

Humboldt State University
University Budget Committee
Friday, January 26, 2007
Meeting Notes

Co-Chairs: Rick Vrem, Saeed Mortazavi

Voting Members: Glenn Sonntag, Lumei Hui, Colleen Mullery, Michael Thomas, Lou Ann Wieand, Laura Weare, Wayne Perryman, Mark Larson

Proxy: Randi for Steve Butler; Randi for Robin Bailie; Wayne for Judith Little
Carol for Carl Coffey

Staff: Carol Terry, Linda Mortenson, Karen Earls

Observers: Greg Crawford

The UBC will begin approving the notes from each previous meeting to ensure that all pertinent comments are captured to their satisfaction. Regarding the notes from January 19th, Mark asked that the sentence beginning “The UBC does not want to be distracted...” be changed to read “Several members did not want to be distracted...” as no vote was taken indicating consensus. Glenn also wished to add that augmentations should be included in the budget presentations as part of the whole divisional picture instead of requiring a second process to review augmentation requests separately.

Mark moved to accept the notes as corrected, Colleen seconded the motion and it carried with 5 abstentions.

Rick summarized the methodology proposals already discussed for the UBC recommendation to the President as follows:

1. FIRMS Comparison
2. Delphi Method
3. Qualitative and Diverse Evaluation

Lou Ann suggested the qualitative review be applied after reviewing the quantitative data similar to a “nominal group technique”. She emphasized the importance of the statistical data. Randi did not believe we had identified the appropriate set of quantitative data. Randi was “troubled” by the 2-year average comparisons because of significant changes in the HSU budget between 04-05 and 05-06. Lou Ann also warned of the implied assumptions in the FIRMS comparison and suggested we use the FIRMS data in our own method and not necessarily in comparison with other campus ratios. Randi saw value in the examination of the comparison percentage discrepancies, at least to determine the underlying content. Carol suggested that we ask the VP’s to explain any FIRMS comparison discrepancy as part of their budget presentation.

The committee was reminded that the FIRMS categories do not break out strictly by divisional boundaries and Rick requested that the FIRMS data be further divided into their sub-codes. Greg also wanted to see the distribution of the FIRMS sub-codes by division so that each divisional baseline was defined in terms of its FIRMS mix.

Saeed introduced the concept of FTES sensitivity to budget cuts in each division and cut more where there is less sensitivity. Rick felt that a direct correlation between FTES and budget

reduction is not necessarily clear or easy to determine. Lumei commented that we no longer have the time frame to pursue the research necessary to determine this sensitivity.

Michael brought up 2 specific examples of what are believed to be campus inefficiencies and stated that this detailed level of examination is where our cost savings are to be found. He asked if we could challenge the VPs during their presentations as part of the UBC prerogative. Rick responded that reduction targets can be recommended, but it is up to the unit administrators to determine how best to achieve the goal. It would not be our role to micromanage the divisions.

Greg suggested that the UBC could identify areas of concern and incorporate that concern into our recommended reduction amount, allowing the VPs to come to their own conclusions

Rick suggested we move ahead by applying the Delphi method to our major budget units and complete two rounds before our next UBC meeting. Glenn was concerned that we had not established common criteria by which to rank each unit. Rick and Saeed felt we could begin with intuitive and diverse points of view and learn about our criteria through the discussion process to follow. Saeed believed we would reach consensus within 3 or 4 rounds and hoped we would apply good university-wide judgment in our ranking process.

Colleen was concerned by the broad scope of each MBU to be ranked as each contained many diverse department functions. Randi also felt the categories were not good representations for our ranking exercise. Lou Ann and Greg both stressed the importance of the discussion following the result distribution to enable better understanding of our criteria.

The question of how to distribute funding based on the Delphi results was raised. Mark wondered if we would stay linked to the results in making the funding decisions. Laura emphasized that even though the instructional units would undoubtedly be given the highest ranking, cuts in those areas are still required in order to reduce our deficit.

Rick agreed that the Delphi method won't tell us what to cut or how much to cut, but felt there would be value in determining our core programs in order to create a shared vision.

Round 1 deadline – Tuesday Noon

Results by end of day

Round 2 deadline – Thursday Noon

Results by end of day

At our next meeting, we will review the results of the second round and discuss those areas where we are not in agreement.

The next UBC meeting is called for Friday, February 2nd from 2 – 4pm in the Corbett Conference Room.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda Mortenson