



**California State University, Stanislaus  
University Budget Advisory Committee**

April 8, 2011 - 8:00 am to 10:00 am  
South Dining Room

NOTES

---

Attendees: 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

Not attending: Steve Filling

Announcements

Co-chair Strong responded to a request from last week about the availability of retention rates by program which are available and can be produced for the committee if needed, but recommends that they not be posted to the web. They are used internally for program reviews.

Co-chair Giambelluca announced that there is data obtained by member Reynoso regarding classroom utilization and room assignments by Enrollment Services. The report can be configured to reflect if it is a smart classroom. Member Tan questioned if rooms within MSR could be used as classrooms or study space. This item was added to the agenda because it ties closely with discussion of items 1 and 2.

**1. Approval of Notes**

Notes from March 25 meeting were approved; the notes from April 1 were deferred to the next meeting.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Agenda approved.

Member Sarraille asked that the topic of consideration of the usage of MSR, closing it for three days of the week and the possibility to change the shifts of employees to 10 hours a day for energy savings be added to the agenda. Member Lonn-Nichols participated in an energy-savings review committee several years ago and can provide the findings to UBAC. Utility costs have increased since that time.

Member Borrelli commented that at one time the campus had flexibility to accommodate differing schedules but now because now there is usually only one person doing that function, it would make it very difficult to accommodate student needs.

Motion to add these items to the next agenda was approved. This information will be added to next week's agenda.

**3. Discussion**

Member Thompson followed up on the total cost of the schedule as noted on the agenda. Co-chair Strong has the information and can provide it to the committee.

Member Tan commented that during last week's discussion of low enrolled classes, the Provost said the class I was teaching (televised, Stockton, etc) is considered one item when he looks at cost of schedule but he treats them as separate sections. My dean looks at the classes and the printout he got it was listed as separate sections. Whatever we post, whether it is factored in, we don't want to post unreliable information. Co-chair Strong said that Academic Affairs has taken into account that there are cross-listed courses, but several may have been missed. He likes the idea of keeping names on in terms of replacement rates.

Member Reynoso shared that the 2011 Spring data is available from Gary Tornngren for low-enrolled courses which is provided by the departments to Enrollment for the schedule.

Co-Chair Giambelluca stressed that we want to understand the data and clear out things which are not appropriate to consider. This concept the committee is discussing is that we should minimize those low-enrolled courses as much as possible.

Co-Chair Giambelluca reported that the campus has received audited financial reports for 2009-1020 released by the Chancellor's Office and they have been posted to the web and sent to the committee.

Member Temple asked if there is an automated system which could cost out the schedule or is there one coming forward? Member Sarraille asked if such a system would involve cost-savings. Co-Chair Giambelluca said that there was no recommendation for such a system at this time.

Co-chair Strong asked why individuals believe that costing out the schedule is hard. He is working with Gary Tornngren and is planning to standardize the approaches and make a few simple assumptions to streamline the process. Member Moore responded that it's not the complexity, but the nature of the changes to delivering a semester in a department. Schedules always have changes and while individually they are not large, but collectively they can have a larger impact. Those issues will not go away with a new system.

Member Temple commented that it would decrease the extensive work and iterations that are done by the staff and could be a better planning tool, and it could improve morale recognizing the amount of work employees are expected to do to meet deadlines, etc. We want the system to help us and not hinder us. It would be an asset in knowing of a need and a tool that can quickly implement a change.

Returning to last week's discussion about waitlists, Member Khodabandeh about all courses should be open to waitlists, and says the waitlists are for GE courses and often have the highest class capacity. Students ask other students about instructors and the class, so some courses are more popular than others. Students want to graduate in 4-5 years with a BA/BS. Member Sarraille thinks some students want to take specific courses and not necessarily just any class; some are interested in what their degree can do for them, but some just want knowledge.

Member Thompson pointed out that that on the schedule during the time that I spend on it as a chair with the stability of the information and doesn't see how at a program level the work will stabilize.

Member Moore agreed that is a challenge, costing out and making sure the program essentials are there but also courses which are not directly related to the core and we need to have a balance. We need to protect the courses so students can go through for degree completion.

Gaging the demand is allowing students to sign up on waitlists for all classes. Guest VP Espinosa explained how the waitlist works: the system can be queried to reveal duplicate overlaps of waitlisted students. If a student is added to a class, they are then removed from waitlisted classes.

GE Mega sections were discussed but our largest room is 180. It had 174 in the class this year. Average 92 during the day, according to the report compiled by Member Reynoso, which pulled information for Monday-Friday, 8-5 because that is the highest demand for room usage. Based on the information there does not need to be larger rooms, but we can change our behavior we could save a lot of money.

Member Moore commented that while we don't have the capacity, perhaps if mega sections were offered in multiple ways. It's about the course – what program it's in and interest of students. It takes time to develop.

