

**Budget and Planning Committee
Agenda**

Thursday, September 20, 2018
10:00 –11:30 AM

Student Health Center, Conference Room (HCCR)

I. Call to order: 10:04 am

Attendance: B. Street (chair), J. Kegley, A. Schmidt, M. Martinez, J. Zorn (ex-officio), A. Hegde, A. Grombly, C. Lam, A. Lauer, D. Boschini

II. Approval of Minutes

- Minutes from 9/6/18 meeting: **no changes**
 - o Motion: J. Kegley, 2nd M. Martinez, Passed

III. Announcements and Information

- Staff person: Executive Senate had four staff interested in serving for Senate, some specifically in BPC. Outstanding votes in Exec. Should be in by the end of the week, and we should have a new staff member next meeting.
- October 4: Kris Krishnan from IRPA will be available to explain the data from his department; there may be some issues with making sure all of the data is available by this date.
- October 18: Questica training is scheduled, but according to ITS, there are issues with reliability of data and interface with Questica. Discussion of the associated issues with Questica and software implementation. Discussion of access and consistency of data and where to go to get the data.
- President Zelezny, discussion on budget transparency and Q&A (**Time Certain 10:30 AM**): L. Zelezny and M. Lukens
 - o To discuss expectations from all sides about Strategic Planning and Budget Process
 - o Priorities: safety and fiscal responsibilities. Shared responsibilities with transparency and efficacy.

- Budget transparency ASI, AS, and Administration should be communicating in multiple ways so that everyone understands the budget and has the opportunity to provide feedback
 - Not sure that we have the right graphics and framework to achieve this
 - About 80% of the budget is out of our control: salaries and benefits
 - Need to establish reserves to cover increases in benefits
 - Make sure we met contractual obligations
 - What is covered by the CO and what is an unfunded mandate, ex. Title IX is an unfunded mandate, but it is important for student safety.
 - Transparency is a continuing, open dialogue on how we make the budget accessible and clear
 - Dr. Zelezny has asked T. Davis and B. Street to listen for and provide/pass on feedback
 - Academic Senate will have a budget presentation provided by T. Davis and B. Street
 - Faculty and ASI should have the opportunity to provide feedback on budgetary concerns. That feedback rolls up to the Cabinet
 - There does need to be changes and improvements to the dissemination of the budget issues
 - Open to feedback on how to present this information to the campus
 - How do faculty, staff, students (ASI), and the campus community need to be communicated with re: the budget.
 - Collection qualitative data for Strategic Planning
 - Community partners
 - Website
 - Coffee with faculty

- Runner walk and talks
 - Open for questions
- Community forums
 - Internal/campus
 - External/community
- Alumni
- Staff
- Beginning of Spring term start analyzing the data and take it to Strategic Planning then back to AS, ASI, then Cabinet.
 - Master Plan is derived from the Strategic Plan
 - The only building on the short list is the Engineering and Energy Innovation building, but there are 5 more buildings on the long-term list
- Strategic Plan is the roadmap for how we allocate resources
 - Human Resources and fiscal resources will have to be aligned with the Strategic Plan
 - Need to feature faculty expertise and student success to build relationships with donors
 - Need to think like entrepreneurs and think of how we are going to generate revenue to fund our unfunded mandates
 - Build efficiencies and revenue generators
- Discussion of how budget data is presented.
 - Issue with identifying what is and is not appropriate
 - Be clear on what we are asking for
 - No hidden agenda or funds
 - Does the President have a model in mind that is effective?
 - Dependent on the culture you are in
 - The new model needs to be developed together
 - Time and energy are most valuable resource

- Bring together material what we like; BPC likes Fresno State's model
- There is usually more explanation for simpler models
 - Example, Academic Affairs includes financial aid which isn't the campus' money to spend; it's pass-through. The same goes to grants too.
- BPC just wants data without the assumption that it isn't something that can be understood.
- ASI/student body want more transparency of where their tuition and student fees go. They want the line items.
- University Program Review: what does each program and department project as their future direction and resource needs, new degrees and graduate programs, etc.
- As we think about Tenure density lines, it should be used an opportunity for the department to plan for the future
 - Replacements are different than new hires; what new areas need to be developed and how does it contribute to the campus and the community
 - Need to craft a vision for the future
 - Look at these hires practically: there are some departments that require tenure-track faculty for accreditation, but there are graduation initiative concerns for departments that will require lecturers that are like English, Math, and Communications
 - How lines are granted to departments is the responsibility of the Provost
- Amount of data that is accessible
 - There's usually only one page of data, and we have been asking for more
 - There is a warm and open response with slow progress

- We would like a budget book like other campuses have available
 - We'd like more detailed information made available
 - We'd like the budget book like we used to have
 - Entrepreneurship
 - How do departments need to work to generate revenue
 - Doesn't always need to go through University Advancement
 - General obligation bonds and fundraising efforts
 - Be available and open to meet with donors to demonstrate CSUB faculty expertise
 - Feed opportunities to the Provost so the President, Provost, and UA can coordinate
- BPC discussion and review of the discussion 11:15am
 - Budget books from '98 and '01 need to be distributed (A. Grombly to send files to B. Street)
 - D. Boschini has an example from Sonoma State she will share with L. Zelezny and the group
 - There are always the issues of playing catch up to understand how processes work or being short the staff to meet objectives
 - How can we adjust and redefine understanding and processes to that this works
 - Individual units used to present in BPC for 4-5 years quite a while ago.
 - Understand too that everyone has concerns with how money is spent and where student funding goes or what tenure means
 - Discussion of faculty-student relations and tenure process and review
 - Communication and education are an issue
 - Tenure also does not mean that faculty cannot be fired

IV. Approval of Agenda

V. Old Business (Time Certain 11:15 AM)

1. BPC and Budget Process
 - a. Requested Data
2. Budget Central
 - a. Available information/data

VI. New Business

3. Discussion on priority for \$1 million University funds
 - a. President Zelezny has mentioned there is funding available this year, and she is soliciting feedback on how it should be allocated.
 - b. Last year BPC had a resolution for \$2 million for new faculty hires. T. Davis has provided a list of committed funds; we currently have commitments of \$5.3 million, including 16/17 and 17/18 expansion hires. This also includes IT Roadmap and Q2S advisors. We have \$1 million uncommitted funds for 18/19 faculty expansion and the additional request for \$1 million more for expansion hires (total request of \$2 million). There is also a priority of building a campus reserve at \$2 million cost this year. This information has not yet been published.
 - c. We need to develop a list of priorities for what faculty want
 - i. Tenure track
 - ii. Need a better handle on the other issues, like the true cost of instruction
4. Discussion on full cost of instruction
 - a. There is a bar graph of “Instructional Cost per FTES, Comparison by School and University”
 - b. What is included there?

VII. Adjourn: 11:35am