through appropriate consultation processes.

**INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS 2014-2015 BUDGET PRIORITIES**

Provost Strong noted that Intercollegiate Athletics is a separate department that reports to him as the Provost, rather than the VPAA. The budget process followed for Intercollegiate Athletics was similar to that for Academic Affairs with the preliminary priorities tied to the University Strategic Plan. Provost Strong reviewed the 2014-2015 preliminary budget priorities for Intercollegiate Athletics and the consultation process used to develop those priorities, as detailed in the document distributed to UBAC prior to the meeting.

*Priority 1: Hire additional staff.* In order for the Intercollegiate Athletics Department to meet their strategic and tactical goals and objectives, modest increases in staff are necessary. Athletics Director Mike Matoso pointed out that our teams are performing in the top 25% of the conference, but with minimum staffing to support coaches and student athletes—increased staffing support is a huge priority.

*Priority 2: Increased Operations (non-personnel) Funding to Support the Delivery of the Mission of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics.* This priority supports increasing the department travel budget for teams, coaches and administrators, so that they are within the norm of the conference the University competes in—the California Collegiate Athletic Association (CCAA). Director Matoso noted that the teams travel every weekend and Athletics receives no additional funding to cover cost increases (e.g., food, lodging, etc.). Provost Strong also pointed out that the NCAA expects more administrators at every event and we struggle to meet that expectation.

*Priority 3: Additional Support for Assistant Coaches.* The specific need is for assistant coach compensation to be competitive with other CSU campuses in the CCAA conference. Provost Strong emphasized that our assistant coach salaries are extremely low, resulting in some sacrifices being made to support the needs of the department and student-athletes.

*Priority 4: Student-Athlete Success.* To enhance the success of student-athletes, an academic tutoring and career development program and center is requested. Provost Strong noted that Student Affairs has some of these functions in place, but this would be in addition to those and in support of athletes; also working to find a center where student-athletes can study and do group work.

In response to ASI Vice President Hooker regarding numbers of staff, Mr. Matoso said probably four, but reviewed the following needs: one in facilities; a sports information person; an academic compliance person; someone to help with corporate sponsorships; and probably another athletic trainer, as we have the smallest number of training staff in the conference. Professor John Mayer, who serves as the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), commented that although the work is getting done it is because many individuals are working way beyond the call of duty. He emphasized that our athletes are competing against some of the largest campuses in our conference, but we have been playing below national expectations of what athletic departments should have; we have been successful at doing that, but on the backs of incredibly hard working individuals.

Noting that the Athletics Department receives funding from Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) fees, and that one-half of the budget is supported by student fees, ASI President Salameh asked how that funding is aligned with the funding from the university budget; is there duplication in some of the things being requested from UBAC and from IRA? Provost Strong commented that IRA awards funding for specific projects on an annual basis for one-time purposes. Professor Mayer also noted that there are restrictions on the use of IRA funds, which cannot go toward salaries and various other types of ongoing expenses. Director Matoso pointed out that the IRA funding received by Athletics (which is different than student fees) is used to cover bus expenses.

**UNIVERSITY-WIDE 2014-2015 BUDGET PRIORITIES**

Provost James Strong reviewed the 2014-2015 preliminary budget priorities for University-wide activities, as outlined in the document distributed to UBAC prior to the meeting. Provost Strong noted that these priorities are the result of conversations and recommendations on need across all divisions; all requests are for one-time funding.

*Priority 1: Increase Partnerships to Improve College Readiness of Entering Students.* The focus is on working with K-12 and community colleges to strengthen preparation for, transition to, and optimization of the years in college. Since much of this is experimental and pilot-project in nature, one-time funding is requested (for now) to support such things as the pursuit of grants and coordinated advising efforts across education sectors. Provost Strong reported that he has met with the Vice Presidents for Instruction at San Joaquin Delta College, Modesto Junior College, and Merced College to try and develop closer relationships and also to understand existing relationships. He noted that the University currently has department-to-department relationships, but we need to know more about what they are and what they are doing; also need to talk more broadly about how we can work together, so that students can transition smoothly and effectively from K-12 and/or community colleges to CSU Stanislaus. Provost Strong said a plan would be put together with that group that would then be scaled to other K-12 schools and community colleges.

*Priority 2: Strengthen Both Academic and Career Advising.* There is strong agreement across most campus sectors that advising is not what it should be at CSU Stanislaus in terms of assessment of what we are currently doing (well or not well), coordination of efforts across sectors, and the overall impact of what we are doing. Provost Strong noted it might be useful to have some improved advising software as one possibility, as well as other trial type projects to see how they work in coordination with Student Affairs and the Advising Resource Center. He also referenced the importance of intrusive advising and taking a proactive role in helping students make good decisions, noting that many are overwhelmed by the collegiate experience and a much more complicated curriculum; especially first generation students.

*Priority 3: Strengthen the Writing Capacity of Students and Employees.* Transition toward systematic campus attention to writing has begun within the academy and within many non-academic units. Noting that President Sheley has previously identified enhanced writing skills as an important goal, Provost Strong said this would serve as a strong indicator or signal to external stakeholders regarding the competencies of the University and of our graduates, and represents an important contribution to help students move to a higher level.

*Priority 4: Advance Campus Community Health, Safety, Risk Management, and Information Security.* While the specifics of health, safety, risk management, and information security are best addressed in divisional budget plans, there is a need to raise awareness of these areas throughout the campus community. The key to success in these areas is cultural change. Provost Strong pointed out that the environment we live in is much more complicated than it was 20 years ago; a more litigious society. Recent information security incidents have focused our attention on these issues and the need to create a greater cultural awareness and mindset.

*Priority 5: Improve Audio Technology in Major Venues for Public Events (including Academic Lectures).* There are a number of excellent events on campus for both internal and external audiences. However, the poor quality of sound systems can detract from the overall quality of those events. We need to begin a systematic assessment of the sound quality across venues and make changes that are within our capacity to fund.

Professor Wooley commented that these priorities don't seem as discrete as the previous (divisional) priorities, noting that it is difficult to get a sense of how things, like strengthening writing, are going to happen. Using strengthening writing capacity as an example, Professor Wooley said that as a faculty member who is teaching large classes it is often a question of workload. He asked if this request includes support for writing centers? Referring to the last sentence under Priority 3 (as we continue this transition, one-time funding will enable both experimentation and progress), Provost Strong said that once funding is identified this would become more developed through experiments and ideas generated within departments. For example, an RFP would be sent out asking departments to identify what they can do to improve student success in their department. Noting that these priorities involve pilot projects and work shops, Dean Tuedio offered a comparison to the staff evaluation process where objectives are set for staff, but it is hard to set those if the structural elements for staff to take advantage of are not in place.

Dean Tuedio pointed out that in the FA&HR request, VP Shimek has asked for a position to help coordinate ways in which health initiatives and other kinds of campus risk and safety initiatives could be rolled out on campus. He asked what the relationship is between VP Shimek's request and Priority 4 (advance campus community health, safety, risk management and information security)? Provost Strong responded that these requests should be more connected than they are at this point, noting there may be other areas or initiatives that could be tied closer together. VP Giambelluca pointed out that there is an Office of Safety and Risk Management and an overarching campus-wide health committee who also deal with these issues. He noted that this priority is designed to build awareness, to get the campus community engaged, and to inculcate this into the culture.

Associate Chair Whitman pointed out that identifying those areas where there may be overlap between divisions is one factor that helps us, as a Committee, address what rises to the top.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.