CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Approved
Minutes of the Meeting of March 4, 2005

Members Present: Dana Edwards, Kris Erway, Armando Gonzales, Karina Garbesi, Bonnie Ho, Terry Kelly, José López, Nancy Mangold, Bruce Trumbo

Members Absent: Saeid Motavalli, Don Wort

Visitors: Pablo Arreola, Bob Brauer, Mark Karplus, Jim Kelly, Norma Rees, Don Sawyer, Dave Travis, Gale Young, Assad Zamir

1. Approval of the Agenda

Agenda approved with no additions.

2. Approval of the Minutes of Feb. 18, 2005 meeting

Minutes for the Jan.21, Feb. 4, and Feb. 18 meetings approved with no corrections.

3. Reports of Ad Hoc Committees

Garbesi discussed a progress report on information about the budget and how it has evolved. The Subcommittee is looking at functional breakdowns as well as Departmental breakdowns, and has developed a list of proposed core functions. The Subcommittee indicates that necessary data are largely available. Major functions identified are Instruction, Student Services, Physical Plant, Academic Support, and Institutional Support. “Special’ functions that need to be included are the University Library, Risk Management, Information Technology, Financial Aid, Energy, University Advancement, and Policing, among others. Garbesi suggested that another function which may be separately identified is Remedial Education. Some functions move across different Campus Divisions.

There was no report from the Long-Range Planning Subcommittee.

4. Report of the Chair

López welcomed Jim Kelly, Interim Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, to the meeting. López and Kelly will meet to discuss COBRA’s activities during the past two years. Brauer introduced Assad Zamir, a visiting Fulbright student from Afghanistan, to the meeting.
López asked Rees to comment on the upcoming Budget Advisory Committee meeting and any new budget developments. Rees discussed the standard order of events in the budget process. The first BAC meeting allows the Committee to familiarize themselves with the budget and the way it is presented in preparation for the meetings in which the Vice Presidents discuss their budget requests. She stated that she has generally advised the VPs to identify areas that go beyond the current year's funding. Concerning next year's budget, information which is preliminary at this time is that the budget is not expected to change dramatically. The Governor's Budget allows for a 2.5% enrollment increase, which will not be allocated equally across the CSU because of different enrollments at the campus level. CSUEB will not quite meet the enrollment target for this year but will come very close. A realistic target to aim for next year will be a 1% increase in enrollment. If enrollment is over the target, the University will seek additional funding. Jim Kelly and Enrollment Services are working to identify applicants who have been denied admission to the CSU of their choice in order to encourage consideration of attending CSUEB. Rees reported that it is expected that the new student housing that is currently under construction will be ready in September 2005.

López discussed the role that COBRA members play on the BAC as individual faculty members. He requested that COBRA have an informal discussion after the BAC meeting next week, as the next regularly scheduled meeting will be on April 1.

López began discussion of the COC/COBRA meetings and the various responses made during the meetings. It was decided to focus on an overall appraisal first and then discuss individual meetings as necessary at a later date. Edwards felt that the discussions revealed general satisfaction with faculty involvement in the budget development process on the part of the Chairs, although the overall level of participation in the process was disappointing. Kelly agreed with this assessment, as there were no major points of dissatisfaction expressed, although suggestions for improvements were made. Mangold concurred, and stated that it seems the process is basically working well, even with the procedural differences between the Colleges. López made a distinction between process itself and the outcomes of the process, and did not fully agree with the perceptions of satisfaction expressed previously and questioned where COBRA might stand on the issues. Kelly suggested that perhaps COBRA might produce a set of common principles which could serve as guidelines for all Colleges, despite the differences in process among them. These principles might be especially useful for future Chairs and Deans. Ho stated that it is likely that the Colleges that have lost more tenure-track positions have worked more closely together because of a greater need to have faculty input into the position allocation and hiring process, and that the Colleges with less of a need seemed to express less interest in participation. Trumbo expressed reservations about the low level of participation and described different possible reasons for this and the views expressed during the meetings.
While he did not consider them a waste of time, he felt COBRA didn't really learn anything new or significant. Trumbo expressed concern especially about the perceived lack of enthusiasm for the process on the part of the younger faculty. Garbesi said that it seems apparent the the COCs and Deans have developed processes that work well for their particular Colleges. She suggested that it might be useful to get a sense of general satisfaction with the process from the collective faculty members of all Colleges. López said that a mechanism to query faculty concerning their level of involvement and whether or not their voices are being heard should be pursued. Due to time constraints, continuing discussion was postponed until the next COBRA meeting.

5. WASC Implementation Plan-Resource Implications-Gale Young

Young discussed two major aspects of the WASC process: the upcoming visit by the WASC Teams and the ongoing work on developing the CSUEB Educational Effectiveness Outcomes. COBRA members are invited to meet with the WASC Team focusing on the Fiscal Dimensions of Operations on Wednesday March 16 at 1:30 pm. She distributed The Educational Effectiveness Outcomes document which details a timeline from April 2005 to June 2006 and lists dollar amounts that the CSUEB WASC Committee is proposing for each task described in the document. Garbesi asked whether these dollars will come from General Funds. Young said that they will, but that the WASC Committee is also looking for grant monies for campus climate studies. The total amount proposed is approximately $50,000, most of which will be expended next year. She said that this amount is essentially a bare-bones request. Sawyer stated that this is an example of another unfunded mandate. López asked if this total dollar amount is realistic, given that the figure seems low. Rees questioned whether indicating dollar amounts for the different goals is useful at all. Young said that a large portion of this amount will be for release time, most of which will be in the Fall and Winter Quarters in FY 05/06. Trumbo questioned why the budget for item 10, Faculty Learning Community, is listed as $8,000, which seems high for this goal. Young indicated that Eileen Barrett is currently planning these activities. Garbesi suggested that if the dollar amounts are significantly understated, then it might be best to provide two dollar amounts, one for the proposed budget and one delineating actual costs. Young will consider this suggestion.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Edwards, Secretary