CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION
Approved
Minutes of the Meeting of Friday, October 15, 2004

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

Members Absent: Dave Larson, Bruce Trumbo

Visitors: Bob Brauer, Stanley Clark, William Dinehart, Myoung-ja Lee Kwon, Norma Rees, Hank Reichman

1. Agenda Approved

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 1, 2004

López clarified that the acronym for the CRUMS Committee contains no “B.” The Committee is entitled Committee on Reporting, Utilizing, and Monitoring Budgets. The minutes were then approved.

3. Report of the Chair

López turned the floor over to Reichman for a report on developments from the CSU Budget Advisory Committee. Reichman attended a recent meeting of the BAC by videoconference, a report from which will be submitted to the CSU Trustees by October 28. After the Trustees meeting, the CSU budget request will be submitted to the California Department of Finance. Richard West has met with the Department of Finance, which suggested that the CSU not ask for more funding than that included in the Governor’s Compact with the CSU. Reichman believes it is very likely that the BAC will only ask for the funding included in the Compact. This year’s base funding request will adjust last year’s base to arrive at the request amount.

Rees added that there will be an Appendix to the Final Report that discusses additional funding needs in excess of the Compact.

Reichman reported that CSU Chancellor Reed had stated that he was pleased by the work of the Coalition for the CSU, which worked diligently for increased funding last year. The Coalition will continue to exist.
Garbesi asked why the Off-Campus Centers discussed on page 2 of the Preliminary Planning CSU Support Budget document were not supported by the marginal enrollment funding. Rees replied that the marginal rate as negotiated is marginal because of the assumption that basic support services are already in place, which may not be the case for the newer off-campus centers.

López asked about the Compact’s overall influence on financial planning. Rees said that the Compact provides a basis for future planning, with the complication that some of the money is related to enrollment growth. Some campuses in the System are more reluctant to boost enrollment to a large degree than are others.

4. COBRA goals for 2004-2005

López referred to the minutes of the October 1 meeting for continued discussion. At that meeting it was agreed that COBRA would form a subcommittee on faculty input to the budget process. Also discussed was the need for a subcommittee which would work with CRUMS to provide COBRA with the type of data it needs. In addition, López discussed the need for a subcommittee of budget recovery. He stated that COBRA needs to develop a format to determine how it will go about achieving its goals and plans. Discussion was focused on Section 4 of the COBRA Annual Report of May 2004 which contained COBRA’s recommendations about the budget process. López spoke of the need for COBRA to align its work with the CAPR Committee. He volunteered to work with the CAPR chair and Ex. Com in this area.

Regarding 4b in the Annual Report, Rees stressed the importance of COBRA not losing its larger focus on University wide matters and not focusing primarily on internal allocations to individual Colleges. Wort stated that COBRA should not try to micromanage budgets. Garbesi asked if Rees might delineate what she would like to see as COBRA’s level of functionality. Rees agreed to do so, as COBRA was primarily in learning mode last year. Concerning COBRA’s Goals, Rees suggested that it might be helpful to hear from the Division Heads again to find out what they had to do after last year’s budget cuts. Motavalli supported this and stated that COBRA has to get a good understanding of what happened with the cuts last year.
López indicated that COBRA will provide Rees and the campus Budget Advisory Committee further suggestions for achieving goals 4a and 4b, which will be emailed to COBRA members for comment.

5. Review of draft Fall ’04 census and enrollment data (Provost Clark)

Clark began by focusing on Page 2 of the Confidential Fall 2004 Enrollment Report. At the beginning of Summer 2004 FTE enrollment was 18.8% below target. The campus was able to reduce this to 9.2% by the end of the Summer Quarter by converting three cohorts from special session to actual FTEs. He said that the Fall enrollment data is continuously improving, and expressed thanks to the Deans, Chairs, and other faculty in assisting in enrollment growth. The Deans have all been given FTE enrollment targets for the current year. The current annual FTE target is 11,814, and if the campus matches the FTE enrollment from Fall, Winter, and Spring 2003 Quarters during the Fall, Winter, and Spring 2004 Quarters it will be right on target to meet the desired figure. Applications and admits are up for the Winter and Spring Quarters.

Rees stressed the importance of meeting the enrollment target and referred to the fact that the Legislature has informed the University System that it would have to give back money if it didn’t meet the campus targets. Clark said that the Provosts are reminded frequently of this very serious concern.

Clark spoke of the Fall Quarter census report which becomes available in the 7th week of instruction, which may show a drop from the beginning of the Quarter. Overall international student enrollment is expected to drop about 15%. The largest growth area is in the undergraduate population. Clark discussed activities focused on increasing enrollment, while Brauer shared some campus promotional materials. Rees discussed greater student housing capacity on campus and the increase in student activities.

López asked if the updated RBBR would be available at next week’s Budget Advisory Committee meeting. Erway said it would, but that complete headcount data might not be included.

6. Analysis of 2004-05 budget allocation in preparation for BAC meeting
López opened the floor for discussion of the Final Budget Draft, and stated that faculty members may make recommendations to BAC outside of being a COBRA member. Reichman mostly agreed with the allocations but brought special attention to the needs of the Student Center for Academic Achievement. Lopez clarified that COBRA will make recommendations at the functional level, and not for individual units. Dinehart stated that the mix between graduate and undergraduate students has an effect on these type of services.

López suggested that COBRA suggest a set of recommendations to BAC. These are: (1) COBRA should receive a budget development calendar and (2) that BAC create a set of budget issues comprised of concerns that are known and unknown that the Administration might consider in arriving at the overall budget. These recommendations might serve as a roadmap for COBRA, in assisting in knowing how and when to develop budget recommendations. President Rees agreed to develop these.

Rees said that current conditions are mostly known, but when new figures are present the budget roadmap can change.

7. New Business

López inquired as to whether COBRA might want to meet directly after the BAC meeting on October 22. The majority preferred to wait for the regularly scheduled meeting the following week, while allowing for more informal communication between members prior to the meeting.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Edwards, Secretary