



California State University, Stanislaus
University Budget Advisory Committee

March 15, 2012 – 11-12:30pm
Lakeside Conference Room

Transcription

Russ: We can call the meeting to order. The, I, I am assuming now and this is a very dangerous thing to do, but we, I'm not holding transcripts. So when the transcripts come if they're, if they're deemed audible and understandable they are sent over to you. Are you receiving some of them?

Yeah.

Yeah. We do.

Russ: If you are not then let me know, because I am not trying to stop them, I'm just trying to just keep the flow. They're not, they're just the, the summary of the actual tapes. Sometimes they take a little longer because I think the people who do the transcription have a little more challenge. If you've not received them, let me know, I'll check into it.

Yeah okay.

Russ: Okay so I'll follow up on that. Thank you. And I will check from time to time to be sure that people are getting them, because I don't really want to stop them in any way. There's nothing to, it is what it is, it is what's on the tape. Okay. Any comments about the agenda? We can move to that.

Frank: A, a motion to approve the agenda.

Russ: Okay is there a second? Okay. Any, any?

Mark: I'd like to [inaudible] the go over a couple of items on the, that I had requested that were on last time, and I don't see them on this time, so I wanted to.

Russ: Do you know what they are?

Mark: Yeah. The, on the last time was 2B, prior year, UBAC recommendations, and I think that was also on the previous agenda.

[Background sounds]

Kelvin: Does that connect to 3B though?

Russ: I don't know.

Kelvin: That's on here now. Prior, prior year.

Russ: Yeah I, I don't know. I thought it did, but.

Neil: What, what actually did you want? Did you want the six or seven that are listed? Or what was it that you wanted? I thought we talked about it last time?

Mark: Right. Well what I thought we were getting, and that why it says prior year UBAC recommendation, on the last agenda it says prior year UBAC recommendations, procedure for reports from directors. So I thought we were going to get information that we could then look at how, what happened in the different divisions was related to our recommendations. That's the point we started from.

Russ: I don't think that people, and at least in the divisions, my group, went back and looked at the UBAC recommendations. But they were told that it was to cut their budgets. You're welcome. And what, what we are going to provide you was the actual cuts and the impacts of those cuts. So I don't know if they, they've gone back to the UBAC letter, because that's not what they were given to do.

Mark:: Do you know why not?

Russ: Why not?

Mark: Yeah.

Russ: Because that was the, the division managers and the president reviewed and approved their budget reduction processes, so.

Mark: Oh no, I mean, I mean why not in the request that went out from UBAC recently? Because that was the question that we were asking. Because that, I mean and that's what I'm saying, the.

Russ: I don't think that, what we did was strategic. What they did was tactical. So I don't think that they were relating everything it did to this particular recommendation to that. I think that what they were asked to do in general was to keep in mind, and you'll see this as a thread, but I certainly didn't ask the, the divisions or the vice presidents and the other divisions, maybe Jim did but I don't recall that, to relate it to a specific recommendation from UBAC.

Mark: You mean that, you mean the recent request you didn't ask?

Russ: Right.

Mark: Well but if you look at the agenda from the last meeting, and the meeting previous to that, it actually says prior year UBAC recommendation, procedure for reports from director. So it's clear that that's what, and I don't know whoever was making the agenda understood that. But so we're not going to get any information about that?

Frank: Well, in the email, do we have these handouts that we have that Terry sent? Are those, those are the reports from the last year's budget cuts. Is that what you guys? Yeah so that's, that's what that is?

Exactly.

Neil: Is that, did you not receive that?

Mark: Yes I received it. I'm saying that it's not, that there's nothing on the agenda for today that relates any of that to our prior year recommendations. I want to get that back on the agenda.

Russ: Okay. You're recommending that go on the agenda?

Mark: Well it may be B or it may not. B says impacts of prior year budget reductions, which is completely different from relating what happened to our recommendations.

Russ: Okay.

Clarissa: I see that as, as a way to incorporate that. So I think that that's a reasonable, when we come to B, a discussion item.

Mark: Anybody see it different, I [inaudible] items are from, are from the agenda, so we can talk about.

Russ: Okay so you're making it, you're making a request to modify the agenda. All right. So is there a second to do that?

Could, quick clarification to that.

Russ: Yes.

Daryle: So I, I want to understand exactly what it is you're asking for, because actually I'm not so clear on the mark. I know you want something to go back on the agenda that was on it previously. But.

Mark: If you look at, here's the agenda from our last meeting. It says, prior year UBAC recommendations, and we're going to get a report from directors that's related to that. This agenda doesn't have that on it.

Daryle: Got you.

Mark: That says, impact.

Daryle: I, I understand that part.

Mark: It says impact on prior year budget reduction.

Daryle: Okay.

Mark: So that's what I'm asking is, are we going to have this conversation that was on the agenda before.

Daryle: So just a follow up. Prior year UBAC recommendations of course well that's clear, but the procedure for reports from directors, that's not so clear to me, what that, what that really, and I'm not saying that you have to answer that question. But that's what I'm not so clear about. So what, what procedure, what are we talking about there?

Mark: I don't know.

Mark: If we had it on the agenda last time.

Daryle: Because.

Mark: Linked to prior year UBAC recommendations, that there was a procedure for of course from directors, I would assume that the reports from directors would be responsive to the prior year UBAC recommendations. So that's, that's the point I'm trying to get at. It's not on our agenda anymore to talk about our prior year recommendations.

Daryle: Well my but there, there was no, I don't remember, I don't recall a procedure, a specific procedure, that's what I'm, that's what I don't recall. I mean we, we knew there was a process, we, we made presentations and we did what we did, yeah. So that's what I'm sort of lost at.

Russ: Yeah the process is that actions were taken.

Daryle:: Actions were taken.

Russ: And [inaudible] the recommendations. But they were general recommendations.

Daryle: Right.

Russ: The implementation has to be at the divisional level, those are all reviewed by the division leaders, and also the president and the chancellor's office. So the question is, I, I think you could, if you want, take a look at what everybody, you know being as transparent as we can here, we gave everybody all the cuts in detail that were taken and the impacts. I think that if you look at the recommendations, you can, if there are questions about that, then I think that's fine, we'll try to address them as a committee, or if we need to, we'll bring somebody in to discuss how those, how to get some clarification. But I did not, and I, and this has been on-going, this work took quite a bit of time to get the units to do to go back and characterize everything they did and then talk about the, the impacts that we've been observing. So Darrell, go ahead.

Daryle: Yeah I and, and I know prior to the, I know I didn't submit a, a report, you know and I don't want to change the language exactly the way it, it is on the, on the agenda you showed me. I didn't submit that kind of a report to the provost after we, you know, after we made presentations, we, you know, we, we met and in academic affairs, or within the college and we made decisions based on what we present, those recommendations. And then, and then we just moved forward that way. But beyond that, there was, from my end anyway, there wasn't an additional kind of a report that went back to anybody after that. So.

Russ: Kelvin.

Kelvin: Mark, I guess what I'm trying to wonder is do you want that specific stated the way or, or can 3B that we have right now just be rephrased to say impacts of prior year budget reductions, with respect to, or something, including the discussion of last year's recommendations? So that as we discuss them, this is included. Is that, I, I'm trying to.

