

**CSU STANISLAUS
UNIVERSITY BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MAY 16, 2014**

**SUMMARY NOTES
(Approved May 23, 2014)**

Present: Ms. Eileen Hamilton, UBAC Chair; Mr. Carl Whitman, UBAC Associate Chair/AVP; Professor Paul O'Brien (Sociology); Professor David Lindsay (FBAC); Professor Stuart Wooley (Biology); Ms. Mariam Salameh (ASI President); Mr. Marvin Hooker (ASI Vice President); Ms. Alissa Aragon (Staff/Campus Life); Ms. Lori Phillips (Staff/CAHSS); Dean James Tuedio (CAHSS); Director Julia Reynoso (Facilities Planning); Budget Manager Michelle Legg (non-voting); Ms. Julia Fahrenbruch (non-voting/volunteer).

Chair Hamilton called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m. Action: It was moved and seconded to approve, as distributed, the draft May 9, 2014 summary notes. The motion passed unanimously.

SUMMARY REMARKS/DISCUSSIONS—PRESIDENT JOSEPH SHELEY

President Sheley began by thanking the UBAC members for taking on this difficult assignment, noting that even in the best of times it is not an easy task. He also thanked the Committee for the fine way they have been serving and have grown more mature and confident in the sense of how the budget process works. He noted that everyone's goal is to do everything possible while still being reasonable and realizing there is a tomorrow that you have to be concerned about. President Sheley also expressed appreciation to the Vice Presidents for their willingness to get together with their counterparts and work cooperatively in developing priorities that no one felt were written in stone.

President Sheley expressed his belief that all of the requests have merit, which makes it even harder as there is not a vast store of money. With regard to the final report, President Sheley commented on a couple possibilities—the Committee could choose to nod and say okay to all of the requests (the safe route), or the Committee could choose a more responsible route and take a shot at a few they think are the most important and make those recommendations.

Noting that the Committee already knows the current status of State funding for higher education, President Sheley said it is unlikely that we will see any money other than that already promised. Commenting on the need for caution about where we are headed, President Sheley pointed out that in two years the CSU will be back into discussions about Proposition 30 (temporary tax initiative). He also noted that the CSU system is waiting to see if the legislative negotiations on the Governor's May Revise proposal will result in any changes to the budget recommendations for the CSU. He said it likely would be mid-to-late summer before we know what budget is being sent our way. If the current budget proposal holds solid, CSU Stanislaus will have 200 new FTES and the funding that accompanies them on the State side, minus SUG (State University Grants). Ultimately, those 200 FTES bring additional instructional costs and we will have to figure out how to deal with what is left on the table.

President Sheley said he would be glad to answer whatever questions the Committee has about the philosophy or approach articulated here, without favoring any particular priority put on the table by the Vice Presidents, ASI, USUEU, or FBAC. He again complimented the Committee members on the quality of their conversations and how they have modeled good behaviors in those discussions.

Discussion

Professor O'Brien began by expressing appreciation to the staff and Budget Manager Legg for the reams of informative materials provided to UBAC. He then pointed out that an issue brought up in the Academic Senate, and discussed in UBAC, is that there are and will be many unmet needs—a lot of requests have come forward, but there has to be that stinging reality when you don't get what you want. Noting that we are only looking at \$1.9M in new funds, Professor O'Brien said we really have to keep reminding the community of that, so that the expectations are not so high they walk away thinking it was not a fair process.

President Sheley said that is one reason for directing so much of his energy outward to the community—advancing the messages and strengthening from the outside because we, as a small campus, are in a more difficult position. We don't have the sheer number demands of the southern California campuses that are turning away 15,000 to 20,000 applicants. We are talking about significantly fewer numbers, so we don't get noticed and it is hard to make our case. President Sheley also pointed out that CSU Fresno has done a good job of pushing themselves and having an advocacy base. In the conversations about FTES target allocations, the issue isn't always that every single individual demand is exactly worth the same weight. At the large campuses some individuals would get hurt, which is the same as here, but their economy will continue to grow and that is not the case here; there is a huge need to increase our college graduation base in professional and skilled laborers. President Sheley said we have to get noticed so that somebody sees it is time to invest in the Central Valley and we can become part of those conversations.

