CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
Committee on Budget and Resource Allocations

Minutes of the Meeting of August 8, 2003

Members Present:
Dana Edwards, Kris Erway, Karina Garbesi, Armando Gonzales, Bill Langan (Chair), Jose A. Lopez, Nancy Mangold, Saeid Montavalli, Don Sawyer, Bruce Trumbo, Don Wort,

Members absent:
None

Guests:
Cal Caplan, Norma Reese, Hank Reichman, (record includes only those who participated in the dialog)

1. Agenda Approved
(unanimous)


3. Procedural Issues
   (a) Nature of Minutes. Langan: Should minutes be limited to relevant discussion and decisions or should they record in detail information such as budget item definitions given in ‘tutorial’ sessions? Trumbo: Minutes should include all original documents. The ‘educators’ should provide the detail. Garbesi: This would be significant burden on them, for example, Erway would have to provide lists of definitions in addition to all the reports they are preparing. Erway concurs. Sense of group: Amount of information included in the July 11 minutes is good. Maintain as possible.

   (b) Should e-mail voting be confidential? That is, should members avoid using global responds on e-mails when voting by e-mail? Garbesi suggests this is best means to ensure integrity of vote. Reichman: Most votes taken in committee are public and many are routine. Norton: Statistics societies issue separate calls for discussion and vote. The votes are secret. Trumbo. Nothing can stop him from e-mailing everyone if he wants to. Langan: Concerned about cascade effect subsequent to voting. Garbesi, in response to Reichman: E-mail voting different in nature from in-person voting in committees. The latter is instantaneous, the former may take days during which time votes are influenced by electronically disseminated votes of others. Informal decision of group: Let chair make the decision on e-mail balloting; open discussion and private voting preferred.

   (c) Edwards: Should absentee voting by e-mail be allowed? General discussion followed regarding the nature of the concern.

   MOTION: (Garbesi, seconded by Sawyer) No absentee voting should be allowed on an issue discussed at a meeting if the member was not present at that meeting.
   VOTE: Yes/No/Abstain 5/0/5
   PASSED
4. Information Needs of the Committee
Langan: Layoff Committee wants to know how deans are allocating cuts. Lopez: Would reports from deans include outside sources? Trumbo: COBRA should invite dean’s to present information one at a time. Langan: Not practical until fall. Garbesi: Also want to hear from the VPs of divisions. Trumbo: Which VPs? Langan: All. Reichman: Might want periodic meetings with those below the division level, particularly from Extension. General agreement on the importance hearing from the director of Extension. Langan: It will be clearer whom else we need to contact after the meetings with the VPs. Can COBRA get the VP reports that were issued at the end of Spring and distributed at the last meeting of the Layoff Committee? Rees: These were prepared for a spring meeting of the president’s Budget Advisory Committee. They indicated how 10% cuts would be addressed; the actual cut is 13%. The numbers are also now out of date. We do not know the campus budget yet; we only know what is happening system-wide. Wort: We might want new BAC meeting when we get concrete information. Rees: Doesn’t think it would be a good use of time to ask VP to completely redo their reports. Wort: Perhaps have them report only on likely modifications to the approach proposed in Spring. Rees: That would be useful to prepare the new BAC members for the next meeting. Wort: We are dealing with the problem of maintaining quality vs. maintaining access. This comment led to a long tangential discussion.1 Reichman: Circulated three documents obtained from the Statewide Senate Budget Taskforce (Status of the CSU Budget as of August 2003, Joint CSU/CFA 2003/2004 Supplemental Report Language, Understanding the CFA/CSU Supplemental Report Language, all undated).

5. Goals of the Committee
Langan: Is our goal to focus on the budget crisis or on the longer term budget issues? Garbesi: Both, according to our mandate. It will be natural and efficient to parallel process those tasks. Lopez: Role of BAC vs. COBRA. BAC good for short term issues, COBRA for longer term. Lopez asks for clarification on the distinction between the committees. Langan: BAC is advisory to the President. COBRA members are a subset of BAC members. Caplan: COBRA reports to the Academic Senate, not the President. Trumbo: Not a good idea to spend too much

---
1 Rees: Chancellor’s message issued yesterday: Because of budget problem, access as we knew it in the past will be restricted. There will be no enrollment growth in 04/05. His message: we simply cannot cover all qualified students anymore.
Langan: Message to the legislature of packing more students in is that we don’t need the money to educate them.
Rees: That is guesswork. We can’t read the legislator’s minds. Is it more useful in the long run to turn away students so they beat up on the legislature or to admit them and have them be unable to get classes and have them beat up on us? This time the legislature itself directed that enrollment be restricted. It may be better to simply try and educate students more slowly. In Rees’s experience, every time there are budget cuts there are attacks on higher education and more demands for accountability.
Wort: It makes no sense for us to say we will accommodate any level of cuts.
Reese: If our strategy of dealing with the crisis leads to significantly decreased enrollments our overall funding will decrease, which can lead to a downward spiral. We need to be very careful. It may be disadvantageous to us. She believes we must do the best we can to meet our targeted enrollment. Although there is no way we can do what we used to do, or even what we did last year, we must meet the quota.
energy separating out the “temporary” crisis from ordinary operations for the next few years. The current budget problems have been significantly deferred to next year’s budget and that process is likely to continue. We are likely to be operating in crisis mode for at least a few years. Hank: Agrees with Trumbo. Regarding COBRA’s goals, the committees on which COBRA was modeled (San Diego and Long Beach) started primarily as budget crisis committees and evolved into regular budget oversight committees. But, in ensuing years the budgets were never flush.

6. **Old Business**
   - Review of most recently available document detailing actual expenditures at the departmental level.” Summarized in the attached “Explanation of the California State University, Hayward, Finance Detail Report (Pre-Closing)”

7. **New Business**
   Potential new business for the committee. Possible issues for COBRA subcommittees to address.
   - Langan: Compliance with ACR-73 is issue that COBRA might consider.
   - Wort: Communicate with legislative representatives of the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee. Track issues that affect the budget.
   - Langan: Examination of the costs of new faculty hiring.
   No resolution on these issues.

8. **Next Meeting**  September 26, 2003, 9am.

9. **Meeting Adjourned**

   Respectfully submitted,

   Karina Garbesi, Secretary

---

2 Documents passed out at COBRA meetings are maintained at the Academic Senate Office.