



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

May 3, 2013

11:00 am – 12:30 pm

South Dining

**NOTES**

---

**Present:** D. Da Rosa, S. Davis, R. Giambelluca, N. Jacklin, K. Jasek-Rysdahl, R. Kamali, J. Reynoso, J. Strong, S. Wooley

**Absent:** E. Costa, S. Jackson, C. Lonn-Nichols, M. Salameh, B. Temple

**Guests:** S. Espinoza, M. Legg, S. Pok, D. Shimek, D. Tonelli

**Recording Secretary:** K. McField

**1. Opening Remarks (if any)**

*VP Giambelluca introduced Ms. Shirley Pok, Vice President for Advancement, who will discuss Advancement's budget priorities.*

**2. Approval of Agenda**

*VP Giambelluca said that today's meeting will focus on the division priorities. Ms. Reynoso moved to approve the agenda, and Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl seconded the motion. Agenda approved.*

**3. Approval of Notes**

*The April 26th notes will be approved at the next meeting so all committee members have time to review them.*

**4. Discussion and Focus Items**

**a. Discussion of Budget Priorities for FY 13-14**

*VP Giambelluca discussed the division priorities and said that although the VPs attempted to provide documents in similar formats, their main focus was on the substance and intentions of the priorities.*

*Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl said that these documents were not what he expected, as he perceives the documents as budget requests without monetary amounts attached. He expressed concern that Academic Affairs seems like the "cash cow" for the university. He provided two examples. (1) Academic Affairs' Priority 1 (Systematically address the uneven distribution of the loss of faculty across departments) discusses the need for a cost analysis of faculty position lines, but it does not*

*address program and academic integrity, student progress to a degree, etc. (2) Academic Affairs' Priority 3 (Increase the profile of International Programs) identifies the "opportunity to bring a significant new revenue stream to the campus." Academic Affairs' generation of revenue seems to be a priority under several initiatives. Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl said that he heard that we are supposed to be forward-looking, but almost every priorities document begins by focusing on the past. For example, Enrollment and Student Affairs' document focuses on the "loss of 43 positions as well as dramatic reductions in operating expenses," and Advancements' document focuses on the "downturn in advocacy" and how we are "behind in our capacity to identify, build and steward the relationships critical to sustained and produce development efforts." All of these statements look at the past instead of the future.*

*Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl suggested that Academic Affairs' priorities should focus on the continuation of excellent programs, development of new programs, and other initiatives that align with the University Strategic Plan (SP). We should tie divisions' activities and priorities to the university's goals. For example, how do Advancement's budget requests contribute to our goal to maintain and retain excellent programs? If these activities are not central to that mission, then they become lower priorities on the list. Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl suggested we rethink how we consider these priorities as opposed to budget requests.*

*Dr. Davis said that he perceived the priorities documents as a series of divisional requests, which encourages readers to assign an organizational structure for the university and budget allocation. VP Giambelluca replied that the intention behind providing divisional documents was to look at overarching themes and cross-divisional issues. For example, all divisions are aware of and concerned about IT issues, like the website. It is difficult to assign that problem to a specific division since all of us recognize the importance of the website but do not have an immediate solution to fix it. Our website communicates who we are to the outside world. Provost Strong agreed and said that the web-communication and IT capacity priorities are on the President's priorities list due to the inter-divisional dimensions of both initiatives. Relative to the SP, Provost Strong said that the opening section of the Academic Affairs document included a discussion of the SP, our mission and our vision without trying to go into too much detail. All of the vice presidents tried to tie their priorities to the SP, but the SP outlines goals at a very high level without actually operationalizing them. As Shakespeare wrote, "there's the rub."*

*Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl replied that he thinks the goals outlined in the SP are operational. Several of the strategic actions in the SP focus on maintaining and developing excellent programs and recruiting and retaining engaged faculty. Therefore, a university priority should be to make sure we hire faculty for programs that are barely meeting student needs or accreditation requirements in order to improve them. Another strategic action supports the professional development of university staff, so we should make staff training and development a priority.*

*Dr. Davis said that he partly agrees with Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl, although he would like an opportunity to read the priority documents more carefully. He noted that Provost Strong referred often to the SP in*

*the Academic Affairs document and wished that the other divisions had also tied their priorities to the SP.*

*IVP Shimek said that he appreciated the suggestions to tie priorities to the SP. Although he did not align his priorities to specific SP language, he can rewrite the commitment to broadest training for staff and faculty as “professional development.” Mr. Jacklin asked if the Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) was still meeting and working on a possible revision of the SP. Provost Strong reported that the SPWG conducted a survey last year regarding faculty and staff perceptions of the SP and its implementation in campus operations. The SPWG reviewed the survey results in fall and presented the results to several groups during the past month (ASI, deans and department chairs, the Academic Senate, etc.).*

*VP Giambelluca said that the SP is relatively silent about infrastructure. He believes this critical area has been overlooked, which is why he focused on campus facilities and IT in his first two priorities. Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl agreed that infrastructure is important and is clearly related to program quality – you cannot hold a science lab if the lab is outdated and falling apart. However, he hoped for priorities that better addressed “where we want to be and what we need to do to get there.” VP Giambelluca replied that he hopes this committee will discuss how priorities are related and how we need to implement them.*

*Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl said that he still perceives these documents as budget requests, not priorities. Examples of university priorities should include “high-quality academic programs,” and then we should determine an implementation plan. VP Giambelluca replied that the vice presidents determined these priorities by determining the key areas that will help the university achieve its mission.*