President Sheley also said that most people don't understand how little money comes in with the new FTES, when you net out the costs for instruction, or realize that some of that may be picked up by students who are taking more units than was built into the model, even with a little margin for error. Instructional costs go up when that happens and \$1.9M isn't a lot of money. That is the importance of UBAC—helping to translate out the messages to the campus community so that they have confidence in how the budget is being handled, that it is transparent, and that the quality of the recommendations will stand on their own. President Sheley expressed his hope, after the budget is finalized, that the campus could start off in September with a forum led by UBAC that reports out on where we are and serves to demonstrate that we really have taken on the issues.

ASI President Salameh asked President Sheley to provide the Committee with his perspective or vision about academic advising on this campus?

Indicating that he does not have a specific vision, President Sheley said it is hard to believe we cannot do better in the sense that our students are not only advised with respect to what it takes to check the right boxes at the right time in order to graduate, but so that they graduate in a way that really means they have taken a curriculum that focuses on the basics, and are advised to focus on the basics as well as the major, and do it in such a way that they walk out the door with real strength embedded in that degree. President Sheley emphasized that this is not just a Stanislaus issue, but is clearly a CSU as well as nationwide concern. Referencing an Academic Senate resolution approved by his predecessor that says the campus should spend money on advising in Student Affairs, President Sheley expressed reluctance to do so without an advising plan. He noted that he has discussed with the Academic Senate (and the General Faculty) the need for the faculty to take the lead in academic advising as part of a professional commitment to do the best for our students. Indicating there are many good models out there, President Sheley said there are ways to mix peer faculty and even staff advising, to centralize it in various places, and to hybridize the way it is done for certain types of endeavors. He asked if we have had the conversations that permit us to have confidence in what we offer in academic advising? Referencing an ASI Resolution (dated 5/13/2014) asking for further discussion and planning on the whole issue of

academic advising, President Sheley emphasized that he would be thrilled to have that conversation and find out that the gap we have to fill is close to nothing, which would be a huge confidence booster. However, he said he has not seen “the survey” of the landscape or heard that enough of this type of conversation is occurring in order to take that position at the moment—it is an important issue and, even if we don’t fund it, at least we need to push that conversation along.

Dean Tuedio commented that there are a lot of different ways to look at the requests in front of us, noting that on one level the Committee has started to group those requests into clusters of priorities. A lot of requests are in an area of managing risks and oversight in areas where compliance is expected, and then there is an area that has to do with compensation for work that has accumulated into positions that either have been trimmed back or haven’t been expanded or taken to another level of compensation—those are two fairly well populated areas of requests. Then there is a student success priority that things like advising are prominent in, but there are other things as well that are folding into that area of student success. Dean Tuedio said that the university mission statement is always at the top of the list, but when the rubber hits the road and we talk about the kinds of things that could sink us really quickly, risk management and compliance are huge ones. However, when we deal with morale issues on campus and the general tenor of the community then the compensation issues are prominent. On top of that, if we do address some of the workload impact, particularly in areas related to faculty, then we have an instructional support problem, because if we grant that kind of assigned time we have vacated classes and they are going to need funding as well, and that is part of student success—it feels like there are three huge areas that are spinning around each other. Dean Tuedio asked for the President’s thoughts in relation to those three dominant areas.

