



**California State University, Stanislaus
University Budget Advisory Committee**
March 4, 2011, 9:00 am to 11:00 am
University South Dining Room

Notes

Attendees: Steve Filling, Russ Giambelluca, Mark Thompson, Becky Temple, Frank Borrelli, Julia Reynoso, John Sarraille, Clarissa Lonn-Nichols, Kim Tan, Neil Jacklin, Daryl Moore, Jim Strong, Sabrina Dominguez, Mehrand Khodabandeh

Documents distributed:

Agenda

Remarks made by Chancellor to Assembly budget subcommittee

Topics for Discussion: Strategic Positioning in Times of Severe Fiscal Uncertainty

1. Committee Welcome

The Chairs asked each member of the committee to introduce themselves and speak to their goals for the committee this year. Some of the goals mentioned included: Collaboration, working to the good of the campus, discussing the numbers, student understanding of cuts, and working together as all are vested in outcomes best for University.

2. Review of Operating Procedures/Committee Schedule

The chairs announced to the committee and the visitors in the room that this meeting is working meeting for the UBA Committee. It is open to public but no visitor comment is going to be taken. There will be at least one open meeting in the schedule where the committee will listen to public comment and suggestions. The meeting will be scheduled and announced.

Notes (not minutes) for reference and reminder will be prepared for each meeting. If detailed reference materials are required, they will be posted on web at the Business and Finance budget website. The co-chair noted that this year a mailbox for budget suggestions will also be provided. There were some concerns for those in the campus community who might wish to submit their suggestions anonymously. It was determined that they could use the budget central page which has a place for suggestions to be submitted. [Follow-up Note: Both the mailbox and the budget central link have been modified to accept anonymous suggestions.]

Notes will be available prior to the next meeting and will be subject to approval by the committee. Corrections will be made if required.

Committee member Khodabandeh noted that the ASI is planning to schedule open forums. He indicated that the ASI wants students to understand how important UBAC is as a committee. Arrangements will be made to coordinate open forums with ASI.

The chair noted that originally meeting schedules were going to be every other week, however a weekly schedule seems appropriate given the fact that the California budget may be passed sooner than in previous years. The schedule most convenient to members appears to be Friday mornings. All attempts at scheduling show that Friday a.m. is best. The chairs indicated that meetings could be held from 8:00 am -10:00 am and that schedule would accommodate faculty schedules.

3. Response to General Committee Questions

Co-chair Giambelluca noted that during the week prior to the committee meeting, a few questions had been received from some of the committee members. While all of the questions had not been included, some would be responded to at the meeting.

One such question related to the Campus Audited Financial Report for 09-10? Co-chair Giambelluca reported that CSU Stanislaus is part of the audit process in the CSU. We don't produce the reports, provided by KMPG. We get the reports when the Chancellor's office has completed the system-wide audit and the reports have been released. This may occur in perhaps 2-3 weeks. When it is available it will be published to the web. He further noted that as a campus we don't always have a full audit; each year the CSU selects campuses for full or partial audits. 08-09 was a partial. We have no audited statements for that year. They are expensive and CSU decides who is audited. FY 2009-10 was full audit year, so reports will be available when they are released by the Chancellor's office.

Another such question from Member Filling related to the numbers and savings related to the elimination of Winter Term. Co-chair Giambelluca and the Campus Budget Manager indicated that some analysis is being done. Results fall and spring will be provided in a report later. Since the return of Winter Term is not a possibility, the topic of winter term is not germane to the discussion of the current and future budget cuts. Member Thompson commented that there was disagreement within the committee over whether any cost savings related to Winter Term are germane to the current deliberations. Page: 2

Committee member Sarraille asked for a status of his Public Records Act request dated 11/3/10 request for University spending during 08-09. The material for this request is being gathered because it is not readily available. Current estimates suggest that it will be avail at the end of the month.

Committee Member Filling commented that his request about the cost-savings of Winter term was germane to the budget discussion.

Co-chair Giambelluca indicated that all savings from moving to semester based calendar and additional revenues made from special sessions are part of the permanent and temporary budgets we will review for cuts.

A discussion about what would be included in the agenda took place with some members of the committee requesting that all items be put on the agenda. Some were concerned that if many items were included on the agenda, it could take the entire meeting to discuss the agenda and never get to the discussion of the topics. Member Thompson commented that: The point of this discussion, not reflected in the notes, was how items are placed on the agenda and whether the agenda can be amended by the committee. It should be made clear that the administrative co-chairs write the agenda. Secondly it should be made clear that the

agenda may be amended at the meeting by the committee members. That's not clear from the language in the notes.

Going forward the Agenda will be published ahead of the meeting. Members will be asked to review and the agenda will be approved at the beginning of the meeting. If the committee gets bogged down with that process we will address it again and if appropriate change it at that time.

