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This plan begins with a short chronology of the University’s budget and enrollment initiatives since summer 2006, when Mohammad H. Qayoumi assumed the presidency. This background places the current budget and enrollment planning process in context for Cal State East Bay. Next, the plan reviews the planning process underway during Fall 2009 and early Winter 2010, leading to the budget and enrollment plan for 2010-11.

Part I. Background

2006-07 and 2007-08

During President Qayoumi’s first year at Cal State East Bay, the University conducted a series of town hall meetings that generated the seven strategic mandates identified in the University’s Framework for the Future. Two mandates focused on budget and enrollment issues:

- An efficient, well-run university with a culture of accountability; and
- Strong growth and full enrollment with personalized learning and expanded access
  http://www20.csueastbay.edu/about/strategic-planning/mandates.html

In the California State University system these two mandates are closely linked because operating budgets (including state support and student fee revenues) are based on meeting enrollment targets. During several prior years, Cal State East Bay had failed to achieve its annual enrollment target. Therefore, one of the President’s initial priorities was to increase enrollments. To demonstrate the importance of this goal, he moved the responsibility for enrollment management to a Cabinet position.

During the 2006-07 academic year, President Qayoumi reorganized the University’s administrative structure by adding two new divisions – Information Technology Services, and Planning and Enrollment Management. These pre-existing functions were separated from Academic Affairs with no increase in budget allocations. At the beginning of fiscal year 2007-08, a fully-funded base budget was allocated to each existing and newly-formed division. This left the University with a structural base budget deficit of $4.2 million that was to be funded centrally from one-time funding sources until it could be eliminated through increased revenues or cost savings. The new vice president for administration and finance developed a budget plan that would focus on managing expenditures, expanding revenues, and increasing enrollments. This plan involved a three-year enrollment growth
initiative that would generate sufficient revenues to eliminate the structural base budget deficit of $4.2 million.

The University proceeded to follow this plan, increasing California resident enrollment by about 10 percent over the next two years, with the expectation that enrollment growth funds would be sufficient to achieve a balanced base budget by 2010-11. (See Table 1, Student Enrollment Trends – Target and Actual, for annual enrollment data.)

2008-09

Unfortunately, in Fall 2008 the State of California realized the exigent nature of its fiscal crisis and imposed a budget reduction on The California State University system and projected no new enrollment growth funds for the next several years. As a result, Cal State East Bay not only began to experience budget reductions, but also recognized that it could no longer depend upon enrollment funding to grow the University out of its $4.2 million structural deficit. Thus, in order to balance the base budget, the University would need to adjust the base budgets for each division.

Cal State East Bay Cabinet began deliberations in October 2008, and met on numerous occasions with the University Planning, Assessment, and Budget Committee as well as the Academic Senate and its committees, and sponsored several university wide forums. The budget principles developed in October and November 2008 emphasized a multi-year approach that applies the values and priorities established through earlier strategic planning processes. Critical among these are maintaining academic quality and enrollment momentum. (See Cal State East Bay’s Strategic Planning Summary and Priorities for Implementation – April 30, 2008: http://www20.csueastbay.edu/about/strategic-planning/files/pdf/Strategic%20Planning%20Summary.pdf)

The principles stressed that reductions should be strategic so as to position the University for success well into the future. Thus, reductions would not be “across the board,” nor would they focus on short-term solutions. Further, savings should not be transferred as costs to another unit, and the University should “do things differently” where possible so as to protect services or quality, and, in some cases, lead to better outcomes. Nonetheless, the magnitude of the reductions for Cal State East Bay meant that some opportunities would be lost, some services or activities reduced or delayed, and additional risks incurred.

The Cabinet’s process included an analysis of the core functions of each division of the University, resulting in changes that affected some divisions more extensively than others, in order to establish new base budgets for the 2009-10 fiscal year. Each member of the Cabinet made a number of managerial changes and adjustments in administrative processes to reduce expenditures, so that all reductions in positions could be accomplished through attrition and/or redirection of employees to serve core functions.

In making the recommendations associated with the new base budgets, the Cabinet recognized implications for each division as well as the following common challenges:
Managing expectations so that students, faculty, staff and other constituents understand that we need to do some things differently, which in many cases also means doing “less with less.”

Ensuring that the advantages of self-service outweigh the more impersonal quality of this approach.

Designing remote and/or automated systems to accommodate urgent, time-sensitive requirements, and non-routine situations (e.g., in supporting instruction).

