# 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 13, 2013

Present: J. Constable, D. Nef, R. Sanchez, R. Maldonado, G. DeVoogd, J. Schmidke, P. Newell, A. Levi, A. Quinteros

Excused:

Absent:

Guests: S. Elrod (Dean, CSM) and A. Lawson (Associate Dean, CSM)

Called to order 3:32 pm TA rm 117

1. Discussion with the Dean and the Associate Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics

The discussion centered on a variety of topics associated with the budget of the College of Science and Mathematics including budget changes at the College level and those associated with the operation of the budget model. Key points addressed were:

* College funds have been impacted at two primary levels (i) several equity raises have been implemented resulting in an increase in faculty costs and (ii) the structure of the budget model has negatively impacted funds allocated to the college. A significant net effect of these factors has resulted in the college not being able to meet student demand for courses as chairs have not been able to add additional sections as needed.
* The college has spent considerable effort in learning the structure of the budget model and assessing how the college reports activities. Their efforts identified some inconsistencies including:
	+ PeopleSoft accounts of FTEF of faculty and FTEF of graduate student TAs is incorrect and resulted in an significant overestimated FTEF overload. As a result the College was penalized for PeopleSoft generated overloads that in reality did not exist resulting in a loss of funds to the college of
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~$389,000. It should be noted that this concern is a PeopleSoft coding/reporting issue that has been rectified through cooperation with Dr. D. Nef.

* + The college also has been re-assessing how courses are classified and associated enrollment limits. These efforts identified a number of course mis-classifications (e.g., identifying a laboratory period as an “activity” rather than a true “laboratory”). Combined with the mis-classification were violations of enrollment limites that together resulted in a reduction of funds allocated to the college of ~$19,000. This concern is now being rectified through college actions to appropriately classify previously mis-classified courses.
* Beyond concerns associated with model mechanics, noted above, the Dean also expressed concerns about the maximum percentage of assigned time allowable within a college and the current funding rate of $500 per laboratory period.
	+ The Dean noted that the model’s limitation of 12.5% maximum for assigned time activities is far below the actual ~22% assigned time activities actually performed by faculty. The net effect is that certain college level activities were not being funded by the model. The committee acknowledged that the 12.5% values represented an average across all the Schools and Colleges and therefore improved reporting by the Schools and Colleges may influence this value in future model iterations.
	+ The College of Science and Mathematics offers a considerable number of laboratory courses, both as independent courses and as a component of a lecture course. The model currently funds laboratory courses at $500 per section to cover consumables and related expenses. The Dean in conjunction with Department Chairs has reevaluated laboratory costs and estimates a per lab cost of ~$1127 – over twice the value accounted for in the model. Key aspects
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of laboratory costs that are not reflected by the current funding rate include: vehicle maintenance costs and gasoline, service contracts, technician costs, calibrations, chemical safety requirements (chemical storage, safety wear, and chemical disposal). The Dean estimates that the College was underfunded for teaching laboratories by ~$684,000. The Committee explained the origins of the $500 per lab section value and will discuss alterations to the funding of laboratory section.

* Other pointed noted by the Dean were: (i) administrative costs for the Office of the Dean was too low. The idea was presented that funds for the Dean’s Office might not just include fund allocation based on the number of faculty, but also based on the number of administrative units in the college. (ii) There was concern that the costs of research and intellectual activity was not built into the model. And (iii) a mechanism for rewarding sound fiscal decisions should be incorporated into the model through a mechanism that provides the Dean with incentive to manage funds wisely.
1. Minutes

The minutes of 16 October were discussed and some changes will be incorporated for approval next week

1. Agenda

MSC to approve the agenda of 16 October 2013.

1. Communications and Announcements

P. Newell can no longer serve on the IETCC and needs a UBC member to replace him for the next three meetings. According to the known IETCC schedule, the following individuals will represent the UBC:

Nov. 14 G. DeVoogd

Dec. 19 R. Sanchez

Jan. 23 A. Levi
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1. New Business

Chair Constable has been scheduling visits to the UBC by the Deans to discuss the budget model. Currently, the following meetings have been scheduled:

Nov. 20 Dean Samiian (CAH)

Nov. 27 Dean Beare (KSEHD)

Dec. 4 President Castro

Jan. 22 Dean Boyer (JCAST)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm

Agenda for next meeting

1. Meet with Dr. V. Samiian of the College of Arts and Humanities.
2. Approval of minutes of 16 October 2013 and 13 November 2013.
3. Approval of agenda.
4. Communications and Announcements.
5. New Business