Budget Principle 7

- Eliminate personal printers
- Moratorium on hiring
- Spread employee responsibilities to cover open positions

- For those departments who can reduce time bases, ask staff for volunteers who would like to move from 12 month to 10 or 11 month positions (many departments have very slow periods during January and the summer months and do not need full staffing to run their operation)

- For those employees who were hired as 10 month employees and were moved to 11 or 12 month employees at the employee’s request or their supervisor’s; move them back to original time base (This has been done to increase an employee’s retirement benefits-highest year of pay)

- Release all non-workstudy student help

- Move to a 9/80 work week. This would eliminate two work days out of each month. This would reduce electric, gas, security, custodial, etc. costs during the days that the university is shut down.

- Move to a 4 day/10-hour work day and close the university approximately four days each month. This would reduce electric, gas, security, custodial, etc. costs during the days that the university is shut down.

  - Please note – with the above suggestions, this would not be possible until next semester as the M-W-F classes would need to be scheduled as M-W classes only (with similar hours to the T-Th schedule)

- Do a true audit of all positions. There is a lot of duplication of effort in departments. There are many people who are not putting in a true 40 hour week. What I have specifically seen is that plant operations has a lot of down time for many personnel, and I have heard from others what they have seen as well with people taking many, long breaks and sitting down on the job. I am sure there are other departments as well where people are sitting back and not giving there all. This is not the time. We had a similar situation in Ohio when I worked for the government. We ended up going to a very skeleton crew for a couple years due to the budget. It is not what anyone wants, but I think at some point it has to become a necessity and we should try to start with the people who do not want to truly work for a living.

- Reduce university 1 programs so faculty are free to teach GE and majors courses

- Voluntary furloughs for tenured faculty. Note - faculty retain benefits, receive service credit, and receive any raises awarded during their furlough. Rationale: Many tenured faculty might be able to generate income by using their expertise in the community.
• Campus Reorganization For General Expense Reductions
  o Outsource University Police to local agencies
  o Streamline what we’re best at and focus on the tasks we do well and partner with others
  o IT Consolidation (CIS, ITS, TLT, Library, Foundation, Advancement)

• Wherever possible, require all university and college administrators to teach at least one class a year in a department for which there expertise is relevant. This has the primary benefit of supporting instruction in economically challenging times. Additional beneficial effects may accrue as a result of an improved understanding of the students body that we serve

• We should allow better allocation of faculty to classes in other departments where they may have teaching expertise in allied subject areas. Currently, a number of regular full-time faculty are "underemployed" in their home departments, teaching one or two courses per semester in their areas of expertise and then some other intro classes or maybe GE. Meanwhile, other departments on campus are busy offering similar courses, or courses in a subject area of great interest to the faculty member, and in some cases they do not have enough full-time faculty to do them so they hire part-timers or skip offering a needed course. But no one ever asks or figures out that there is a real expert in a different department who would eagerly come over to teach.

• I suggest we follow the same steps as our other state workers and accept a 2 day a month furlough if the savings will save jobs.

• Volunteer students could visit all local high schools to motivate students to attend CSUF. The volunteer could make video presentations to display the campus and all the programs it has to offer.

• Reduce university student recruitment activities - if we are any percentage above what we are being paid in FTE by the state, then we don't have to put that much effort into recruiting students. Perhaps focusing recruitment efforts on high schools and colleges in Fresno Country would be an appropriate manner in which to focus our student recruitment efforts. Reduce recruitment of transfer students. I don't think we convince enough community college students who are planning to go to a UC to come to Fresno State to justify intense recruiting efforts at community colleges.

• Cease "governmental relations" activities because activities are more appropriate when conducted by president himself and/or CSU systemwide office

• Reduce "advancement" by laying off college/school level advancement reps and combining advancement reps so that colleges/schools not meeting advancement goals get more competent support.
• Defund CETL. The improvement of teaching is certainly something which we all take very seriously. Brown-bag lunch discussions among faculty on campus need cost nothing; we can use those. Workshops and talks from expensively compensated "experts", and full-time administration and office staff... not so much.

• We need to seriously consider consolidation of some services. Between the University and the auxiliaries there is duplication of services. We have discussed EO 919 for some time. Why should departments have to juggle and account for trust accounts on the State side and others on the Foundation side? Why do they have to take deposits to the Foundation and our University cashiers? They have to follow two sets of procedures to spend the money, using two different sets of forms. They also have to run reports out of two systems – PS and JD Edwards. I truly believe there is inadequate control of Foundation trust accounts. I saw it as internal auditor. We need better control. But what holds us up? Interest earnings that go to the campus improvement fund. We need to change the business model so that this is no longer an excuse. We are already using interest earnings for initiatives that the President currently uses the Improvement Fund for. Everything, that is, except for alcohol. There are workarounds, but some people do not want to listen.

