CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD  
Committee on Budget and Resource Allocations  

Minutes of the Meeting of May 7, 2004  

Members Present:  
Kris Erway, Armando Gonzales, Bill Langan (Chair), Eleanor Levine, Jose Lopez, Nancy Mangold, Saeid Motavalli, Don Sawyer, Don Wort  

Guests:  
Bob Brauer, Stanley Clark, Bill Dinehart, Mark Karplus, Michael Leung, Julie Norton, Norma Rees  

1. Agenda was approved as amended with item #4 being postponed until next week when Greg Pogue and Dick Metz will be available (Time Certain: 9:15 AM).  

2. Minutes were not available for approval  

3. Report of the Chair  
It was reported that the Layoff Committee has completed its work, and is finalizing the wording of its report. The Committee will go into recess, and will be available during the summer as needed or called upon by the President to convene.  

Wort- Asked about the availability of the Committee during the Summer.  

Langan- Indicated that the Committee would be available if called into session this summer.  

4. Discussion of Decision-making process to send out layoff notices  
Langan- regarding the layoff notices received by staff, asked the President how the process occurred and when did it decide to act in time for July 1, 2004.  

Rees- Pointed out that July 1 was the earliest time to institute staff layoff to have effect for next academic year. The timing of the announcement is dependent upon collective bargaining agreement by the respective unions, and that the University is obliged to follow a specific procedure, 1) First step is to notify the Chancellors Office, 2) Chancellor notifies the Union, 3) The unions asks for information and names of those individuals affected. The timeline is depending upon the specific union, 60 days-75 days notice.  

Langan- Asked which unions were involved and, regarding the affected individuals, which unit were they employed under.  

Rees- Employment related to SETC is under Administration and Business Affairs, and CSEA could appear in all four divisions.  

Lopez- Asked the effect in numbers to individual colleges.  

Rees- Do not have the figures. President pointed out that individuals receiving a letter may or may not become a separated employee. From experience, it may take many months to determine the final outcome.  

Levine- The school paper indicated that the number of letters sent out was proportionally larger than those from other CSU campuses, if so why?  

Rees- pointed out that she is not aware of what other campuses are doing. Campuses do not share this type of information with each other, because of differences between individual institutions. There is the possibility that we are ahead of the curve. Rees indicated that she had a brief discussion with the Chancellor.  

Wort- Asked the President if there was any direction from the Chancellor or System.
Rees- The Chancellor’s response in relation to the staff issue was to look carefully toward the campus police in maintaining a safe and secure campus environment, and indicated in the most careful way possible follow the obligations under the collective bargaining agreement.

Clark- Pointed out it would be difficult for the Chancellor to give advice or direction because of the specific nature of individual campuses and current budget history. He pointed out that the larger campuses by the size of their budgets have greater flexibility, than CSUH. These decisions are related to addressing specific local issues.

Question arose related to the process for “bumping” and it was suggested that it would be best to wait for next weeks guests (Pogue and Metz) to explain the process.

Langan- Pointed out that the paper quoted Dick Metz that the scenarios were based upon 15% reduction for next year, and asked is it different for other units, and how much will the layoffs save?

Rees- Metz and Pogue will be the individuals to best provide those numbers. She reminded that at the last BAC meeting she had indicated her instructions to each division manager to prepare a budget with 15% reduction.

Langan- Directed question to Clark, and asked related to the process as he understood it, how far down the unit was input given or solicited?

Clark- Clark responded that all unit heads in Academic Affairs gave input.

Rees- Added that this was also the case for Student Affairs.

Langan- Asked if the Dean’s were given a dollar amount to target or cut?

Clark- All were directed to prepare for a 15% cut.

Lopez- Recognizing the general process for layoffs and announcement, he asked if faculty groups were notified earlier than the action?

Rees- First notification to CSU, and then to the unions.

Lopez- Asked if earlier notification would be prohibited by the contract in notifying faculty?

Clark- Yes, he also pointed out that the unions in the past had let individuals know before the campus was able to notify the employee.

Rees- Pointed out that each of our affected employees was handed a letter personally by their supervisor as well as, a certified letter sent to their home. She also reported that the Career Development Center has volunteered to provide assistance to those individuals in pursuit of new jobs.

Wort- Indicated that the only criticism he has heard is why staff were not notified earlier. He opined that it could have been that the President was trying to avoid this action.

Clark- Pointed out that the timing relates to the adherence to the collective bargaining agreements.

Rees- We could not let staff know before we notified the unions.

Brauer- Pointed out that the President has been active to keep the campus informed on the budget.

Levine- Asked how are we to give information or input into the decision process if by contract it is not possible? She pointed out that students she deals with are angry about the loss of services. She emphasized the point that she is not making a criticism, but rather is asking the question of how are we to provide input.

Langan- Pointed out that part of the input has been the unit heads. They are making decisions based on the numbers and services which can or cannot be continued. Where we come in (COBRA) is after hearing the testimony and receiving the information is to provide input to the process.