Mark: Well it could be, but the agenda doesn't say that we're going to do that. And again, I mean, I'm the person who brought this up in the committee, so I think I know what I requested. And what I wanted to look at was the recommendations from UBAC, and what effect those had in the division. And so.

Russ: Well I think the net, the bottom line is that what the recommendations from UBAC are, resulted in the things that you all have or have received. And that's the, that's the outcome of those recommendations. Now if there is something that appears anomalous there, I mean I think, as I said, it took a while to pull these together. But and I don't necessarily feel we have to rush, as a committee, to discuss them today. We can do that again. Now if you all want to revise the, you know, if after reviewing it, you want to have some questions or raise some questions, that's perfectly okay. I mean I think that's what we want, we want to be able to do is answer any questions that still, this is, why'd you do this, this has no relations of anything, or whatever. But I think that's the, that's the part that we can do down the road. But I certainly, I would kind of agree with Calvin in this one now is that the goal was, there's the recommendations, and here's the outcome. Now if there's some anomaly there you're not comfortable with you or need more clarification that can be handled, but.

Mark: Well all's I know is I don't, I mean you're placing it like he sees some straight forward connection. I don't necessarily see that. That's the question that I raise, what is the straight forward connection between the recommendations and the outcome. So for example, if you say well one of the recommendations was variable cuts across divisions, okay I think we can look, and if someone in a division like development, could say we got a variable cut. And then we could say, well is that appears to be related to a UBAC recommendation.

Russ: Yeah. I think that's true. I mean in general, that is the kind of level of connection you're going to see, is that you've got a strategic statement on the one hand, and then an implementation that's very specific. But if I took you down through the risks, and we're past our time certain here. So can we, we'll come back to that. Does anybody have any problem with that amendment? Or do we just want to catch?

Clarissa: It's what I suggested a few minutes ago, so move forward.

Frank: Yeah as a motion.

Russ: All right.

Frank: I don't see a problem with friendly amendment, if you want to call it that.

Russ: Well I'm, I'm, I'm, as the chair, I'm struggling trying to, to figure out how we will make that work. So you guys, if, if you want to make that as a recommendation to modify the agenda, then we'll need a second to do that, and then we'll vote on the, the recommendation to amend it. Is there a second to rec, to.

Kim: I'll second.

Russ: Kim okay. Any discussion about the recommendation to change this? All those in favor?

I did.

Go ahead.

Frank: I'm sorry. But before the discussions, just so I understand. So, so we have the, the documents that Terry gave us. Those are the, the narratives of all their reports, okay. So now we want to discuss those, is that, is that, is that so I understand?

Mark: But the point is.

Mark: Discuss them in relation to the recommendations.

Frank: To the recommendations.

Mark: From UBAC, and that, if you look at today's agenda that's been altered from the last agenda where there's nothing what's been removed is prior year UVAC recommendations, as if this item has nothing to do with it. So that's what I want back on the agenda.

There you go.

Russ: Okay. Everybody, any other comments or discussions? All those in favor of the motion to amend the agenda to include that, please raise your hand. Opposed. Okay. We'll add it. Now can we have a motion to accept the agenda, as amended.

Mark: I had a, that was related to the second thing that was removed from the agenda. Last year, I mean last meeting, we had an item that said replacing, reconstituting or restructuring UBAC, and that's also been removed from the agenda.

Clarissa: Restructuring.

Russ: Restructuring of UBAC is there. That's, that's what I was, that's what I received from the, the co-chair.

Mark: Well it, it's his agenda from last time that he made.

Russ: I'm just telling you what I got.

Mark: No I'm just saying, but that's the restructure of UBAC is a completely different item than.

Russ: Okay.

Mark: Replacing [inaudible]

Russ: So what is your wording? I don't have.

Mark: It's the same as it was on the March 1st agenda, replacing, reconstituting or restructuring UBAC.

Okay.

Clarissa: Is this your agenda item Mark?

Mark: I'm sorry?

Clarissa: Is this your agenda item?

Mark: It's one I suggested, yeah.

Clarissa: Okay.

Mark: And also, I'm just saying, that's what I, part of 2B on the previous agenda was, that's related to this, is looking at what is the actual impact of the recommendations we made. So.

Russ: Since this was the prior agenda, I'll replace it with this, and had I seen that I would have replaced it anyway.

All right.

Russ: That's not what I received. So it doesn't matter. All right. So can we, with those two changes, go forward and approve the agenda? All those in favor of approval of the agenda, as amended.

Aye.

Aye.

Russ: Opposed. Okay. The agenda's approved. Want to move to, right away if I can, to this report from the chairs of the, the Holistic Program Review Committee. Professor Jim Tuedio and Professor Richard Weikart. Okay if we could have you guys, thank you very much for coming and you know if you could enlighten us on the things that are happening there. Feel free to come up here. Let's get some chairs.

Frank: You need another one? Here, Jim's got, oh that.

Russ: Oh we pulled that out earlier, so that's good. Again thank you for coming, I know it's a very important committee and I want to hear what's going on.

Jim: And it's kind of reciprocation. We invited Russ to come speak with us at our first meeting, and I'm sure we'll have him come back on occasion, and we will come back here on occasion as frequently as we have something to update you on, which could be after every meeting, it depends on, on how far we really get into things. I'll let Richard say anything to start with.

Richard: Oh yeah, it's, it's actually the preliminary was to give much information to you. We've only had one meeting. That meeting was basically orienting us to trying to figure out what kind of data we're going to need. We haven't actually received from the colleges the, we should get today in fact, we should be getting the reports from the colleges that will give us their feedback on the, the program review and what they, their responses to the Provost charged to the committee, and the, the various points that he had made about ways he wants to see budget cutting take place. So we haven't made any kind of decisions at all, we've just sort of laid out sort of try to figure out what the landscape looks like. And so it's, there's not really a whole lot we can say right now. I think unless you have questions for us, or want to give us some feedback.

Jim: We can give you, how many of you are familiar with the memorandum that set our charge, and the last thing they had distributed widely enough.

Jim: You know that basically we're looking at an issue of how to balance the preservation of equality of our academic mission with the budget realities that we face. And we expect the colleges to respond in, in view of the long list of criteria that was suggested for the committee to take up, and, and make a focus of attention. And we're also going to be receiving mountains of data basically that reach back in, in time roughly five year increments as far as I can tell we're, we're certainly looking at five year increments to, to get a sense for student/faculty ratios, average, average class sizes, and the impacts monetarily on the support for academic programs in view of all of the reductions that have occurred since 2008/2009. And so that will be looked at, not only in the large, but also within the structure of colleges, and then within departments and programs. And we'll be looking at the ways in which programs support different facets of the curriculum, whether as primarily serving a major, or primarily serving general education program, or contributing balance of, of priorities. And there will of course be consideration through the criteria as to whether there are any programs that we are not as committed to as we thought we were in light of the problems that we face. And if it turns out that there's any recommendation to, to consider the suspension or the discontinuation of a program, that's going to go through a very normal process of review that's already set in place and would happen next fall, it would not be something that would happen so quickly this spring. That aside, we do have an issue of how to address what we face July 1st. And so you're as aware as we are the fact that some, some decisions are going to need to be made with respect to how to

trim our expenditures in areas that are not as essential. So this committee is going to be playing, as, as consulative a roll as we can, but certainly within our own work, we're going to be crunching as much of the information as we can, as quickly and effectively as we can to arrive at perspectives that we can turn into recommendations that we'll share with the community for an open forum in mid-May, and then there will still be about a month for us to digest that feedback, and then finalize our reports. So, someone had a.

