

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

November 30, 2011

Members Present: J. Constable, D. Nef, R. Sanchez; P. Newell, P. Amaral

Members Absent: A. Parham, J. Parks

Visitors: Dr. Robert Harper

The meeting was called to order by Chair Constable at 3:35 p.m. in Thomas 117.

1. Minutes. MSC to approve the Minutes of November 9, 2011.
2. Agenda. MSC to approve the Agenda as distributed.
3. Communications and Announcements

Report on the 29 November meeting of the Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Task Force (AABATF).

The Provost has completed “listening sessions” with all of the Schools and Colleges and has scheduled meetings with the students and the Department Chairs next. The AABATF at its next meeting will consider (i) if the magnitude of the budget gap has changed and (ii) do the recommendations of the task force require changes.

Report on the shared services conference by P. Newell.

The idea of the shared services conference was to inform CSU Fresno administration about how shared services may result in a cost savings to the university by condensing “fractional” work performed by multiple individuals across the University into single positions. Estimating the potential suitability of CSUF for a shared service approach will require ~ \$400 K for a consultancy plan, however, some of this cost offset as the University has much of the required technological infrastructure already in place.

There are concerns to implementing a shared services structure including:

- The suitability of the approach for a small to mid-sized University
- Impacts on staffing levels and union considerations
- Requirement for considerable budgetary transparency
- Involves a fair degree of change in College “culture” including autonomy and a requirement for advanced planning

4. New Business

None presented to the Committee

5. Discussion of the future of the current budget model and approaches to the creation and/or modification of the model to reflect the budget realities of the University.

A key conflict within the present budget system is that Dean's who are fiscally efficient generate higher SFRs that result in reduced funding the subsequent year - in essence the College is penalized for fiscal efficiency. Additionally, there are discrepancies in funding and acceptable SFRs between graduate and undergraduate FTES.

Bob Harper presented a preliminary model based on calculating the number of FTEF required to service a known number of graduate and undergraduate FTES. The model includes key drivers of teaching load (tenure track, lecturers, and teaching assistants), teaching level (graduate and undergraduate), class size (graduate and undergraduate) coupled to salary (tenure track, lecturers, and teaching assistants) along with other factors. Key benefits of the model are that it can be used as a planning tool to address how to teach the required FTES, and the costs incurred by teaching using different staffing approaches. It also uses readily identifiable data. It was suggested to request each of the School and College Deans produce a one page summary of key components they would like a future budget model to contain.

Discussion also addressed the use of the Schedule of Classes (SOC) worksheet as an additional tool to allow Dean's to assess the costs of offering specific classes. Anne Burkholder will be contacted to have her make a presentation to the University Budget Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm

Agenda for Wednesday 30 November 2011

1. Approval of minutes of 30 November 2011
2. Approval of agenda for 18 January 2012
3. Communications and Announcements
4. New Business
5. Discussion of budget model alternatives