Related to the previous discussion – why not run all the housing receivables through our student accounts? If we are serious about showing more of a student’s financial activity with the campus on their student accounts, why not look at that? I’m sure that housing could send us a file that could be uploaded into PS, just like we are doing with the ticket office for Athletics. Why not load all of them into PS? Just because we choose to have multiple auxiliaries on this campus, why should a student have to pay multiple entities for services? Let’s get serious about running more activity through a central point and make it easier for everyone. I know that Debbie will argue that she will not get her money as fast if it first gets deposited in a campus account. But I think these types of excuses are getting too much in the way of progress. For too long we have been prisoners of these excuses. We need to come up with some creative ways to address these excuses. We can find workarounds for some. And maybe the auxiliaries need to just change the way they operate.

• We should seriously consider putting the auxiliaries on PeopleSoft – I’m not sure when this would occur considering the move to the CFS (before, concurrent or after). We could greatly simplify accounting for all involved, down to the department level, if we did. One sets of reports, one chart of accounts, one set of forms, one workflow system, etc. We are moving forward with workflow, but for now that only includes campus operations, not auxiliaries.

• The Association is looking to hire a Controller-type. Here’s an alternative. Dissolve Programs for Children and make it a campus or Foundation trust account. Move the accounting for ASI to the State, similar to what we are doing for Athletics. Financial Services could absorb their payroll, procurement, deposits and AP work. There is an accountant at the Association who does only accounting for ASI and PFC. Move her to my office and she can help with some of the reporting for those two entities and help us
with other general accounting duties. Maybe by doing that the Association would not need to hire someone after all.

- The merger of the Department of Music and the Department of Theatre Arts into the Division of Performing Arts or the Department of Performing Arts. Theatre Arts already houses the Dance option, so it might also be appropriately titled the Division (or Department) of Dance, Music and Theatre Arts or The Department (or) Division of Performing Arts--Dance, Music and Theatre Arts.

Cost savings (and other potential benefits) might include: a) combined efforts with regard to publicity of public performances, including a combined ticket office and online operations; b) consolidation of staff into linked areas such as academic staff and technical staff. Shared expertise in common areas could greatly benefit the Performing Arts area and reduce duplication of effort; c) combined efforts with regard to outreach and recruiting; d) consolidated and professional performing arts management of the area; e) development efforts, audience development and community interest could be vastly improved with all of the performing arts areas collaborating both privately and publicly.

- Equalize athletics and academics as far as hiring is concerned. It seems that athletic vacancies are being filled normally, while very few academic searches have been approved. Case in point: if an academic department loses 3 faculty, how many would be approved? if an athletic team loses 3 assistant coaches, how many would be approved (my guess is 3)? Not equitable.

- Cancel the Provost search and the outside consulting firm. Prospective applicants have their own network and will know about the position without needing the search firm. Again, we are sending the wrong signal here. If an Interim can do it for 6 months, he can do it for 18 months.

- Delay provost search until there is more money - this critical position can be filled on an interim basis for another year.

- My ideas are all referring to the academic side as this is the area I know. The main assumption is that our options are limited to three things:

  a. Limit instructional services

  b. Maintain level of instructional services while externalizing the cost

  c. Maintain level of instructional services while deferring the cost

Since preserving level of instructional services seems to be a priority I will start at the bottom:
Point c. **Cost deferral** - should we be forced to cut the level of our support from part time faculty and lectures, the unfilled / cancelled sections could be offered to FERPing faculty and count against their future instructional obligations. For instance – FERPing faculty, based on an individual agreement, could opt for teaching 3 sections per semester instead of two in exchange for having his/her last year of FERPing without instructional obligations. The assumption is that 3-4 years from today we will be able to make up instructional needs with part time faculty members during – hopefully – better times.

Point b. **Cost externalized** – As we face major shortage of sections due to possible layoff of part time faculty, we cannot afford anymore to waste our resources on students who are not ready. This calls for three possible solutions that effectively pass the cost of remedial instruction on the students:

all remedial classes should be moved to the Extended Ed and priced accordingly

carefully selected lower division courses (e.g. Statistics I – DS73) should start using entry/ diagnostic tests. Consequently, faculty could deny registration for deficient students and direct them to remedial courses offered through Extended Ed; freeing those seats will help streamline those dedicated, better students toward graduation,

additional fees should be imposed on students taking the same class more than once even if it is part of a standard 12 units load (This may not bring much money but we may be surprised how much better our students could do – if faced with this new rule).