I think, yes.

(No visual of speaker): It's, it's been a while since I've seen the final version of the charge is going to change numerous times. One of the things I remember in one of the earlier versions, that kind of seems kind of odd to me was, with the emphasis on, again as I read it, increasing teaching loads, increasing class sizes, those things. Even to the effect of changing governance structures within colleges and what not to reduce the on-time faculty spend in governance. But I didn't see anything talking about research, and research expectations. And is that something that is part of this, and how might, and again, [inaudible] see a time back into the RPT process and was that something that every department then would have to reevaluate and would that affect that process, on an expectation side, if we're really rethinking everything.

Jim: Well I guess the obvious answer is in some way yes. I think the, the question of whether the committee would add new criteria to focus on is certainly allowed by the charge, and I'm sure that, especially now, that we would, as deans have gone through the [inaudible] process it's going to be very fresh on our minds, so yeah, I do think that these are, are the kinds of, of issues that are going to be put alongside the, the questions of efficiency, because they're part of the quality things that, that we're concerned about detecting. Yeah.

You know?

Daryl: [Inaudible] I'm not sure what the [inaudible] and so I, I probably should know the answer to this question. But how many meetings will we have between now and the time that we put this recommendation forward? Because we've only had one meeting as a committee, and we need to.

Jim: Yeah we meet tomorrow for the first time, substantially.

Daryl: Right.

Jim: And we're going to have about a three hour meeting. We're meeting on March 26th for a couple of hours, we're meeting on March, April 2nd for a couple of hours, we're meeting on the 27th of April, after Spring Break, for about three hours, we're meeting for three hours on May 11th, that's it. So we're looking at five meetings in advance of the preparation of the report.

Daryl: Because my concern means at the time I, I think, I'm going to tell you, I think it's not only a really realistic timeline for what we have to do. And that's not a criticism of, of anybody who put the timeline

together, it's just you know, I know yeah we all know we've got, we all know it's looming, but this process is, you know it's, it's complex. It, it really is. And...

Jim: It's complex. And I think it, it's important not to view the charge as a, as comprehensive as it is.

Daryle: Right.

Jim: It's not comprehensive enough. Nor does it call for a comprehensive closing report.

Daryl: Right.

Jim: It calls for us to do work within a period of time, that's going to allow us to, to, to speak to the challenge of meeting a July 1st priority and preparing for issues in the fall that, that become more acute the closer the reality crystalizes. So we're looking at, I think, and I think the memo makes it clear also, that there is, there's the potential to, to develop an on-going process that would continue the, the collective analysis of these things, these kinds of issues. And I hope we do that, personally. But I, I know it's up to the, the committee and the Provost and others to decide whether it's really fruitful or not. But I think if we're trying to answer all the questions, it's not going to, it's not going to be very effective. So we're, we're asked to target things that make the most sense to attend to within these criteria. And so that's our first job and that's something that we're going to think about tomorrow in relation to the reports that the colleges are making. That's going to set the agenda for the immediate term of the committee, and that may take us five, five meetings to work through and that may be as far as we can get this time, so that's quite possible.

Russ: Clarissa.

Clarissa: Well I thank you both very much. I'm, this is an immense amount of work, and, and indeed very complicated. I'm wondering, as, as you mentioned the short term versus the, the very long term pathway or trajectory of this in terms of outcomes, where, where do you foresee you know the variable of, of time to degree, and how various programs, or the committee as a whole might seek feedback so that we can, I guess you could say, advantage the student, maintain academic rigor, but again enhancing time towards degree. I know that's a somewhat loaded questions, but I wanted to just get your feedback.

Jim: No that was on the feedback last year. And, and one of our datasets will be reporting on time to degree down to the level of every program. So we're going to, we're going to see the, the pace at which students who come in to degree finish the degree. And, and we're going to be very careful to, I, I think, from multiple angles likely, we're going to be thinking about the implication on progress to degree of the kinds of things that we're considering recommending. So I mean we, we have to remember our primary mission, and that's as stated here, and it's fundamental, and it's stated in our mission that we're here to, to cultivate successful student learning experiences and get them a degree

that is going to serve them when they step out into the rest of their life. And we will pay attention to that. We have a, a very complex problem because there's not much we've approved over the years that didn't address the priorities that were recognized and real. But you know we, we have to now look at the situation that we're in. And if we were starting from scratch we would not build this, you know, we build a lot of this, but we wouldn't build all of it, because we wouldn't be able to afford to. And so it's, it's hard to go in the other direction. But that's kind of the way we're going to have to, that's the, it's the, you know if we were, if we were building it, what would we make sure that we were putting down there on the foundation? And it would have to be the things that facilitate the successful educational experiences of our students for sure.

Richard: As one of the faculty reps on the committee, and I can assure you that all the faculty that have given me input on the thing, and I'm, and the administrators too, I'm not, I'm not saying they're not, but have shown a, a keen interest in dealing with all of these issues that relate to students success. I mean that's our goal, that's what we're here for, and we're trying to keep that front and center in every way that we can to try to maintain quality. And that's one of the big issues because we have these, these quantitative parameters that we're dealing with, that is the amount of money that we're going to be able to put into the programs that we have now, but how can we maintain the kind of quality. And that's, that has been a big issue that all the faculty have brought to me. When you start talking about things like student-faculty ratios, well you know we need to, you know and as Calvin suggests, you know, you know, have higher student faculty ratios and things like that to try to, you know, satisfy the bottom line. But then that does, that does end up eroding the quality of classes many times because professors just aren't going to have the time to be able to grade as many papers, to, so they're going to have to cut back on the amount that they're assigning, or do other kind of things, things like that. And it will, there is a qualitative issue there about the kind of quality education we want to be giving to our students. So those things are always in our minds, and thinking about.

And what about the.

Richard: Any kind of things that are being addressed here and, and cuts, or trying to, you know make things more "efficient", you know the word efficient gets used a lot in, in the document and such too. But I mean the term efficient, it you be careful because it, the word efficiency is supposed to imply that we're getting the same quality, you know, with less, with less price. But we have to be careful that we're not eroding the quality as we're getting the supposed efficiencies.

Clarissa: Can I ask just a follow up question, because I think you hit on an important point, at, at least for, for where I'm coming from, and I think that you know we, we can do many things, but I, I don't think that we can many things very well. And so the quality of that educational experience, and I think that we've focused largely, I think we need a paradigm shift. I think we've focused so much on cutting, we've lost track of envisioning what, what our programs need, what, you know, what

is best, what, what do we need to have instead of what can we retract, and what's the minimum that we can go to. And I, and I'm wondering if that's not a part of what has disenheartened all of us who are so passionate about the investment of our jobs and, and that investment in the students. And so I'm wondering if the committee might explore and help, you know, the campus or the programs, explore what do you need to be successful. What would that look like so that if we said we're going to do ten, ten programs really well and I know this is a gross exaggeration and it's intentional, but if we choose programs that were going to do really well, let's do them really well, rather than, you know, I feel like minimizing it to the point of what did, what are minimum expectations and we've sort of demoralized our faculty and our staff.

