# 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 19, 2014

Present: P. Newell (Acting Chair), D. Nef, R. Sanchez, J. Schmidke, R. Maldonado, A. Levi,

Excused: G. DeVoogd, J. Constable

Absent: A. Quinteros

Guests: Dr. J. Hironaka-Juteau (Dean, College of Health and Human Services, CHHS), Dr. M. Lowe (Associate Dean, CHHS), Ms Suzanne Shaw (Assistant to the Dean, CHHS), and Ms I. Carson (Budget Manager, CHHS)

Called to order 3:34 pm Thomas Administration Room 117

1. Minutes

Minutes for 12 March 2014 will be completed upon the return of Chair Constable.

1. Agenda

MSC the approval of the agenda of 19 March 2014.

1. Communications and Announcements
2. New Business
3. Discussion of the Budget Model with the Dean of the College of Health and Human Services.

The committee discussed the impacts of the new Budget Model with Dean Hironaka-Juteau with the goal of identifying aspects of the model that fail to account for College specific needs. The discussion was wide ranging and included the following topics:
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* CHHS faculty are involved with a number of activities that are not directly accounted for by the model (e.g., managing of internships). The formal approach of the College is to actually give the duties to a single faculty, but distribute the WTU across a larger number of faculty. Other essential duties are addressed by faculty volunteering their time to support the College goal of enhancing student success.
* There were questions as to whether the caps on WTU and FTES and their relationship to course CS# qualify as double “reductions” to the College budget. D. Nef will examine this point.
* There was some concern on the current census date (during week 5); could this date artificially generate a college profile that does not reflect the true duties of the college?
* It was questioned how the model addresses “overages” of assigned time. If the College meets the FTES target, but has overages in assigned time (i.e. beyond the 12% permitted by the model), what happens? The current assigned time percent for the College is 11%.
* A more complete explanation of “Administration Costs” was requested in that it was not clear how the $5000 per faculty member was determined. Did the UBC estimate this from an examination of costs at the College level or at the University level? It was suggested that an examination at the College level might be warranted as it is expected that the administrative costs in CHHS may greater than the administrative costs when estimated at a University level.
* The above discussion above fed into a conversation about how support personnel are funded. Specifically, it was noted that the current funding of technicians is not addressed as a line item, rather, technicians are funded indirectly through the “Administrative Costs” line in the model. There are a number of key technicians/Coordinators/Directors within CHHS that are essential for the College to meet its mission. Some positions are funded by grants/contracts, while others are supported by the state. Some of these positions include:
  + SSD, GE advisor, nursing and physical therapy admissions coordinator, and staff in the Student Services Center (State positions)
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* + Simulation Coordinator (State position) and technician (Foundation position) in the Knorr Simulation Laboratory (State position)
  + Equipment Coordinator in Kinesiology (State position)
  + Clinic supervisor and staff in the Speech-Language and Hearing Clinic (all State positions)
  + Field Coordinator in Social work (State position)
  + Nursing Resource Center Coordinator (State position)
  + Assistant field coordinator in Social Work (State position)
  + Future hire of public relations specialist. (State position)
  + Assistant Director/Grant writing support and office support staff (all State positions)
* There was also a brief discussion of space limitations within the College.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm

Agenda for 26 March meeting

1. Approval of minutes of 19March 2014.
2. Approval of agenda.
3. Communications and Announcements.
4. New Business