4. Remarks from Chancellor Reed to the Assembly Budget Committee

Co-chair Giambelluca provided some frame of reference remarks from Governor and Legislature concerning the budget. CA is trying to address the deficit by cuts – higher education is one segment targeted. At this point the extent of the budget cuts for the system and the campus is uncertain. There are similarities and differences from the past. The CSU – as indicated by Brown – is facing 500M reduction. The actual cuts are not certain until the decision about the tax initiatives being add to a vote.

5. Review of Topics of Discussion Document

Co-chair Giambelluca indicated that from the status of the process it doesn't matter if we're talking \$300 M or a \$ Billion, the cuts are significant to the campus. As the Chancellor indicated to the assembly and legislature, the issues for the CSU are no longer how much do we cut, because we've already had substantial cuts this year, a lot of conversation about trying to do a strategic job of process change (such as combining departments or changing the way class schedules are created which can result in savings, and positioning for the future. This is the charge we've been given by the Chancellor's office. A process change – in a strategic way – and that we can do this with some dispatch. The document prepared is to be food for thought around which we will establish agendas. The key areas identified by the chancellor's office are also those that must be specifically addressed by our campus.

The document was authored by the VP Business and Finance and was reviewed and edited by other members of the senior leadership team. It is designed to be a place of discussion so you have the benefit of hearing what we hear from a number of sources. This is provided as a common frame of reference and a place to start, but is s certainly not the only items that could be considered by the committee. Some of these came from our strategic plan, we still want to provide a quality education, allow some development of faculty base, and a place where our students can learn and grow. It's that context of what created this document. It's a starting place.

Our current FTES target is ~~7615~~ 6715. This is higher than the 6665 FTES at which the campus was balanced at the beginning of the fiscal year. Our current base budget is based upon 6665 FTES. The target is not as tightly connected to the fiscal resources provided by the state as it used to be. More and more campuses will be told to teach the students and do it with the money we have available. There are likely not to be penalties for enrollments within 2% of the budget target.

The committee reviewed the document and the campus cuts attributed to various levels of cuts to the system. There were questions about the amount that might accrue to the campus if the tax extensions are not approved. While that is speculative, it could be an additional \$11 Million to the campus which would be devastating.

Committee member Tan asked where these numbers came from. She wanted to see them on paper because of the complexity. Co-chair Giambelluca and the campus Budget Director Legg will provide a detail of the numbers in the summary for payments that reduce our \$3.7 M allocation to \$2.5 M.

Discussion occurred around the establishment of FTES targets for the different colleges. Co-chair Strong indicated that normally the colleges establish targets and describe how they will meet the 6715 FTES overall campus target. He indicated that the campus has weekly enrollment management meetings with Deans and Suzanne, the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, and they work very carefully to meet those targets.

Committee member Moore noted that the campus also looks historically in the departments to understand how the departments have generated FTES over time. They examine how realistic it is for them to meet numbers – adjusting section offerings etc. including in-coming freshman. Member Thompson stated that the senior administration cannot get input regarding targets just meeting the deans and not talking to the faculty.

Committee member Thompson raised the concern over not having faculty input about the composition of student body (Member Thompson commented that he had heard reports of statements by the new VP about changing the composition of the student body.) Member Filling indicated that he had heard these remarks in person. Page: 4

. Provost Strong indicated that he had no recollection of these comments having been made in his presence.

Co-chair Strong indicated that he disagreed with the remarks made by member Thompson about faculty input in establishing class schedules and departmental teaching targets. He indicated that the deans are always charged to meet and talk with the faculty about meeting these targets. We are always looking for students who work and can be successful at Stanislaus. Moreover Co-chair Strong indicated that he has been talking to Kelvin and indicated that he was willing to discuss having a faculty representative on the committee. They will be discussing this more. Member Thompson reiterated that his particular point was about consultation with faculty on the composition of the student body rather than on meeting targets per se. Page: 4

Co-chair Strong agreed to follow-up on points made by Committee members concerning a shifting student body.

Committee member Thompson asked how the committee should view its task and timeline.

Co-chair Giambelluca indicated that iPage: 4

n the past, UBAC would go work with the deans and non-academics on how to accommodate specific reductions in their units. The campus has done a good job of cutting \$10M from budget and still offers quality education to our students. This year's process and these numbers suggest we're already bare bones, significant cuts already done – it's not an easy task. The President is looking for strategic guidance in issues about the assumptions on how we do business. This document may hold some of these ways we can do business. I'm not speaking about regulations and reporting requirements, those will not be removed, no change because of budget. The challenge is to be strategic and provide recommendations. Using the UBAC and the recommendations of other groups on campus, we must find a way to go forward.

Co-chair Giambelluca reported that the UBAC recommendations are to be sent to the President by May 1st. The hope is that the committee will make recommendations with the approval of all members and forward those recommendations to the President by May 1.