At the end we can maintain commitment of our part time faculty by moving them from the state payroll to the Extended Ed. Invariably, following every crises we have to scramble to bring back a new group of part time faculty and it never serves the quality of instruction. This way they will continue working for the university.

- **Budget Savings Suggestion:** Move summer term back to Extended Education

**Background:** In fiscal year 2006-07 the campus moved summer term from self support Extended Education to state side general fund operations. This change was at the direction of the Chancellor’s Office. As a result of this change, there have been negative impacts to both campus operations and students.

Schools must absorb summer term in their annual general fund operating budget. To do so requires the schools to shift some of their fall/spring enrollments to summer term and pay faulty additional pay. This additional faculty cost was approximately $712,000 in summer 2008.

Students are also impacted as summer course offering have declined over the past few years as a result of the increase in state side costs

**Financial Assumptions:** The net revenue (net of fee waivers) collected from 2008 state side summer term was approximately $1.4 million. Given faculty costs of $712,000, this
revenue amount seems adequate to pay faculty costs as well as university overhead such as facilities use, accounting services, admissions & records as well as Extended Education processing. Actually most of the overhead items mentioned above are already being funded with state dollars (we are already offering state side summer term so there should be no increase services needed, just a shift in how we offer it). There is an underlying assumption that the loss in FTES and subsequent loss in revenue to the general fund would be offset by absorbing the lost FTES with more student admits.

**Benefits/Impact:** Assuming the university can at break even running summer term though Extended Education (needing a more formal review of financials), there would be several benefits:

The schools would more cost effective in delivering course sections in just fall and spring saving most of the $712,000 on summer salaries (it is assumed that some of the $712,000 would have to be paid to meet increases enrollment in fall and spring but at a fraction of the costs).

More course sections could be offered in fall/spring as the result of shifting enrollment (from summer to fall/spring) benefiting students.

Expanded summer term offerings. In a time of fiscal constraints on the general fund side and limited access, we could actually serve more students by offering summer though Extended Education thus satisfying part of the unmet regional demand.

We could keep our facilities utilized during the summer as was the original intent of moving to year round operations.

To make this work financially, no low enrollment courses should be offered in summer. Only those courses that could generate breakeven revenue.

- During a recent Classification and Compensation Review, I looked at the size of several academic units in terms of staff & Faculty and majors. What struck me was that we have several departments where the staff/Faculty to student ration is extremely high. The median staff/Faculty to Student ratio is 18:1. So you can see how these department stand out.

The source for this information is People Soft database (for those assigned by Dept Id.) and the 2008-2009 Data Book published by Institutional Research. The calculated ratio reflects the number of majors divided by the Staff/Faculty FTE. Unless the courses taught in these departments are attended by a significant number of students with different majors, We should be looking at the viability of these programs. I know many of these programs are politically sensitive, but under the circumstances that should not be a budgetary factor.

I confess I know very little about the academic side of the University and could be missing a critical factor. So I offer this observation with that stipulation. Consider it “brainstorming”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff/Faculty FTE</th>
<th>DEPT_DESCR</th>
<th>DEPTID</th>
<th>Staff &amp; Faculty Assigned</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Student to Staff Ratio</th>
<th>Monthly Labor (Benefits not included)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>33254 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.75:1</td>
<td>$23,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>33257 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3:1</td>
<td>$47,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>33261 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4:1</td>
<td>$28,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>33251 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.6:1</td>
<td>$57,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>33255 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.2:1</td>
<td>$51,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Last year, the campus spent $28,400 to bring in a concert quality sound system to the Save Mart center and the student recreation center for commencement ceremonies. It would appear that the built-in public address system could suffice to present a graduation ceremony, especially during difficult fiscal times.

As a comparison, the Fresno high schools use the Save Mart center’s own built in, standard public address system to conduct their graduation ceremonies. I spoke with two of their district staff who both stated they are satisfied with the public address system.

The recreation center may need a portable sound system, but perhaps less expensive than the several thousand expended for this in that building last year. The sound system rented for Save Mart has been a sole-source award for the past several years. Perhaps conducting at least informal bidding for a smaller system at the recreation center may result in some savings on even the need for sound in that building.

Depending on the cost of a scaled down system for the recreation center, and not renting a system for Save Mart, total reoccurring savings could be about $22,000 to $25,000 per year.