CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD  
Committee on Budget and Resource Allocations

Approved as amended

Minutes of the Meeting of February 20, 2004

Members Present:
Dana Edwards, Kris Erway, Karina Garbesi, Armando Gonzales, Bill Langan (Chair), Elinor Levine, José A. López, Nancy Mangold, Don Sawyer, Don Wort

Absent:
Saeid Motavalli

Guests:
Sam Basu, Bob Brauer, Stanley Clark, William Dinehart, Myoung-ja Lee Kwon, Michael Leung, Hank Reichman, Alden Reimonenq, Aline Soules, Bob Strobel, Dave Travis, Peter Wilson

Meeting convened 9:00 am.

Agenda approved.
Belone will not be coming

Chair’s Report.
Langan regarding state elections: Support for Prop 57 is very low; if it fails the deficit will double. Prop 55 also looks like it may not pass (it is at 50% right now). The Layoff Committee has recommended series of steps for the deans to consider to avoid the need for layoffs. Recommendations included on how to maximize students in courses. We are now trying to avoid further cuts that would result from missing the FTE target.

Clark: In the coming year if we miss the target by 1.5 percent we will be penalized in this and future years (the CSUH base budget will be reduced). Looks right now that we will be 1.72% below. Clark has requested that CSUH be able to renegotiate the target for 04/05, if we miss our 03/04 target.

Reichman: Some YRO campuses, to make the 5% FTES cut, are making one part of the year self-supported and using the general fund for the rest. In the self-supported periods, faculty would be paid through Extended Ed. at lower salary schedule. We cannot do this because we already have a well-established summer program.

Langan: Those campuses can only do that if their normal enrollment grows.

Levine: How is summer FTES calculated?

Clark: Summer FTES is part of the annualized FTES, our summer FTES is between 4 and 5 thousand.

Sawyer: We are developing fall schedules now. As we cut lecturers, we are cutting FTES significantly. Are we accounting for the impacts?

Langan: The Layoff Committee is trying to address that by increasing SFR among T/TT and FERP faculty. There will naturally be an SFR gap between full time lecturers and T/TT, resulting from the fact that full-time lecturers teach 15 units, whereas full time T/TT teach only 12 units. The only alternative to increasing SFR among T/TT and FERPers is to layoff T/TT and FERPers. UCL will be recommending that cuts to instruction should be lower than the fractional budget cut. It will be up to COBRA to recommend which non-instructional programs could be cut.

Wort: The logic of trying to compensate for the SFR gap is highly problematic because it would actually require higher SFR in T/TT classes than in lecturer’s classes.
Leung: The College can manage SFR and FTES more effectively than individual departments. We have to raise the caps on classes. Though Leung respects the individual department’s decisions on that.

Clark: We are trying to push centralized scheduling of classes, to limit the impacts of section cuts. We are considering eliminated the printed schedule to give us more time.

López: It is more complex than increasing the number of students per section. Credential programs have a required practicum. We decrease supervision capacity as well by doing so.

Basu: CBE has already been urging their departments to raise their caps. Chairs are cooperating. Yet, the caps in CBE are already so high, that Chairs are terrified of meeting students, because they are so angry. Across the board solutions may not be feasible.

Reimonenq: When we start talking about cutting the other divisions, we need to realize that those have already been heavily cut. It will dilute the quality of instruction to make yet more deep cuts in those other divisions.

Garbesi: If we raise caps (which appears unavoidable) we have to explicitly document how this will effect instruction (feedback on writing, for example) and place a moratorium on some of the requirements placed on faculty (for example teaching writing in GE courses), rather than just pretending that we can do it all, having all the expectations on the books and not meeting them.

Reichman: History tried raising the cap on one of the large classes of one of the wildly popular professors and enrollment didn’t actually increase.

Leung: Certainly there are classes for which caps should not be increased. But every college must have some classes for which the impacts would not be so bad. We also need to relax the requirements for graduation (that is substitute courses as needed).

Langan: New issue. Periodically COBRA members receive suggestions for specific programs that should be cut. COBRA cannot address these on an ad hoc basis. Langan suggests that we compile this information and then respond to it later.

López: Do we as a committee want to play that role? If we gather that information we are forced into that role? How do we judge whether the proposals are legitimate?

Langan: As members of BAC, we will be playing that role.

Reichman: We do have an obligation to consider serious suggestions on the budget from the faculty.

Garbesi: Recommends having a retreat to discuss actual cuts; there is never adequate time for discussion during meetings.

Levine: At some point do we get together to review the impacts of our attempts to maintain FTES and simultaneously cut?

Langan: At the beginning of this year we looked at the effects of the previous year’s cuts. That practice should continue in future years.

Levine: Raises issue of a new hires to make room reservation person, who is paid more than incoming T/TT faculty.

Budget Reports of Units within Academic Affairs

Library Report: Myoung-ja Lee Kwon, University Librarian

Hand outs: Library Budget, Library Update Memo from Lee Kwon to University Faculty (Feb 17, 2004), CSU Annual Library Statistics 2002-2003. • The library took a 9% budget cut this year, with respect to year before (that number included staff and faculty salaries), while library costs went up (books about 3%/year, serials about 7%/year), and those numbers do not account or inflation. Promotion increases are unfunded. The library reduced staff from 23.5 to 18.5 since 01/02. This has had a severe impact. There has been a critical decrease in the material’s budget. The integrity of the library collection is suffering. • Since 01/02, there has been a 30% decrease in expenditure on materials (mainly through the journal
cancellation process). The library has been using electronic resources as much as possible to offset cost cuts. But electronic offsets cannot meet all of the kinds of services provided by the library. Students need a place to get together on a computer campus; the library is used for that purpose. The library has to save up for several years for major purposes (computers, for example). She has been considering various approaches for the 15% cut scenario, including fewer hours. If student temporary help is cut back, those students may have to quite school. • CSU Annual Library Statistics demonstrates that the library is operating very lean.

