



**California State University, Stanislaus  
University Budget Advisory Committee**  
March 18, 2011, 8:00 am to 10:00 am  
University South Dining Room

Notes

---

Attendees: Becky Temple, Clarissa Lonn-Nichols, Daryl Moore, Frank Borrelli, Jim Strong, John Sarraille, Julia Reynoso, Kim Tan, Mark Thompson, Mehran Khodabandeh, Russ Giambelluca

Absent: Steven Filling, Neal Jacklin, Sabrina Dominguez

Documents distributed:

March 18, 2010 Agenda

Agenda Items dated February 24, 2011 from Staff members of UBAC

March 11, 2011 Meeting Notes

President Shirvani's e-mail to campus and 2011-12 General Fund Allocations chart

FY 2011/12 Budget Reduction Planning Scenarios

---

Co-chair Giambelluca called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

He opened the discussion by raising concerns expressed by the committee in the previous meeting over the completeness of the notes being prepared. In order to capture the full meeting notes, he proposed that all meetings be videotaped. Member Sarraille stated that the matter of recording and videotaping had been discussed during the March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting. A motion was not supported. Due to the detail in which some members of the committee would like notes taken, member Borrelli made a MOTION to videotape and post on the web UBAC meetings and a friendly amendment by member Khodabandeh to include attributed notes being made available. Motion Seconded. MOTION PASSED.

They will be posted as a link on the UBAC website for campus viewing.

**1. Approval of Notes**

Notes were brought up for approval and discussion. There was debate on the time the notes and agenda were distributed to the committee via e-mail. Motion passed last week about attributing statements to members and not allowing changes to statements made by other members.

Member Sarrailé stated his concern that notes from previous meetings will not be attributed since the suggestions which member Thompson submitted were not evident. Co-chair Giambelluca reminded the committee to send changes to the all the notes so they can be incorporated. When the next sets of notes are distributed, all will be sent with changes incorporated and hopefully the committee will motion to approve all three sets of meeting notes.

Discussion of previous meeting notes has not yet occurred, which was to happen at this meeting. Member Sarraille made a MOTION to put off approving the notes from March 11 until the notes from March 4 are reviewed and approved. Motion seconded by member Khodabandeh. MOTION PASSED.

## **2. Approval of Agenda Items**

The agenda distributed was very lengthy; compiled from committee members' input, the Chancellor's letter, and information from the budget suggestion box and organized to eliminate duplications by co-chair Strong. An additional document with staff agenda recommendations was distributed to committee to be considered as part of the agenda. Since recommendations are expected to come from the campus community it is likely that the agenda itself will be a fluid document with items being added and discussed by the committee and prioritized for discussion. If there are concepts missing, committee members were invited to forward them to co-chairs. Co-chair Strong reminded the committee that they will have an opportunity to review suggested topics, decide if they are germane, and decide a priority and focus on topics and that the prioritization of agenda topics is an open-ended discussion.

The content of the agenda was questioned by member Thompson because some items that he was told were submitted do not appear on the agenda. Co-chair Giambelluca confirmed he had checked all locations which budget suggestions arrive and encouraged those missing items to be forwarded to him. A request to check the links from the website and the budget suggestion box will be submitted to Dave Tonelli. Other agenda items came from previous meeting agenda documents.

Member Sarraille asked to add the budget planning process for our campus, if is not already on the agenda.

Member Khodabandeh made a MOTION to insert A, B, C, and D from staff recommendations into the agenda. It was clarified that they are part of the agenda so the MOTION was WITHDRAWN.

The committee was advised by member Sarraille that items on the agenda should be compared to the charge to the committee and reminded them of the motion passed last meeting which directed how to organize these agenda items.

Member Sarraille expressed concerned that the length of the agenda made it unwieldy to review in a short period of time and member Tan felt there is no consistency in the meetings organization. Member Khodabandeh said that the students are frustrated with the committee's inability to move forward. Member Lonn-Nichols stated that regardless of the ordering on the agenda that all items were viable and that this is the only committee comprised with faculty, staff, and students with a charge and the opportunity to discuss them. Member Thompson responded that the he had concerns over the structure of the committee.

Discussion ended and MOTION to approve agenda was seconded. MOTION PASSED.

Member Temple raised discussion on those items which are most important to the students and asked member Khodabandeh for his input from the students. Priority is graduating in 4-5 years and anything contributing to that goal. Faculty being allowed to stay on-campus, more part-time faculty, and no course

cuts. Other services which have suffered are the tutoring center and career services, which many students were unaware of until it was gone. This list is not inclusive; there are polls and forums with students which could be made available for committee review in annotated form.

Co-chair Strong brought up the need for additional meetings because of the limited time available to the committee to make its recommendations. Member Sarraille commented on the many meetings from last year and the recommendations made could have been accomplished with fewer meetings. Co-chair Strong supported the need for those meetings last year and the commented that the recommendations made by the committee provided meaningful direction to the President. One of those recommendations spawned a committee looking additional information about reorganizing colleges.

