

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

March 2, 2011

Members Present: J. Constable, J. Kus, J. Parks, A. Parham, P. Newell, E. Junn

Members Absent:

Visitors: J. Waayers, Dr. P. Amaral

The meeting was called to order by Chair Constable at 3:32 p.m. in TA room #117.

1. Minutes. MSC to approve the Minutes of 2/23/11.
2. Agenda. MSC to approve the Agenda as distributed.
3. Communications and Announcements.

Chair Constable has sent a note to Elise Rodriguez at the Provost's Office requesting additional information on Centers and Institutes on campus and their impact on University resources.

A reply has been received from Mr. Babick regarding arranging a meeting between Chair Constable, Mr. Babick and Chief Huerta.

The UBC was updated regarding the BA in Latin American Studies and the open invitation from Chair Constable to Drs. V. Torres and C. Perez to attend a UBC meeting to strengthen their program proposal.

It was noted in the recent FACEL meeting that the completion of the new swimming pool is being confounded by the need to construct a diving tower. A bid by the current contractor to add the diving tower is approximately \$600K.

4. New Business.

None

5. Discussion of budget model modifications

John Waayers continued to present to the UBC some of his thoughts for modifying the current budget model. A hypothetical spreadsheet was presented in which the model incorporates:

A condensed structure on a single spreadsheet that could incorporate global increases or decreases in funding either on a per FTES basis or on a percentage basis.

A split into fixed enrollment and variable enrollment components to allow Deans to count on a fixed funding level (the fixed enrollment aspect) augmented by increases or decreases in funding based on changes in FTES (the variable enrollment aspect).

Fixed annual Dean's Office costs across the Colleges.

A wide ranging discussion of these changes and the goals of the budget model in general raised questions about:

“Gaming” the model by a particular College/School to increase its funding.

How to encourage appropriate use of the model and “rewarding” responsible fiscal behavior, specifically with respect to use of salary savings when positions were vacated or unfilled.

The “feed forward” impacts of the sample model, specifically how would funding in year one feed into funding for year two. This is critical for understanding the long term sustainability of the model.

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

Agenda for Wednesday 9 March 2011

1. Discussion of budget model modifications
2. Approval of minutes of 2 March 2011
3. Approval of agenda for 9 March 2011
4. Communications and Announcements
5. New Business