Jim: Can I have a chance to [inaudible]

Russ: Yeah, sure.

Jim: You have to really careful with that. We, we all do. Because it's really very much about balancing considerations, and qualitative considerations are not one set parameter. They are themselves a very rich parameter. And there are things that we would love to do, we can valid, they're important, our students would gain from them, and it would cost a lot of money to, to really do it effectively. Now we may choose to recommend that we do that and that we keep that if we're already doing it. And, and we'll be thinking very carefully about what that means to what's left, because those kinds of decisions have an impact on the remainder of, as the provost calls them, our portfolio, right. And, and I think, you know, we, we have investments in all of these academic programs and initiatives, support structures. And we can't pay all those bills, if the reality comes true. And so it may be that we can see ways in which we can impact quality in ways that would be called negative, but still sufficient to address what we need to in that sector, because in another area there's a qualitative consideration that is paramount to us. And we're going to insist that that be the higher priority. So that priority [inaudible] we will be making suggestions about and then everybody else will come after us. [inaudible]

[Inaudible]

Thank you.

Daryl: You know I was going to say, I, I think that's really, really behind the, the whole idea of the holistic review, to making those kinds of assessments, observations. So you know that, that's theoretic, that's the theory behind that. And, and so I think we'll do that again, you know I just I hope we're going to be able to, to navigate because it was really complex. You mentioned, yeah we're doing a lot, a lot of these things we are doing that are expensive, and are viable and all, and you know, exactly as you put it Jim. But we have to figure out well what with, I said this maybe two years ago, but I certainly said last year on UVAC we have to really think, you know, what the university is going to evolve to given the financial situation that we will remain in for some time. And that's, and we've, and I think you know institutionally it's

not that we've been resonate to do it we just haven't been able to get to that, and I think we're, you know, we're getting to that now with committees like this and now the committees on campus.

Jim: One of the things the committee is definitely going to be factoring into this discussion is the profile of our students. Which is not just a profile, but it's a very complex profile and it requires a lot of special initiative on our part to, to take up and address then and help through the process. And sometimes there's an expense associated with doing that effectively. And so you know that's, that's the kind of thing that's going to create the complexity for that came through efficiency questions for instance. Because there's all kinds of research that shows the class size, in certain areas of curricular and intellectual development, are a critical factor in, in how things succeed. And we've already built curricula that are, are kind of grounded on those [inaudible] And so we're going to, to be apprised of that at the college course I'm sure, and, and we need to be aware of it ourselves. And so we have a special chapter because of this, the, the specific complexity of needs that the students have that come to this campus is supposed to alter [inaudible] San Luis Obispo.

Russ: Question.

Professor Tan: I was wondering whether the, the community is looking at, you know, state versus non-state money income. So like you need programs in summer and winter. How do we [inaudible] into, you know the whole picture. And also in terms of the revenue generated by the non-state side, how the allocation, the usage of the money is, you know, in terms of helping the mission of the University.

Jim: Okay. The real direct answer here, this is your problem. It's not our problem. Okay.

Professor Tan: So when you say.

Jim: But at the same time, I want.

At the [inaudible] level you.

I'm just, I'm answering.

Are you answering.

Jim: A little facetiously here. But the you I mean.

UBAC.

This is a.

UBAC.

Jim: To me this is a UBAC situation with you guys really getting some traction on, because it has to do with how those resources can and will be distributed out to, to address budgetary needs across the curriculum.

What we can do is we can talk about where it might be feasible to consider moving stateside programs to UEE programs, or cultivating a UEE program that is going to feed revenue back in but it's going to be only helpful if we know how that's coming back, you know, to assist the academic programs. And I don't think it can be our charge to figure out how that's going on, and I'm not sure that we should get bound up in recommending that, but you guys, you meet as frequently as we do, if not more so. And I would hope that that would be something that you guys could help us factor in by the discussions that you have. So I think it's certainly at least two, two different directions that discussion has gone forward.

[Inaudible]

Mehran: I think this committee's charge is a lengthy one, I have no doubt about it. But I just want, I urge the committee to look because what I hear constantly as a student from faculty administration staff as we understand student's needs. And I think that's a very bold statement because most of you see students from a statistical standpoint on paper that's reflected. And that's not an assumption I make blindly, that's an assumption I've made from viewing multiple, multiple administrator, staff, and staff show me papers. This is what our students are. Now that's not what our students are at all. They're not figures on a piece of paper. And I understand we do have one student representative on the committee. But I don't think that's enough investment into actually understanding what students need besides what you see of them on paper.

Jim: But I would think that that student is your conduit to us with that information.

Mehran: I, I completely agree, but I do all, I would also say is if that was the case it would be three people, four people sitting around the table because I would say that one person could be a conduit for staff, one person could be the conduit for faculty, one person can be the conduit for administration. But that's not the case. We have one conduit for 9,000 students, six conduits for, I don't know the exact figure, six conduits for faculty, six conduits for staff, six conduits for administration. And if that was, if we were playing the sta--, we were playing the approach of that one person can represent adequately, then it would be four people sitting around the table making the decision, whereas it's not in fact. I just, I'm not urging the committee. I'm not saying the committees charged, I'm not trying to discredit it in any way. I know it's something that has to be done and we're at the point in the, the discussion of all these different options of this is finally been put on the table. I just urge the committee not to fall into the trap of saying we know the best interests of the students purely because we interact with them, either in the classroom, in an office space. That's not a student. That's not how you can get the full fill of the student. And I also would make the claim that the students on this campus, I, I've made the point of learning, learning, learning about as many of them as I can on a personal basis, not by having them fill out a survey. Because if you ask me, students, students get so much misinformation from so many different facets on this campus that they don't know what the real issues are because there, because there's so much cloak and dagger. But I would

just urge you not to, this committee move forward with the, with the idea of students can be, their needs can be assessed by what a piece of paper says in regards to classroom size, or majors, or which classes are full at one time, or which bubble they filled in off that, on a faculty's, a faculty member's evaluation, or what they said about an administrator two years ago. You really get to know the students more than just that.

Jim: Have you, have you guys, and, and the ASI, gotten to know your students?

Mehran: I would say we do.

Jim: So why don't you communicate to us what you think is relevant from what you have learned that we need to have factored into our discussion because that's, that's how we're flowing all of the feedback in the end.

Mehran: The, the optimist, the optimist in me says, if I relay that information, that'll be taken at face value. The pessimist in me says I can relay it but [inaudible] but people can still make up their minds.

Jim: I'm sure that we would be willing to invite three or four of you to come to the table if that would make you feel.

Mehran: Oh no I, I mean.