Being responsive to specialized needs of individual colleges, departments, administrative units, and locations (e.g., Concord) that don’t easily conform to centralized approaches.

Restructuring support at Concord to conform to the organizational structure of the divisions across the University.

Maintaining quality control with less supervision and administrative support.

Sustaining professional development with travel limitations.

Preserving some flexibility for unexpected circumstances with limited contingency funds.

### 2009 Summer

During the spring and summer of 2009 the State of California’s fiscal crisis worsened, leading to additional reductions to the California State University system. The Board of Trustees responded by increasing student fees to help close the gap, but recognized that campuses would also need to trim their budgets and their enrollments further. In part because some of the budget reductions needed to be implemented immediately for the 2009-10 fiscal year, the CSU negotiated a furlough program for one year with most of the collective bargaining units that represent CSU employees, including the California Faculty Association.

Cal State East Bay’s Cabinet recommended to President Qayoumi that the furlough reductions be allocated based on the salary budget for each division. In addition, the Cabinet recommended initially that the additional “unresolved” reductions assigned at the same time by the CSU be pro-rated similarly because the earlier process in 2008-09 had already made differential adjustments among the divisions. Subsequent revenue projections for 2010-11 left the University with an unallocated amount of $1.2 million, so the Cabinet recommended that this amount be added to the base budget for Academic Affairs in recognition of the centrality of instruction to the University’s mission. (See Table 2, Four-Year Analysis of Division Base Budgets vis a vis Enrollment Targets. The $44.2 million base budget for Academic Affairs for 2009-10 includes this additional $1.2 million before adjustments were made when the reporting units in the former Student Affairs division were reassigned among three other divisions, as shown in the second column for 2009-10).

Concurrently, the University also recognized that the success of its enrollment growth initiatives would likely result in enrollment above the CSU target for 2009-10 and began to initiate enrollment growth controls. These included a significant reduction in admission targets for Winter and Spring 2010, and efforts to encourage students with an excessive number of units to complete their degrees. (Note that the CSU provided one-time funds during 2009-10 to each campus in the system to meet short-term enrollment needs in 2009-10. The entire amount of $826,000 allocated to Cal State East Bay was distributed to
Academic Affairs, but does not appear in Table 2 because the funds are one-time funding and not part of the continuing base budget.)

Fall 2009 and Winter 2010

Following the President’s charge to the Cabinet to develop a balanced base budget that meets the CSU enrollment target for Cal State East Bay, the Cabinet began working on adjustments to achieve this goal for the 2010-11 fiscal year. Due to the anticipated expiration of the furlough program, which averted most layoffs for the 2009-10 fiscal year, the Cabinet identified further budget reductions necessary to accomplish a balanced budget and enrollment plan for 2010-11. Recognizing the urgency of preparing for 2010-11, the President welcomed an initiative by the Academic Senate to establish a task force to seek ideas from the faculty, and asked each member of the Cabinet to draft a budget plan by mid December. Further, the President urged Cal State East Bay as well as the California State University in general to think creatively about the challenges ahead while protecting academic quality and student access to the extent possible. (See “Addressing the budget crisis with innovation and transformation” in the President’s View, December 2, 2009, http://www20.csueastbay.edu/news/2009/08/presidents-view-080309.html).

During Fall 2009, each member of the Cabinet worked through the University’s administrative structure to identify ways to change administrative business processes and service delivery systems to reduce future costs. Within Academic Affairs, the Provost’s Council, and Deans with their college councils, worked diligently to balance resources with enrollment expectations. Concurrently, the Academic Senate conducted a series of town hall meetings and approved a report based on the findings on December 1. The University’s Planning, Assessment, and Budget Committee (UPABC) met in November and December to review the University’s budget and enrollment planning process for 2010-11.

The President reviewed the submittals from each division and asked the Cabinet to make some additional adjustments in early January 2010 to achieve a balanced based budget for 2010-11. The analysis included a calculation of revenues that would be lost with the CSU assigned enrollment reduction of 9.5 percent. Assuming that most of this enrollment would have been taught by lecturers, Cal State East Bay estimated that this reduction would save the University $2.5 million in salary costs. However, Academic Affairs base budget was only reduced by about $1.2 million, leaving the difference to help that division cover earlier “unresolved” reductions. The final adjustment for 2010-11 included a supplemental allocation of $1.2 million in one-time funds to Academic Affairs for 2010-11 to help the colleges accomplish the changes they need to make in order to meet lower enrollment targets. (Again, Table 2 only shows the base budget adjustment because the one-time funds are only available for one year.)

\[1\] Note also that several of the permanent and one-time adjustments to Academic Affairs amount to $1.2 million by coincidence, not design.
Part II. The University Perspective for 2010-11 – Summary

Tables 1 and 2 summarize enrollment and base budget trends over the past several years. As already noted, the University set out to grow itself out of a structural deficit and was on the way to accomplishing this objective. However, the exigencies of the California budget crisis left the University without anticipated enrollment growth funding. Indeed, the CSU has assigned each campus a lower enrollment target for 2010-11, which amounts to 9.5 percent for Cal State East Bay.

