

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

October 03, 2012

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

Members Absent: D. Bukofzer (excused)

Visitors: Jim Schmidke

The meeting was called to order by Chair Constable at 3:36 p.m. in Thomas 117.

1. Minutes. MSC to approve the minutes of 26 September 2012.
2. Agenda. MSC to approve the agenda as distributed.
3. Communications and Announcements

Chair Constable noted that President Welty has accepted the UBC's recommendation regarding the altered structure of the Level A Review Committee. Chair Constable will draft a memo to President Welty noting the recommendation of Dr. J. Parks and Dr. R. Maldonado to serve as the UBC representatives on the Level A Review Committee.

Chair Constable presented changes in both Facilities and Campus Environment Liaison Committee (FACEL) and the Campus Planning Committee (CPC) structure to improve information flow regarding facilities projects. The intent is to dissolve FACEL and increase faculty representation in the CPC to (i) include two members of the Academic Senate, (ii) one faculty member from each of the eight Schools and Colleges, and (iii) one member from the Library.

Dr. Newell noted receipt of a memo from President Welty stating that the University Resources Planning and Advisory Committee (URPAC) had been dissolved due to the reinstatement of the Level A Review Committee.

Chair Constable reminded the UBC of the Budget Information Session on October 8 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm in the Satellite Student Union at which Dr. Nef and Dr. Constable will be presenting.

4. New Business
None.

5. Discussion of the budget model.

The primary focus of continued discussion of the budget model was the impact of low enrollment limits on C1-C8 courses that would eliminate budget model funding of a course should it fall below a specific headcount value. Model runs to estimate the impact of such a change indicated a negative change in the budget of each School and College. As such the UBC discussed setting finer resolution enrollment limits, specifically setting the enrollment limit for C1-C2 higher than that for C3-C8. There was also a discussion comparing limits set by headcount as opposed to limits set by a minimum percentage of maximum allowable enrollment. Additionally, structuring the enrollment limits to distinguish between graduate and undergraduate courses was proposed. Model runs will be performed to assess how these finer scale course limits will impact School and College budgets.

The Committee also addressed the issue of upper limits in which courses that could accept a marginal increase in enrollment (e.g., 10%) beyond the stated maximum would be rewarded with additional funds in a linear manner. However, beyond that marginal limit, no further increase in funding would occur to dissuade excessive over-enrollment that that could compromise the learning environment as designated by the course's CS number. Significant discussion addressed the concern that some courses might be unable to increase enrollment (e.g., room size limits) and capitalize on this mechanism to increase funding. However, it was noted that these upper limits primarily apply to C2 – C8 classes and that centrally scheduled rooms should be able to find suitable spaces. It was carefully noted that these upper limits do not apply to laboratories (C13, C15, C16) where increasing enrollment is not an option due to the requirement for specialized facilities and student safety concerns. Discussion further noted that in many Schools and Colleges low enrollment classes could, in essence, be funded by high enrollment classes; but some essential programs may have low enrollment in all classes resulting in an inability to capitalize on an increase in funding through increased enrollment.

Beyond addressing limits on course enrollment that impact School and College budgets by affecting changes in instructional costs, the Committee also discussed the component of the model that estimates administrative costs associated with the operation of a School and College. Funds determined through this component of the budget model seek to assess School and College costs associated with the Office of the Dean along with other college characteristics that influence its costs. Characteristics being considered include year-to-year changes in enrollment, number of majors, number of graduating students per year, costs for equipment, laboratories, needs for accreditation, and release time among others. It was also noted that the model currently lacks direct accounting for the teaching of online classes – an instructional component that remains to be incorporated.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05p.m.

Agenda for Wednesday 10 October 2012:

1. Approval of minutes of 3 October 2012.
2. Approval of agenda for 10 October 2012.
3. Communications and Announcements.
4. New Business.
5. Presentation by Bob Boyd on the deferred maintenance situation at the University.
6. Continued discussion on the budget model details.