



AY 2025-2026 Budget and Planning Committee

Minutes

Thursday, October 30, 2025

10:00 am – 11:30 am

Zoom only: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/5762616847>

Attendees: A. Grombly (Chair), A. Lauer, Y. Ko, H. Gonzalez, N. Hayes (ex-officio), D. Wu, R. Dugan, A. Reyes, M. Danforth (ex-officio), L. Hernandez, D. Horn

1. Call to Order: Meeting started at 10:03AM

2. Approval of Agenda: D. Horn made a motion, H. Gonzalez seconded. Motion approved.

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. Minutes from September 17: D. Wu made a motion to approve; H. Gonzalez seconded. Motion approved.
- b. Minutes from October 2: N. Hayes amended for her name to switch with K. Watson and change adjournment time from 11:32AM to 10:32AM. H. Gonzalez made a motion to approve with changes; A. Reyes seconded. Motion approved.
- c. Minutes from October 16: D. Wu made a motion to approve; H. Gonzalez seconded. Motion approved.

4. Announcements :

- a. A. Lauer commented about asking Senate EC to investigate Athletics. N. Hayes stated the audit of Athletics (AUP) will be referenced in Spring 2026 Budget meeting.
- b. A. Lauer asked about the lawsuit from two former softball players and who will pay for the settlement. A. Grombly stated that she has heard different things about the settlement. M. Danforth found out from President Harper that there is an insurance fund that all campuses pay into to cover lawsuits, so settlement fines come from the

Chancellor's Office. H. Gonzalez asked whether there is a deductible that each campus pays for lawsuit claims. M. Danforth was unsure, as she didn't ask President Harper about deductibles but did explain it seems that the lawsuits are paid out through the Chancellor's Office and not by the individual campus. M. Danforth questioned whether the EEOC and OCR lawsuit fines are covered by the same insurance fund in the Chancellor's Office.

5. **New Business**

- a. **Budget Book available on Budget Central (Time Certain: 10:10 am;** N. Hayes; actual time **10:20AM)** N. Hayes explained that the Budget Book went "live" for 2024-2025 fiscal year which is located at the bottom of the campus website. Users can click on "Budget Central" link to access the book along with previous budget forum recordings. Previous years' budget books are also available through the Budget Central link.
 - i. Chapter 1 lists the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) who chartered this year's budget book instead of the University's Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committees since the University is in the process of developing a new strategic plan.
 - ii. Chapter 2 includes university organizational charts for campus units. N. Hayes noted that the Budget Book is printable, either the full book, by each chapter, or specific content.
 - iii. Chapter 3, University Base Budget provides information about definitions, shared governance, the 2025-2026 budget calendar (including comparison of CSUB budget with CSU system budget calendar) and the work by BAC. This may change with the implementation of a new strategic plan.

For the Operating Fund Allocation, N. Hayes encouraged BPC members to log in and review how funds are allocated. The budget component is exactly how it has been reflected in previous years. The actuals for fund allocation have been added to increase budget transparency. The allocation goes by Division as of last fiscal year but with divisional restructuring, this will change. The \$7.7 million shortfall is from last year. Chapter 5 of the Budget Book by Division and by College (expenses but not revenue). Prior year encumbrance rollovers included in the current budget; each area broken out by faculty, staff, and administration in the Divisions.

- iv. Chapter 4 workbook "University Self-Supporting (Enterprise)" Budgets. N. Hayes did not spend much time on this chapter.
- v. Chapter 5 workbook "Base Budget Operating Fund" has "actuals" column added as well as department level and account category; one can search by any department. N. Hayes used the example of Athletics to show specific departments. This component of budget book only includes general operating fund; it does not include students fees or Foundation money. All departments are listed, along with benefits and tie to all data previously shared. Salary Allocation, in Chapter 3, shows salaries for faculty, staff, management, and students and the percentage of what is budgeted. The green column on bar graph represents "actuals" to provide full transparency to see how the campus is performing in all areas. Operating reserves is not new information but our "rainy day reserves" is reducing and now trying to implement measures to improve rainy day fund (Chapter 3). CSUB can cover one half of a month; there is also an historical look at reserves. The base

budget (recurring) funds for AY2025-2026 requested by the Board of Trustees was \$593.0 million. CSU base budget was \$8.5 billion and we took a cut of \$148.3 million. Athletics information is forthcoming due to working with NCAA; we can look at past years base budgeting regarding the review that occurs by CPAs for Athletics (Chapter 5). AY24-25 report will be available in January 2026. Prior years can be reviewed on the website. M. Danforth asked for clarification for when the report will be available.