Norton- These issues will be part of the Budget Forum which will take place on June 1, 2004.

Lopez- Asked if Deans looked at the seniority lists, and is the process that the lowest individuals on the list are the ones who are separated.

Clark- Greg Pogue will be able to explain the process as it relates to seniority within the classification that the individual resides next week. The process is not the Deans responsibility.
Leung- Pointed out that an individual in the college may be moving to reassignment and not necessarily lost.

Lopez- Someone in the organization is going to lose the position, we may not identify where it is immediately, but there is a loss in the organization.

Rees- Reminded the Committee that everyone is presently employed until July 1, 2004. The action would not happen until July 1.

Levine- Pointed out that decisions have been made earlier, she opined that feedback by faculty is important in the process. She would take on extra responsibilities of staff if the saving could be directed to other important services such as enrollment services.

Erway- Emphasized that managers are faced with providing the functions without the individuals. With regard to an earlier question about the amount of savings, without knowing specific positions and salaries, with those limitations the best guess is approximately $3 million (including benefits).

Levine- Sixty-three positions or “people” are scheduled for cut, COBRA has no say about what happens?

Langan- Right now, yes. Our job is to find ways to have input to the process.

Rees- Things are presently “so” fluid, the numbers are preliminary numbers, things could get worse or better. Layoffs can be rescinded. She also indicated that individuals have recall rights for 5 years.

Clark- In response to Professor Levine’s question and based upon the magnitude of the cuts facing Academic Affairs which is approximately $5.8 million, he noted that he welcomes any advice COBRA can provide to him.

Motavalli- If faculty layoff is necessary, is the same process followed?

Clark- No, Tenure is specific to department or unit and not the University, and he referenced the specific Article (38) in the contract that describes the process.

Langan- Explained what the term “layoff” meant in the contract with regards to Entitled Lecturers who are 1.0 PY, and those who are less than 1.0 PY.

Lopez- Indicated a need for a process, a systemic process by which faculty can provide input to budget decisions based upon functions within the institution and not individuals. That is, what functions must be protected within the institution in our view as a basis for providing recommendations to the President and Provost for delivery of quality education to our students.

Langan- Viewed two primary functions for COBRA, recommendations to the BAC for preparation of the 2004-2005 budget, and developing a process for faculty input prior to when decisions are made, that is, input on functions and the priority of functions.

5. Continued discussion of the budget process (including Levine’s issue about consultation regarding course enrollment limits).

Levine- Conceptually she would like to see the decision making power as it relates to the student enrollment requirements for classes (caps minimum and maximum) be given to the departmental faculty as a whole. She pointed out that part of the incentive to take more students in larger classes is to balance the FTES as it relates to lower enrolled or low cap courses. She suggested that there is little incentive for faculty to take 70 students in a 45 cap course when a 12 cap course with 10 students is dropped. It was her view the faculty should have more control at the department level.

Mangold- Indicated that increase in cap size has already taken place in College of Business and Economics. Further, she wished to clarify a possible misunderstanding related to the practice of CBE with Extra Quarter for Pay (EQP) that was made at the previous meeting. She indicated that an earlier comment suggesting that the increase in caps in SBE was used to pay for EQP was incorrect. She had reviewed the comment with the Dean and provided a number of reasons why regular faculty teach in the summer for EQP. Primary was the fact that a large
number of graduate students attend during the summer and, therefore, there are a greater number of graduate course offerings and the accreditation agencies require regular faculty to provide 75% or more of the instruction. Also, EQP helps to mitigate or offset the salary gap in hard to hire disciplines.

Leung- Indicated that he had serious concerns as to how some degree programs target FTES. His concern relates to how a department, for example, can require 2 courses with 4 WTU’s and 1 course with 7 WTU’s all having a cap of 12 students required in the major. In discussing the issue with the department chair he was pointing out the fiscal impact with regard to the large allotted resources in one area which is taught with TT-faculty while the lower division requirements are staffed with lecturers and have large enrollments. He pointed out that he has given the department some latitude, but he has serious concerns into the future with continuing decreasing budget and resources.

Langan- Asked the question as to whether there should be a uniform process in the institution or among colleges?

Leung- Indicated the reason he is expressing concern relates to the issue of consultation with faculty. Consultation continues with the faculty, but the College is facing serious constraints that will need to be balanced.

Mangold- Opined that the decisions should not be general recommendations, but left to the college and the department.

Wort- We should not get into the specifics; we should recommend consultation with faculty from individual programs.

Discussion ensued on the nature of the similarities and differences between colleges and specific programs, and the difficulty of providing FTES targets to departments. It was clear that there needs to be in place a process by which the institution can respond to enrollment demands and not lose FTES.


Langan- Began the discussion, but with time running short indicated that he was planning to distribute to the Committee early next week a draft of the final report to the Senate which will include our recommendations, and asked that input or suggestions be directed to him.

7. Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Donald Sawyer