



California State University, Stanislaus
University Budget Advisory Committee

June 14, 2012 – 11-12:30pm

P146

Transcription

[Silence]

Russ: Really have this equipment set up so we don't have to make them -- trudge it around, and so on. The room is perfectly set up to hear us and to capture what it is we say. There were some glitches in the last one where they had this -- look at it, and it looks like a flying saucer in the room. And it's a very sensitive mic, and it picked up all the information plus more. You know, so every time we turn these over to a transcription service, they make a decision about whether or not they think they can transcribe. And according to Jerry, this last one, we're not sure. They're going to look at it, and so on. To do the transcription, in cases like that where they're not sure, they, Number One, charge us a pretty good premium. Two, they don't guarantee when it comes out the other end that it's going to be readable. He indicated, in looking at it, that, if you were viewing it, you certainly could see and hear because it's just like this room but transcription folks are fussy; and so that's kind of where we go. So I suggested that last -- at the last meeting. He said it won't happen going forward because they're really adjusting around with the mics and with the sound sources, and that should not be the problem in the future. So with your permission, I'm not going to press too hard on the transcription of that meeting and that the likelihood of it coming out successful at the end will be -- is not very high. But if you want to look at it, you can go back and look at the tape, which will be on the Website. Is there a problem with that for anyone? I've looked at some of the transcription just in passing. I don't edit them or anything because they are the record, and some of them, boy, I mean, you know, it's really hard. They can't tell. I can tell because I know the voice. But they don't attribute properly, and so on. So I'm not going to stop doing the transcription. It's not what I'm telling you. I'm just telling you that last week's was a startup for here and it is an issue. The other announcement I would like to make for all of you is that last week, as you recall, we had two student reps appear. They really had not been formally invited to the committee and I know why that happens. That's happened in the past. It happened with [Inaudible] Paul, some others. There is a process that we use to get student representation on all committees including UBAC but that had not been done. And so when I talked to Ron Noble about it -- and their students may come today, and they're perfectly welcome to come and sit in. But if it comes down to a vote, --

[No Audio]

Russ: unduly elected members of the student body. Ron has already initiated the process to get membership. It may well be that they're the

ones. It may well be. It's just not automatic. It has not been automatic. So you know, just realize that I'm trying to keep a smiling protocol. I was a bit surprised when they came last time. But without trying to embarrass them or anything, I just wanted you all to know. As I say, it may well be they'll be fine, and they'll be the ones that the students elect. [Electronic Noise] It is not a protocol that it's always this person or that person based on their position. Is your hotel's actually sailing today? Or what, Daryl?

Daryl: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

Russ: I thought I heard a boat whistle and I thought maybe your hotel was sailing away.

Daryl: Yeah. No, I'm sorry. That was -- I had inadvertently hit my iTunes.

Russ: Oh, great. Okay. Well, if you've got.

Daryl: Sorry.

Russ: That's okay. That's not a problem. I just -- I got a little nervous to think you might sail off into the distance there with the -- all right. Any questions about that? Ron assured me that, that had not been done. And so I wanted to make sure you knew. Again, I have no problem with them individually participating, but the students know the process and he has already begun it. So it may not be that they'll come. They may not. They may decide not to come. I don't know. But if they do, I'll explain and you'll understand.

>> So [Inaudible].

>> Yeah.

Mark: What is the process for performance [Speaking Simultaneously]?

>> The process -- that's a good question. Mark.

Russ: And the process is that whenever a group, committee or whatever needs student representation, they go to Ron Noble and Ron goes to the students, and they have a mechanism inside their organizations for coming up with names, provides a list of names, background, looks at the names and generally recommends two, maybe one extra, and, or sometimes there aren't that many who want to participate. For them, it's -- a lot of it is, you know, voluntary so they -- we don't push them that hard. But if they do come through with additional names, then we talk. He and I talk, or whoever is going to have the committee, talk about time commitments, and so on, to make sure that the students can give up the necessary time. He knows that in advance, and he tries to get that out there in the request for representation. But you know, sometimes students think they can do lots of things. And when it comes down to really knowing what the commitment is, it's not something they're willing to take on. So that's my understanding. And if anybody else knows any differently, holler. Okay.

Mark: [Inaudible] he goes to the students that mean -- you mean that ASI?
Or?

Russ: He goes to the ASI. He goes to the union. He has other entities that he seeks, probably focuses on the ASI too, but work through representation.

[Pause]

Russ: Okay. Given what he said about the notes, I'm going to skip over that one. I did not know that until I got here. So I had put on the agenda, and I'm telling my office, that, as soon as we get a transcription that, you know, hangs together, that -- just to put it up on the site so it's posted and we don't waste a lot of time, you know, mailing it out, unless some are very, very, very, very lengthy, as you can imagine. So we're not going to put them out in paper. But we will put them up on the Website. Can we look at the agenda and see if we have an approval for the agenda for today? I did not receive, as far as I know, and I didn't -- I left my office about noon today. I did not see anything that was current in terms of recommendations to be put on the first reading list, and we can talk about that later. But I just wanted to be sure for the agenda's sake that, you know, I didn't miss anything that I could have seen before. But if there are any items, we can add them as we go here.

Neil: Well, if we added something at this point, Russ, would it be considered first reading? Or is it just, you know, some people can, you know, look at it and consider it ahead of time?

>> Yeah, ahead of time. Yeah.

Russ: Yeah, I mean, if we -- if you want to add things today, we'll put them on the first reading. That's not a problem. And in fact, I would urge you. I think I've been asking everyone, you know, please let me know, just talk to Labor Council. I said, you know, if you all have information you want to talk to your -- anybody on the committee, whether it's people that you work with and know, or if it's somebody you want to convey an idea or a recommendation, please do, and that's my goal, to get as many out there so that we can look at them. So it's kind of where we are.

[Pause]

Russ: So can I have a motion for approval of the agenda as it stands for now?

Becky: Motion [Inaudible].

Russ: Okay. Is there a second? Julie?

Julie: I second.

Russ: Thank you. Julie did. All right. All those in favor?

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

Russ: I should have asked. Any discussion? All in favor?

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

Russ: Opposed? Okay. So the agenda is okay. For those of you who did not get to make it, the Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee did have a second meeting on Monday, and it was, I think, an interesting meeting. Their goal was to make sure that they listened more and, you know, I think talk about some of the -- listen for questions, listen for ideas, recommendations, and I think they accomplished that goal pretty well. They did not have a lot of prepared material, and they took less than 20 minutes to take the role. So I think that was a good thing, and so on. There were a number of items and I'm going to put them out there just to -- so that you all know. You've got the PowerPoint that has the detailed listing of many of the suggestions. Most of the things talked about there were rehash or re -- sort of a revisitation of some of those same issues. I think the meeting was good from the standpoint that people are now coming to grips with a lot of the issues that are effecting the CSU and effecting the state and really getting serious, maybe a talk about talking about some of them, some that you -- some were simple as, you know, everybody turn off your computer at night to, you know, looking at trying to consolidate payroll in some location system, like payroll; tiered tuitions from the revenue perspective; permanent reductions of staff, salary and faculty salary; tuition increases; a little bit of talk about the reserves and the use of those potential reserves; and the last item that I recorded was a conversation about the Trailer Bill, which is a bill that's attached to the budget. It's called a Trailer Bill because it's hooked on to the back, which changes the way benefits are considered, or the CSU. I think for all higher Ed but for the CSU primarily. Our benefits are defined by statute currently. That means that when the changes in cost of those benefits is identified, that cost is mandated to be passed through to the CSU. The Trailer Bill, that everybody was talking about in that meeting, indicated that, that would not be subject to law any more but would become an issue for a bargaining. So that's kind of what it means. Michelle, I don't remember. You'll have to help me. We've been seeing the projections of the current increases for just the health benefits. Do you remember what the number was, total, for the system, their increase cost?

Michelle: I knew our campus is 344,000, is our estimate.