There was a discussion about whether the UBAC should establish some sub-committees to work outside of the regular committee work to address some of these topics. Everyone agreed that these are going to be difficult discussions. They will take time. There are many different perspectives around the table. There might be a need to work away from the committee to get all these discussion items covered. Some members thought that it might be helpful to go out to members of other committees for input. In any case, the committee must complete its work and provide its recommendations in a timely fashion.

Some members of the committee indicated that they would like to think about this a bit before embarking on an extensive sub-committee activity. This will be raised again at a future meeting.

The committee also discussed other main discussion points contained in the discussion document. These included synergy programs, etc. The campus has been doing some programs with other campuses, local governments and the UC System. Committee member Borelli made the point that our campus was very proactive in seeking out these opportunities for savings over the past several years. There has been some successful collaboration. Synergy is sharing our successes but the concern is that the smaller campuses could be watered down when larger campuses have large reserves, and have resources to operate the program.

Currently the campus is partnering with the UC System and other CSU campuses to lower travel costs to travelers on University business by implementing the on-line Connexus System.

The committee spent some time discussing some more noteworthy unfunded program requirements. Committee member Mehran raised the issue of the Early Start Program and remediation in general.

Every item on discussion list focuses on students. The unfunded remediation mandate from the CO creates a lot of pressure fiscal and academic pressure on the campuses. There is a deadline to the Chancellor to meet this mandate.

Member Thompson comments: This paragraph needs to be attributed. Also, it needs to be clarified what is claimed to be an "unfunded remediation mandate" and "there is no money for remediation." For example, does this mean that no student fees are paid for courses, no FTE is gained, and no state funding is provided for courses, including pre-GE, baccalaureate-level courses students take?

I believe the implications in the text are inaccurate and will be misleading if published to the campus.

As well, the other attachment already distributed to the campus includes a bullet that reads: *If we spend the money on remediation, where is the money for college education?*

The writer of that statement needs to define what he or she means by *college education*. For example, would *college education* include all courses that count as units toward the degree?

Also, is this statement meant to apply to summer courses offered due to Early Start or will those courses being offered through UEE?Page: 5

Member Temple commented that the issue of remediation is an important issue for CSU because there is no money allocated specifically for remediation. If one assumes that remediation is a crucial part of a college education (degree completion), its part of the money the campus already gets. Some think its part of preparation of attending college, it may be thought of something important but think of other ways to offer it. Do it in other formats: on-line, MJC or working with local high schools, or internally. The key question is if we spend the money on remediation there are fewer resources for teaching other college courses.

Committee member Lonn-Nichols asked if the committee could be provided with some information about the costs associated with remediation. What courses and offerings are there? If it goes to a different form of delivery, how does it impact quality, sections, instruction? It is clear that there is a need to identify how many remedial courses do we have, put a cost on them. Think about how to transition to not offering remediation courses, or to doing something differently, how would that impact our attractiveness to students, impacting FTES? Could we replace FTES or would it require time and planning? Pedagogy issues are affected – this is not an easy discussion or analysis that might result in changing remediation. How does this impact the quality of education? Is it something we can afford to change? We're now looking at pieces of the pie, unlike last year.

Committee Member Thompson commented about remediation as a discussion about a specific group of students. Since currently 70% of our students are first generation the campus needs to be aware of who is represented in the classroom. Changing remediation could really affect our campus. Member Thompson commented that eliminating necessary courses further discourages many first-generation and under-represented students and harms our system-mandated efforts at retention and graduation.

I would remind the committee, that these remarks were made in the context of my discussion of the results of large-scale quantitative studies of first-generation students. The meaningless sentence included in the notes does nothing to capture that information.)Page: 6

No one should delude themselves to think that eliminating remediation won't negatively impact the most at-risk students on campus. The paragraph itself focuses on the departments of Math and English. It is important to know what the actual cost of teaching these courses is. Careful decisions need to be made to be sure that the claims that the student can save money with some of these changes.

Committee member Filling urged the committee to be extremely careful about using cost information to make these types of decisions. Co-chair Strong indicated that the committee will need to do a careful cost analysis.

Co-chair Giambelluca commented that every case on this list, there could be a strong argument for status quo. Careful thinking is very necessary. Are there ways to accomplish the same objectives and still do things differently to save money? Are there other outside the box ways to accomplish the same goals? Could our students be co-enrolled for remedial education in other institutions, extended education, on-line? These are just assessments. None of these will be easy to give up. Member *Thompson noted these comments could be applied to any group of students the administration frames as targets in cutting budgets. This comment references the document provided to the committee by Co-chair Giambelluca on March 4 discussing various processes and considerations for possible revision and budget reduction.*

6. Adjourn

The committee moved for adjournment at 11:09 am.