Referencing his earlier comment that all of the priority requests have merit, President Sheley noted that what Dean Tuedio articulated in those three areas probably picks up about 70% of the priority requests—within those, how are you going to do it? He pointed out that it would not be a huge help if the Committee comes in at that high level, but also noted that every single one of those deserves respectful conversations. The whole notion of making sure that we get sufficient instruction on this campus is a push and pull issue. Students should be able to graduate on time, but many have other obligations and no matter what we set up they can’t spend enough time in school to get out in six years (or less). What exactly does it take to do that? Noting he does not like to use last year as a benchmark, President Sheley said in effect it is because we are not getting new money that is going to very quickly unload whatever pressures we built into our structures. Without identifying where he would put it on the priority list, President Sheley said that, as an example, chair assigned time is a worthy issue—it is a hard job and is getting even harder and overlaps with risk management. That one will clearly be there as we are asking people to do more than just put a schedule together. President Sheley emphasized, however, that he is committed to not simply talking in terms of instruction when we talk about fulfilling our mission—that is why advising, mentoring, and the quality of the diploma is such a huge deal, and he will not automatically assume that a diploma carries with it the level of quality we hope it does until we make sure it does. Advising is a huge part of that and so are the university experience and the quality of the engagement of our students. President Sheley said that, as studies have shown, it is not just about class time. Almost anything gets students better integrated into the campus fabric—whether it’s student government, committees, athletics, music, fraternities and sororities, and so on, that level of engagement brings up the student’s GPA and progress to graduation. President Sheley expressed his belief that we can accomplish quite a bit where we are, but the key questions are how do we take care of the burdens on some sectors and how do we increase that advising level? Also commenting on the ongoing instructional equipment issues, President Sheley noted that there is a point at which duct tape doesn’t do the job anymore and we need to be serious about addressing that issue.

Regarding compensation, President Sheley pointed out that this is a contract year and he is not legally in a position to comment on compensation issues, especially during contract negotiations and bargaining at the CSU system level.

ASI President Salameh referenced a recent SFAC (Student Fee Advisory Committee) meeting, noting her shock to see a course fee go from \$10 to \$150. Although she understands the rationale behind it—the demand for students to get a quality education—she wondered what kind of initiatives are being taken on campus to increase department budgets that have not been increased over the years to help ease the burden of implementing course fees on our students? She pointed out that this issue was not brought up within the Vice Presidents priorities.

Noting that the ASI has the ability to bring issues to the table through their resolution process, President Sheley also stated that his goal is to make sure course fees are not nebulous—we need to make sure that every single one is legitimate, has been aired reasonably, and isn't in any sense a gouge. He also noted that course fees are earmarked for specific purposes and those funds cannot be moved or spent elsewhere. The real question is, are they merited or are we (administration and students) willing to discount the quality that they are supposedly helping to pick up? President Sheley said that we have not been in a position on any campus to enhance any budget for a long time and, good or bad, campuses have had to make some trades that in the end were necessary. He also pointed out that the same issues come up in addressing the costs of instruction beyond the instructor. President Sheley emphasized that if the students believe the issue of course fees needs to come up the ladder of priorities, then they should feel free to put it on the table for discussion with UBAC.

Expressing appreciation for what the Committee is about to go through, President Sheley promised to take their recommendations very seriously. He noted that he would come back for clarification if needed, but if the recommendations are pretty clear on their face he would deal with them that way.

2014-2015 DIVISION PRIORITIES – COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Priorities Matrix

Ms. Phillips distributed a matrix displaying all Division requests with column headings across the top for the seven previously identified categories, plus additional columns for Reserves, Health/Wellness, Efficiency, UBAC Rank#, and Base or 1x funds. The last two pages of the matrix include the FBAC, ASI, and Staff requests (but are not filled in as the Committee has not yet addressed those). At the end of the meeting, Ms. Phillips indicated she would update the matrix and send it electronically to the Committee members. In response to Professor Wooley, Associate Chair Whitman confirmed that the matrix would be displayed on the UBAC website.

During discussion, ASI President Salameh noted that the only item in the ASI resolution that was not included in the Vice Presidents priorities was career services. In response to Professor O'Brien, Ms. Salameh clarified that the resolution distributed today focuses on how to improve advising services on campus. She said they would like to have a broader discussion with the campus community about that, as well as present the resolution to the Committee for further consideration in making decisions about academic advising.

Professor Lindsay noted that the priorities in the FBAC resolution (3/AS/14/FBAC–Budget Priorities) are stated in a broad manner. The following paragraphs list the priority items and summarize comments made during discussion.

