California State University, Stanislaus
University Budget Advisory Committee
March 25, 2011,
8:00 am to 10:00 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

Not attending: Sabrina Dominguez, Mehran Khodabandeh

1. Approval of Notes

March 4 meeting notes approved

March 11 meeting notes approved

March 18 meeting notes deferred because of changes e-mailed had not incorporated into the document.

2. Approval of Agenda

Co-chair Giambelluca reiterated to the committee that subcommittees, if used, would onlybe for fact-finding and would be providing information for consideration to the committee. He also reported that there was no consensus on availability for half-day work sessions of the committee based upon the doodle results.

There was discussion around prioritizing agenda items which had been decided at last week's meeting. Member Sarraille requested that the committee include the consideration of the budget planning process in the agenda as one of the topics for discussion. Co-chair Strong commented that the discussion of the budget planning process was reasonable and had been included in the list of suggested agenda items. After some discussion of the agenda topics, the committee agreed to discuss the following topics.

2.b. Cost analysis and possible savings
- i. Class schedule
  - 4. Mega sections
  - 5. Leverage technology to improve efficiency
  - 6. Utilization of online courses to reduce time and space constraints on enrollment
  - 7. Improve articulation agreements to reduce course offerings

and

- xi. Consideration of the budget planning process

Member Lonn-Nichols made a motion that the committee discuss these items as a starting point. The motion was seconded and passed.

3. Discussion and Focus Items

Member Sarraille asked about newspaper reports quoting Chancellor Reed as saying that10,000 students will not be admitted to the CSU. According to the co-chairs, the reduction referred to in the news article referred to the reduction of the CSU enrollment target from 339,000 to 330,000 for 2011-12. Our campus enrollment target of 6715 is based upon a CSU enrollment of 330,000 student FTEs. This target has not been reduced further.

Referring to a discussion line from the last meeting, Member Sarraille commented about the co-chairs supplying planning information to the colleges and establishing planning budget reduction targets, directed in certain way, and in proportion to size of budgets of those groups. The committee should look at that, how planning cuts are happening on campus, and how it should be done. Co-chair Strong supported the review of the budget planning process. Co-chair Giambelluca explained that the divisions were provided with budget reduction targets that would help them re-think processes and look for strategic opportunities for reductions. The units are not being told how to do their planning and it is not the charge of the committee to do analysis of the division changes already implemented. Co-chair Strong confirmed that the spreadsheet was sent out as a place to start and that the deans were instructed to work with their department chairs or planning committees. Member Jacklin said he received a letter focusing on reducing staff and Member Thompson expressed his concern that while he serves on his college's committee, the budget scenario has not been discussed by that commitee. Co-chair Strong said he would be following up with the deans and EIC for CNS to ensure the matter was given the depth of discussion required to make the best recommendations possible. Member Sarraille expressed an observation that although the comment had been made that the campus would not do across the board cuts, these planning targets looked like they would be used to do across the board cuts. He commented that looking at historical data, some units had grown in FTE while others had decreased in size. Co-chair Giambelluca commented that one of the weaknesses of historical date is that it doesn't indicate where organizational changes have occurred and where functions have been reassigned. While it appears that some divisions have a larger budget over time, a closer look shows that reorganizations within those divisions can have a significant impact on those budgets. He gave some examples of departments that have been reassigned (i.e. Enrollment Services used to report to the Academic Affairs, now it's a function of Student Affairs).

Member Lonn-Nichols reminded the committee that in previous years when the scenarios were submitted that UBAC had the leaders of the divisions meet with the committee to discuss their numbers and the changes which had occurred that influenced those numbers. She requested that the same process occur this year. Co-chair Strong commented that the committee should not spend its limited time trying to delineate what organizational changes have been made over the last few years, and that they not particularly helpful in determining where cuts should be made in the current year or in the future. We should focus on the organizational structure as it is and review proposed budget reductions with an eye to providing recommendations to the President. Speaking to division leaders makes sense and will be coordinated so their time is well-spent providing information.

Member Moore commented that last year's budget scenario process was very difficult and upsetting to the campus community because it allowed people an opportunity to review the proposals and see references to the reductions of their position. He said it was very difficult and we have to be honest but we also have to be more sensitive to the effects these discussions and scenarios may have on individuals. He commented that the anxiety level already present caused folks to really react to the results of the planning scenarios and in some cases take the actions contemplated personally. He indicated that we need to conduct this process much more humanely. Co-chair Giambelluca indicated that the scenarios this year will be structured to keep the information at a level which is meaningful but not one which causes or adds to the angst on campus. He noted that the administration is very mindful of the situation. Member Filling commented that the campus has a a moral and ethical obligation to notice people of possible job cuts. Co-chair Giambelluca commented that the campus will follow all the requirements of our bargaining agreements in the planning and discussion of possible job cuts.

Member Sarraille commented that many of the topics on the agenda do not offer short-term solutions and feels we have a crisis brewing, and while there are a few things we might be able to start a process to save money, there do not seem to be many to help in coming academic year. Co-chair Strong commented that while some of the topics will require some further discussion and planning, there are things that can be done to begin the process of reducing costs. He commented that the campus may have to use some of the temporary money to provide a bridge to achieving additional permanent reductions.