Levine: Is there a ‘friends of the library’ group?
Lee Kwon: No, but the library is working on fund raising.

**Enrollment Services Report: Bob Strobel, AVP Enrollment Management**

Strobel: ES is responsible for recruitment, admissions, registration, financial aid, graduation, and technology group. When Strobel came to CSUH, ES was very far behind other campuses on modernization. He was brought in to modernize ES, but inadequate funding has seriously constrained that process. The budget itself has been relatively steady, but there have been enormous increases in workload. In this transition period ES is doing most jobs manually, while at the same time trying to set up the new system (scanning documents, for example), during a period when staff has been sharply cut. Staffing has dropped by 20 FTE over past two years. ES got a pass through to implement Degreeworks. ES is now being asked to prepare for a 15% additional cut for next academic year. A cut of that size is 1.5 times the operating budget.

Clark: Strobel and staff have done wonderful job under extremely difficult conditions in providing cost cutting. At the same time they have had to address mandates, like the privacy issues in ID.

Sawyer: How close are you to becoming non-functional?
Strobel: Depends on the cuts in services that can be tolerated? Service has already suffered. ES has had a hard time this year getting out financial aid awards. They realize the very significant impact on students.

Levine: How can we understand the most critical vs. expendable expenditures.
Strobel: The first cuts will be on outreach publications.
Levine: Is there any indication that publications have been effective?
Strobel: Hard to tell. We may be more effective with direct contacts.
López: Thes14 unit limit on registration, did that come from ES?
Strobel: Yes.
López: Appears like it may have significant impact on FTES. How well publicized was this? And what was the reason for imposing the limit.
Strobel: Every student who registered new about it. It was announced on mass mail. The purpose was to make most efficient use of seats, to limit students shopping around. This would allow the greatest number of students to schedule full loads, which is needed for financial aid.

Garbesi: It sounds like a 15% cut would be devastating if it is twice your operating budget.
Clark: Provost will be monitoring the budget very closely to address this.

**CONTRA COSTA Campus Report: Dean Peter Wilson**

Handouts: CCC Organization Chart. CCC Budget.
Wilson: The Budget reflected in the documents are used to maintain all of the basic services at CCC, except library, DPS and student services. Centralized advising at CCC addresses both GE and majors, because there are no faculty based out there. CCC recruits new students at community colleges and high schools in Contra Costa, Napa and Solano counties representing both Hayward and Contra Costa campuses. • CCC costs were budget was cut
6% since last year. In previous years CC had been allowed to over-expend substantially. That is no longer allowed. A 15% cut would be about $194k, twice as big as the CCC operating budget. Cuts will mean not cleaning the buildings, not maintaining the equipment. Cannot take further cuts without affecting personnel. Staff would go down by 7. There are 776 annualized FTES out at CCC (ignoring classes those students might take here). Multiplied by reimbursement per student, would be $5.4M. The majority of this is not going to CCC.

Langan: But salaries are not paid out there.

Wilson: CC is a revenue generator.

Levine: If we closed the CC, would that reduce our funding?

Rees: When CCC started, it was separately funded. For years there was a separate budget item for CSUH and CC in the CSU overall budget. Rees asked that those be combined. Why? Original funding for CCC was based on a completely hypothetical number of students. That many students never materialized. If we indicated that we were closing the doors there we would loose significantly, because the cut would almost surely be based on that historic high number. We would not only loose money but our potential as a regional university. But Rees primary goal is to make sure that the Hayward campus does not suffer as result of political move with respect to CCC.

Wilson: The University has not begun to take advantage of the potential of the CCC. Current attempts to develop private funding for that campus are promising. Trying to get the community colleges and high schools to offer course on the CCC campuses as a means to draw students to complete their education at CCC.

Levine: There has been much pressure on faculty to teach out at CC, which has taken a large toll on faculty. Commute time and lacking resources creates much wasted time. It appears like an adversarial relationship in which faculty are constantly asked to give.

Garbesi: The cuts will make it very difficult to continue to have the faculty here provide the service needed at CCC.

Wort: Has not observed any adversarial relationship between CC and here. CBE has many faculty who live out there. It has been beneficial and the resources and support has been excellent at CC. The potential benefits of CCC are large. Maintaining CC is an investment in the future.

Reichman: It would be valuable to build a faculty that is more closely associated with CCC, but we need to make sure that CCC does not become separate from CSUH.

Levine: Having committed faculty at CCC can be very damaging to departments with a small number of T/TT faculty. Can’t staff committees.

Rees: We cannot have it both ways, not hire people specifically for CCC and not have our people here go out there and teach. We chose not to make CCC an independent campus.

**Upcoming Meetings:**
March 12 instead of the 19th. Sonja Redmond, Student Affairs, and John Charles, Information and Computing Services.
March 5th: Carl Bellone, Academic Programs and Graduate Studies, and Dick Metz, Administration and Business Affairs.

**Adjourned 11:35**

Respectfully submitted,
Karina Garbesi, Secretary