Table 2 summarizes the changes in base budgets for the University and each division since 2007-08. The lower section of the table readjusts Academic Affairs and the other divisions in order to compare base budgets over time. This section of the table shows that Academic Affairs’ adjusted base budget has decreased by 19.2 percent. Because part of the change for Academic Affairs is accounted for by the enrollment reduction, the base budget allocation per target Student Credit Unit has dropped by 10.5 percent. In contrast, the other divisions of the University have collectively taken a reduction of 21.5 percent.

The enrollment plan for 2010-11 includes four primary efforts designed to bring enrollment in alignment with the reduced enrollment target for Cal State East Bay, consistent with suggestions from the Academic Senate Task Force report.

- Reduction of summer quarter offerings under state support to a bare minimum needed to facilitate graduation of continuing students and to meet the needs of specific populations such as teacher education that run year-long cohorts that start in the summer.

- Admission limits for specific programs, including two “impacted” undergraduate majors and relatively high-cost graduate professional programs.

- Emphasis on making progress to degree for new and continuing students through the following:
  - Streamlining remedial and upper division writing skills coursework;
  - Encouraging earlier declaration of major;
  - Expecting “high unit” seniors to complete their programs in a timely manner;
  - Controlling the maximum number of units for which each student can register to allow more students to fill their course schedule; and
  - Managing academic progress expectations.

- Use of self-support for new initiatives and other programs that meet the intent of Executive Order 802, which outlines the framework for self-support and special session instruction.
Part III. Division Budget and Enrollment Plans for 2010-11

1. Academic Affairs

2. Administration and Finance

3. Information Technology Services

4. Planning, Enrollment Management, and Student Affairs

5. University Advancement

DRAFT
Planning Process Overview

Through various forums during Fall Quarter, 2009, administrative staff and faculty have been engaged in discussions regarding meeting demands of the anticipated further downturn in State support while meeting a lower mandated enrollment target. While enrollment is targeted to be lower by 9.5% during 2010-11, the actual base budget dollars are anticipated to be reduced even further. For CSUEB the Academic Affairs base budget is anticipated to drop from $54,852,000 in 2008-09 to about $44,200,000 during 2010-11. This $10.1M drop is roughly 90% of the money spent hiring lecturers in 2008-09, or about equal to a reduction of 2100 class sections relative to 2008-09. However, since longer planning and implementation processes are required to adjust academic programs, the University is adding $1.2M of one time additional funding to Academic Affairs General Fund budget in 2010-11 in order to help bridge into 2011-12.

Following early discussions in the Provost’s Council during late September, the Academic Senate was alerted to the need to plan for the dramatic change in available resources and was asked for recommendations regarding several policies that might be implemented to help manage enrollment and provide student access to classes. In the following months consultations occurred within the President’s Cabinet, cabinet members with staff in the Chancellor’s Office, within the Provost’s Council, within College Councils, and by the Academic Senate through faculty forums on Academic Reorganization. The Academic Senate forwarded final recommendations following its December 1, 2009 meeting. Those recommendations were generally consistent with the planning framework of November 10, 2009 which grew out of discussion with the President’s Extended Cabinet and communicated to College Deans by the Provost. This framework was also shared with Department Chairs, Ex Com, UPABC, and COBRA. It was intended to guide College Deans who were charged to work with their College Councils and faculty to develop a draft plan to meet the budget and enrollment targets.

College draft budget plans have been reviewed during discussions with the President and Provost. College draft plans were due to the Provost by December 1. During the December 17-January 4 period Cabinet Division plans were reviewed by the President. Following a Cabinet review on January 4, 2010, final decisions regarding draft budget numbers and enrollment targets were communicated to College Deans, who were asked to make necessary revisions in their individual college plans.
Overview of Academic Program Initiatives and Changes

A number of the specific proposals summarized below come specifically from suggestions made by the Academic Senate Task Force and in the recommendations approved by the Senate on December 1, 2009. Where campus policy requires further Senate review and recommendations on these and other proposals, Senate action will be requested prior to implementation of those specific initiatives.