Russ: Ours is an additional 344,000 of unfunded mandates, and it could be more. It could be less. So we'll do some estimates. It really depends on actuals. So when, you know, people sign up, whether they're signing up just for themselves or spouse or family, that's what determines, because the increase rates vary by whether it's a single person or husband or wife or spouse or a family subscription. So that's what will ultimately

determine it. But I just wanted you to be aware that, that was discussed in the meeting as an important -- it is very significant. It would be a very significant change to the way the benefits and the CSU contribution is determined, if it were to become the new law of the land, at least California. Okay. Any questions? Some of you who were at that meeting, if you want to add anything, you know, please feel free. The idea here is just to let people know that the system is really trying to get information out on the table. And one of the things that came up -- and I brought it up last time -- is that there has been a lot of talk about furlough and not furlough, and furlough is still being looked at as a very viable way to at least bridge for a year. It could cover the entire reduction that we've been given for one year to give people time to plan, to get into the new year, whatever. It has its intended problems. Some campuses did not implement it, you know, in a way that allowed them to achieve their full savings, some didn't have a real methodology to it. That was not the case on this campus. Our campus, I think the implementation was extremely successful and we recovered what we intended to recover. And aside from the disruptions that come with this sort of thing, no matter what, I think ultimately people became comfortable with having -- if you have to do it, we made it as painless as possible. So I've been being a proponent of that as a way of bridging from the standpoint of looking at financial problems and looking at, you know, having a large cut hit us in the middle of the year. I would say it's a lot better than, you know, stripping ourselves clean of all of our operating cash and, you know, being subject to cuts in the rest of the year, which could happen. I don't believe 250 is the last number we'll see. So I've been a proponent of it. I think it's beginning to get some traction. I don't know where that will all go. Are there any questions about that? Or any other comments somebody wants to make about the Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee? If so, you know, now's your chance.

[Pause]

Mark: Could you say more about reserves?

Mark: I think before you talked about, like, the different levers that you can use for budget, but I don't think that was one of the levers.

Russ: It isn't, because when it came up -- and it was raised by one of our campus people [Inaudible] -- and when it came up, it was addressed to Ben Quillen [Phonetic] and he was just talking about the Systemwide reserves, which is where most of the reserves are, if they exist anywhere. We have a small -- we're allowed to keep a small reserve, 3 percent of our budget, if we can. But as he -- as Ben Quillen pointed out, the vast bulk of those reserves are earmarked or identified for various purposes around the system, and he talked about the cost of a Systemwide payroll. For one month, I think he said was, like, 300 million, is what I recall. Michelle, maybe I'm wrong. But I think that was the number he banged around -- so -- per month. So it doesn't take -- and two years ago and the three years ago when I came in June, the state took all the reserves from the CSU, just came in and scooped them up, because they have access to them, and took them to cover their budget shortfalls and their cash flow. We're putting a huge burden on cash flow on the rest of it, on the campuses and everybody downstream of them, and

gave them IOU's as a replacement for taking their cash. So as he points out -- he pointed out that it doesn't take very many months to chew up any of the free reserves, the available reserves, or divert some of them that might have been earmarked for other things. So he didn't offer forth the fact that there were a lot of freedom or flexibility in the use of those reserves to cover budget reductions. That's pretty much what I remember. Others of you who attended, you can speak to it, if you will. I don't particularly pay too much attention to what -- I know there are 23 campuses interacting with the system. I know they have reserves down there. But I know there's a lot of inflows for a variety of things, from research all the way to, you know, benefits and other stuff, so. Yes.

Becky: Did you get the impression that a Systemwide Budget Committee was going to wait and make recommendations later on this fall after the election? Or did you feel like they were ready to take action and make some decisions sooner, like in July or this month?

Russ: Ben Quillen told everybody that he had given the chief financial officers, myself, specific instructions to not wait, to begin to put together formal plans. He indicated that because it was a question. And you know, the execution of those plans will have to wait, in some cases. In some cases, it doesn't have to wait. I mean, there are things that can be done that should be done now. You know, I think that, that's why I'm very concerned about what's happening with -- personally with holistic review and some of the things this group has been working on to make sure we're really offering an effective schedule and that we know what our target is and we got that translated out. So you know, I think there's a lot we can do that doesn't have to wait until November. So that's what we're doing. We're going to try to do that.

Becky: But I was --

Russ: But I need this committee's input on recommendations to guide that decision-making. You know, we went out to the campus in March and we asked the division managers to think about how they would restructure themselves and how they would do things, and they have. There are things that require impacts on people. There are things that don't require impacts on people. So what we've said is try to impact -- implement anything that you know that will save money [Inaudible], spending one-time money and saving the long-term money or whatever. That's just good operating stuff.

Becky: And [Inaudible] I was actually referring to the Systemwide Budget Committee. Were they planning on putting -- did they say, hey, we're going to start making decisions now for the Systemwide, like safer furloughs or something? Did they give any timetables?

Russ: The goal of that committee I think -- and this only comes from the trustee meeting that I attended. The goal of that committee is to try to influence the trustees, concerning the options that they have in the next meeting. So [Inaudible] executive Council next week, and then at the next meeting it will be a trustee's meeting and that will be the one where we show tuition increases, will come up. The issue of furloughs may come up. I don't know. It might too early. The issue of some of the other

reductions that they were talking about may come up. So I think that this is a committee that's really trying to push issues in front of the trustees for action. You know, I don't think they're waiting until the November for that. There's an issue around SUG. You know, can we divert the one-third set aside to other purposes, or at least a portion thereof? And those things are all being considered. So you know, we just -- I wouldn't say they're waiting at all. I think they're pushing as hard as they can. Okay.

>> That's good to know.

Russ: Yeah. I mean, I think there's a real urgency there. As you all know, there's a lot of constraints on that system at the Systemwide level, most of them political but still. Okay. Anything more about this Systemwide Budget Committee? Let's talk about -- are there items that we want to bring up to include as a first reading item that you want to discuss today? Anybody have recommendations they want to bring forward?

Neil: Just two of them and there'll be some more coming.

Becky: We tried to give them before the meeting and it's just too much [Inaudible].

Frank: We couldn't get away from our council [Inaudible] been all over the place.

Becky: I think because they didn't try.

>> [Inaudible] a few.

Neil: We've got more coming.

Frank: Is there a way we can have them e-mailed to [Inaudible]?

Neil: Do you have a hard copy of it?

Frank: Yeah.

Neil: Yeah.

Frank: Yeah.

[Inaudible]

Frank: I wanted to e-mail them to everybody, but we didn't finish until right before two.

>> I'm just going to add these [Inaudible].

Frank: This is from --

Neil: Yeah.

[Background Discussions]

Russ: So there are two items?

>> I think there's some more.

[Background Discussions]

Russ: You know, it doesn't matter how pretty they look. If you had things [Inaudible], I mean.

Becky: See, Neil wanted pink paper and I said no. Like, we should just stick with the white [Inaudible].

>> Okay.

>> His e-mail address, DJ Moore [Assumed Spelling]? Is this his handwriting?

Russ: Yes.

[Pause]

Russ: Well, we're going to e-mail you two proposed recommendations that will go under the first reading category of the agenda. So they're going to be coming your way. In the meantime, who's presenting? Is Neil -- are you going to --

Neil: Yeah.

Russ: -- talk about them?

>> Me and Becky.

Russ: Okay. You and Becky. Okay. If you want to go ahead.

[Pause]

>> Do you want to check [Inaudible]?

Neil: Yeah.

Clarissa: So the first one that Neil passed out reads: We recommend across division collaboration that will prosper synergistic partnerships, problem-solving and team building. This comes from significant feedback from fellow staff on campus [Inaudible] their insight and ideas. We got a lot of great ideas and actually learned a lot about multiple problem-solving aspects on how we can work together. So this is a recommendation that's reflected from the feedback we got campuswide from the staff and also really not just from staff perspective but truly from the staff who's felt like, you know, as a university community, there's a great deal of value in developing greater partnerships amongst all employee groups. So for those reasons, for the health of our organizational culture as well. That's why this recommendation is being brought forth.

