

CSU STANISLAUS
UNIVERSITY BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
March 30, 2015
SUMMARY NOTES
(Approved 5-4-15)

Committee Members Present: Ms. Eileen Hamilton, UBAC Chair; Ms. Julia Reynoso, UBAC Co-Chair (Director, Facilities Planning & Finance); Professor William Foreman (FBAC Representative, English); Professor Stuart Wooley (Biology); Ms. Lori Phillips (Staff/CAHSS); Brian Duggan, MA (Director of Learning Services, OIT); Dean James Tuedio (CAHSS); Ms. Michelle Legg, (Budget Manager, non-voting member); Professor Paul O'Brien (Sociology); Ms. Alissa Aragon (Staff/Campus Life); Ms. Mariam Salameh (ASI President); Mr. Marvin Hooker (ASI Vice President); Ms. Mary Van Eyk (non-voting, temporary recorder)

Committee Members Not Present: Ms. Justine Borba (non-voting member)

Other Attendees: Dr. James T. Strong, Dr. Suzanne M. Espinoza, Mr. Chuck Gonzalez, Mr. Gary Tornngren, Dr. John Mayer

1. Call to Order:

Chair Hamilton called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

2. Review/Comment on Draft Summary Notes:

- a) March 2, 2015 – Deferred for next meeting.
- b) March 9, 2015 – A motion was made/seconded, to approve the March 9, 2015 meeting notes. Motion carried.

3. Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs – Dr. James T. Strong

The Provost addressed questions sent to him previously by UBAC. The first question he addressed was regarding strategies for adjusting to the sunset of Proposition 30. Provost Strong indicated that eighty-five to ninety percent of the budget is personnel. If there is no budget growth, the University will not be in a position to create any net/new staff, faculty, programs, etc. If the University has to create net/new positions or programs, the funds will have to be reallocated from existing sources. If the University is able to increase the number of international students or Extended Ed, this could be a funding source and potentially the largest funding source. If Prop 30 does sunset, and is not renewed or a new funding source is not provided, the University would only replace faculty and staff positions vacated when absolutely necessary. Retiring permanent tenured faculty would be replaced with temporary lecturers. This could be arbitrary and may not be able to be implemented in all cases. We could use whatever reserves we have to fund programs. People and programs are the highest priority per the President. If there was a strong enough consensus among stakeholders we would consider discontinuing a program. We would try to find funding from other sources. The Extended Education budget could be a source for developing new programs and should be alright unless a bill that is proposed could do away with summer and winter session. The same or similar bill was brought forward last year and did not make it through committee.

Another area that could be affected is grants. The University would attempt to get additional grants if its current grants are not renewed. Provost Strong distributed the Department of Education Institutional

Grants Report, dated March 1, 2015. Total cost of operations of our four grants (PACE, CECE, TRIO and SSS) is \$1,300,000, of which \$600,000 is personnel.

In response to limited enrollment targets, Dr. Strong reviewed the sources of funds related to increasing growth and demonstrated how those funds could help pay for enrollment and have excess to help some areas catch up for cuts of the past. Indicating that limited enrollment targets would limit the funding growth for campus and the ability to dedicate new funding to programs.

Dr. Strong also discussed new faculty contract language indicating that some of the costs have yet to be calculated, but also discussed new contract language that is not funded by the Chancellor's Office. One specific item discussed was the WTU release time for new faculty, with calculations for the cost being estimated at \$600,000 for two years. He also indicated that In-Range Progressions for staff are not funded by the Chancellor's Office and the campus/divisions must fund them.

In response to the subject of the Academic Advising Task force, Dr. Strong indicated the recommendation would be forthcoming shortly and that the recommendations would have costs associated with them that are yet to be determined. Current year funding of \$100,000 set aside in one time funding is still available to contribute and other costs could be phased in over time.

Priorities relative to the strategic plan will be released in a few weeks. CIPSP is working on the priorities and should be done soon. The committee has identified six priorities and there will be some costs associated with these, but can be phased in over time or reconsidered if circumstances change.

With regard to strategies for increasing alternative sources of funds, one such is international students. Dr. Strong indicated that although difficult to recruit due to the differences from our resident student practices, it was not impossible. A recent analysis of the cost and revenue for 85 students resulted in \$1,219,000 in annual revenue and a \$717,000 contribution to overhead. The most important reason to bring in international students is the campus mission to help internationalize the campus. International students are an excellent way to bring in students, bring in more revenue, improve the mission, and also improve the quality of the educational experience. It will also result in having some additional funding for a host of activities. The campus is at the bottom two or three for the number of international students on campus in the whole CSU. Dr. Strong pointed out that in the 1990's we had up to 283 international students and are currently expecting to have 100 this fall. The campus is working hard to recruit more students and is confident they will be successful. It was also noted that international students do attend state-side courses but do not count against our target enrollments.

The Provost also addressed the Stockton campus as it relates to alternative sources of funds. The Provost indicated that the situation with Stockton is that if we use UEE programs, there is a contribution to overhead. We need to meet the needs of the Stockton Community as it is the right thing to do. Dr. Strong indicated that state side courses will not, however, increase contributions to overhead, as he understood the question he was being requested to respond to. Sources and uses of UEE funds was discussed in detail and pointed to as an ongoing possibility for growth in programs when growth in the state resources slows down. Current year revenues of \$2,375,000 and \$1 million in contributions to overhead were discussed specifically as well as other payments of faculty salaries and chair stipends directly related to programs as well as scholarships.

The Provost also addressed the question of priorities for academic affairs. They include unfunded mandates and hiring of permanent faculty to cover our schedule.