[Inaudible]

Mehran: And it's, it's, I, I'm not, I, I've been, I'm speaking from my experience. Students on this campus in ASI have a general consensus of the system has not, students in general on this campus, the system has made, put them last. Stuff has been, stuff has happened and no student input was taken into account. I can vouch from an ASI standpoint that the input we do put in, has been received, but can I honestly tell every one of my students that I say something that this is a student need, if I'm agreed with 100 percent of the time? No. Because I'm looked as, my expertise of knowing students is not held in the same regard as expertise of 20 years in, in the biz. And it's just, I'm, I'm just, I'm just voicing this out that if we're going to take this holistic approach, and I really, I'm really glad that we're having this discussion and people from all sides, sides are open for discussion. But I'm really trying to get the point through that if we're taking the holistic approach, and we're making this transition, this slow transition in the entire CSU of treating, treating higher education more as enterprising business, rather than a public good, then you've got to report to your primary consumers, and that's either the parents of the students, or the students.

Richard: Okay, Clarissa.

Can I say, con [inaudible]

You may.

Richard: [Inaudible] quickly that, I, I think your perspective is just, in my, my view a little cynical. I mean most faculty that I know are

wanting to get to know students, that's why we want to keep the class sizes at manageable levels. We are wanting to interact with students and promote student success. And we, and in department meetings, in other kind of faculty meetings, and faculty settings, that is where the focus very often is. So I mean yes we may not know them as well as you do, although most of us have known the students longer than many of you have, and have experienced it from that angle as well. But I mean my perspective is that the faculty are interested in student's success, that's what we're here for and that's what we've committed our lives to, and why we're making salaries less than we can make on the outside, and the other careers if we wanted to pursue that.

Russ: Clarissa and then Darrel and then Mehran.

Clarissa: You know I, I hear what you're saying [inaudible] in the sense that students want to and I think this comes from many of you who are reading or understanding you're wanting to be involved, and so I see that that comes from a very good place. I think in the last years we've students have more of an active role in terms of, you know, communicating their expectations to the legislature, and going to Sacramento is important. I think one of the things that you could take back to ASI and back to your constituents, this, what I like about this holistic review and all of the numbers, I think one through 17, is it's holistic and that there's mixed methods approach. And so that when it talks about online learning or examination of technology when faculty are sitting and talking about what the curriculum development and pedagogy that it really is about student needs, and it's about the teaching and the learning, and, and I think that the, the application of it, sure not all students are, are in the curriculum development committee, you know and get to hear all the considerations that are weighed. But you know I, I think it would be really positive, a really good experience if maybe some of the students like, you know, Jim was saying maybe went to the committee. Because I think they could then hear this stuff on paper, it gets brought to life. And they, they could hear at least more about what's going on in their university and the facets of it.

Russ: Darrell.

Daryl: Yeah I was going to say Mehran, you know this, in response to some of your comments. Everybody at the table, I figure what's the number, how many, it's a very large committee. But you know, and you've, you've, in another respect, you know you've made some generalizations, some big generalizations there. You know so yeah, I'm in administration, but you know what I'm not there representing administration, I'm there as the dean of the college of the arts. I'm one person there as the dean of the college of the arts. So, so my point is, there are many people at that table who want the same kind of intimate exchange of information and understanding of their programs, their divisions and so on. And, and, and feel perhaps that that's a very difficult thing to get out. I mean I struggle with that in, in representing the college and, and advocating for things that I know we need to remain viable. Because it's not so easy, because you know everybody doesn't understand, well you know if you're going to have a music program you have to applied lessons, and you know, there are only, you know, how many instruments in an orchestra, and

one professor can't teach all of those lessons. Things like this. So to be sure this committee I think is definitely going to be open to, to what you're, you are asking and, and certainly you have to get, I agree with you, we have to get better, of course. I mean the university here it's for the students. So to Jim's point, I think whatever you can do in your position to help us on that committee, and to try to get that information to make sure we get it so that we, we get it straight. You know I just implore you to do and you know we will support you in that effort.

And [inaudible]

[Inaudible]

Mehran: So I didn't mean to offend anybody here. There are no, all around, it was just, it's, and my views may be a little cynical. But I think I was quoted by a newspaper for what I said to Gavan Newsome to his face was, every student at this rally, the March [inaudible] is currently cynical of the system they're living in. It's your job not to make us believers, but to make us optimists again, because believers follow blindly, optimists question, but still think you have their, their well being. The past, since 2, since '08/'09, students, the perception, purely perception, I'm saying ASI had, the students within ASI have a different view of what's going on with falling into what Clarissa said. But the perception has been students concerns are not falling first. We tried to quell that perception as much as possible, but it's deterred when further studies, programs, initiatives come out from the other three divisions that lend themselves more to that perception. My encouraging, what I was encouraging the committee to do is do not let those perceptions come about. It'll make the job of the committee a lot easier if those perceptions are not allowed to surface, rather the, rather the doc, everything is completely shared in that student regard. And I know that's the job of associated students, but then I fell back to the, if it was, if it was an equally represented committee, it would just be four people sitting around the table. What we have is the largest representative body on this campus but we only have one representative on that committee that's supposed to disseminate all that information. And that's what I was getting at. Don't, don't, on, my cynicisms aside, I'm cynical about everything, I'm a politician now, but my cynicisms aside I'm trying to do what's better for my students and it's not in the best interest of my student body to be cynical like me. I have to be. And I'm willing to be for every single one of them. But I don't think it's in the best interest of this university to make sure every one of our 9,000 plus students are cynical about the other three divisions on campus. So I wasn't saying that it's currently what's happening, or it's happening now, I'm saying, don't let it happen in the future because the perception is that it has happened.

Yeah.

Jim: There's plenty, there's plenty for them coming down the pike [inaudible] our job from [inaudible] more cynical than them, when they find out that their enrollment opportunities are capped, that there's resistance already been reduced yeah I mean that's what I mean by capped, yeah. But you know, or that we just can't afford to offer courses at the

time that they need them, or the frequency or the number of sections. It's just, you know those things are going to stir it up and they're going to feel that, that their voice wasn't heard. We'll do the best we can to, to make it as clear as we can that we have as our first priority to, to invest as much in the delivery of a curriculum that meets our student demand as possible. But we have a system that's telling us that we're not exactly free to do that. And that's a real, real, real big problem.

Russ: Richard and then Mark, and then Neil.

Richard: The further we move down the business enterprise model, the more students will become [inaudible] data. And we will, and if you don't think Wal-Mart and all these others are driven by data, and that's how they, they operate the [inaudible] headed. Unfortunately we're trying to fight that.

Russ: And Mark.

Mark: I just wanted to ask what's the, the process around the report or I mean what are you going to send out a draft for broad review and input, or what will happen, yeah.

Jim: We're distributing a report on May 15th, that's the target date to distribute to the campus. We're planning an open forum, it's already scheduled for May 23rd. And so, and, and there will be kind of a, a chance for, for other kinds of input as well for those who don't want to do it at the open forum. And at that point, we're going to digest what we've received and go back to the report and finalize it.

Mehran: And there's to be, we're also going to have a two-thirds vote of the committee for any recommendations that are going to go forward with the provost as well, so it's.

Russ: Neil.

Neil: And, and I think I [inaudible] brought that back. I think his point started off with still the same thing, we're going to be holistic it should be equal members of each group at the table. Since you're going to have a vote, his representation needs to be there, and that's what I think he was getting at.