>> Okay.

Frank: I have an example of when it talks about synergistic partnerships. You know, we're talking about Systemwide doing synergistic process. But we feel that we could do a better job doing that here on this campus between divisions, because right now we're doing -- every division's coming up with their own plan, but we've never looked at -- and we even have one where there was a recommendation of the -- one of the committees, reorganization committee, on the academic side, and they designated some positions there that were staff positions to be eliminated. Well, what's kind of funny, there's one department on campus that's hiring a position that's basically the same as one of the positions that is being designated for reduction in the reorganization plan. So if we had areas talking to each other, possibly if there's no need over here, there's a need over here, that could be done this way. So I mean, again, that's just one of the examples that we see. We don't see a lot of discussion between divisions. We just see them, divisions as a whole. So that was just my put on it.

Clarissa: I think another -- just a small piece that's a part of this. For me, I feel particularly -- its importance for me ranks very high and, that, I think there are various aspects where we collaborate, where, for example, faculty, staff and management all work toward retention, graduation. There's I think a multitude of things that we collaborate together. And I think the more we learn better about our own roles, I think the greater our partnerships could be; and so with faculty and staff, with, you know, staff and management and vice versa. So for me, the relationship building is, I think, our strongest piece, and I think that will be some of our most powerful relationships to move us into the next year and beyond.

Russ: Anybody else?

Neil: Can I ask that you read the -- can you read it, once again, for me please?

Neil: Thank you.

Clarissa: We recommend across division, collaboration that will foster synergistic partnerships, problem-solving and team building.

Neil: Thank you.

Neil: I was going to ask.

Russ: This is good. And I'm assuming that, and maybe it needs to be stated that. Do you recommend this collaboration and partnerships and problem-solving and team building and division's effort to reduce their budgets or to meet required budget reductions? Is that what you're saying?

Clarissa: That's --

Russ: Because it's missing --

Clarissa: That would be one of the last [Inaudible]. Yes.

Russ: I don't know how others feel, but, you know, what's the purpose? The purpose is to -- everybody get together and talk about this as a vehicle for reducing division budgets. Right?

Clarissa: I would -- we would --

Russ: Or in the process or I don't know. As -- do you see where I'm going with that?

Clarissa: I do.

Russ: I just felt like it was missing something. I don't know.

Clarissa: The purpose for the budget reduction.

>> Let's make that a [Speaking Simultaneously].

Russ: Achieving division budget reduction targets, or whatever.

Clarissa: Okay. For the purpose of achieving budget reduction.

Russ: You tell me what you want. I'm just offering it out there as an idea of saying I think we need to do something, and.

[Pause]

Clarissa: Do I have this right, Becky? For the purpose of doing a budget reduction targets [Inaudible]. Okay.

Russ: So when you have it the way you'd like it, would you read it again so the group can think about?

Clarissa: Sure.

Russ: Because that's what we'll be -- that's what we'll put into the recommendation [Telephone Ringing].

Clarissa: I'm writing it. Sorry. Bear with me --

Russ: No, that's all right.

Clarissa: -- and I'll read it again for everybody.

Russ: Any others have questions about this recommendation? Or things they want to ask before we move on to others?

>> Daryl, you should have those in an e-mail.

>> Oh, good point.

>> Is that all right?

>> I'm sorry. I didn't hear. What's the question?

>> You should have those points in an e-mail now.

>> Okay. Okay. I'm looking out for them. I have my e-mail open. So as soon as I get them, I will open them up.

Russ: Great.

Clarissa: Okay. So the friendly amendment that's accepted will read in full. The full resolution will read -- I apologize. We recommend across division collaboration that will foster synergistic partnerships, problem-solving and team building for the purpose of achieving budget reduction targets.

[Pause]

>> [Background Whispering] Any other comments or questions?

[Pause]

Mark: I think what Clarissa [Assumed Spelling] had said just before the amendment, you know, it actually made me think of a good example for myself, was just putting online a tutorial together, and the number of people in different offices that had -- you know, that had to go through -- I think I, you know, met most of the people on campus, it seemed like. So I think it is good, most of the time, to work with people, you know, and to build, you know, for team building. But then I thought adding the -- for the purpose, you know, of achieving budget reduction. And then that made me question if Frank's example still would function under that because it wouldn't be about -- we have a position -- we're losing one here and need one here. It would be more about we're going to cut -- you know, we're going to cut a position somewhere to achieve a budget reduction. So I don't know if it fits still under the wording. It's just a comment.

Clarissa: Yeah. But a good point I think -- well, I'll just speak personally for myself. I think since everyone in some shape or form, you know, is likely to see in the division a reduction in regards to budget. I guess the overall spirit of this one for me is the cross collaboration. I think could, hopefully, in those synergistic partnerships, could hopefully be a resource and come from that angle. I think we're going to be needing each other even more, and the more we understand our roles and shared resources. But that's a good point.

Frank: If I could add from past history, I've seen where, you know, we have our separate budgets between divisions, and I've seen divisions get together. And I know they probably have these discussions between them, but they talk about, you know, I'm going to be short over here and someone says, well, you know, I've got money, or I've got support that I was going to have to cut. I could move here. So maybe, again, at this committee level we don't see that, or I don't know that. So that's why I think, again, in the form a synergistic, like Mark had mentioned. I think

that we need to see that -- or because, I mean, everyone's come here and they give us their proposals on how they're going to cut. But as you can see, if we went through those, if we had a chance to discuss those as a committee, you might see where the cuts are going to come here but there might be a need here; so there could be a budget shift between one and the other. But it's more looked at, like, the separate divisions that have their own money and I don't see that, where they could work together for the common good of the campus. But like Mark said, that might go against a little bit about what -- in terms of budget reductions. But I've just seen if there's a need on campus. And I can give examples. Like, there's one advancement, used to do the Webpage. Now it looks like OIT is kind of taken over, doing the Webpage, in a sense. And it's not because of advancement had the cut or OIT had the cuts, because the campus needs somebody to do the Webpage. So I just -- however, that should -- that question should be structured. I just look at it as more of we should cross collaborate more than just this separate entities. That's what I believe. Because we could --

Russ: I can speak --

Frank: -- we could solve a lot of this.

Daryl: I'm sorry. I wanted to -- I didn't mean to interrupt you, Frank. Did you finish? I'm sorry. Okay. So you know, this recommendation sounds really good. You know, the language is -- it's nice language. But I was just wondering though because we're talking about, you know, many ways, a complex operation, you know, you could say. So I'm just -- and I don't -- this isn't any kind of -- I don't state this -- I'm not asking this question from any point of opposition to the recommendation. But I just wanted to know if you've given some thought to how you might operationalize that, how that could work given the -- our structure and the complexities of all of the people on campus who make up, you know, the University in terms of employment, so, you know, union, faculty, administrator, you know, and otherwise? How might that work, you know?

>> I do have some examples.

Becky: You know, we haven't thought through complete operationalization. That's really a tough word right now for me to say. But one of the experiences we had for our staff, UBAC, that I thought was very positive, is we had staff come in from so many different divisions and sit down and problem solve, and we had immediate -- it was immediate gratification. Okay. Here's some ways -- you could just -- you could wrap it up in 10 minutes and save money, and that was just from one conversation. And if we were able to do that more frequently, perhaps through ad hoc committees, I think there's several different avenues and ways to achieve it, but I think it needs to happen more frequently. Then, I know a couple years ago -- I don't know if any of you recall -- that, you know, staff got together and we had this big long list of ideas, and one of the things that we put forth the recommendation was we would like to see a staff on staff level, especially. Our desks -- you know, we each know our desk very well. And to be able to collaborate with other staff members on ideas and problem solving and money-saving, we know our desk well, and we don't have a chance to always get with others. And so I would like to see

-- one way I'd like to see is a standing ad hoc committee that maybe they meet quarterly, maybe what -- you know, I don't know the best way but to have it -- have a starting point and have it actually operationalized. Here you go manager, stamp this and put this into action. It would be one way.