Summer 2010 Term

At this point the CSU has set limits on what campuses can charge matriculated students for self-support Summer Session courses. Because of these financial limitations self-support summer session courses will be constrained in a way that resources and costs must be carefully managed. Enrollments must be great enough to offset costs.

CSUEB will offer a 2010 summer program, albeit likely smaller than past summer terms funded traditionally, by offering courses both in self-support and state support. Colleges will develop the summer schedule with consideration of student progress to degree, programmatic priorities, enrollment targets, and financial planning.

Enrollment Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CY Enrollment Targets</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>35,119</td>
<td>31,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEAS</td>
<td>27,360</td>
<td>24,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>72,362</td>
<td>65,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>44,259</td>
<td>40,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>2,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181,621</td>
<td>164,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond the undergraduate programs already declared impacted (nursing and business administration), new admissions will be reduced in some areas in order to shift resources to facilitate access for undergraduates. The following sections describe college proposals that will result in changes in admissions and enrollments.

College Action Plans

CBE

The College of Business and Economics will streamline programs and curricula, thereby facilitating student progress to degree and implement additional changes. Further reductions in staff support will occur through attrition bringing staff headcount down by six since 2007, and MPP headcount down by two over this same period.
More specifically:

- Continue College enrollment management practices
- Eliminate Marketing 3495 Business Communications from the Business Core. The number of sections of Marketing 3495 will be significantly reduced in 2010-11. Marketing 3495 may be eliminated from the state supported curriculum in 2011-12. (Students have an option of taking English 3000, 3001, and/or 3002 Upper Division Writing Skills courses offered in self-support, if they do not test out of the upper division writing skills requirement [per guidelines in University Catalog]).
- Discontinue or suspend the MS degree in Business Administration (note: this is not the MBA program)
- Stagger offerings in the MA in Economics over a two-year period, admitting students annually.
- Additional graduate programs under development and planned to be offered through self-support include a professional MBA and an MS in Accounting. A new graduate degree targeting career enrichment for individuals working in financial analysis is also being developed and will be submitted for review and approval.

**CEAS**

Graduate admissions will be reduced in the following programs in order to shift additional resources to undergraduate programs and reduce overall enrollment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Admissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Leadership MA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Credential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EdD Program</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional development and executive programs are in development to be offered through self-support in order to meet regional needs. The following programs will be offered through self-support: Masters programs in the Department of Hospitality, Recreation and Tourism; Multiple Subject Credential cohort in cooperation with Alameda County Office of Education; a cohort in the MS in Curriculum in partnership with the Antioch Unified School District; and the Level II Administrative Services Program.
CLASS

In order to shift resources to undergraduate required courses the following actions will be necessary. CLASS will take the following steps in order to meet its target with the help of reimbursements, one-time allocations, and grants & contracts. There will also be savings through personnel attrition and reduction in staff by approximately 8.7 FTE

Upper Division Writing Skills Courses ENG 3000, 3001, and 3002 (approximately 44 sections/CY) offered only in self-support. Students may test out of the writing skills requirement (per guidelines in University Catalog).

Admissions will be reduced in the following graduate programs to meet lower targets and resources:

(% Reduction)

• Public Administration 50%
• Health Care Administration 50%
• Communicative Sciences and Disorders 25% Limit upper division admissions, too

• MSW at Hayward down from 91 to 70 admissions + reduce/eliminate admissions in the Concord MSW program 45% Reduction in State supported admissions (approximate)

• Limit graduate enrollments in five additional departments

Planning is underway to offer Executive Programs on self support possibly at the Oakland Center and Concord Campus in several of these areas.

In efforts to protect high demand majors, the following additional actions will be implemented. There will be reduction/elimination of student assistants, reassignment of staff, reductions of options within degrees, significant reduction in chair released time, and elimination of graduate coordinator time during 10-11 and possibly 11-12 unless graduate enrollments rebound. CLASS Departments are committed to offering at least ten 90-120 student class sections, thereby increasing the College SFR. The College office will reduce O&E and consolidate staff functions.

CSI

At this time the College feels it can maintain all of its existing programs through raising the SFR significantly; savings made through reductions in staff costs through leaving vacancies and reductions in time base, reductions in assigned time, and reimbursements
from self-supported offerings and grant reimbursements. College offerings during Summer Quarter, 2010 will be self support only.

