

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 31, 2012

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

Members Absent: D. Bukofzer (excused)

Visitors: None

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 24 Oct. 2012 with typographical corrections.

2. Agenda

MSC to approve the agenda as distributed.

3. Communications and Announcements

Chair Constable passed out an organizational chart of Continuing and Global Education for the general information of the Committee.

Chair Constable provided copies of an email from Dr. J. Schmidke regarding material discussed at the 24 Oct. UBC meeting including accounting for costs of GE and majors instruction as well as the idea of rewarding recruitment. Also noted in the email was the possibility to create a two-tiered equipment budget allocation with a portion (~75%) based on spending history and a portion (~25%) based on proposals.

4. New Business

None.

5. Discussion of Budget Model.

A key step in moving forward with the budget model parameterization is how to determine starting baseline values for specific components.

College administrative costs are estimated at \$55K per 10 faculty members (or \$5500 per faculty member). Discussion revolved around how to better estimate the \$55K value. As a first pass total college administrative costs, outside of the Dean's office, will be estimated from the sum of the administrative costs of each Department to estimate total college administrative cost. This value will be divided by the number of faculty to give estimated administrative costs per faculty member in each college.

The operation of the Dean's office is estimated at \$250K. The current actual costs of each college to operate the Dean's office will be estimated from personnel costs in the office as personnel costs represent the major fraction of total costs. Total Dean's office personnel costs will be compared across colleges as will costs per FTES and FTEF to assess the suitability of the \$250K office cost estimate.

The funding of graduation rates through the model generated significant discussion as much of the success of students is determined by their own activities rather than those of the college. Additionally, it was noted that some majors are more challenging than others and therefore may exhibit higher failure and thus lower graduation rates. The Committee felt that it was not appropriate to penalize colleges with challenging majors, especially in light of the fact that graduating a poorly trained individual could be a public dis-service. It was also noted that many incoming students require significant academic remediation making it more challenging to achieve graduation. However, the Committee also recognized that the ability to reward successful colleges does have merit, but the Committee believes it is unwise to establish a monetary amount for that success at this time.

Funding of equipment costs was also discussed, especially with respect to the difficulty in establishing a historical baseline for college-level equipment costs in light of the fact that many college have deferred equipment purchases over the last several years due to the current fiscal climate. It was suggested that equipment funding possibly be structured such that equipment dollars would be allocated as currently proposed using an "equipment intensity index" ranging from one to 10. In this approach, each index unit would be multiplied by \$25K per unit. The challenge of determining a college's "equipment intensity index" and the funds per unit was also discussed. It was also proposed that once the final allocation to equipment was established, a portion would remain under college control and a portion would be set aside and allocated through a competitive process administered by the UBC. Discussion also addressed the idea that the balance between college-controlled funds and UBC-administered funds could be changed over time in order to provide time to establish a suitable equipment intensity index for each college. It was also proposed that funds be distributed based on grant/contract activity such that securing outside funding would influence the magnitude of funds received through the budget model.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm

Agenda for Wednesday 7 November 2012

1. Approval of minutes of 31 October 2012.
2. Approval of agenda for 7 November 2012.
3. Communications and Announcements.
4. New Business.
5. Continued discussion on the budget model details.