

## Academic Planning, Assessment, & Resource Committee

Date: 25 Oct 2016

Time: 3:00 pm -- 5:00 pm

Place: Academic Affairs Conference Room

### Present

Michael Visser (Chair), Laura Krier, Kath Morris, Mark Perri, Suzanne Rivoire, Daniel Soto, Tim Wandling, Karen Moranski, Shawn Kilat, Laura Lupei

### Report from the chair

- Michael Visser met with administrators and discussed graduation initiatives. 450 million base funding for student graduation initiatives has been allocated.
- Academic Space Subcommittee draft is being circulated. Initial draft was too focused on classrooms. Structure and functions wants an election to the subcommittee. Ballot statements will ensure a wide variety of viewpoints for the subcommittee. There is also an academic technology committee which we will coordinate with. We discussed the value of appointing faculty with the right expertise as well as to encourage participation. Elected participants are likely to be junior faculty members without sufficient experience.
- Shawn Kilat is now a member of the committee. Justin Lipp is no longer a member of the committee.

### Business

#### Presentation on University Budget and Marginal Cost

This presentation is meant to support decisions and questions. We have a marginal cost of enrollment methodology for new students. Includes costs that are directly affected by increases in enrollment. New marginal cost funds split between State Allocation and Tuition Fee.

Presentation focuses on the University Operating Fund, excludes parking, housing, etc. Components include instruction, research, public service, academic support, student services, institutional support, operation and maintenance, student financial aid. Instruction includes faculty and department chairs. Academic support includes Deans, administrative services, advising, and tutor centers.

University Budget by Marginal Cost Component percentages were reported. Instruction is 42% of budget. Removing the Financial Aid changes these percentages.

The marginal cost formula allocations are discretionary. The SSU and CSU expenditures of funds are different than the allocations. This likely reflects the difficulties and timing of our budget process where the budget is released after expenditures have begun. We are under the CSU guideline in instruction and over the guideline in the plant operation and maintenance and institutional support.

Service commitments from faculty that are bought out show up in instruction despite a plausible argument that it is academic support work. It would be informative to know what the percentage of instruction is release time that isn't strictly instruction. This doesn't include release time paid for with external funding.

Our SSU budget allocations have been relatively stable on a percentage basis over the 2011--2016 time period.

Marginal Cost Methodology, Budget, and Actuals by FTES Our spending in 2015--2016 per FTES is \$11.9K. \$5.5K of this is instruction. We need to determine the difference in FTES used to determine per FTES for the budget and the actuals. Instruction per FTES has increased by about 10% in absolute terms over 2011--2016.

The marginal cost allocation is now part of our budget, creating an incentive to continue enrollment growth.

We are low compared to our comparable peers (Bakersfield, Humboldt, San Marcos, Stanislaus) in the general fund allocation. There are historical reasons for this related to the low cost needed to mount a liberal arts curriculum. This allocation likely hasn't been revisited since 1993.

## **Dashboard report**

Michael will take the list of metrics from the previous minutes and take them to Reporting and Analytics.

## **Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters**

We are being asked to revise this policy. The Campus Re-engineering Committee is no longer functioning and won't be coming back.

## **Annual Budget Cycle**

Academic cycle does not match the annual budget cycle. We will plan our schedule so that we can anticipate and provide feedback on a timeframe that allows for changes.