

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

February 20, 2013

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

Members Absent: J. Taviano

Visitors: J. 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 13 February 2013 with corrections.

2. Agenda

MSC to approve the agenda as distributed.

3. Communications and Announcements

Chair Constable noted that the terms of three members of the UBC (Bukofzer, Parks, and Parham) were expiring and that the call for nominations for committee vacancies would be going out in the next two weeks.

4. New Business

None

5. Discussion of the Level A Review Committee Recommendations

The discussion of the Level A Review Committee recommendations continued based on a tentative motion presented by Chair Constable that was not supported. Further discussion hinged on the significance of the \$3.0M from the State in determining the use of both the \$1.1M of recurring set aside funds and the \$1.1M one-time carry forward funds. During the discussions the following motion was made and passed.

MSC

- (i) If the \$3.0M from the State materializes, the UBC supports the recommendations of the Level A Review Committee and respectfully suggests that the Level A Review Committee reconvene to consider the distributions and priorities of all the Level A divisions and continue to address budget priorities as needed.
- (ii) If the \$3.0M from the State does not materialize, the UBC does not support the Level A Review Committee recommendations and respectfully suggests that the Level A Review Committee reconvene to re-assess the allocation priorities of available monies, the \$1.1M in set aside funds and the \$1.1M in one-time carry forward funds, and continue to address budget priorities as needed.
- (iii) The UBC strongly suggests that the Level A Review Committee remain an active part of the budget process at California State University, Fresno. As such the UBC supports that the Level A Review Committee
 - a. Meet every other year to review the Level A distributions and priorities.
 - b. Meet during alternate years to review the reserves held by the divisions and centrally monitored accounts.
 - c. Meet to reconsider the Level A percentages as new funding becomes available.

6. Initial discussion of the proposed new Nursing programs.

Chair Constable provided an overview of the four new graduate nursing programs being proposed the Department of Nursing in order to meet changes in accreditation requirements by American Nurses Credentialing Center.

The first two new programs include an MS option in *Pediatric Clinical Nurse Specialist / Nurse Educator* for degree seeking students and a certificate of advanced study in the same area for students who have already graduated with an MS degree in nursing. The second two new programs include an MS option in *Adult-Gero Clinical Nurse Specialist / Nurse Educator* for degree seeking students and a certificate of advanced study in the same area for students who have already graduated with an MS degree in nursing.

Chair Constable will contact the Department of Nursing to arrange a presentation about the program to the UBC.

7. Discussion of the budget model

Discussion of the budget model continued to address the concerns of the Deans regarding the budget model. Issues addressed included:

- Lab fees of \$500 per section are inadequate.

The inadequacies of these funds were known at the time the model was being developed, however, data for a better value were lacking. These funds are intended to support both consumables in the teaching laboratory and contribute to staffing costs.

- Costs of technicians, along with other staff, are not directly included in the model.

The costs of staffing for colleges, including technicians, is intended as part of the supplemental funding of \$5500 per faculty member. Discussions identified that these funding rates were possible too low, especially in College that have a number of technicians. Additionally, as technicians frequently aid in the teaching laboratory support it was thought that a new line in the model accounting for the number of technicians in a College and baseline funds for these positions might be appropriate modification. D. Nef will report on technician numbers for each of the Colleges at the next meeting.

- Some Schools and Colleges are required to have “Coordinators” for specific types of programs to maintain accreditation and these costs are not explicitly included.

Accounting for the costs of a “Coordinator” generated discussion as to whether the assigned time limitations imposed by the model sufficiently account for the time required for these duties when they are required for accreditation purposes. It was considered that an appropriate mechanism to including these costs might be achieved by increasing the allowable percentage of assigned time in those Colleges where Coordinators are required.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm

Agenda for Wednesday 27 February 2013

1. Approval of minutes of 20 February 2013.
2. Approval of agenda for 27 February 2013.
3. Communications and Announcements.
4. New Business
5. Initial discussion of the proposed new Nursing programs
6. Continued discussion on the budget model details.