Russ: Okay, Professor Tan.

Professor Tan: Well following on from [inaudible]'s comment about, you know business enterprise, I think if we move towards more unique program in, in summer and winter, it's going to cost the student more, because this is, this would, you know the fees are higher. 50:13

[inaudible]

Russ: I, I understand the [inaudible] for this. Are there any other questions for the Committee?

Russ: I, I want to personally thank both of you for.

Clarissa: Thank you very much.

Russ: For taking this on. I do understand being involved with budget matters that you guys are also taking on a very challenging activity here. Nobody wants to do any of the things that you're likely to bring forward and want to recommend, but in the case of where we live, this is the reality of our life now. And it's not likely to change in that time, any time soon. So I thank you for your service in that regard, and I, I appreciate your approach and your openness to this, and listening to what people had to say. Thank you.

Thank you.

Russ Thank you, Jim. Thank you, Richard. Okay. I would like to, to recommend to the committee that we, we should have received in your email the remaining two pieces of data that, that came out, which is business and finance division cuts, and the present office reductions. And so I would recommend that, that you all take time to read them. Maybe we can postpone this item until our next meeting, and.

[Inaudible]

Russ: Sure you may have been sent, should have been sent about an hour ago, from Terry.

Frank: An hour, we got the ones, I didn't get the finance ones and the, the second one, the last two. So we haven't got those yet, but all the other ones yes.

Russ: Okay, so I have them here in hard copy.

Frank: Okay.

Russ: But I think I would rather you all get them and, in electronic form so that's what you wanted. And then we'll get them next week, or the next time we meet. I would also, just to, to try to, to [inaudible] tape by Mark has asked for and has reminded the committee to look at them in the sense of any, put some guidance or remarks on them for, for the committees. Yes Calvin.

Calvin: One of the emails you sent out this morning, general fund initial base budget sources and allocations.

Russ: Yeah that's-

Calvin: Some other things that are difficult to, to have be able to compare year to year, is because there's, for instance, faculty affairs has moved out of the division into its own athletics moved into a division, you know. Enrollment has moved to different ones. So these numbers, you're not comparing like to like. So I don't know if it's possible to, not blow this up completely, but blow it up a little bit so that for instance enrollment of, enrollment you can kind of see where

that went, as [inaudible] was saying in academic affairs you can kind of see that with, he can do that with his, but, but there's these others, you know, business and finance I think now has, what you now have full IT?

Russ: Yes.

Calvin: And so you, you know, there, up until let's see.

Russ: Well I'll just say Calvin, I understand where you're going with that, I, I just gave the committee this, and.

Calvin: No, these are nice.

Russ: We can do that. We can trace those. They, this is always the case when you look at year-to-year comparison. It really, it's, it's really a, a value to the committee and I will certainly provide that next time. I just wanted you, I was going to speak to this one today if we have time. That was my goal to talk to this one, because there has been some confusion about the nature of the fact that we do have a reduction. There is no question that we do have to face a, a \$4.6 million reduction and we may face more. What's not included is all our estimates of unfunded mandates, those still have to be determined. But it's very early in the, in the budget year, from the standpoint of the state. So we don't know what those all are. And I, so I, I was planning to talk about that. But let me, let me just ask, is, is what I propose for item B, okay with the committee? That you all take a look at what's sent to you electronically? And then the next time we meet we will go over those and probably focus on it. If you want to focus on that as a discussion item? And then we will take as much time as we need there, and then we'll move on to other items on the agenda. I'll put that first. And we'll go from there. Is that okay with the committee, and do I need to do that formally? All right. So, so let's talk a little bit about this one page here. Does everybody have a copy they can refer to? It's, page.

Clarissa: '07/'08, through '12/'13?

Russ: This is, this is a budget document I'm referring to. Everybody? I can give you copies.

Clarissa: Hold on a second.

Russ: That one I have.

Clarissa: My eyes are like an 85 year old. So I need like the hard copy of that.

Frank: Take that and pass it down.

Daryl: Is this the general operating funds?

Russ: Yes it is Daryl. If you.

Frank: I've got more.

Clarissa: Here's some extras.

Frank: I think it's the one called sources.

Clarissa: Calvin, Mark, do you both need extra copies? They're coming.

Yeah I got it.

Got more coming.

Frank: Okay we got them. We got them all.

Russ: Ken do you need one?

Russ: Darle do you need one?

Russ: You're good?

Okay.

Russ: Okay here you need. Yes perfectly okay.

Frank: We didn't know what it was called.

Russ: Everybody have a copy of the needs one? All right. What, what I was starting to show here and what, what we have given to this committee for, for as many years as certainly I have been doing it, and I think before I got here they used to do it, is to show the sources of, and uses, of the funding. Because it, it is a picture of what we really have in the way of resources to work with. I think that there's some things that I want you to kind of note. And those are that you know we have indeed, as we face '12-'13, starting in July, we had a carry forward \$100 million figure cut that I explained to you earlier, or maybe I explained to the last group, I've forgotten now. Anyway we had a \$100 million trigger cut that we had to face in January of this year and I used one time reserves for the bridge, the bridge from January to June. And then Michelle and I and others counted on the fact that we did have a fee increase that would kick in to effect starting in the next budget year for fall, and that was a nine percent increase and that would cover the, the base permanency of that budget reduction. What we didn't plan on was another \$200 million budget reduction, which is a base cut. And that's a \$4.6 million reduction because its \$200 million, and we know that because that's what the chancellor's office has told us what would be our share of that cut. In addition, we may have some unfunded mandates that come through, assured there will be some from benefits and there will be others that we just don't have a handle on at this point yet. But, but we know they'll be coming.

[Inaudible] the zeros on the [inaudible]

Russ: No. No I don't, they're just, they're just zero for now. Yeah. All right. So what I wanted you to see was the two numbers on the far right are directly from our allocation letters, that is the amount of money

that we have and we have a general fund allocation. And our state university and tuition and fees. That's what we have in the way of resources. And then the academic and other budgets as you see below, are, are expenditures. That's what we have in the way of projected as of today, as of now. That \$9 million. So we do have a short fall. That short fall's likely to grow. I point to you a couple things that sort of stepping back, you can, you can go in and look at the numbers in depth if you want and, and Calvin's point, I will provide you with a detail of a, an individual units so you can see some of the movements. Because he's right, you know, IT does operate out of really in my budget, you can see their number zero here. But they really are part of my budget now. So yes, Professor Tan.

Professor Tan: [inaudible] maybe giving the information for you, can you also [inaudible] the [inaudible] that move, what caused them to be moved? Was it something to do with changes in the [inaudible] system, such as coding, or is it some other factors?

Russ: I'm not sure I know [inaudible]. I mean the factors are varied in some cases. We've hired more consolidated units in the past to save budgetary, you know, expenses, or the president or others have decided they want a more cohesive focus on units. We are the biggest customer for OIT, as finance and all of the enterprise systems. So that may be the rational. But I don't think that rational or that can be as clearly articulated as you may be looking for.

Professor Tan: Yeah.

