Present: Rick Vrem (Co-Chair), Ken Fulgham (Co-Chair), Saeed Mortazavi, Judith Little, Greg Crawford, TK Koesterer, Wayne Perryman, Laurie Sheppard, Susie Dodson, Nancy Kelly, Carl Coffey, Carol Terry, Karen Earls, Lorie Rudebock.

Absent: Christopher Thompson, Labor Council Representative, Steve Butler, Diana Campos, Randi Darnall-Burke, Burt Nordstrom.

Proxies: Nicole Alvarado for Samantha Williams-Gray.

Guests: Bob Snyder, David Rowe, Tom Dewey.

The UBC’s recommended priorities for additional funding in FY2005/2006 were forwarded to the campus via email on May 4, for comments and feedback. About 26 responses were received by Carol in the Budget Office. She provided a broad breakdown of the number of comments supporting funding under each of the following categories:

Ca. 21 Recruitment (including Enrollment and Retention)
Ca. 9 Health and Safety
Ca. 7 Diversity
Ca. 6 Strategic Plan (server migration, classroom rehab., etc.)
Ca. 4 University Advancement
Ca. 2 Mandatory (WASC, CMS)

Evaluation and Discussion of Comments/Responses from Campus Community:

- Many descriptions of the initiatives (titles) are meaningless to those not involved in the process; some are clearer than others – this might not have been the most useful format for requesting feedback
- Frustration expressed at the short timeline for responses
- A request was made to factor in cost/benefit information, where possible; it was noted that care needs to be taken when looking at the cost/benefit analysis; for example, there seems to be some misunderstanding of the impact of not meeting FTES target. The campus is under close scrutiny by the Chancellor’s Office. The fees collected for summer session will break even with the costs of instruction; but it will also generate ca. 250 annualized FTES, which will mean the enrollment target for AY2005/2006 will be 7,139. (Summer session revenue is already built into revenue projections for FY05/06.)

Suggestions for Sharing Recommendations With the Campus:

- Share the UBC’s recommendations as information only to the campus community
- Remind the campus that UBC meetings are open
- Finish the process earlier so that recommendations can go out earlier and the campus has more time to respond

It was noted that these are difficult decisions, there is not enough money, and it will never be possible to please everyone.
Noel-Levitz has issued its recommendations and it was noted that there are not proposals specifically addressing the issues that have been raised by the completed studies. How will these immediate needs that are not currently covered under the funding initiatives be handled?

For the recommendations on partial funding, it was agreed that specific amounts would not be identified by the UBC and that the President would be responsible for determining those amounts.

Discussion on how the Committee would like to use the campus feedback:
- Archive the comments for next year and review them as the process begins
- Append the comments to the UBC’s recommendations when they are forwarded to the President
- The purpose of sending out the recommendations to the campus was for information, not voting, so the committee should not be re-visiting its own decisions based on the comments
- The comments need to be taken with a grain of salt; it is not a representative sample of the campus
- It was agreed that the campus comments would be shared via email. The text of the comments (without attribution) will be copy/pasted into a document for UBC members. Committee members who received comments were asked to forward the text of those comments to Carol, to be included with the comments received by the Budget Office.

UBC Recommendations to the President:

The recommendations are ready to forward to the University Executive Committee as is, with the comments received from the campus appended. It should be noted in the cover letter that there are items with the same prioritization ranking; they are listed in alphabetical order, so their order within that group is not an indication of priority. The cover letter should also include mention of the partial funding recommendations.

Discussion of Reallocation process:

Does the UBC want to make recommendations to the University Executive Committee on reallocation of the existing budget?

- Could it be considered in terms of “items to protect” versus “items to be cut”? The President’s priorities would be items to protect, including Enrollment and Advancement. Is the Committee in agreement and/or are there other items to protect?

- Establish priorities for preserving base-budget funding and protect those from reallocation.

- It the President recommends funding over and above what is available, then the President should specify where the funding will come from.

- Will it be possible for the UBC to reach consensus on this in one hour? It would be ideal, but not likely.

- Some members felt they needed to review the presentations before making any recommendations on reallocating funding. Some members felt it would be more comfortable if the division leaders made the decisions on internal reallocations. It is hard to judge where the “fat” is, when there is none. Q: Are there any obvious places to make cuts
without seriously affecting the University? A: The “easy” cuts have already been made, which makes those remaining very difficult.

- It was suggested that next year budget requests for additional funding include options for reallocation of resources. Basically each division will have to figure out how to fund its initiatives within its own budget.

- To make it more equitable, it was suggested that an established % cut be made across the board, i.e., a “flat tax” and then let the reallocation occur based on funding established priorities. It was noted that if everyone is cut equally and some are funded more; than an imbalance is created.

- The UBC was told not to micro-manage when reviewing initiatives; so it doesn’t seem fair to be expected to do that with reallocation. The Committee’s decisions on the initiatives were based on detailed information that was included in the decision packages; that level of detailed information was not provided to support reallocation decisions.

DECISION: It was agreed to forward the list of recommendations as is, without recommendations for reallocations.

Carol will format the recommendations and draft the cover letter. The cover letter will be shared with UBC members.

Future UBC meetings, evaluation of process and “de-briefing”:

It was established that a core group (6 out of 10 voting members) will be available on campus this summer, in case there is a need to meet and conduct business.

It was noted that administrators could not serve as proxies for staff representatives, even if from the same division. Proxies should be of the same classification and from the same unit/college/division as the elected representative.

There needs to be discussion of when a vote is being taken, versus a poll. The faculty co-chair only votes in case of a tie, but it is not always clear when a vote is being taken versus a poll. Does the co-chair participate in a vote to rank funding priorities?

It was suggested that documents be tested for printability, before forwarding to committee members; different formatting will be used next year.

Process:

- It would be good published the UBC’s funding priorities/categories to the campus before sending out the call for augmentation requests.

- Provide cost benefit analysis where applicable in the decision packages, i.e., “net” costs

- It would be helpful to see a comparison of HSU’s budget categories with other comparable institutions.

- Ask for measurable outcomes; if the campus knows the UBC’s goals/priorities, then requests can be identified as to how they fit into those goals
• Consider giving each voting member of UBC a set number of “points”, to be distributed as desired; rather than one vote per item.

• The budget presentations were very worthwhile; it would be helpful to have print-outs of the PowerPoint presentations for taking notes; helped to get an overall view of the divisions; the information was not necessarily useful in a quantitative sense; the information provided a “bigger picture”.

• There was information on cumulative cuts provided last year; could this be updated for Fall 2005, so that the committee has a better sense; it is hard to get a feel for what has “gone missing” outside of one’s own department/unit; it helps to provide a larger contextual picture. It was noted that a summary page of historical data to see trends might be useful, but it is very hard to simplify. There are less expendable amounts of money, an “invisible” factor which needs to be taken into account.

Next year’s process will be similar, with projected cuts and requests to fund initiatives. The campus is still behind in salaries, so it may be in an equally tough position next year unless more money comes to the CSU.

It was agreed that the current process is a tremendous improvement over the past and will continue to develop and improve each year.