>> Julie.

Julia: I actually have a really good example of how that happens with the business analyst group, that meets once a month. And in that situation we do share ideas. Michelle brings the group together, organizes it. We -- they bring information to that group of people that work across division, all on budgets. And during that session, there's also open discussion of problems they encounter and how one person handles it and how that saves time for them and, that, how that resolves a problem for somebody else. So that's like a really regularly scheduled meeting of that group of people. And I think that kind of model could be used for --

>> Yeah.

Julia: -- different functions on campus.

Becky: [Speaking Simultaneously] sent by e-mail occasionally by accident and it always brings efficiency, I mean -- which is one form of currency, you know.

Russ: Right. Because we do have -- we will be looking at all positions that aren't permanent. I mean, this is just one of the things that people have to do because, in effect, that is doable without a layoff, per se. Frank, you had a comment. And then --

Frank: Daryl, to answer your question, again, in a sense of -- one of the ideas that staff brought, that was something very unique in this process, was they had said, as an example, they're a 12-month employee, and 10 months of the year on the academic side they're going crazy, but two months out of the year they're doing a lot of catch-up. But they can help out in another department, where they're two months of the year, they're going crazy. And so again, this is going synergistic again, looking not just at divisions but looking within the divisions this way. So as an example, you might have a need for one month that you can't afford, or another division has support that they could lend that person within the job classification [Inaudible] to be able to do that. I've seen this happen on other campuses too, where some people work, I don't know, eight months in one department and two months in another and another two months in another, but they're looking at the campus on peak periods of time. I know where I work some periods of time are when school starts, are a lot crazier than times when school is in session. So again, if we looked at this as a whole instead of divisions, you could accomplish those goals and we could A; save some money and, B; provide some support to areas that need the support that don't have it. So again, I know it's complex, but it takes everybody putting their heads together to be able to accomplish that. So that was an example.

Russ: Yeah. Calvin.

Russ: Go ahead.

Frank: He just said thank you.

Kelvin: Again, I'm coming into this late, but it seems to me that you're all given examples of collaboration that's already happening, and if there might be something else to add to this that would say we either recommend the formalization of processes to increase collaboration, or we recommend looking for a additional forms of collaborative. I don't know. It just sounds like --

Becky: My --

Kelvin: -- again, everything -- you've talked about an ad hoc committee. You've talked about doing this informally.

Becky: It doesn't exist right now.

Kelvin: Right. So --

Becky: My idea doesn't exist. It just happens once when us UBAC staff pull everybody together. So that would be something that I would like to see.

Kelvin: We've got an example over here that is kind of --

>> Right.

Kelvin: -- a process that is pretty --

>> Some things are happening.

Kelvin: So it seems like we want more than that.

>> Right.

Kelvin: So I don't know what the exact language is but this is increased more, that -- you know, I don't know if that makes any sense or not, but.

>> [Background Discussions] I think the [Inaudible] talking about working across divisions more frequent than just working on [Speaking Simultaneously].

>> Right. Again, more of this --

>> Right. Right. Right.

Kelvin: -- as opposed to just -- because I could see somebody from the outside looking at this as it's a no-brainer. Why you even have to recommend [Inaudible]. Well, no, what we're doing is looking for either a more formal process that this would happen or, you know, increase the niche. Again, I don't know what the exact language is, but that's --

>> Okay. Well.

Daryl: But Calvin's kind of where -- that's sort of where I'm -- we're kind of in the same place actually, I think. That's kind of perhaps what I was trying to get at too. So that makes sense to me, the way we just put it. I kind of think this is exactly what maybe it needs to say [Electronic Noise].

Russ: Let me give you some examples of what many universities are already doing, Daryl, because I think this is -- I mean, again, I hadn't thought about it until this came out. But when you think about -- I mean, I spent many years at the Berkeley campus and I know how decentralized that organization is, that institution is. They are moving to a concept called, Shared Service Centers, and that is very -- it's a very defined program. So you know, but your point is well taken. And that came as a requirement, that departments collaborate to define those shared service areas. So I hear you. But that's just one example. You know, there are many institutions that are doing that. And I think the other example that I can come up with that we have -- that I have used in the past in other places is that when all the divisions have their thoughts and proposals and mechanisms in place for reducing their budgets, that, then those division leaders all get in a room and really go through a formalized process of balancing all that information across division from division. It's not something that can be done in a large group, but it is done frequently. I can cite many campuses where it's done as a part of the formal process, where, at the last -- that last step. Here, in the CSU, there probably be a step beyond it. So the last step that I could visualize would be that all the divisional leaders who have to answer for that cut ultimately would say, okay, this is what I think and then they get in a room and they decide, you know, so and so can't, needs to have this happen or that. When you do that, that's going to hurt this. So together they collaborate and come down. Maybe it means that one of them is going to have to go a little deeper. Maybe it means that both of them are going to have to go a little deeper. Maybe it means that someone else who hadn't even thought about that process is going to have to be impacted. So that's a very formal way of operationalizing it. And it's something that actually we could do here. We had talked about it in senior staff here. Now at CSU you have one more step and, that is, that when all the impacts are done, after that process, then we kind of do what I think that the group is thinking about and, that is, we go through and look, and if people are going to be impacted by it, we look at the opportunities for dealing with those people. So that would be the ultimate final step and then it would go on from there. So I don't think that what they put is necessarily not operationalizing -- not operationalizable. But I think that what we're missing is, if I can just say that, is we recommend a formal process for -- be established, you know, that a formal process be established for ensuring across divisional collaboration or something, words to that effect. You guys can, you know -- does that answer or address what both of you were talking about in some way? So -- but there are a lot -- there's a lot of money to be saved in doing this and, you know, the net for many of the institutions for -- I know at Berkeley, I'm very close to the folks there still, and I talk to them a lot. It's millions of dollars they're saving by doing these service centers. It does mean fewer people though, I have to say to you,

that, the net is that there are fewer people on the campus as a result in various positions, various things. But we have positions that are open. We have positions that are temporarily filled. We have positions that are all -- there are all kinds of things going on in our campus. And that's what I think you're aiming for, is to get some rationalization of those needs into a place where you have people. Is -- maybe I'm speaking out of turn here.

[Background Discussions]

Clarissa: Can I?

Russ: Yes, [Inaudible].

Clarissa: Can I just add something? So you know, we -- I think it's somewhat noted that the budget reduction scenarios -- in those scenarios, it does say that some positions would be in jeopardy. But I think, for putting it on the record, this recommendation isn't to -- it's not to reduce them. It's not -- well, sorry. Let me -- this recommendation is not meant to make for the reductions and the employee groups here on this campus, if that makes sense. It's not saying let's do this so we can further --

Neil: -- downsize.

Clarissa: -- downsize. This is sort of acknowledging the constraints we presently have on faculty, staff and administrators, and is looking for other ideas to not get to it, because we're already cutting bone marrow, if that makes sense.

Russ: Well, it does. But I think, you know -- I think that's probably true across the campus. And that's what makes 5.3 million a very challenging thing for this committee. So what I really want to say is, that, if you're saying we need a formalized process to look at it, --

>> Yeah.

Russ: -- I wouldn't speculate on the outcome.

Clarissa: Right. That's what I'm --

Russ: I don't think you can.

Clarissa: -- separate from --

Russ: I'm not -- I'm giving you examples of how it's been operationalized.

Clarissa: Okay.

Russ: I'm not saying that in this campus it would result to this or it would result to that.

Clarissa: Sure.

Russ: I'm saying, at Berkeley, it resulted in a \$15 million annual savings and it's going to impact in these ways. That's what they've done. And that's a lot of money for them, because over 10 years, that gets to be a significant sum. And that's just now. I mean, then there's the other things they're doing with Systemwide by doing that collaboration, if you will. But what you're saying is there's -- you need -- we don't have a formal process for cross divisional collaboration, reconciliation and partnership development in order to save money. That's the goal here. I mean, if it isn't, we've got to rethink it.