- vi. Chapter 6 included dashboards for student enrollment and Student fees.
- vii. Chapter 7 include a systemwide profile to compare CSUB to other campuses regarding faculty, staff and management statistics and related headcounts. Student-to-Faculty Ratio (SFR), lecturers, tenure-track faculty. The figures refer to actuals being paid, not what has been budgeted nor for position control. Tenure density trend compares CSUB with other CSUs; the data now includes position control and what it would look like if those lines had been filled. There is a staff headcount by year, disaggregated by position. The numbers are also declining and includes past units. Next year's budget book cycle will reflect new units from the recent campus reorganization; MPPs are included in the count and declining in number.
- viii. Chapter 8 includes CPA audit financial statements for auxiliary units such as ASI, Foundation, Sponsored Programs and Student-Centered Enterprises). N. Hayes stated that if we have questions we can reach out.

H. Gonzalez asked N. Hayes to provide more explanation for encumbrances and whether they need to be "unallocated" to go back into the budget or are they "rolled over". N. Hayes explained if there is an encumbrance and goods have not been paid

for but purchased or ordered, that portion of the budget is rolled over. A unit does not “lose the budget” as it is added from the prior year to the current year. It becomes a department line item.

A. Lauer asked what happens if there is overspending. N. Hayes responded she is not sure how things will occur moving forward and that the “rainy day” reserves are declining to fill in overspending gaps. The unspent money is rolled over but the overspending still has to be covered and figure out alternatives to cover costs.

Y. Ko asked about management and the position control trend that shows a downward trend but the number is the same as it was in 2019-2020 when there was the largest FTES. How can the increase in the President’s Office be explained? N. Hayes explained that there was budget allocation for Title IX in AY2024-2025 which was housed in the President’s Office. Title IX has now switched to the Office of People and Culture. The campus was required to “beef up” its Title IX efforts, but next year’s budget will reflect a lowered allocation to due to Title IX moving to the Office of People and Culture.

H. Gonzalez commented that we can see the effects of the Title IX deficiencies across the CSU system, and the money allocation and Title IX positions are needed to address shortcomings found within the system.

A. Lauer commented that industry and business jobs disappearing due to AI and asked if there is any strategic planning in Chancellor’s Office to reduce jobs with AI?

N. Hayes replied that she has not heard anything about use of AI to replace workers.

A. Grombly commented that she sits on an AI committee and will make note to ask the Chief Information Officer (CIO) about it.

b. Academic Calendar Drafts

A. Grombly asked BPC members to review the AY2026-2027 calendar and Summer 2027 calendar for suggestions and potential errors. The Academic Calendar Committee is still waiting for information from ASI about election dates, from SASEM to get registration and application dates finalized, as well as also waiting for dates for application for graduation and registration for postbaccalaureate students. The move out date for students living in the residence halls is after commencement which has changed from prior practice. For the Summer Session calendar, changes have been made and the schedule draft has been completed.

L. Hernandez suggested that if A.Grombly does not get a reply regarding postbaccalaureate information that she should merge the postbac information with other registration information.

M. Danforth remarked that academic calendars need to be done by December 4 in order to get the calendars to the Chancellor's Office. This is the same for the Academic Master Plan (AMP). Due the upcoming deadline, it is likely that the first reading will be waived at the final Senate meeting of the fall semester.

6. Old Business

a. Referral #2025-2026 18 Special Review Committee for Anthropology (Time certain: 10:30 am [10:47AM])

A. Grombly drafted the resolution from our last meeting and wants to make sure that she covered everything that was discussed.

D. Wu suggested to change "Extended University and Global Outreach" to "Extended Education and Global Outreach".

D. Wu question whether to keep the statement “financial considerations were not central to the decision to support decision” in the resolution.