Member Tan asked if the costs of CMS were paid for by the CSU. Co-chair Giambelluca explained that the CMS changes are system-wide and an unfunded mandate from the Chancellor's Office which affects all business units on campus. The process is well controlled and the quality and integrity of the data will be carried forward from the current system to the new system once it is implemented. Member Borrelli shared that our staff is doing all the testing and the time takes away from current job responsibilities, causing some delay in processing requests.

Member Moore commented that as a committee we have a finite amount of time to give recommendations, but doesn't think the committee will make general assumptions about major historical changes to the unit budget lines, but he also believes that it is important for that information to be available for people to see. Member Tan suggested that footnotes be included in years where major change in organization has occurred as a way of keeping track.

Members Thompson, Sarraille, and Filling data be provided to the committee in the form of spreadsheets as they had been by Mary Stephens in the past. Co-chair Giambelluca responded that official university data is posted to the web PDF form. Members can use the data however they wish but the data of record will be provided in this format only. Member Thompson indicated that he had requested information from Budget Manager Legg showing FTE for staff; this information is not currently collected in the Human Resources or the financial system.

UEE is revenue generating and is considered differently in the framework of the discussion with deans. We're trying the maximize summer enrollment to generate surplus to mitigate the immediate impacts of budget cuts. Their budget for UEE is on the UEE website.

Co-chair Giambelluca was asked what his top five agenda items are. He responded assisting students to degree in the most effective way which includes traditional and on-line courses offerings, reviewing low enrolled programs, reviewing technology and using it to the best advantage possible, administrative efficiencies, and matching enrollments to teaching.

Member Tan commented that at San Jose State they have an on-line student advising system which assists them in keeping their focus on the classes students need for degree completion. Co-chair Giambelluca explained that PeopleSoft will have a similar program feature in the future. Currently degree audit exists in PeopleSoft and has an interactive section which tells students where they are deficient, but its functionality is limited. New Student Orientation should be enhanced by using this new tool. Member Temple inquired about software for student scheduling because it is currently a manual process. Member Moore explained that his college has course sequences or roadmaps for the students to follow which keeps them on track to reach their degree objective in a reasonable time These roadmaps are also very helpful for New Student Orientation.

Member Thompson asked the committee what 2.b.i.6. "Utilitzation of on-line courses to reduce time and space constraints on enrollment" meant to the committee. Co-chair Strong responded that if upper division electives and lower enrolled majors were available online enrollment could improvement. This could be particularly helpful to the courses which are struggling and perhaps we could partner with another CSU campus to save some low-enrolled majors by pooling resources. Member Filling expressed his doubt that there is more market to capture by this move. Having more on-line course available could also be helpful in reducing facilities costs by reducing the number of classrooms needed. Member Filling stated he teaches at night and sees many empty classrooms. Co-chair Giambelluca commented that with all the research that has been done, that on-line offerings are up at many campuses for the convenience of the student population. Member Moore also mentioned that faculty prefer to teach during the day and so evening classes are not nearly as popular; Member Filling stated that the faculty are not polled about when they want to teach. He commented that he is told when and where to teach and is not given a choice.

Without time and place constraints, the notion is that enrollments would be better and it's a case for one ground based course and a second on-line session observed co-chair Strong. A lot of current students are agreeable to online courses, it could enhance enrollment.

Member Thompson said he's not sure how much is saved, but I like your response to save majors and pleased to hear the academic element come into the explanation. He questioned low enrolled courses listed under same heading. What do we mean? Is it well below course cap? Co-chair Strong explained that low means courses which don't produce much FTES and are expensive to operate; we need to look at them and see how to mitigate to save money. If we don't need for pedagogical reasons, we could save time on part-time budget.

Member Sarraille commented that this is an example of one of the things which is pointless for us to be discussing because of ongoing efforts for online education and people are working on it and doing their best. Co-chair Strong explained that this committee supports the utilization of online courses described as useful.

Member Filling expressed his concern that unless we understand the relationship, we can make mistakes about some prospective costs savings.

Member Temple comments that she has never seen data about the departments' success in meeting enrollment caps/targets. Member Moore said those are visible at the department level and the caps are noted in the course proposal.

Co-chair Strong also explained that GE offerings are done by the departments and we could do a better job of reconciling enrollments when classes are offered. We could have a more integrated approach and reduce sections, as opposed to the open market approach allows for the introduction of waste associated with that process.

4. Other Business

The committee voted to extend the meeting to 10:30am and continue the process.

Member Jacklin made a motion that the next meeting be devoted to enrollment and the issues associated enrollment, target setting, etc. Improve enrollment management to reduce costs

1. Student demand drives enrollment and university operations
2. Determine profile(s) of successful students and recruit more of them – improves retention rate and reduces need to recruit transfer and first time freshman.
    a. Improve "bang-for-buck" for recruitment dollars
3. Improve all aspects of demand analysis
    a. Program, course, section demand analysis improving section "fill rates," retention, and graduation rates

Motion was seconded and approved.

5. Adjourn

Meeting was moved for adjournment at 10:32 am.