

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
5200 N. Barton Ave, M/S ML 34
Fresno, California 93740-8014
Office of the Academic Senate
Ext. 8-2743

Oct 19, 2016

Present: J. Cummins, A. Levi, R. Maldonado (Chair), D. Nef, J. Parks, R. Pun, J. Schmidtke

Excused:

Called to order 3:35 pm in Henry Madden Library Room 1222

1. Agenda

MSC to approve the agenda for 19 Oct 2016.

2. Minutes

MSC to approve the Minutes of 12 Oct 2016

MSC to amend the Minutes of 21 Sep 2016 to show that the minutes of 8 Sep had been approved at the 21 Sep 2016 meeting but inadvertently omitted from the minutes of that day

3. Communications and Announcements

None

4. Continued discussion of the Budget Model

a. Review of current Passthroughs in Academic Affairs

D. Nef reviewed the passthroughs with the committee. These passthroughs reflect a range of kinds of money, some whose origins are murky in the dimmer historical past, some reflective of past line items that were just maintained in the newer budgeting process, some more recent based on various commitments made to particular programs. There is little to no oversight of the money after it gets to college or school, other than whatever the deans might do.

Examples of the first include the BSN and Nursing programs within HHS. \$182,865 and \$382,435, respectively were established many years ago and have been maintained at those levels without inflationary adjustments. Examples of the second include passthroughs for CATI

and the University Farm Laboratory in JCAST. These were funded separately many years ago and that arrangement was maintained with the passthroughs.

Examples of the third include some faculty release time managed through the Provost's office such as the Service Learning Coordinator and the University Veterinarian. Also, some Presidential projects. Finally, an agreement with a donor for LCOE, again via the President, resulted in money going to Lyles outside of the model.

These passthroughs amount to approximately \$6,800,000. Some, like the support for Doctoral programs are calculated by formulas we established. Others are largely historical legacies. The committee did not discuss particulars, but it was raised that some could be accommodated within the model formula and may be worth a re-review.

b. Smittcamp backfill

Smittcamp funding provides backfill for faculty teaching honors classes and the model also funds those faculty salaries to their colleges. The committee felt this provided an incentive, but not large, for colleges to loan faculty to the Honors College.

c. Lowest number of students for funding classes C1-C8.

We again examined data on the funding of lower enrolled courses funded at a rate of 20% of the C factor size (60 for C1). The data needed further refinement; D. Nef will bring a report at a future meeting

d. Cross-listed courses

A question had come up in this discussion about funding of cross-listed courses (along with a cross-listed course that might have enough total students to be funded, but one or both of the separate classes might fall below the number required for funding). The committee felt that since it was essentially a single course (from the faculty perspective), if the total student number met the funding limit, it should be funded. In the process of looking at this data, an error was discovered in the model. The model was funding the salary for each cross-listed course, essentially doubling the funding for each cross-listed course.

Meeting adjourned 4:40pm

Next meeting date: Nov 2, 2016, 3:30pm

Agenda 2 Nov 2016

1. Approval of agenda.
2. Approval of minutes of 19 Oct 2016
3. Communications and Announcements.
4. New Business
5. Continued review of the Budget Model
 - a. Lowest number of students for funding classes
 - b. Effect of release time funding on allocation