**Concord Campus**

Curriculum offered at Concord will be focused on high regional interest and community financially supported programs scheduled so that the campus will open at most four days per week. Summer Quarter, 2010 offerings will be very limited. Therefore, summer 2010 classes will be scheduled so that only one or two buildings need be opened for at most two, possibly three days per week. Those offered on self-support will have to defray part of the costs.

Programs Colleges may be able to support include the following:

- Pre-Nursing
- Nursing
- BA Business (Generic)
- Liberal Studies (teaching option, Early Childhood Education)
- Human Development
- Master’s in Social Work
- College of Education Programs to be determined.

Relative to 2008-09 there have already been significant staff reductions at the Concord campus.

- MPP Associate Dean converted to 0.5 Faculty Released Time.
- SSP II Academic Advisor position eliminated at Concord and transferred to the Hayward Campus.
- The MPP Director has taken on additional duties as Director of the P-20 Initiative.
- MPP Facilities manager was reassigned to the Hayward Campus for four days per week.
- IT Coordinator position eliminated at the Concord campus and transferred to the Hayward campus.
- Computer Lab Supervisor position eliminated.
- Library Assistant transferred to Hayward.

**Other University Wide Actions**

In order to assure that students have access to courses, initial enrollment by a student will be limited to 18 units without approval. A maximum number of units a student may take on state support will be implemented in an effort to move students to graduation.

**Library and Student Academic Services**

This includes Academic Advising and Career Center (AACE), Student Academic Support (SAS) Student Center for Academic Achievement (SCAA), the Hayward and Concord Libraries, the Learning Commons, and programs that are externally supported
(at least in part) such as Upward Bound, Renaissance Scholars, EXCEL, and the McNair Programs.

The intent is not to cut further the budgets in SCAA, AACE, and SAS. The Library will try to keep commitments to various key data bases and inter-library lending. In order to maintain core hours and services, various personnel changes will be undertaken. The library book budget has already been decimated.

Central Academic Affairs Administration (Provost’s Office, APGS, ORSP, Academic Senate Support, etc.)

Due to reductions in MPP positions during the past two years, enough salary savings are accrued to allow the central administration to operate, albeit with reduced staff, with only additional minimal reduction in P/T staff hours.

Reductions in MPP positions include:

• MPP IV: Associate Provost position is unfilled. The functions of this position will continue to be covered by the University Librarian. Part of the salary savings is being used to offset reductions in the Library by funding part of the salary of the Interim Associate Provost and Director of Libraries.

• MPP III converted to MPP II. Associate Vice President for Academic Resources Position converted to Administrator II, Senior Director.

• MPP converted to 0.50 faculty released time in AP&GS, plus several significant changes in personnel assignments, leaving positions vacant, and reductions in catalog printing costs, have resulted in over $400K savings relative to the 08-09 budget.

All of the above actions have resulted in savings by administrators and staff taking on additional duties.
Planning for 2010-11 for A&F began in the context of the division’s mission and its commitment to diversity.

**Mission**

*The Division of Administration and Finance provides customer-oriented professional services intended to enrich the educational experience, further the University’s strategic priorities, maintain the integrity and accountability of the institution, and enhance the University’s standing in the community.*

**Diversity Commitment**

*We value and respect diversity, inclusion, civility and individual uniqueness and recognize the strength these factors bring to our community and learning environment. All of our interactions should reflect trust, caring and mutual respect.*

The Division’s leadership also enunciated several principles, consistent with this mission and vision. That is, budget adjustments would be made considering the following:

- Opportunities for service delivery to benefit from the emerging administrative service delivery model that stresses online service as the first response;
- Maintain current safety and health service levels;
- Critical mass within each functional area to meet its responsibilities to the University, considering vacancies in each unit to date;
- Flexibility to realign activities and assignments among functional areas and across annual and quarterly service cycles; and
- Longer-term implications of immediate actions

Budget adjustments in the Division also built on the process for 2009-10 for Administration and Finance, adding the relevant aspects of Student Affairs from the reorganization of July 2009. Some of cost-saving measures that were introduced for 2009-10 include these:

- Reducing overtime and temporary staff, with an impact on service levels within multiple departments (Facilities, CaPS, Accounting);
- Moving budgetary responsibility to line management;
- Combining departments to take advantage of disparate transactions cycles;
- Moving many student and employee services programs online, with consequent loss of the personal aspects of face-to-face interaction; and
- Substituting data warehouse reports for ad hoc reports to provide standardized data for decision making, with limited individualized analysis.
For 2010-11 the Division will continue with these economies, and add to that more systemic efforts. Importantly, A&F will depend increasingly on service delivery through online, self-service applications. However, the success of such processes depends on support from ITS as well as a commitment of A&F staff time.