Russ: Athletics moved to, athletics was under the provost, then it got moved to, to an advancement for a while, then I think it got moved to the president, and I think it, and you know some of this is you just, you know, you just didn't want to have to deal with them on a daily basis and, and that's perfectly legitimate. It varies in various campuses and you can find a couple of rationales for why it would work. But it, a lot of this is based upon you know what's going on with the organization at the time. Not, not in the, there's no mathematic formula for why.

Professor Tan: [inaudible] when the [inaudible]

Russ: Yeah, well I, I don't know if I can provide it. I'll try and do my best at, just from what I know. But I don't know if there's any real, I don't think anybody wrote down, well today we're going to [inaudible] I think what the president told me when, when they moved to my organization was that one of their biggest users. We are their biggest users. We provide move activity going on and between the financial and the student system that work out of our operation primarily. Then any other departments on campus so and, and I think sometimes you, others look for whether the supervision is, is familiar with the operation or not. So that one [inaudible] athletics is quite a bit different, and [inaudible] management was in the provost for a while. And that got moved when we were consolidating the students services activities and to vice president Espinosa's area to try to bring a holistic, I hate to use that word, but a, you know a marketing to alumni approach to, to student services. So that those moves were made for that purpose. Athletics, I think if you

want to sort of key strategic quality in athletics, and so on, you don't make it a fund raising effort, you put it over with your provost and try to infuse the academic disciplines and academic quality standards that having that under the provost. But so those are the kinds of things. Those are probably the biggest changes that you will see here. Michelle I don't think there's any other big ones. Oh well one more, I, I should say, one more. HR used to be split into part of it being in academic, under the provost, and part of it being in, in my operation and the administrative side. When about two years ago the thought was that there were a lot of duplicate functions, there were a lot of functions that do have a very strong similarity, and so we thought we would put them together to try to, to clean out those, those duplications, and maybe try to make them more efficient and effective by combining them. So those are the reasons they were moved. So that's the other big change that you would see. It exists here now as HR, human resources. So you know I think that's the one thing it has no numbers in the past. You can see these pretty quickly. It has no numbers up until this current 2011-12 that it has its own budget as of 2011-12. So these things are, are, that's pretty much it. There aren't very many that, of these things that occur. Yeah.

[Inaudible]

Russ: Yeah and so I mean in, and I, you know I could almost write them down for you if you want. But, but that's the, the point. The other point I want to make is that here we are, in 2012 and '13. And go back to 2007 and '08, and you know our budget in 2012-13 is \$90 million, expenses wise, is approximately \$90 million, \$91 million if you're really a good rounder. And 19, in 2007 it's \$90 million. So here we are, we've gone five years and we're at the same place for an expenditure perspective. Our revenue has gone almost no where as well. Even though everybody says, you know, we have, oh wow we have so much more tuition. Well that's true, but we don't have the bottom line is, we're still where we were five years ago. But the, the troubling part of this, and I think where some people get messed up, is that if you look at the proportion of tuition and fees five years ago versus today, you'll see that the, the tipping point has been reached? Well that has some implications for us. That has some very strategic implications, because we have to also accommodate the higher, the great need for financial aid out of this. So the greater set aside, and take a look down at the bottom. I mean financial aid's always a protective category. And, and this gets lost in a lot of the analyses that go on. Five years ago, financial aid was about nine percent of our budget. Today it's almost 20 percent of our budget. Same total. Same total. But it is now one of the big gorillas in that, that operation. So and what's happened is all the other things, as a proportion have gone down dramatically. So that's kind of one of the things that's really noteworthy when you hear the, the even the CSU or whether you hear politicians talking about this stuff, this, this is stuff that they don't ever get into, and it's really important stuff to us because it affects us structurally. And so I, I want to make sure and that's why I like this single sheet because it dispels a lot of the myths that may be out there in terms of, of you know, we don't need to do this or there's, there's money out there. There's no, there's no more beside this. So that's the thing that I want to make sure we're clear on. Let's see if there's anything else that I wanted to point out. I think the other things to

realize too is that in early years, '07 and '08, and '09 and '10, not only where we are going down, but we also were short of cash too. We didn't have any reserves. We were negative. So meeting budget cuts was even more challenging and that's why the campus felt some of the pain the way it did. You know I, I give a good credit to the staff and financial services, and in particular a young lady sitting behind all of you over there, Michelle Legg, who has worked through it and worked hard to, to do what the chancellor's required on many campuses to do, and that is to build some reserve. Now in 2010, you know we followed late in the year, 2009, we got an allocation and we opted as, as campus not to distribute that allocation. And a good thing. We got the allocation in November, we gave it back in February. So that was part of the mitigating factors for, for 2010. We did a similar thing, and we've always captured any, any overages on fee revenues to hold base budget and, and that's what's happening right now. So 2011-12 we will have some residual from fee revenues that's base. So we'll find whatever we have. We'll find whatever we have and we'll have to deal with whatever else is coming. And so you know my opinion is this is really important. That's why the campus should have practices in place that build these kinds of reserves. Because this, this state in particular is very unstable when it comes to being able to predict two years down the road what we're likely to have in the way of resources. So what we've tried to do, strategically, is to make sure that we don't get caught in these waves of change and react to them very quickly. So that, that's what we did. We took one time resources to bridge, for six months this year, and now we'll apply permanent resources where we can, and this includes no faculty hiring, this includes, you know, this, these are the assumptions. If we do those things, then the number will go up. The, the deficit will go up. So there are lots of other little things out there. These are, this is bare bones, this is where I am right today being as open and, and clear about it as I can be with all of you. There are no assumptions for any of those things in these numbers. So you know, when you hear that kind of stuff, that, that's what it will mean. That's what it, and that's why I like this page, because it'll just translate right directly to an express line, the revenues are pretty well set. You heard Jim Tuedio say and I, I believe this to be true, we are at this moment being told to stay on 6715, for the coming year. But you know, my fat, if you think Mehran is cynical, when it comes to enrollment targets, I'm cynical. Because I have been on phone call after phone call after phone call where those numbers have gone up and down and up and down and up and down, one month apart. And pretty much assured, right now, that we will not have a string of admits next year. We are over rolled. We were over rolled this year. There's a world of change going on out around us. That change has moved us from a campus that sometimes struggled to get enrollments, to meet its enrollment targets to one that's now like the community colleges and is burgeoning at the seams. We can't keep people away. Our enrollment practices prevent us from keeping people out. We have to resort to things like shutting off admissions, and doing other things to limit the flow of students in, qualified students in terms of the, of the CSU. So that puts a real burden on us. So that right now we are over the five percent, we were, we are being told we will be down at 6715, last time we, we, we did this was 60, excuse me 2008. The numbers are right there for you to see. You can see we were at 7170, almost the same exact situation, 7174 in 2008. We had to come down to 6665, we didn't make it and we got punched

for it. And now we're going to be told to get back down to 6715 from about 7250. So it's a tough, this is a tough balance, and you know I had somebody ask me on Monday when I sat with the provost brown bag group and you know I, I, he said well why don't we just deal with this, tell them we're not going to do this enrollment. Well we just don't have a choice. This is not a financial issue. This is a political issue. And you know the state, with all due respect for all the student representative and so on, that if, if we are not going to get additional revenues, or additional resources from state allocations. And if we are not going to be able to raise tuition and by the way that is a, a statement that is for real, we are not going to be allowed to raise tuition, then I don't know to, to Calvin's point earlier, you know if, if this a public good then you know the public needs to fund it. If it isn't a public good they won't fund it and I have a feeling that they're telling us something. So you know that's the only conclusion I can draw given the direction the funding has gone. So are there any questions about this chart? Becky then Mark.