Clarissa: [Speaking Simultaneously] you know, I'd like to make sure we keep those.

Clarissa: Shall I reread it? Shall we -- shall I reread it? That way we can all --

Russ: Please.

Clarissa: -- have language. We recommend a formal process be established for ensuring across division collaboration that will foster synergistic partnerships, problem solving and team building for the purpose of achieving budget reduction targets. Do I have that accurate?

Russ: Can you tell me?

[Inaudible]

Russ: Go ahead, Daryl.

Daryl: No, I was just saying that sounds like -- that sounds good. That sounds like what we're talking about getting to, so.

Russ: Clarissa, could I ask for examples.

Daryl: I think it's specific that -- and it speaks to some of the issues that just kind of came up with the comments.

[Background Discussions]

Russ: Okay.

Russ: All right. I will put it in the -- at agenda this way. Any other questions? Comments?

Neil: Well, I only have one comment, that is, we aren't replacing people right now. Some jobs are not getting refilled. So in a way, this is, by collaboration and working together and stuff, we can actually cover those positions more efficiently and that is in the savings. And you're right. We're losing people, but we don't intend to just eliminate people. We're filling -- backfilling with cross training, doing that with each other so we're all functioning correctly to keep this University afloat.

Russ: Yeah. I wasn't specifying specifics of this campus. I'm just -- I was out telling you how we did it or how others have done it in other institutions.

Russ: Okay. That's that one. Any others that need to be put in the record? There's one more here. Who's going to deal with that one?

Becky: I can do it. We recommend increasing revenue through University Extended Education by diversifying course and program offerings for the purpose of enhancing workforce development opportunities in our region.

[Pause]

Russ: I mean, Calvin's comment before, might we apply here, as we're already doing some of this. Is there something that we want to emphasize, Calvin?

Kelvin: The concern I have about this is that I feel like every meeting that I come here I say, well, how are we getting the UEE money over to support us and, that, we keep doing a whole bunch more of these and it still doesn't -- we still have the same problem, that, and none of that can help us with these cuts, or we can't do it enough. So we have a whole bunch of people doing a whole lot more work and we can't use it for our bottom line. That's the biggest concern I have about this UEE we have. We've been doing this for a long time now, and there are questions I bring every time that never gets answered.

Russ: Okay. Michelle, I see you back there. Don't worry. But go ahead, Neil [Assumed Spelling]. And Julie, did you have a [Speaking Simultaneously]?

Neil: One of the groups that came in was business and they actually were hiring faculty and I asked -- and I don't remember her name now. It's not coming to me. But --

[Inaudible]

Neil: Yeah. No, not our forum. When they came here, business. She was saying that you could actually hire staff too using UEE money. So it does somehow get back. They're using that.

Kelvin: But there's a big chunk, is not.

Neil: What's that?

Kelvin: There's a big chunk that isn't.

Neil: Oh, well, I'm just pointing out that it is being able to get funneled back, in some cases. And hopefully, in the future we can figure out better ways.

Russ: Julie and then Michelle.

Julia: One of the [Inaudible] Webinar was that they were looking at tax and rent on Institute and Centers, UEE grants and rent and et cetera. So they're -- I know Michelle is working on it. It would be appropriately [Static: Inaudible] originally so that it's not a question after-the-fact, how do we spend that money. You've got to cost out the actual cost.

[Static: Inaudible]

>> Michelle --

[Static: Inaudible]

>> [Inaudible] working on this.

Michelle: I just wanted to respond to that UEE [Inaudible].

Russ: Yes.

Michelle: [Inaudible] and it hasn't officially been done, but what has been decided is to utilize this year's revenue and basically fund the library for those summer and winter sessions because that benefits all of academic affairs. So I think they're using those UEE funds to offset the cuts to the library so they can still provide that same level of service.

Russ: It's on a one-time basis. They are one-time funding.

Michelle: Right.

Russ: But if they do it again next year, then, you know, that's [Inaudible] recurring but not a permanent base. Okay. Daryl. And I would say further -- just before I get interrupted, Daryl, for one second. I know Calvin that you're concerned and your concern is really valid about it. But we do have a process now that we think is really close to being finalized. And I think once that gets through to the necessary reviews and approvals, then you'll start to see that flow, and I think you'll see it flow in a rational and in a very transparent way. That's what we've been aiming for, something that's auditable and visible and I don't -- you know.

Mark: Can you give us a brief description on it?

Russ: Well, I think it goes along with what Julie said. One of the things that we were not doing is we were not fully capturing the full cost of summer or any innercession, that special session. So we've gone down and got that, all that information now and it changes, you know. It's not appropriate to have UEE function on the campus and not pay for services for custodians or pay for actual use of the facilities, and so on. So that we just not -- did not do here, not fully. So it's been one of my goals over the last couple of years to keep refining that fully-costed formula and apply it to all of these [Inaudible], not just UEE, but I've got a lot of other self-supports that I have to do it with too. And they've been getting the same deal and that's just -- that's not appropriate because it really means that some of the groups wind up doing

service and not getting any reimbursement for the service they're providing. So Daryl and then Calvin.

Daryl: Yeah. I just didn't -- you know what, with UEE, of course, the focus is always on -- I shouldn't say always -- but we have been focusing on, okay, the revenue, the money, how is it going to get that to the program, and so on, and that's, you know, appropriately so. But I didn't want to miss -- I didn't want us to miss what I think seems to be the primary intent of this recommendation that's got to do with programs, program offerings, enhancing workforce development opportunities in the region. That's a specific thing. I don't know who wrote this. But it seems to me that, that's the primary thing in the recommendation because, of course, UEE, we are continually trying to build, you know, more program offerings for this particular delivery to targeted groups in the region. So in terms of enhancing workforce development opportunities, can anyone or the authors of the recommendation, can you speak to that a little bit in more detail perhaps? I think I understand what it means, that, it sounds like a good idea. But I wondered if perhaps you could be a little bit -- give an example of just that kind of enhancement. Was I clear? No?

Russ: Yeah.

Daryl: Okay.

Russ: Anybody want to comment?

>> Well -- let me collect my thoughts.

Daryl: So I mean, this, of course, when you talk about enhancing workforce development, I mean, okay, so what are there in the region? You know, there -- I imagine there are various workforces or specific industries perhaps. Is this what you're talking about in terms of development? Yeah?

>> Well, maybe I can --

>> Mr. Tan [Assumed Spelling], you go ahead. Calvin, did you want to speak?

>> No, no. I'm on kind of a different [Inaudible].

Tan: Yeah. I guess I might speak on that, Daryl. I was at the University Extended Education Website because I might be teaching summer now. And I noticed now that the Extended Ed is offering a certificate program. I mean, I didn't put into detail them, you know, but it seems to be, you know, kind of variety, or maybe this recommendation is maybe -- is to add to the list that they have on their [Inaudible]. Maybe, you know, finding out what kind of certificate programs that Odyssey CSU might be offering and then maybe we can also offer it in this area. So I mean, I'm not sure, like, the current certificate program for what, doing it, you know. Yeah.

Daryl: No. Can I just interject? Thanks Professor Tan. But you know, I think, you know, again, you know, it's a really smart statement but, you know, again, operationalizing that because I think you can save that. But you really have to go and reach out to these industries to see what kinds of things their employees may want or need to give them those development opportunities and then bring that back to campus to see if faculty and the folks in our various programs, you know, if there's a way to develop things to meet that need. I just think it's -- again, it's a really broad kind of statement, but I'm trying to get us to really specify maybe how we could, you know, get to that because I don't think it's so easy to do, like, of course, nothing is. But that's really what my comment -- sir, my comments are about.

[Inaudible]

Tan: Okay. Maybe the recommendation that you all have in front of you, instead of cost and program offering, just say diverse or increasing offering, you know, just without specifying costs or programs. So it can be anything that is offered to UEE, you know. Make it more flexible.

Russ: My question to all of you is -- I've got to ask the question -- how will this help our budget situation?

