



California State University, Stanislaus

University Budget Advisory Committee

April 1, 2011 - 8:00 am to 10:00 am

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, Mehran Khodabandeh

Guests: Gary Torngren, Senior Budget Analyst, Provost Office and Lisa Bernardo, Dean of Admissions

Committee Documents Distributed:

CSUS Headcount and Term FTES by College/Dept/Program CY 2005-10

CSUS Headcount and Term FTES by College/Dept/Program Fall Semester 2006-10

Enrollment Targets and Census (annualized 2006-2011)

1. Approval of Notes

Notes from March 18 meeting were approved; the notes from March 25 were deferred to the next meeting. Previously approved notes have been posted to the web.

2. Approval of Agenda

Member Sarraille asked that the topic to stop all areas of reporting of assessment added to the agenda. Motion to add – PASSED. The agenda includes items from last meeting's discussion, but they have been moved to the end of the document. No additional changes were made to the agenda.

3. Discussion and Focus Items (renumbered from last week's agenda)

Motion and agreement to explore enrollment. Presentation from Gary took schedules from PeopleSoft for 2011-12 and did an estimated cost analysis. It is in an access database and can be manipulated to reflect course costs and other details about courses. Independent Study sections were discussed. Independent Studies have .33 students of WTUs. Internships are included in IS. Cost being in the range of \$955K, which does not include professors teaching in overload. But many don't teach in that way. IS often has many sections because class availability or cancellation.

The session started with scheduling and dealing with enrollment and planning process, and a frame of reference about what resources are tied up in the schedule. The information provided has direct costs of the WTUs of the schedule, without benefits and other costs, which lead to Member Filling stating that this limited information is insufficient to have meaningful discussion. Co-chair Strong explained that by reviewing the assigned direct costs to WTUs for instruction, we can see how much we are spending for instruction that purpose and if there are ways to reduce WTUs. If we reduce the WTUs, the savings would be the replacement rate of part-time instruction and would also serve

in reducing benefits. A WTU is worth 16.65; it's academic workload. Faculty have 30 WTU; 24 instructional (includes assigned time) and 6 non-instructional as service to department or university.

Member Sarraille asked if the committee would see similar information on areas other than instruction and co-chair Giambelluca said if the data existed, it could be provided to the committee.

Member Moore commented that this scheduling and costing out is a process which involves department chairs working with faculty to develop schedule and cost. It is the key information used in this process which determines salary of faculty.

Member Tan expressed concern about classroom assignment, lack of space for students to spread out, and the ability to accommodate the students particularly during exam time. She also wants the type of class considered when a room is assigned. Member Reynoso's research on classroom usage shows them at 85% capacity during the 8am-5pm time. Co-chair Giambelluca explained that the campus has been doing analytics on classrooms which we will share with committee later. Considering other class usage times and using classrooms in efficient buildings, and reducing use of or closing inefficient buildings.

Co-chair Giambelluca asked Lisa Bernard about when classes are scheduled rooms, how is it determined? Lisa explained that there is a priority; when colleges submit schedule each course has classroom preferences and every accommodation is made to match the class to preference as long as size is appropriate. We also look at projections and 3-yr average and if the average is less than room seating we would not give them a larger room.

"Low enrolled" classes became a topic of discussion because it was expressed by several members that these could be a focus for dropping them as they tend to cost more because of low student enrollment. This does not indicate the kind of class it is or the cap of the course. Co-chair Strong stated he thought that 10 students was what was determined to be "low enrolled".

Member Moore stated that in the process of developing courses, enrollment caps must be driven by program. Many courses in individualized areas may be set at 15-18. The provost receives that information and discusses it with Deans. We are not blindly looking at low enrolled courses. Independent Studies, low-enrolled (not because of the type of course), and other considerations are in the dialogue at college and other levels and we need to be more sensitive to it because of the budget.

Member Temple reminded the committee that IS is all about student demand and that they are not classes assigned by the deans, but a department-level decision. Is there an audit we could look at to review needs not being met? Co-chair Strong asked the committee if it is thought the students may be doing IS because courses are not available? Can we see that report showing low enrolled courses next meeting?

Member Thompson stated that he has seen increase in IS because of course cutting just before semester started. The reason used is "not covered in current curriculum". Member Sarraille said the committee also needs to consider over-enrolled courses as well.

Member Temple also inquired about what is being done about student demand and wait list classes? Are we opening the wait list? It does not offer a good picture of what is the true demand.

Co-chair Strong explained that he is encouraging the deans and chairs to have large wait lists before the semester starts so we can get a feel for how many students want the class or section, and open a section in response to the data. A major problem with the waitlist in PeopleSoft is that it is polluted; it is designed for convenience of students and not a good predictor of section demand.

Lisa explained that the campus is moving to PeopleSoft 9.0 and thinks that option is available. If not, there is a plug-in to create that data.

Member Sarraille commented that we're talking in terms of reducing the convenience of the waitlist to students in lieu of course planning. Member Khodabandeh stated that he doesn't think students are investing that much time on waitlists. Students are looking for any class that will meet a scheduling need.

Member Tan asked how the waitlist system works; Lisa explained that as student on a list and a waitlisted class opens, the program matches the student with availability and pushes student to the class registration. She says at least 50% have a waitlist and that will increase going forward.

Co-chair Strong gave deans and unit administrators a spreadsheet showed their share of cut, proportional to budget last week. The cover e-mail stated that it was a place to start and they should identify areas to cut, we would discuss their ideas, and then bring that info to UBAC. An across-the-board cut is not expected.

4. Other Business

Career services – student demand and jobs. Where are our graduates being employed?

5. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:07 a.m.