A&F’s ability to support the functions aligned with the University’s mandates during 2010-11 will be constrained due to reductions in salaries and operating expenses.

Strategic planning for CSUEB (overall)
- Limited resources (esp. staff) in ITS as well as A&F will continue to delay development of measureable outcomes and “dashboard” indicators;

Culture of Accountability
- Access to a robust data warehouse that supports data driven decisions will be delayed and in some cases will not be delivered at all; and
- Reductions in telephone and face-to-face services (despite online availability) are likely to reduce student and employee satisfaction with service levels.

Inclusive Campus Climate and Vibrant University Villages
- Limited operating budget will hamper the ability to renovate classrooms to increase instructional capacity;
- Limited staffing will constrain the maintenance and service levels within Facilities and Grounds;
- Reduction in staffing in HR will compromise the development of a comprehensive workforce development program; and
- Staff reductions and less professional development will affect morale.
Planning for 2010-11 for ITS began in the context of the division’s mission and vision, including its commitment to diversity.

Mission
The Division of Information Technology Services (ITS) strives to support and enrich the university experience for students, faculty and staff – an experience that is increasingly technology enabled and network based. ITS teams develop, operate and maintain the University's shared computing and networking infrastructures, major administrative and academic information systems, baseline instructional and information technologies, and the requisite technical support services.

Vision
Excellence in teaching and learning, information sharing, and the exchange of ideas and viewpoints, along with anytime/anywhere access to resources and services, are defining features of the academically rich, student centered university experience we intend to provide for Cal State East Bay students. The goal of excellence in the use of information technology is an essential ingredient in achieving this vision.

Diversity Commitment
We commit to the principles of universal design and accessibility; operational excellence; highly responsive, helpful and supportive relationships; and open-minded, receptive collaboration – key ingredients for expanding access, as well as building trust and mutual respect within our diverse university community.

The Division’s leadership also enunciated several principles, consistent with this mission and vision. That is, budget adjustments would be made considering the following:

- The ability of the division to address a full-range of administrative and academic technology needs of the University’s faculty, staff and students;
- Opportunities for reducing our cost structures by extending our shared-services model in collaboration with sister campuses – a.k.a. “synergy” initiatives;
- Cabinet plans for transitioning labor intensive administrative service delivery models to online self-service delivery models;
- Flexibility to realign activities and assignments through consolidation, virtualization and lifecycle management of the University’s technology infrastructures and services;
- Critical mass within each service delivery area to meet its responsibilities to the University, considering vacancies in each unit to date; and
- Longer-term implications of immediate actions.

For 2010-11 the budget adjustments in ITS will significantly expand upon those initially introduced for 2009-10.
• Elimination of professional project management services and project consulting funds with an impact on the University’s project capacity, project schedules, deliverables, and portfolio management services;
• Reduction in applications support for the University’s major information systems and data warehouses with an impact on divisional efforts to implement online self-service delivery models for administrative divisions;
• Reduction in desktop support services for faculty, staff, and students with an impact on problem resolution services, computer refresh schedules, and computer inventories;
• Continued suspension of smart-classroom conversions and reduced maintenance support for existing technology equipped classrooms with an impact on equipment failure rates;
• Reduction in support for computing labs – requiring closure, consolidation, and virtualization of approximately 20 computing labs;
• Reduction in instructional technology support services with an impact on support for faculty use of emerging instructional technologies;
• Reduction in server and storage funding with an impact on server availability, refresh cycles, and storage capacity;
• Reduction in licenses and vendor maintenance contract service levels with an impact on software availability and response to calls for help from vendors;
• Reduction in network support services with an impact on remote access availability and problem resolution; and
• Staff reductions and less professional development will affect morale.

University Mandates:

ITS does not have lead responsibility for the seven mandates articulated within the Framework for the Future. However, the technology infrastructures and services provided by ITS are essential for successful achievement of all seven of the mandates. Correspondingly, ITS plays an important supporting role in the success of all the campuses, administrative divisions, colleges, and segments of the University’s community of faculty, staff, students, alumni and friends.