M. Danforth suggested the wording for third resolve should add Subject Area 4/Area D due to Cal-GETC changes.

A. Lauer remarked that finances were a central component for the special review committee.

R. Dugan asked how to address the current policy of “3 quarters/2 semesters” since CSUB is a semester-system campus.

A. Grombly asked whether one year is sufficient to complete their degree.

M. Danforth replied that the agreement may say “Spring 2027” and suggested the timeline be amended the resolution since is based on when the review committee completed the work in Spring 2025.

A. Grombly remarked that we should advocate for the idea of a “teach out plan” of two years for current Anthropology majors to complete their degree. M. Danforth suggested “teach out plan” language in the resolution.

D. Wu suggested to replace “support” with “recommend” or “suggest”.

A. Lauer remarked that the special review committee discussed how it would consider students taking classes through CSU online to help them graduate on time.

Y Ko asked whether our campus helps students by supporting their transfer to another university when their program closes? How may the university respond to students inquiries?

A. Grombly replied that she does not know if the campus provides financial support

A. Grombly stated that Y. Ko’s question may be a Provost-related question

L. Hernandez commented that CSUB does not have articulation agreements with other CSUs for degree programs; it is up to the new CSU campus on what they will accept for any degree.

A. Grombly stated she follow up with Provost Thien for Y. Ko's question.

M. Danforth stated that BPC has to work with AAC and have agreement with resolution language.

N. Hayes asked if CSUB is ensuring that students are provided the opportunity to complete their degrees here, is there a reason why we should support their transfer? It does not affect the resolution language but just wanted to mention this point.

A. Grombly replied that there is only a handful of students and it may not be an option for them.

A. Reyes remarked that he can understand why a student would not want to stay at CSUB since there will be no support system post-graduation with professors for networking opportunities.

R. Dugan suggested that for the second "Resolved" edit the sentence to start with "That the Academic Senate recommends a teach out plan for students in the major".

Y Ko agreed with R. Dugan's suggestion since the first sentence seemed contradictory to later language in the resolution about length of time to complete their degree.

A. Grombly will send the edited resolution to AAC for their feedback.

b. Referral # 2025-2026 12 Proposal for New Concentration MPA HCM

A. Grombly stated there were some small edits made based on L. Hernandez's feedback, as well as using the word "existing" for resources already there.

M. Danforth suggested that there should be standard language for resolutions for the backlogged proposals from last academic year.

A. Grombly has reviewed similar resolution language for proposals to save time; BPC raised no concerns so Amanda will forward the referral to AAC.

H. Gonzalez asked if it necessary to say “sufficient” along with “existing resources”.

A. Grombly stated that “sufficient” can be removed if needed.

M. Danforth suggested to use language such as “there are no resource implications” when focusing on existing resources

D. Wu suggested the following phrase: “The existing resources are sufficient to support this program in its successful future operations.:

A. Grombly remarked that it may not need to say “successful” since things are already in place.

H. Gonzalez supported statement that “existing resources are sufficient to support this program” since nothing new has been added to the existing program.

c. Referral #2025-2026 13 Proposal for New Concentration MPA NPM

H. Gonzalez suggested similar edits for this resolution as those that have been made for the MPA HCM resolution.

d. Referral #2025-2026 07 Proposal to Rename the Computer Science Information Security Concentration

A. Grombly stated that similar language was used when Music renamed its bachelor’s program last academic year

M. Danforth suggested the following to add to the resolution: there are “no curricular or resource implications” with this concentration name change

H. Gonzalez supported M. Danforth’s suggestion.

A. Grombly will forward to AAC for feedback and comments

e. Referral #2025-2026 09 Proposal for New Minor in Applied Mathematics

A. Grombly reported that AAC Chair reached out to Math department chair to ensure minor is open to all students, not just for students in the hard sciences.

H. Gonzalez remarked to include similar “resolved” language from existing proposals for the rationale for the new minor in Applied Mathematics

Amanda will leave track changes on so that AAC can see what has been changed.

f. Referral #2025-2026 11 Proposal for New Minor Creative Writing

A. Grombly has still not heard back from the department chair to answer question about the new minor.

7. Open Forum (Time Certain: 11:20 am) No items raised for open forum.

8. Adjourn: Meeting adjourned at 11:32AM.