Becky: I have a couple questions. I, when, when you use the word they I assume you are either referring to the chancellor's office or to the state legislators, when you're referring to the political.

Russ: When I'm referring to the political, I primarily am referring to the legislator because you know a lot of what the CSU does is in response. The budget, the governor's budget is a political document that went and drove the, the \$200 million additional trigger cuts.

Becky: Okay I'm going to just be real.

Russ: So that's the they I'm referring to.

Becky: Okay because I'm naive as to the role that the chancellor's office plays in our system, can you tell me what they're doing to help us, I presume they're a liaison that, that sits between the, the legislation and, and us. And they run the 23 campuses and that they're doing things for us to help us. Now that they.

Russ: I think they're doing things to help us. I think they're doing things, they're doing things that you know we're part of the system. So when the legislature looks at us, they don't look at Stanislaus as a campus, they look at the CSU system. So yes I would say they absolutely are. I, I was in Washington two weeks ago, that's why I missed the last meeting. So yes there's a lot trying to be done to keep funding, flowing to the, to the CSU. I, I think the reality that I'm trying to convey to you all is that for whatever reason that is not met with great success. And, and I'm not saying that only for us because per the, the UC is, has also had similar cuts, but you know for us it's a different ballgame. We, we're not like the CSU. We, we really are like a small localized college. We depend on that state support and tuition, that's our only two sources. We don't have a big research operation. So we're a different ballgame. And to make big wholesale cuts in the big, in the general allocation is a much more impacted thing. My time at UC Berkeley, the state allocation never went above 20 percent. So it was always a smaller part of the budget. So that's a different thing. And I don't think that this CSU is

not trying. I think they're trying very hard. I think they're being met with resistance that they've never really encountered before. And they're being told to go away. Problems are too big, go away. And.

Becky: So are they going to relinquish some of the mandates that they're giving us? I mean some of these percentages like you pointed out the financial aid jumping from nine percent to 2 percent, that's, that's huge.

Russ: Yes it is, and it's unfortunately locked up in the education code and you know I think people are talking about it and certainly the chancellor's office is talking about it. But it is not something that will change in, in a moment. It will be a long difficult process. Mark we want to get to you, you got a question?

Mark: Well just about the, the lines for athletic fees, clear wire and just reimbursements of general fund. Those don't appear in the.

Russ: No they don't and they don't for a good reason. We have been required, so to speak, by the chancellor's office, those, those are what we call a general restricted fund. They go off into a separate fund that can only be used for those purposes. And so we've had to do that in the last year, that's why that's changed. And there are a number of these and like the MBA fees for example.

Michelle: [inaudible]

Russ: Those are some footnotes you might want, yeah okay that's good, thank you Michelle, I. So [inaudible] has moved out of IT to a trust account which is for that purpose. So a lot of these things had to be moved to restricted type accounts or to other, other funds because the state didn't want them to appear in the general fund. They are restricted use, so athletic fees can only be used for certain things in athletics. MBA fees can only be used for certain things in the business school. And so on. So we, we have made those adjustments, that's a good question. People should be aware of it. You won't see that at any expanded form, it's just a mandate that we have dealt with this year in terms of having to account for those sources of revenue.

Mark: So but.

Russ: And they're not available to us as a general fund resource.

Mark: Right but if the money is going to still be spent and one of the uses of funds, categories?

Michelle: No, actually the [inaudible] be reduced.

Mark: Yeah and.

Michelle: [inaudible] the person who had that budget was [inaudible] because it was reduced by the amount of revenue it produced.

Mark: Okay let me ask in a different way. So [inaudible] I think was like a 20 year, basically so we're still getting one point, \$1 million from Clearwater.

Michelle: Correct. And [inaudible] those expenses that used to be in the [inaudible] against those funds are now going to go into a Clearwater trust fund. Because that's what it doesn't [inaudible] need to be posted from now on. Self support, auxiliary and grants are now going to go into well we've got several, what's called internal service funds and we've been told that those revenues can come into these new funds ,but we must expend them by year-end. And so what they're basically doing is having us set up a sub-fund to separate out that, the fees and the funding that comes to the state, and miscellaneous revenue. So they can really see what each campus has in terms of their fees and their general operating fund.

Russ: Yeah they're [inaudible] general operating and so they've moved all these ancillary things which used to be out there and used to where in some cases, you know, incorporated. And I think it's from, from a financial perspective, I think it's a good thing because it forces those units to really account for and deal with those resources and the people that are being charged to do them.

A long time [inaudible] those, those things are about.

Mark: I don't know, \$3.5 million or something in '10-'11. But that doesn't in any way offset this bottom number in the bottom right corner.

Michelle: It does because every time a revenue has been moved to another fund, for instance if you look at the budget reductions for this year in academic affairs, academic affairs had, I want to say \$336,000 in grant funds that came into their general operating fund, and they were utilizing those funds for part timers for [inaudible] time. Those funds were actually reduced from their budget. They no longer have them there, and if they have a part timer that's funded from grant release fund, they have to charge them directly to the grant fund. So it's been a shifting of both revenue and expenses.

Russ: The only they could accomplish this was to shift both.

Russ: Yeah. Well I'm just, I'm just trying to understand it. So there's, they say if those had not been shifted, you know, had this not happened, and those were still there, then that would be about equal to that bottom number.

Michelle: No because we would also have an increased budget on each of those areas.

Mark: Okay so it's not, so it's not, it's not an offset in any way, that shift is not on, so it's not offset this bottom number, that's what I was trying to get at.

Russ: Professor Tan.

Professor Tan: This time you mentioned the word reserve, you know it's good to have a reserve, so in [inaudible] this document when you say reserve, is the base budget assets, right? Is that word the same? That is the reason. I just wanted to clarify.

Russ: Right. No problem. Okay are there any other questions as we are at the end of our time for today. Sorry we did not move. I was really glad that the conversation with the holistic review committee, that is not a committee that, you know, that's a committee that's very important but it's one that you know we'll hear from them from time to time. I'm going to suggest that we have a motion for adjournment, unless there's other questions.

Neil: One further question.

Russ: Yes Neil.

Neil: Just I noticed on this, the red is the work study.

Russ: Yes.

Neil: \$265,000.

Michelle: Yes [inaudible] we get it from the federal government for [inaudible] work study. Actually we're, we're currently moving that to the financial [inaudible] it's the last piece of the miscellaneous funding that's included in our general fund budget, and they do not want that to come into the general operating fund. They want it to stay with financial aid.

Russ: They want it to stay with financial aid right.

Neil: Yeah.

Russ: Okay. Any other comments or questions about this chart? If not can I have a motion for adjournment?

Frank: Motion.

Russ: Done. Thank you is there a second?

Becky: Second.

Russ: Thank you. Meeting...