In sum, ITS will continue to reduce services, staffing levels, and expenditures in order to balance its budget.
Planning, Enrollment Management, and Student Affairs
Budget and Enrollment Plan for 2010-11
December 16, 2009

Planning for 2010-11 for PEMSA began in the context of the new division’s mission and vision, including its commitment to diversity.

Mission
PEMSA provides information and assistance to current and future students, faculty, staff, alumni, and members of the community at large. PEMSA’s role is to attract, enroll, and support student learning, leadership, and success; and to provide administrative analysis and planning for Cal State East Bay.

Vision
PEMSA supports the University in becoming an educational leader that prepares students to be successful citizens in a diverse and global society. PEMSA strives to provide a supportive environment with innovative student services and quality assistance that help students achieve their goals.

Diversity Commitment
PEMSA embraces and fosters diversity in all its forms and actively promotes a welcoming, supportive, fully inclusive, and accessible University community. PEMSA is committed to a strategic approach to student services and enrollment management that reaches out to students and families from traditionally underserved communities and that supports campus efforts to increase enrollment, retention and graduation rates for students from all backgrounds.

The Division’s leadership also enunciated several principles, consistent with this mission and vision. That is, budget adjustments would be made considering the following:

- The ability of the division to address a full-range of access and success needs of the University’s changing student population;
- Support for implementation of the University’s enrollment plan for 2010-11;
- Longer-term implications of immediate actions;
- Opportunities for service delivery to benefit from the emerging administrative service delivery model that stresses online service as the first response;
- Critical mass within each functional area to meet its responsibilities to the University, considering vacancies in each unit to date; and
- Flexibility to realign activities and assignments among functional areas and across annual and quarterly service cycles.

Budget adjustments in the Division also built on the process for 2009-10 for the former Division of Planning and Enrollment Management, adding the relevant aspects of Student Affairs from the reorganization of July 2009. Some of cost-saving measures that were introduced for 2009-10 include these:

- Reducing overtime and temporary staff, with an impact on service levels and timing for processing applications, transcripts, degrees, and financial aid;
- Scaling back mailings, publications and events, with public relations implications for outreach and recruitment;
Moving orientation programs online, particularly for transfer students, to handle volume, with consequent loss of the personal aspects of face-to-face interaction;
Substituting data warehouse reports for ad hoc reports to provide standardized data for decision making, with limited individualized analysis.

For 2010-11 the Division will continue with these economies, and add to that more systemic efforts. Importantly, PEMSA will depend increasingly on service delivery through online, self-service applications. However, the success of such processes depends on support from ITS as well as a commitment of PEMSA staff time.

Meeting the enrollment reductions mandated by the CSU for Cal State East Bay will require further streamlining of administrative processes. Applications have increased at the same time that admissions must be limited, requiring additional selection procedures not previously required at Cal State East Bay. On the other hand, earlier application and document deadlines will contribute to improved work flow management. Another specific consequence of resource limits is that the academic departments are looking for classrooms with more seating capacity, challenging PEMSA to work with both the academic departments and facilities to schedule courses more efficiently.

PEMSA’s ability to support the functions aligned with the University’s mandates during 2010-11 will be constrained due to reductions in salaries and operating expenses.

Strategic planning for CSUEB (overall)
- Limited resources (esp. staff) in ITS as well as PEMSA will continue to delay development of measureable outcomes and “dashboard” indicators;
- Limited operating budget will postpone implementation of aspects of the Hayward campus master plan that require staff resources and consultants.

Student Access and Success
- More constrained communications and outreach and enrollment development efforts, as well as earlier deadlines, will make it more challenging to sustain the University’s historically diverse student population;
- Reductions in telephone and face-to-face services (despite online availability) are likely to reduce student satisfaction with service levels and may pose challenges for students less familiar with admission, financial aid, and registration processes;
- Enforcement of deadlines and other requirements may increase demand for trouble-shooting as well as the volume of appeals.

Inclusive Campus Climate and Vibrant University Villages
- Limited operating budget will hamper the ability to renovate classrooms to increase instructional capacity.
- Limited staffing will constrain support for existing student life programs and defer expansion of activities and leadership opportunities;
- Staff reductions and less professional development will affect morale.

In sum, PEMSA will continue to reduce OE&E and fill no vacant positions, but will also have to reduce staffing levels and expenditures on student assistants in order balance its budget.
Planning for the University Advancement (UA) 2010-11 Base Budget began in the context of the division’s mission and vision, including its commitment to diversity.

**Mission**

University Advancement builds a compelling case for choice and support of CSUEB among all of its constituents by communicating and advocating for the university’s distinctive regional position, role, and contributions, thus forging relationships and securing commitments required to advance the institution’s mission and priorities.