- *Maintain maximum possible access for qualified students, including admission to campus and access to courses required for degree completion*—ASI President Salameh noted that they had a great discussion at the Academic Senate meeting regarding the two-pass registration system and finding a solution. Commenting that there will always be problems with bottleneck courses and students getting the classes they need to graduate on time, she asked how the Committee could help with increasing class sections for students—if that is something the Committee wants to look into, or even look at any other priorities that may help in that area? Professor O'Brien noted that it was a direct request of the students to have enough sections so that they can take classes to graduate.
- *Raise the percentage of FTES instruction delivered by tenured/tenure-track faculty (as per ACR 73) to 75% (most recently measured at 64.6% as of fall 2013) with the intention of reducing the student/faculty ratio*—In response to questions, Professor Lindsay said that in 2001 the Legislature adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution 73 and gave guidance to the CSU indicating it might be nice if the percentage of FTES instruction by tenured or tenure-track faculty was 75% or higher.
- *Adequately fund non-instructional faculty and staff positions to effectively support the central mission, specifically including tenure-track psychological counselors, tenure-track librarians, and career services advisors*—Professor Lindsay indicated that parts of this overlap with some of the other suggestions that came out of Faculty Affairs, although specifically requesting tenure-track psychological counselors/librarians doesn't necessarily overlap with what was requested before. Professor O'Brien suggested it might also dovetail with priority #4 in Academic Affairs (address uneven distribution and loss of faculty...). He also pointed out that there has been some more generic discussion about the need for more faculty as students numbers increase. Professor Wooley said that Enrollment and Student Affairs also had a request regarding psychological counselors (priority #2).
- *Fund adequate assigned time for tenured/tenure-track faculty to allow an average of 18 wtus teaching assignment thus allowing time for expected research, scholarship and creative activities, professional development, and community engagement*—Professor Lindsay noted that this item was unique to FBAC and doesn't show up in any of the other documents.
- *Fund the recently approved department chair workload rubric*—Also in Academic Affairs request (priority #1).
- *Hire dean level leadership for graduate programs and the office of research and sponsored programs*—Also in the Academic Affairs request (priority #5).
- *Institutionalize funding for activities now performed by CEGE and PACE that contribute to student success*—Professor Lindsay indicated this may have been implied in the Academic Affairs request, but was not explicitly stated. Dean Tuedio noted that this also refers to things that were put in place with significant grant support from the Federal Government, which is about to come to an end, and the campus implied we would carry it on. Professor Wooley asked if this means there is an implicit agreement made ahead of time to continue funding CEGE and PACE? Dean Tuedio responded that the campus gave them the explicit impression that we were committed to carrying it forward, but did not specifically identify how that would be accomplished. He noted that it might be dealt with to some degree in the Academic Affairs recommendation regarding a Graduate School Dean and combining graduate education with ORSP (priority #5). He emphasized it is worth remembering that to get these (and other) grants we need to have a track record of following through.
- *Fund campus activities that honor and promote diversity on campus and the neighboring communities*—Also referenced in the Faculty Affairs & Human Resources request (priority #2).

Ms. Phillips said that two areas not listed in the matrix are the reserves and the Library, and noted that ASI President Salameh also has brought up increasing the number of courses, if possible. She asked if the Committee wants to add those as line items? Ms. Salameh noted that one issue was increasing class sections, if possible, and another one was the instructional classroom experience—enhancing the quality of a student’s education by increasing department budgets, so that students won’t have the burden of high course fees.

Professor O’Brien said that the reserves definitely should have a line. Dean Tuedio concurred, noting that it probably fits under the university-wide priorities. Regarding the Library, Professor O’Brien said it is good to bring up and have it on there, but it seems that much of the conversation was how to change its character; what can be moved around to make that more legitimate in following policy? Dean Tuedio pointed out that one aspect of that is how much should be coming out of base as opposed to lottery? In that that sense, it is definitely a direct line of competition with other priorities and that comes under Academic Affairs.