When asked about the pending legislation that might impact UEE and whether the \$3.2 million for discipline based programs might be impacted, too, the Provost replied no. It would impact summer and winter intersessions if passed. It seems like there is concern that those courses are not offered during the year state-side. Chuck Gonzalez concurred, saying the intent of the legislation is to limit summer and winter offerings of courses that could be and are offered during the regular academic year. The legislation, if passed, would seriously limit what UEE can offer. It would not affect special session discipline based programs such as the Executive MBA, the Nursing ASBSN or similar programs.

The question was raised about the possibility of the Library development within the upcoming budget process. The Provost replied that the budget for capital projects is on hold. The Chancellor's Office and the Board of Trustees are trying to sort out the new approach to bonds that the state has enacted and have not yet come to a conclusion. They have not decided how to fund capital projects. With our LOFT (Libraries of the Future Task Force) Committee, we are moving into the first phase of design development, and hope to find alternate sources of funds.

When asked if Prop 30 will have any effect on offering new courses, the Provost replied that any activity that increases cost will have to get an extra look because the funding would have to come from existing resources. In response to a question about the University's liability to the personnel working in the grant programs, the Provost replied in some cases there is an obligation to personnel with retreat rights. He is in agreement with the President that the University would try to find alternate employment for the personnel on campus.

4. Vice President for Enrollment & Student Affairs – Dr. Suzanne M. Espinoza

Dr. Espinoza began the discussion with the campus' attempts to meet student enrollment demands, particularly with transfer students and the challenges of remaining within targeted enrollments without the tools available to impacted campuses. This includes efforts to convince the Chancellor's Office to allow campuses that have available capacity to accommodate overflow issues and meet the needs of students. She indicated that Stanislaus is well positioned to be one among a few other campuses to accommodate increased enrollments.

Dr. Espinoza continued on to address the question of strategies Enrollment & Student Affairs has in place for adjusting to funding changes relative to the sunset of Proposition 30. In the past, they have pursued different strategies to deal with cuts. They ask the directors of departments to develop a list of activities in three tiers of priority. In that way, they would be able to identify those activities that would have to be protected. The University is not in a great position right now and this would make things even more difficult. We do not want to lose any more staff. Two of the grants, SSS and PACE, are under Student Affairs. Many staff funded in the grant have retreat rights because they were employees in other areas before they went to the grant. Student Support Services is a gettable grant, however, the competition for the grant is tough. The proposal has been submitted, it looks good and they are optimistic about that one, but will not receive the letter until September. PACE was written with the intent to test some ideas and implement the most successful. It is not possible to ask for that grant to be extended, as it was a one-time funding source. We could move some people to a new grant. Currently, the grant has savings and they could use those funds for six months after the grant expires. You are not able to apply for another grant until that funding expires. The University does not have the money to fund \$600,000 in positions. There are a few positions on campus that are funded through temporary funds. They are permanent people on

temporary funding. The number of students that are impacted by the PACE Grant right now is about 540, while the number of students impacted by the Student Support Services (SSS) program is about 250.

In response to the question of impact on implementation of union contracts and salary adjustments, Dr. Espinoza replied that a number of IRPs and reclassifications have been submitted. Many staff members have stepped forward and taken on new work are receiving IRPs but the funding has not increased to cover it. The IRPs are all covered within the division and are impacting current budgets.

The status of the Academic Advising Task Force Report will be distributed soon. Dr. Espinoza indicated that the initiatives will take money to implement. They have not yet spent any of the funds allocated as a result of the last UBAC recommendations and it will fund some of those expenses.

When asked if the STEM Grant is operated through Student Affairs, Dr. Espinoza replied that STEM Grant was written by Student Affairs, however has been totally taken over by the College of Science. Dr. Espinoza was asked about the request for additional funding for counselling, to which she replied that some of the staff were not fulltime. All of the Psychological Counseling Services staff have been put on five days a week for a three-year contract. Tenure, however, is an ongoing conversation. Issues related to confidentiality that came out of the consultant's report, were associated to confidentiality and the fact that they were relying on student support in the office because of a lack of administrative support staff. They are rearranging some of the money that was appropriated to make something happen. They are taking the consultant's report very seriously.

When asked why the University would not become an impacted campus, Dr. Espinoza replied that impaction rules require campuses to demonstrate an enrollment pressure over an extended period of time. The University would have go through a process including having open forums with the community. Not everyone agrees that impaction is the best answer for our campus. We would have to take a real, sober look at impaction before going in that direction. Dr. Espinoza was then asked what other, viable ways there are to deal with enrollment. The forecast for the region indicate very high graduation rates and potential demand is enormous. Dr. Espinoza replied that it is a tough spot to be in. One of the things we have been able to convince the Chancellor's Office of is the idea that campuses should not be penalized for not reaching targets or going over. We have made compelling arguments to key people in the Chancellor's Office that resonates with them. The level of poverty in this area is much lower than other areas. We have to make people understand what is really at stake. When asked if CSU Stanislaus has taken students from other impacted CSU areas because they cannot get in there, Dr. Espinoza replied CSU Stanislaus is getting students from those areas that are in our application pool early on, but we cannot take them after the fact because we cannot accommodate them. When asked if there were programs that could possibly be identified that can be classified as impacted that could help, Dr. Espinoza stated there is a very complex scheme of impaction. We have a different problem on our campus. She also offered, for example, that we have students in a pre-degree situation who cannot get in a program and use up their financial aid without ever getting in to the program.

NEXT MEETING DATE:

The next meeting date is scheduled for April 13, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:21 p.m.

A motion was made/seconded, (Hooker, O'Brien), to approve adjourning the meeting.