Daryl: It enhances revenue, I think, but I think that's what's behind that. I think it's about enhanced revenue [Speaking Simultaneously] because those are. That's what I believe it's about.

Neil: Years ago, it hasn't happened in a while, but we used to teach here making class, which was on Extended Ed, and it -- you know, he had to pay for the use of all the equipment in the room, the time, everything, all that went -- came back to the University, all that money that he generated through the -- even I got a little kickback because I was the technician.

Clarissa: Maybe we're already doing it all.

>> I don't know.

Clarissa: Yeah. I think that there's -- what everyone is speaking to -- I think that there's a multitude of opportunity. I think it isn't a static piece. I think that there's mainstay pieces with workforce development, but there's also, you know, various ebb and flow with different industries, as I think Daryl, you know, highlighted and Professor Tan. So I think, for me, I'm okay with leaving it general. But I agree that the point about Professor Tan adding the word, increase, right before diversifying, and we could, you know -- of course, we could delete course and program. I think offerings is sufficient enough. I think this is meant to be broad in the sense that -- my feeling is you let the people that are involved with that area sort of make the decisions on the operational side as to how to increase it, what's the feasibility, what are the limitations. So for me, I wouldn't want to write any more specifics. I know we could if we agreed on them, I suppose. But for me, I understand where this recommendation is up from the broader sense.

Russ: Okay. So in the interest of keeping this moving, go ahead, Daryl.

Daryl: I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Russ. Well, I was just going to say -- you know, you might want to say some of that really [Inaudible] there's got to be a partnership with the specific industries, so these companies or, you know, these groups. I think that's really important, because without that, you know, you're going to be developing -- you would be developing things perhaps to that and that might not meet those needs. So I think a statement that may be -- something that maybe addresses that in there, you know, might be -- I mean, it might be helpful. Perhaps you think it's a given and people make that assumption, but I think that might be a helpful thing to add. I'm sorry. Thank you.

[Pause]

Kelvin: I think the other -- I agree with Daryl -- but I think the other part of it is, you know, I know of programs right now that are developing programs for UEE and others that are thinking about it. One of the big difficulties they have is it's often done as extra work above their already heavy loads. And so if there's some way you could -- if we [Inaudible] increase in revenues, making sure that the people that are doing this work up front are getting support through UEE. It's incentivizing a little bit maybe more so that, you know, again, this -- the development stuff is done extra a lot of times. And so I'm looking at the departments that are trying to do these things. It's a heckuva lot of work.

Clarissa: It's a lot of work [Inaudible] aren't going out right now.

[Background Discussions]

Tan: I mean, most of the time there's like this pay scale that you have to follow.

>> Yeah.

>> Yeah, it's kind of [Inaudible].

Neil: There's differences between if you're teaching it. We're talking now about --

>> -- the development.

>> -- the development, which is very labor-intensive [Inaudible] talking about.

>> Yeah.

Tan: Russ, I want to ask about this [Inaudible] that I see in the UEE Website. How does that operate? Because I'm -- like, it's just a certificate; right? So the revenue that comes in, you know, it goes into the University. How much is it? Is it a lot? And you know, who actually teaches those certificate program? Are they people on campus? Like, they

offer stuff on campus or faculty on campus? Or they can outsource to some organization somewhere, you know, lingering on Website?

Russ: I don't know specifically. But if we wanted, we could get Kevin to come in.

Tan: Yeah.

[Background Discussions]

Frank: It's like this -- the group called the Gatlin Group or something. It was like a private company, that, I log into a Website and it was already all there and I'd sit there [Inaudible] and do my homework and then afterwards I get a certificate from this company. So --

Tan: You get it from the University [Speaking Simultaneously].

Frank: Why, I would have to register through our University.

Tan: Oh.

Frank: KR University, but then I went on to some portal and it took me somewhere else and I already had the class and I could ask the teacher questions and they would send me e-mails back and forth.

Tan: Now how much this University get for providing that link?

Frank: Again, I don't know that question. I just explain how I -- how it worked. And then they give you -- you have to take so many.

Tan: Yeah.

Frank: There's certificates [Speaking Simultaneously].

Tan: Why don't we do it ourselves? I mean, [Speaking simultaneously].

Frank: That's a lot of work. Yeah. Yeah.

Frank: These people went out and did the work.

Tan: Yeah, I know. But how much does our University get for providing that link, you know, that he clicked?

Frank: So it cost me \$80. How much did the campus give? And how much did they give?

Tan: Yeah. Yeah.

Tan: Yeah.

Tan: Yeah.

>> It must have been a lot.

>> It was about -- yeah, 70 or 80.

Tan: Maybe get \$10.

Michelle: We could just bring the general business club for UEE, the page that shows what programs they're offering and the overall revenues.

>> Yeah.

>> Yeah.

Russ: I think we could do that. And I think it would also be very interesting to have Kevin, you know, if we wanted to do that, just have him give you a brief because it's changed. You know, it's probably changed a little bit from their plan, and probably not a little bit, probably quite a bit, because as things evolve over the year, they decide they're going to offer something or they don't. Faculty come to them and they say I'd like to offer a program like this, or they go out to the departments and say, hey, I'd like to do a sequence of courses leading up to a certificate. So if we're interested in that, we can do that. I'm -- for the purpose here of keeping us moving, I want to move. If that's okay the way it is, then we'll leave it that way and we'll put it in. Yes, [Inaudible].

Mark: I just wanted to go back to the idea, put in my two cents on the workforce development phrasing, because, to me, that's kind of like the discussion we had about mission. I know -- I don't think you were here last time. But we had a wonderful discussion about what constituted mission and what constituted academic mission and what the differences were and who was included in each one. So for example, in talking about academic mission, there were questions whether that, I guess, were just to include what instruction faculty do, some taught more broadly, some less. And I see the same thing here with enhancing workforce development. There's a lot of interpretation that could be done there. I could say, well, I'm teaching a freshman comp class in the summer; so I'm obviously enhancing workforce development. But someone who wants to put together the summer schedule in a certain way may think, well, I would rather have courses. I don't know what. We're going to move nursing completely into summer. So that's what enhancing workforce development means. And I think both of those interpretations, you know, were acceptable. But this doesn't provide any, you know, real sense of if it means one of those or both of those or neither of them.

Clarissa: That's true. Because, you know, I think, for me, I was wondering aren't we given -- isn't there an executive board that sort of governs that you can't just move academic programs existing over to self-support? I mean, so wouldn't we be -- I don't want to say protected in that sense. So we're not just moving programs over to get more money to charge the students more.

Mark: [Inaudible]. To me, it feels like it depends on whether we need enrollment on the state side or not.

Russ: Well, I think that this is -- you know, it's a good question and I think, you know, it has been discussed. If you ask yourself what the real mission of this -- of the CSU is, we could focus. It has been focused primarily on undergraduate education and applied master's. So one could say that if it doesn't fit within that framework, then it probably has a lower priority. But that needs to be discussed. I think that's -- you know, when I sat and listened to SBAC, for example, I thought that -- those are the things they ought to really put some energy into. And I've said this at my [Inaudible] Allegiance. I said you guys really have to think strategy here. What is it that you really are going to do? And then a lot of this other stuff blows from it. There are programs. There are programs right on our campus that would flourish. It would be okay if they were fully UEE kind of a program schedule. And they don't have to be the normal format. They can be formatted to be cohort-based or whatever. We've done that all the time. We do that all the time. And they would flourish because they're just a high demand. There are others if you tried to do that, they would probably sink like a rock. So I think those are -- I didn't answer the question because I don't think there's an easy answer until the strategies are set, then you can kind of come down off of that. Clarissa and Becky, I'd like to --

Clarissa: So just a quick point --

Russ: Yeah.

Clarissa: -- because I think this is an important one. Some of the feedback that we got, I think it was meant that they be programs that are supplementing what we have so not jeopardizing -- or I should say, not trying to make a determination as to what programs are offered right now. It wasn't meant to move in that direction or territory. It was mostly I think to grow and be -- and have programs that are supplementing. Well, I don't even know if supplementing. I suppose you could debate that over too. But they would be programs other than what we have here, --

Russ: Right. I would think that would --

Clarissa: -- if that helps.

