

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
5241 N. Maple, M/S TA 43
Fresno, California 93740-8027
Office of the Academic Senate
Ext. 8-2743

September 19, 2012

Members Present: J. Constable, P. Newell, D. Nef, R. Sanchez, R. Maldonado, J. Parks

Members Absent: D. Bukofzer

Visitors: Jim Schmidke

The meeting was called to order by Chair Constable at 3:34 p.m. in Thomas 117.

1. Minutes. MSC to approve the minutes of 12 September 2012 with a clarification on item 7.
2. Agenda. MSC to approve the agenda as distributed.
3. Communications and Announcements

The Statewide Senate Report was briefly discussed relative to the responses of the CSU system should Proposition 30 fail to pass and the Cal State Online program.

The meeting with representatives of Cal State Online on Wednesday September 26 was noted and there will be an open session for faculty questions 2-3 pm in the Haak conference room.

Chair Constable noted that he had met with Dean Hoff (CSM) during which concern for the new model was voiced with respect to the fact that its use resulted in a loss of funds of ~\$1.6 M to the College.

4. New Business
None
5. Discussion of information on non-reimbursed assigned time distributed by Dennis Nef.

There appears to be considerable variability among Schools and Colleges in how assigned time is reported in PeopleSoft. Ideally, assigned time may be categorized into three distinct fractions (i) Instructionally related assigned time (IRAT), (ii) Instructional Administrative Fraction (IAF), and (iii) Other Source of Funding (OSF). The sum of these three fractions is shown on the FAD report as "assigned time". It appears that there is variation in identifying how to code certain types of activities into these three assigned time categories. The result is significant

variation among Schools and Colleges in reporting assigned time and its accurate partitioning into the three fractions above. Accuracy in reporting non-reimbursed assigned time by the Schools and Colleges, especially IRAT, has additional relevance to the construction of the budget model in resolving the differences between reported faculty workload (the FAD report) as compared to that determined from the listing of all classes taught in each college.

6. Discussion of the budget model.

The discussion started with an overview of actual model operation initiating with the spreadsheet documenting all actual courses taught at the University. Each course is listed along with several of its corresponding attributes (e.g., CS number, number of students enrolled, number of units, faculty base salary per month). These values are used to calculate additional per course values including K factor (a workload factor that varies with CS number), FTES, WTU, FTEF, and faculty cost per course. This part of the model centers on calculating the portion of total instructional course costs associated with personnel.

Additional discussion revolved around model mechanics and the need for the UBC to decide (i) how the model should implement course limits on enrollment; and (ii) a mechanism to accurately fund Colleges with diverse programs containing courses with both large and small enrollment. Subsequently, discussion noted concern with funding smaller expensive programs and raised the fundamental question of the need to offer a diverse selections of courses (some of which may be low enrollment) to maintain the character of the University, while at the same time efficiently managing limited financial resources. Continued discussion of model mechanics returned to the problem of the discrepancy between FAD report data and course offerings data for which a practical solution has been identified.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00p.m.

Agenda for Wednesday 26 September 2012:

1. Approval of minutes of 19 September 2012.
2. Approval of agenda for 26 September 2012.
3. Communications and Announcements.
4. New Business.
5. Discussion on the budget model specifically imposition of limits and diverse program funding.