*Provost Strong said that he thinks evaluating these priorities in terms of operations, the SP, and the budget is a large task. Instead, we may want to consider how net new monies should be invested. Provost Strong suggested three different ways of budgeting: 1) Focus on net new and new investments, 2) Look at the reallocation of funds, and 3) Maintain the existing status quo because operations are so interconnected among divisions. It is difficult to use the SP to provide overall direction for our operations. For example, the Stockton Center is not offering the breadth of programs demanded by the community. The community approached us directly about offering more programs, so the Stockton Center is a priority. It also fits within the university’s general strategic goal to create and maintain quality programs. The next challenge is to determine the highest priorities to operationalize this goal.*

*Dr. Wooley said that he expected the same type of university-wide priorities as Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl expected. For example, several priorities documents requested new staff and MPP positions (such as Athletics: Priority 2: Additional Staff Position and all priorities in the Enrollment and Student Affairs document). In order to understand the need for these new positions, we could tie their functions to the SP and say that “this position allows us to accomplish a specific goal, which relates to a specific*

*priority in the SP.” Dr. Wooley said that this is the connection he is missing between the priority documents and the university’s mission and SP.*

*Provost Strong said that it was difficult to write these connections since priorities were originally identified as budget lines. He tried to tie them to the SP but agrees with Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl that the connection could be clearer. For example, we want to improve the quality of instruction. Exactly how do we do that? Dr. Wooley agreed that this is a challenge and suggested UBAC identifies the connections. Where do extra support for RSCA, new positions for Athletics and Student Affairs, and other priority items fit relative to the SP? Once we identify the connections, we can determine which priorities are critical.*

*Ms. Da Rosa said that she has a different opinion. The SP was written in 2007, and the SP writers did not anticipate the budget situation from 2008 through present day. We have been instructed not to “go back” or plan on “restoration,” so the SP from 2007 may not truly align with our current priorities and constraints.*

*Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl said that he does not have a problem with moving beyond the SP, but we still need to understand the university’s overall goals. Dean Kamali agreed that without goals and priorities, all we will do is manage the situation as it is (short term solution). He supports a forward-looking scenario to identify the steps we need to implement in order to excel. In the absence of some other university priority document, we should consider the goals outlined in the SP. Mr. Jacklin suggested we focus on the top two or three goals in the SP, such as the commitment to high-quality academic programs. Provost Strong added that although some of the SP is outdated, it is currently the only SP we have and should be strongly considered. VP Giambelluca agreed with the provost but said he also thinks the comments by Ms. Da Rosa are valid. We do not want history to inhibit us and should also add key current issues, such as technology. Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl replied that it is not UBAC’s charge to set the university’s priorities. If the committee created the priorities, committee members would likely fight for priorities that benefit their particular constituencies. IVP Shimek agreed and said that although he has great respect for UBAC, it would be concerning if any committee defined the university priorities without significant participation from the campus community.*

*VP Giambelluca asked how the committee will judge the priority requests. Ms. Reynoso said that she perceived the documents as representative of different divisions’ interests, not really in the context of cross-divisional priorities and impacts. Dr. Davis suggested that UBAC needed some sort of consensus from the vice presidents regarding university-wide priorities that connect all of the seven priority documents. VP Espinoza replied that she believes the themes in the vice presidents’ discussions included three general overarching priorities for the university: 1) Meet the university mission and provide high-quality academic programs; 2) Provide student support services, such as advising; and 3) Maintain or improve infrastructure (physical facilities and information technology). VP Espinoza said that she thinks the priority documents address needs within those three areas. Provost Strong agreed and said that the themes related back to the SP, and we can make a reasonable interpretation of the SP and add new priorities, like infrastructure. He asked the committee to let the*

*vice presidents know if something is missing from the documents or if the priorities need to be more clearly articulated to address the SP. There is a difficult balance to maintain between broad and narrowly specific priorities.*

*Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl disagreed and said that it is not UBAC's charge to look for priorities that were missed. VP Espinoza defined three priorities earlier – do all of the vice presidents agree that these are the highest priorities? If so, the committee can evaluate these budget requests relative to whether the requests relate to the three priorities. VP Giambelluca said that these documents reflect how the vice presidents view the importance of moving forward in an environment where funding will be uncertain, we want to grow, and we want to position ourselves in a way that makes the university better.*

*Dr. Davis said that the three priorities mentioned by VP Espinoza map fairly consistently into the old SP. VP Espinoza agreed and said that the vice presidents worked closely together not to simply determine new opportunities for growth but to also determine which activities needed to be preserved.*

*Dr. Davis asked how UBAC will proceed. Ms. Reynoso said that she still wants a presentation from the vice presidents, and VP Giambelluca replied that the process is more collaborative this year and the vice presidents' participation at the UBAC meetings represented conversations vs. presentations. Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl said that he would like to hear the vice presidents discuss their budget requests in term of the three priorities (or four, if "growth" is also a priority). Alternatively, UBAC could review the requests and map them to the priorities. Dr. Wooley asked if the vice presidents' priorities are ranked in order of need, and VP Espinoza said yes, although it would also be helpful if all priorities were partially funded (instead of eliminating some of them). Dr. Davis asked if we should know the costs of these budget requests vs. money available, or some more abstract arrangement. VP Giambelluca said that the committee should consider the priorities, not necessarily the funding. Dr. Wooley agreed that the committee may be able to avoid divisional disagreements if we focus on the importance of priorities vs. allocation of funds to one division instead of another. Dr. Davis said that the challenge in the SP was defining which priorities are most important, and the SP does not identify the costs associated with funding one priority but not another. Mr. Jacklin said it would also help if he knew whether we are falling behind by not focusing on one of these priorities or whether we can maintain our services without additional funding.*

## **5. Other Business**

## **6. Adjourn**

*Dr. Davis moved to adjourn the meeting, and Dr. Wooley seconded the motion. Adjourned at 12:22 p.m.*