

Campus Finance Committee Meeting

Date: Thursday, March 10

Time: 9am

In Attendance

Elizabeth Watkins, Gerry Bomotti, Anil Deolalikar, Christopher Lynch, Dana Simmons, Daryle Williams, Maria Aldana (sub for Deborah Deas), Jason Stajich, Jeff Girod, Johnny Cruz, Kathryn Uhrich, Ken Baerenklau, Kevin Vaughn, Louie Rodriguez, Mariam Lam, Melanie Wu, Rodolfo Torres, Shaun Bowler, Steven Mandeville-Gamble, Jennifer Talbot (sub for Yunzeng Wang), Scott Heil (guest) and Stephanie Flores (committee support)

Review of Delaware comparative data modelling and potential FTE weights – Discussion by all

- How would it be implemented (retroactively in some way; only with enrollment growth in the future; or not at all)? The optics in CNAS and BCOE may be positive, but this would be a zero-sum game overall. This change could, in general, make very little impact financially in the short term if focused on new enrollment growth, but would have a longer impact over time.
 - Concern how it will look to under-represented students. We shouldn't worry about optics because it's a disservice to the first generation, under represented students in the higher cost programs. We need to align resources with costs. We are adjusting the structural flaw in the original model, which de facto defined the costs for all disciplines to be the same (which research shows is not accurate).
 - Reminder that subsidizing occurs in all different funding streams across the campus.
 - Communication/messaging will be key because there is not a lot of trust on this campus.
- Some main components of the Budget Model could be separated. For example, funding for TAs could come from tuition/enrollment growth funding, since that is variable with enrollment growth, and the Faculty salary/workload funding could come from both tuition/enrollment growth but also new core revenue allocations.
- Lab expenses were not specifically the driver of expenses (these costs would be in the total expenditures from the Delaware model), but it was more focused on faculty salaries and faculty instruction workload. Class sizes are somewhat driven by classroom size available space. Need to also look at instructional workload by contact hours versus credit hours for the TAs as well as prep hours.

- Subvention increases in the model seemed to have accounted for salary and benefit increases but not all cost increases. The Faculty FTE from cluster hiring initiative did add teaching capacity from central core, but it will not allow for future growth. It does not seem feasible that the revenue from this current budget model is sufficient to support major increases in faculty and staff, as a result of enrollment growth.
- It is important to recognize that there is a difference in the cost of instruction (STEM, Arts) between disciplines and we should implement weights going forward to recognize those differences. The current model uses “1” as the same weight for all disciplines, even though all the data shows this is not accurate.
- Diversity and Equity perspective – some perspective that the nurturing and care of our diverse students is occurring in CHASS that students may not be finding in other areas, so they change their major. Some support that we should move forward with weighting and address the other issues in another way.
 - How does student demand play into enrollment planning in lower cost instruction programs when STEM is being pushed across the country?
 - There are underrepresented students across the campus and it’s important to support all our students to help them meet career goals.
- Do we need to look at the mix of ladder-rank and lecturers to reduce cost? UCLA and Berkeley are outliers in the UC with the number of lecturers they use. Other campuses also have 18%-25% of non-residents that provide more revenue to cover their costs. Enrollment planning may need to consider enrollment growth in lower cost instruction areas to balance the growth in high cost areas.

Closing Comments - Liz

- One of the Provost’s goals is stabilizing the budget
- White paper on restarting the strategic planning will go to the Academic Senate on Monday
- Recap of recent Enrollment Committee and Dean’s Council discussions on enrollment. The CFC and these 2 groups need to integrate their conversations and we will need financial numbers to assist in the conversations. If we cut off enrollment, we are guaranteed to get a cut because we are part of a system that is serving the students of California.
- Work is on-going at the UCOP/State level – rebenching changes /AB 2046
- Need to remind ourselves on how we gotten this far? We get spikes in funding that can’t be predicted, but stabilizes the funding over time.

Next Meeting

Thursday, April 7 at 9am