>> -- [Inaudible] a good argument.

Clarissa: Okay.

Russ: Financial perspective, and say there are programs we got now offers state side, that, if we could take those very same programs and offer them in another format, we could increase the number of people involved in those programs because the demand is there. I mean, if you think about programs, like criminal justice or whatever, you could do some things that we do very well where there's a high demand. You take them outside of the -- because right now the state is constraints. When you're looking at state programs, what you're offering is what I can get away with within the money that I have. When you take a different mindset of that and look at it a different way, you begin to open the door and that means -- it doesn't mean the faculty have to necessarily work harder. That might mean that you can then hire people to augment the programs so you

actually can grow the pie, so to speak. So I would take a different view. And I -- that's kind of where I was coming from when you see some of these. But right now I see the state as only just a box that we have to live within, and it usually means we do less than we could have done.

Mark: I wanted to add just a couple other things. One, is if -- to keep in mind, if -- I always think about the people who are teaching the classes. If I'm teaching it, it doesn't make any difference if it's somebody, who, that's all they're doing, instead of being able to teach that class in the fall and spring. That could well mean that there -- you know, it's a loss of benefits for them to teach those classes.

Russ: Yeah. I mean, these are all considered. Everything has to be balanced as we work through. Becky, did you want to say [Speaking Simultaneously]?

Mark: I just had another --

Russ: Oh, you had another point?

Mark: Yeah.

Mark: I'm sorry.

Mark: It's just that it's going back to the point of support. If we're going on furloughs and we don't have any assigned time anymore and, you know, we're supposed to be -- you know, everybody has got to teach exactly 24.0 or more now, it makes it harder to develop programs. And just very briefly, we were trying to work on a professional writing certificate, sending out a survey on it, had a database of 300 businesses, but we needed to send postcards to 200. We could not get \$50 to send out postcards. And I went from, you know, my chair all the way up to Helena, through UEE, through IR, and couldn't get 50 bucks.

>> I don't understand that, you know.

Mark: To get out a survey to 200 businesses about a professional right. So it's not like, you know, it's just waiting there for you to say -- for faculty to say okay --

Russ: Yeah.

Mark: -- we'll participate. It's hard.

Russ: It is. I feel that -- you know what I worry about most -- and then we've got to kind of move on -- is that this creates a mindset. What we've been in for the last four years has created a mindset and is creating a mindset that is very negative to growth and to future, and that troubles me a lot just -- go ahead.

Clarissa: I had a point that I wanted to make for writing this, is that we have an opportunity as a campus to help our community, and I would love to see us be leaders to reduce our unemployment and get it down below 17 percent. This is -- I mean, we have a lot of things that we can

offer from this campus, and doing it through the University Extended Ed seems like a great profitable way to do it. And how we get there? I don't have the answers to. And it looks like they're making a lot of strides from what I just saw. But that was my perspective.

Russ: Okay. Are there any other comments? Any other recommendations that need to be added to this list? If not, can we move to Item B, on Three? And that's -- yes, Tan.

Tan: Didn't you already mention about getting Kevin to come here to do --

Russ: Yes.

Tan: -- talk about the UEE? I think that would be worthwhile, at least, you know, for us to know what's going on, on that side so, that, you know, with the recommendation here, we might want to modify it, you know, based on what he shows us.

Russ: We haven't talked to actually any of the self-support groups in their conversations. We talked to the basic operational units on campus. But as Michelle indicated, we do make them put together a business plan every year; that speaks to their goals for revenue and where they hope to be. Some of them, of course, are internal or fee-driven so they don't -- that doesn't spill over into the campus. We hold the -- that just means they can grow and develop in the feed structure. But others, like UEE, does have an impact, for all the reasons we talked about. Okay. Any other comments about that? I'll -- how many would like to see Kevin to come here? All right. So I'll ask him to do it and see if we can do it.

[Pause]

Russ: Okay.

[Pause]

Russ: All right. Let's move to Item C, please. We have some items that are here for a second reading, and whatever we don't cover today, I'm going to make sure we do first thing next time. So I'm going to reverse the order that I have to try to manage this a little bit. And I would ask anybody to send me stuff in the off-time so that I can get it on there, and we might save a little bit of the conversation time for the discussion. But I don't want to restrict for recommendations. I want people to feel like they can do as many as they need to. Yes, Tan.

>> So we can bring [Inaudible]?

Russ: Yes. Sure. Absolutely. You get them to me. Because the idea will be that, you know, some of these have actually been pretty heavily discussed. I'm trying to get us through this process. So maybe by the end of June we have some things to put in front of them, the new president. I think he's eagerly awaiting on. Okay. We had three recommendations that were on the conversation block last time; and so we're going to move those to the next phase. Item Number One is the recommendation that the primary budget party for CSU Stanislaus is to maintain the academic

mission of the University. And we had some discussion about this last time. Do we have any conversation or discussion about it today? Do you have any ideas about this? There were some comments in terms of what constituted the academic mission last time. I think the Provost made some suggestions. I certainly look at this and say I think my concern about this is that it focuses -- I mean, the academic mission is a priority. If you read our strategic plan, it's a priority. But I would say that, for me, singling it out is troublesome. So I would want to have it be that we focus on meeting our strategic plan, and it's covered in there. I don't have a problem with that, that budget priorities be given to those activities that support and sustain the strategic plan at the University.

[Pause]

Russ: Or if that's not good, recommend that budget priorities for CSU Stanislaus should be established to support the mission of the University. More general. So I give you two options. I don't know how this fits with what you were thinking, [Inaudible], the mission.

Mark: Let me toss in a couple things when we get to that. One is just [Inaudible] the Provost was interested in, whether this was a sense of a Senate resolution, and what it was drawn from was a sense of the Senate resolution. And I thought about what the import of that might be. But as far as our purposes, I couldn't come up with anything. So I'm sorry he's not here today because I had planned to ask him about that. And I think one of their concerns was to -- with the words, primary and academic. And what I drew from the discussion was that there was concern that academic mission leaves out, for example, any care of the campus. So I think what is more correctly stated is that it would just be the mission of the University, because within the discussion, also came up that -- implicit -- it is implicit that the mission is an academic mission.

[Pause]

Mark: As far as the primary budget priority, I guess I would say if -- you know, if the mission of the University is not our primary budget priority, I don't know what would be. So I'll stop there for now.

Russ: Well, I think there might be one that's kind of -- you know, I can think of, is we have to keep the lights on; so we have to pay our bills. And sometimes -- that's where I was going with it. I don't have a problem with it being a budgetary priority, even a high budgetary priority. But I -- you know, there could be things that will at least have -- give it a run for its money, because we can't open it. And I've seen this happen at other campuses where there are overarching things, either with enrollments or with other things that drive the dollars so low that academic mission starts getting parsed out in order to keep the campus open and running. But I don't have a problem with budget priority. And I agree with you that --

Daryl: Russ.

Russ: Yes, Daryl, go ahead.

Daryl: Yeah. I was going to say, I mean, you know, regarding the delivery and the ability to sustain everything that's part of the academic mission, I mean, of course, we have to have those things in place. There's got to be a certain kind -- I mean, I don't need to tell you this. I mean, I know you know this. So that's why I really don't have -- I don't think it's -- I think stating it, you know, calling the attention to the academic mission of the institution I think -- I don't see that it's -- as problematic. I mean, it's -- you know, back to Mark's comments, I mean, it's dealt with that way in the mission. So -- and of course, it goes without saying, you know, there are so many things that go into being able to deliver or to make good on that mission that have to be in place. So I just think -- I don't know if that's a helpful comment, but I just wanted to say that.

Russ: I think that was the spirit that I took it into too. So go ahead.

>> Well, --

Russ: yep.