In response to questions from Chair Hamilton about the next steps, Professor Wooley noted that there are a number of priorities that seem to fit into a lot of categories, while others may only fit in one category but may also be crucial. As a way to start, he suggested that those that fit into a larger number of categories might be placed on the higher priority list (at least initially) than those that only fit in one or two categories.

Ms. Phillips asked when we make proposals are we going to break it out by category and then prioritize within, or are we just going to do an overall priority indicating the areas we felt supported them? In further discussions, Ms. Phillips clarified that she was referring to the areas the Committee had assigned at the top of the list rather than the Vice Presidents categories by area. Regarding the question of the Vice Presidents priorities, ASIVP Hooker said it is his understanding that not all Vice Presidents listed or ranked those in priority order (e.g., Enrollment & Student Affairs).

Professor Lindsay pointed out that the reason the Committee came up with the broad categories was because we imagined that eventually in writing the report we would be speaking in major themes—we would be addressing a theme of student success, addressing a theme of risk, addressing a theme of compensation. He suggested that the Committee think in terms of the theme first and then look at the elements of the theme thereafter. Professor O’Brien agreed and noted that student success is the perfect example that cuts across divisional requests, so it is better to categorize it on that more macro level than to look at the minutia in a certain area. Professor Lindsay expressed his belief that, considering our mission, student success would be one of the number one themes the Committee would be looking at. ASI President Salameh concurred.

Dean Tuedio commented that, in some ways, what puts us out on a limb is the risk management side of things. He said that in mentioning compensation he meant to also accentuate workload impact on staffing and staffing needs, which came through several of the Vice Presidents reports. We all identify with the fact that we took out staff positions to save other things that at the time were a high priority—there are a combination of things about workload that, in a way, tie back into risk and student success just because of some of the exposures of not having enough staffing.

Referencing the matrix, Professor Wooley pointed out that on the first two pages there are no ‘Xs’ in student support, so apparently none of the items under University Advancement and Business and Finance support student success. However, there are a lot of ‘Xs’ under risk management in those areas. As you think about student success as a primary mission of the university, then everything that ties into that becomes those top priorities—to get students here, keep them here, help them be successful so that

they leave successful. Although students aren't necessarily going to do better because there are more police, it certainly makes it a nicer learning environment, especially in the evenings, because students will be here studying if they feel safe. Professor O'Brien acknowledged that it is very organic and hard to easily disentangle student success. He also noted that we would not get much student success if the buildings weren't air-conditioned, so it's really hard to disentangle that into nice little categories. Professor O'Brien expressed his belief that this is a good beginning to slowly start working through and making some sense of it; otherwise, we would just be arguing over the individual minutia without seeing the larger picture.

With respect to areas on the matrix that have not been filled in, Professor Wooley expressed his belief that the efficiency issue goes along with the workload and the staffing issues. Referencing examples under Enrollment & Student Affairs (additional professional staff for the Dean of Students, administrative support for the Dean of Students, and staff for the degree audit), Professor Wooley said that all of those are efficiencies. He said that if we catch the student issues earlier then they would not have a problem later when it's time to graduate. Other areas that Professor Wooley felt would address efficiency included: tutoring, a facilities person in athletics, career advising, writing capacity of students and employees, campus safety, risk management, information security, chair release time, additional staff in Academic Affairs, faculty positions, and the Dean for Graduate Programs and ORSP.

Professor Wooley suggested that assigning numbers (rather than an 'X') would make ranking easier. Professor Lindsay agreed that number ranking with respect to the major themes is a good way to proceed—we could see what we feel are the top ones in our major thematic areas. Dean Tuedio also agreed, noting that this would be an interesting exercise, because then we will have the top things in each of those lists to focus attention on and see how they feel as relative weights.

Chair Hamilton reported that the Committee would review the matrix and receive individual input from members at the next meeting, scheduled for May 23, from 12:30 – 2:00 p.m., in the Lakeside Conference room. Ms. Phillips sent an updated matrix electronically to Committee members following the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.