Co-chair Strong motioned for half-day work sessions on an as-needed basis with a pre-approved agenda. MOTION SECONDED – MOTION PASSED.

Member Khodabandeh motioned for a Doodle poll to be sent committee to coordinate schedules. MOTION SECONDED – MOTION PASSED.

Co-chair Giambelluca responded to Member Thompson's question about using budget scenarios by passing out the President's e-mail to the campus, the CSU 2011-2012 preliminary allocation letter, and FY 2011/12 Budget Reduction Planning Scenarios document. This information addresses the nature of the cut as is currently characterized, but there is still a great deal of uncertainty about what the final budget reduction number will be. Since we don't know, a series of targets have been established. The worst case is an \$11M cut based upon a \$500 Million reduction to the CSU, but the current allocated amount from the Chancellor is \$7.567 M.

Co-chairs Strong and Giambelluca indicated that they have distributed this document to Deans and Vice Presidents. The goal is to provide strategic guidance to President by focusing on big saving items and provide scenarios which minimize the negative impacts on the students. These agenda items being discussed in the UBAC committee are also being discussed by the divisions, colleges, and other campus units.

Based upon the information available, the date these cuts will have to be implemented is July 1, 2011, meaning we need to be operating at \$7.567 M less than we are now. Co-chair Giambelluca referred the committee to the allocation sheet which shows a negative allocation.

Member Thompson asked about the May 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for recommendations to the President. Co-chair Giambelluca explained that lead time is needed to review recommendations with the President prior to submitting them to the Chancellor which will occur in May - after the committee presents its recommendations. Recommendations made to the Chancellor by the President must receive approval before being conveyed to the campus and implemented.

Our campus student enrollment target is 6715 FTES, which is slightly above last year's target of 6665 FTES. Member Temple reminded the committee that the campus had trouble meeting that target last year and paid for additional classes for those students with Federal Stimulus Money. That money will not be available for offering classes this year. That will mean that we will have to do more with our reduced resources to provide

courses and other support to students. Co-chair Giambelluca said that our FTES increase is slightly less in percentage in comparison to other campuses because of our challenges meeting the changing enrollment targets.

Member Moore commented that we will have to use all of our planning processes and power to deliver these programs optimally. Student demand drives the process. We have to balance programs and basic requirements, making sure we can deliver critical courses for majors, without ignoring liberal studies and GE classes. This is not a top down process; it will require working with department chairs to develop a successful plan. In the past, we have not been as strategic or diligent with sections being offered as we could have been. Going forward, the world has changed and we will have to do much better. We meet weekly in my college to be strategic and efficient.

Member Khodabandeh asked the committee to mitigate the impact of the cuts on students. Co-chair Giambelluca responded that we're always focused like that, but we must take into account that it's no longer business as usual. We have to rethink all processes and look for ways to provide what the students need in the most efficient way.

Member Sarraille reminded the committee of last year's experience the Chancellor's Office saying we would have to reduce students and we focused on cutting Academic Affairs rather than other areas. Now that the target is more students next year maybe there is a rationalization for preserving Academic Affairs.

Co-chair Giambelluca explained that our rationalization comes from the Chancellor's letter which recognizes that processes must change, but the priorities of the students are highest. We have an equation that is: number of students, budget, and tuition paid to come up with solution set. We don't have a solution set because we cannot change the number of students we take, we know we're going to have a budget cut, and we cannot increase tuition. Therefore a number of the processes which have the potential to save money are on our agenda.

Member Thompson feels it would be helpful to see how cuts have been made and would like data showing trends for Faculty and FTES, trend Cost, 5-yr % trend. Budget Manager Legg says it is available on the web. Member Sarraille states that there is nothing up on multi-year about actual spending for any year on the website. There is budget info from previous years and perhaps we can glean actual spending for faculty and staff from those documents.

Budget Director Legg agreed to meet with Mark Thompson concerning the data currently on the web.

Division of Labor and subcommittees were brought up by co-chair Strong. Member Khodabandeh suggests that if sub-committees are used that they only bring findings without bias and only for fact-finding, not decision-making. Co-chair Giambelluca referred to the resources on campus available to provide information to the committee. We have individuals who are close to the processes we will discuss and it will be important to hear from them as necessary. Co-chair Strong advised that we give people a time certain for attending the UBAC meetings so as not to abuse their time when they are providing us a service. Member Temple says if we could pre-submit our questions to these individuals it would also allow for quick data gathering and member Tan asks that any such requests be copied to other members so as not to duplicate efforts.

### **3. Discussion and Focus Items**

A brief discussion of enrollment processes was begun. No conclusions.

### **4. Other Business**

### **5. Adjourn**

Meeting was adjourned at 9:59 a.m.