**Vision**

UA is recognized for a pivotal leadership role in:

- Transforming CSUEB into a regional high-access university of choice and destination campus
- Generating prospective student interest and affinity leading to record high enrollment
- Garnering statewide and national recognition for CSUEB as model of educational innovation.
- Building an endowment that underwrites and ensures the success of the University’s quest for excellence and distinction
- Positioning CSUEB as steward of the region’s future and human capital, worthy of regional business and industry support and collaboration
- Cultivating the University’s most valuable and powerful strategic relationships among business, community, educational, cultural, and political leaders
- Planning and executing history-making, record-breaking comprehensive and capital campaigns

**Diversity Commitment**

UA commits to support the CSUEB mission to provide “an academically rich, multicultural learning experience,” by increasing private support so that students of all backgrounds receive an education that truly prepares them to discover and develop their full and professional potential. This will be accomplished through the University’s first comprehensive fundraising campaign (2009-2017)

The division has employed the following principles in creating its budget plan for 2010-11:

- Strategically analyze and rank budget reduction ideas relative to their impact on the University’s Mandates, Strategic Planning Summary and Priorities for Implementation, and, specific to University Advancement, the University’s comprehensive campaign.
- Avoid “across the board” actions or percentages
- Make reductions based on analysis of long-term commitments and directions, not “quick fixes”
- Emphasize ways to accomplish functions that reduce costs while protecting quality (do things differently)

In 2010-11, the UA base budget reduction will require the following steps:

- In development and fundraising, major gifts travel and cultivation will be reduced by 50%, prospect research will be eliminated, end-of-calendar year and Winter/Spring telemarketing
campaigns will be cut by 52%, and targeted direct mail campaigns and parent’s campaign eliminated.

- In the area of development communications, the Annual Report of Private Giving (magazine insert) and the President’s Friends Letter to high-end prospects will be eliminated.
- In constituent and alumni relations, the budget for Cal State East Bay Magazine will be reduced by 60% with the number of issues cut from 3 to 2 and reduction of distribution to approximately 60% or less of our alumni constituency. Assuming ITS support, we will offer a Web-based e-subscription option, allowing us to prioritize who receives the magazine by mail (preferred by many).
- We will suspend general awareness (brand reinforcement) marketing.
- In marketing communications, we will provide only maintenance support for PEMSA’s existing marketing materials.
- In government and community relations, we will reduce attendance at off-campus events/sponsorships by 85% and chamber memberships by 46% (major chambers and regional association memberships will be retained).
- We will reduce our general supplies and telephone expenditures by 22%

During 2010-11, UA’s ability to support those University mandates where it is the lead division—quest for distinction (recognized) and university of choice through regional stewardship—will be constrained due to reductions in salaries and operating expenses.

Quest for distinction (recognized)

- Elimination of University marketing and advertising will cause decline in awareness and diminution of recent gains in awareness and quality perception versus competitors, and will also undercut enrollment recruitment efforts and increase future recruitment costs.
- Reduced circulation of Cal State East Bay Magazine and elimination of President’s Letters will reverse recent gains in improving weak alumni and constituent affinity and relations, compromising ongoing initiatives including fundraising and advocacy.
- Reductions in reach and frequency of constituent communications will likely increase alumni and constituent – as well as internal – dissatisfaction and complaints that CSUEB does an inadequate job of maintaining key relationships by communicating regularly and providing ongoing news and information about developments, progress, and achievements.

University of choice through regional stewardship

- Reduced major gift cultivation and travel budgets will slow campaign leadership-phase fundraising, potentially extend the campaign’s leadership phase and diminish campaign total results.
- Unless reversed in future base budget allocations, reduced circulation of Cal State East Bay Magazine and elimination of President’s Letters will result in decreased campaign public phase marketing and fundraising results and increased public phase marketing
- Reduced telemarketing and targeted direct mail campaigns will reduce (1) annual fund results that support departmental scholarships and other programs and (2) growth in the number of annual donors, a major source of future major gift donors

As a result of the above, unless supplemental funding is secured CSUEB will not materially improve its CSU fundraising-results ranking nor make material progress toward its objective of raising private support to an amount that is equal to 10% of State support.
Part IV. Implementation

This section will be completed following University discussions of the budget and enrollment plan. The implementation section will outline the steps that each division and faculty governance will need to complete in order to accomplish the budget reductions and enrollment adjustments in the plan.
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