Co-chair Strong commented that with General Education, scheduling is a complex situation. In some semesters and categories, we have probably not had enough and others too many. We need to develop a more efficient schedule and avoid impacting effectiveness and academic mission. My feeling is to leverage technology and best practice, and still have same academic outcome. I see waitlists as conflicting, weighing student convenience and demand course section. My preference is for prediction, making sure our data is clear relative to people who sign up for waitlist and what the enrollment rate is for the section.

Member Sarraille feels we should recommend and support and foster the work going on between the colleges, chairs, and faculty to try to meet the needs of the students. Offer classes they need, utilize space using the on-going data to help them meet the need for demanded courses.

Member Khodabandeh feels that the committee can have an initial discussion, but we should have a remediation program before students come to so they are at the same proficiency level as those not having to take remedial. This could be farmed out to other facilities such as MJC or Merced. Our campus has to build something around the Early Start. The range for completion is before the end of the student's first year. Remediation is for precollege math and English; they are courses that don't count towards graduation and bring students up to admission standards. There are Summer courses which are aimed for Early Start and new courses are approved to offer in Fall; some UEE and some mainstreaming students. Co-chair Strong is waiting to hear back from CO on our Early Start plan. One issue to make sure that every campus has the ability to transfer and has courses for ES units which are transferrable to other campuses.

Guest VP Espinosa was asked about Bookbag and on-line advising for students and advisors to see which requirements are missing for degree completion. Student Affairs and Enrollment is working on degree audit right now and its functionality, starting with freshmen and looking to see how their schedules are meeting their degree path. The challenge will be transfer students because their classes are added manually.

Addressing the desire to save on utilities, using certain buildings and shut others down, suggested co-chair Giambelluca. We have to keep some open all the time, but we don't have to schedule them as others. Naraghi must run 24/7, but maybe we could schedule classes which are not usually held in that building which is more easily maintained and is energy efficient. Consideration should be given to the way block scheduling of classes is done and perhaps consider moving classes to single day with room used 3 hours at a time rather than our current practice. This line of thought came from the initial idea that more classrooms were needed even though the schedule did not suggest

they were needed, but it did show that becoming more aware, changing the way room assignments are prioritized and giving consideration to pedagogy, layout, etc. could save the campus money.

Concern of increasing class size or classes and times they are offered end up costing more money because someone must teach was raised by Member Sarraille. Member Thompson asked if this meant adding students to classes?

Co-chair Giambelluca was commenting from a numbers perspective. Studies of our campus show our general FTE and our faculty-to-student ratio of 20-1. If you take that and change it by a small number, the financials change dramatically. The reason for considering it for scheduling is that we have the room to change the number of students. Workload is another issue and is clearly defined on the faculty side, while not as much on staff side. Member Lonn-Nichols feels more diversification and perhaps offering more class sections between 8am-9pm.

Members Thompson and Sarraille felt that observation was misstated and ill-defined. Faculty workload do is dependent up numerous things and more students must be highly correlated with their workload.

Member Moore commented that the course cap was arrived at for a reason. We can consider some of your suggestions, but it will always be left to the faculty to offer the course. We may need more understanding of faculty workload. Full-time faculty want to be at 24 credits (combined) and the idea of 30 had to do with “invisible” credits which they do beyond delivering courses. More clarification is needed about this issue. And is it in contract?

Member Sarraille would like to get real information. If we’re spending more per student than other campuses, I would be greatly interested in aligning better with them. Member Lonn-Nichols reminded the committee that these numbers were reviewed last year and we can look at those numbers again.

Co-chair Strong said we should try to schedule enrollments to hit at course caps and that they are based on sound pedagogically reasons that are current and reviewed. If technology or best practices have occurred for those caps, that we look at those. When it comes to low enrolled courses, we need to look at if we can afford them because some workload is not being realized. It is very complex because of all the data and number of variables in establishing workload, but we need to look at the other side of the workload which doesn’t meet expectation.

Member Sarraille remarked that some courses are overloaded, but if we get rid of under-loaded courses we would be working at more than capacity. The goal is not to make everyone work as much as they possibly can, but to serve the students. If we cut low enrolled courses it might discourage some people and they may not take other courses, affecting our FTES.

Co-chair Giambelluca suggested a 4-hour meeting and the divisions scheduled to present their scenarios to the committee. Member Moore commented on his experience last year as a presenter and asked how did that process assist the committee in the recommendation process? With the possible reductions as stated by the Chancellor’s Office, it is unlikely scenarios will be done in that same manner as last year.

Co-chair Giambelluca stressed that the committee can communicate information to the campus in a variety of ways, but would like to concentrate on conversation between presenters and committee. Member Borrelli prefers to have as much information as possible before making any recommendations. With all the avenues of information, I want to know the impact on the campus

overall. The campus knows what the numbers look like and people may not like what they see, but knowing is more beneficial.

Co-chair Giambelluca reminded the committee on the focus on this exercise and how to formulate strategic recommendations. The committee's discourse shows that no certain area was being targeted as an area potential for savings, but was diverse across campus division.

No objection was raised to next week's meeting on Friday, April 15 from 8-12. The committee was encouraged to send potential questions for presenters to answer.

#### **4. Other Business**

#### **5. Adjourn**

Adjourned 10:02am.