Neil: -- again, I would like to make a friendly amendment, but after that, I'm going to say something, probably is just the opposite. I'd like it where budget -- the budget priorities of CSU Stanislaus is to maintain the overall health of the entire University. Having said that, again, I still believe that the president, the new president, you know, I believe he knows this already. I would like to go back to something that Becky had said previously and, that, I think this should be kind of at the beginning of all of our recommendations. This should be the statement that we, you know, support -- yeah, [Inaudible] if you want to do it -- before all the recommendations, to recognize the mission of the University and the overall health of the University in his decision-making, if we're going to remind him of that, which, again, I think he knows that.

Russ: I'm sure everybody knows that but having it become formal is [Inaudible] is important. I don't think it's unimportant to do. Calvin.

Kelvin: I guess I look at -- one of the recommendations that I'm thinking about writing has to do with really publicizing the dire conditions. To me, it's shocking that a University would have to recommend that we protect the academic mission. I would hope the public would look at that and say that's how bad it is, is you've got to make a statement like this, but that is how bad it is. And so I'm in favor of this, in part, because of how dire it shows the condition of the public education or higher education right now. I think it's just terrible that we have to make this kind of a statement. But I think it's a true statement at the moment.

>> Yeah.

[Pause]

Russ: Anybody else? Tan.

Tan: I would support this thing that we're talking about. Maybe another kind of industry, like hospital. You know, we say that the mission of the hospital is provided quality, you know, healthcare. Understood that you need the doctors but you need the rest of the people, you know, to run an efficient high-quality hospital. You need the doctors, but, of course, you need the nurses, and then you need the people behind the front desk, and you need to make sure that the facilities are clean. But overall, that whole thing, if you're talking about the overall health of the [Inaudible], that's, I think, is captured by, you know, providing academic mission, because to do that, it's not just one group of people on campus. It's everybody. We need everyone. Just like in a hospital, you need -- you cannot have one group and not have all the other groups.

>> So what was your --

>> I didn't [Inaudible] --

Neil: Just basically I'm changing it to maintain the overall health of the entire University.

Russ: And Calvin, you were speaking to the issue, protecting.

Kelvin: I like it the way it is.

Russ: You like it the way it is. I'm sorry. Okay. All right. Any more conversation? Do you want to vote? Go ahead.

Clarissa: We did look up the last week when we read the mission and then we read; we discovered that academic mission was, you know, -- to paraphrase -- the joy of teaching and learning. So -- and that was -- if he was finding it correctly. The Provost wasn't sure. So I would want to see that just taken out, the academic taken out.

Russ: So the mission of the University, which I thought I heard you say, was also --

Clarissa: I didn't.

>> -- within the realm.

Kelvin: He said that at the beginning.

>> Yeah.

>> Okay. And this; right?

Russ: So what -- how would you like to proceed with this? Do you want to --

Mark: [Inaudible] are we going to have the second meeting? Or just ask if it's friendly [Inaudible].

[Inaudible]

>> Yeah.

Mark: Yeah, I'll ask you. Well, I mean, I think anyone in the group could object to it.

Russ: What I think is we're all really supportive of something like this. I think it's -- if it's semantics, you know, maybe that would be -- but I think I'm certainly more comfortable with it just being the mission because the mission does spell out what -- where some of the priorities are, and I think it puts the president on notice that, you know, it helps him to have some levers that he can say, look, I'm doing these things. It's supportive, the overall mission of the institution. So if we'll take out academic, that's what we'll vote on. Okay. Here is Seven.

Mark: Yeah, I was just going to cite it. As far as the part about the overall health, to me, that's very different, and what it made me think of was the idea of consultants on campus, especially consultants that came in counseling, like the middle of President Shavanese [Phonetic] term. We've never did really find out how much money was spent on those consultants. I've heard \$200,000. That might be wildly off in either direction. But it's -- I know that there were a lot of consultants who spent a lot of time on this campus. That could be construed as for the mission or the university. But I don't really think it -- you know, that spending that money that way was really to maintain the academic mission of the University. So just the idea of if you're looking at the general health, it's easier to bring more things under that umbrella; that I don't think really fit to serve the mission that well.

Russ: Yeah. I think to those -- just, I don't know if you saw them, Mark. But there had been reports published on that over the last few years, and I don't have them write handy, but I know that they -- there were public records requested, requested that information. And I don't know what the number was, but I don't think it was substantial as we claim.

Mark: Yeah. Well, that's what I was -- I got it third-hand, I guess, because my source had just looked at the information from the public records request and that's the number that I got, was 200,000.

Russ: Yeah. So I don't think it was. I'm going to go actually pull up the data. We're voting on Recommendation Number One in the second reading, with the change that recommend -- I hope you'll give me some freedom. The committee recommends that a primary budget priority for the CSU -- for SCU Stanislaus is to maintain the mission of the University. That's what we're voting on.

[Background Discussions]

Russ: Yeah. We've got to be careful now who's got proxies here because --

[Inaudible]

Russ: Okay. You're voting too.

>> [Inaudible] I have Steve's.

Russ: You have Steve's and I have the Provost's. So you got your own back. Everybody else here is okay? Okay.

[Inaudible]

Russ: Daryl.

Daryl: You know, I just vote up on that one. I would vote for that.

Russ: All right, sir. Good.

[Background Discussions and Silence]

Russ: Okay. Can you pass them to me, please? I don't think this is going to be a hard one to count.

[Pause]

Russ: And I'm going to say that we overstretched our time. So I will put the rest of these on to the meeting next week.

[Pause]

Russ: If those are extras, yeah, I'll take them for next week.

[Pause]

>> Okay.

[Pause]

Russ: Okay. This first one is passed. The number is 6-4.

[Pause]

Russ: I just want to say a couple comments about the meeting schedule and we can close. I appreciate some input from Calvin. And looking at the schedule, probably the most challenging part of this committee is scheduling it, and it's a pain, and the rest is easy compared to getting everybody in the room at the same time and frequently. And I don't really want to change it around every week. I think that's just counterproductive. But after looking at the schedule again and, with your cooperation, I think at least for June, until we have a sense of any changes in the teaching schedule, we'll go ahead and move the meeting on Thursday because Thursday seems to be a better day for everybody, a lot earlier. So it's going to be from 11 to 12:30. And Daryl, I don't know what that does to you, but I suspect that we're moving the meeting up from two -- so you might just want to stay up Daryl and work [Inaudible]. Honestly, I have so appreciated you taking time to be here in the middle of the night. But the committee, in order to try to get everybody here, I think having the committee meet from 11 o'clock to 12:30 Pacific Standard Time, Pacific Daylight Times. Excuse me.

Daryl: So that means it will be --

Russ: And Daryl, I will certainly understand.

Daryl: That's 2 AM in the morning for me.

Russ: Yeah. Yeah. So instead of going to bed, just stay up an extra hour
[Laughter].

Daryl: Because, you know, I'm already into Friday. Actually, I'm just about getting ready to go prepare for this lecture I've got here.

Russ: Yeah. Okay. Well, thank you.

Daryl: So yeah, but I'm going to try to make those as well. I'll just try to see if I can. And depending on what night it is, I may be up anyway. It depends, so.

Russ: Yeah. So Daryl, it's -- I really appreciate your efforts. This is a yeoman's task, and you've just done a terrific sacrifice to be part of our committee. Thank you.

Daryl: Oh, no problem. Oh, no, no. No, thank you. Thank you all.

Russ: So I think --

Daryl: So I'm going to sign -- if you don't mind, can I sign out now?

>> Absolutely. Go do the lecture.

Daryl: Okay. You all take care and I'll see you at the next meeting.

Russ: Bye Daryl.

>> Thank you. Bye-bye.

>> Bye-bye. Thank you.

Russ: Okay. So I just want to say that I appreciate your cooperation. That, we'll do that starting next week for the next couple of meetings and then we'll check in again to see -- I'm going to keep this posted Thursdays as I can because I think it works for everybody, and we'll go from there. Hopefully, we'll look at the teaching schedules and go from there. Thank you everybody. A motion for adjournment. Frank.

>> Second.

>> Second. Neil, meeting is adjourned.

[Silence]