

Transcription of Whiteboard Photos from Budget Forum 12/08/17

1.4 Reduced Assigned Time for Faculty

Pros

- More jobs for students
- Grad students may increase retention and recruit
- Budget savings (Need to cut back on lectures. Shift workload to tenure track and and save money)

Cons

- Impact workload (see Faculty Affairs Report, grading, TAs' hours limited by union)
- Lecturers may refuse assignments
- Pay cut to lectures and possibly loss of benefits
- Make it harder to attract lecturers
- Targets a few majors (e.g. Biology)
- Absence of trained TAs
- Hurt retention, recruitment, and graduation
- Less writing feedback, thus lower quality education
- Earlier moved to large classes as cost savings, now being punished
- Difficult to find way to reach full work loads of 12 or 15 wtu
- Reduces student/faculty interaction
- Department chairs already being overworked.

Suggestions

- Effectiveness of all committees (eliminate ineffective)
- Access and find right size of assigned time
- Policy for distribution of assigned time
- Need to budget assigned time

Recommendations for Implementation

- Through bargaining
- Raise level to where excess enrollment is triggered
- Reduce work assignments on chairs

Questions

- How will in affect advising?

1.5 and 1.8 - Increase class size (when possible) and reduce WTUs by reducing the number of courses offered

Pros

- Implement success efforts
 - Lecture compute in large rooms
 - Increase already large classes

Cons

- Decrease student success
- Larger classes impact students
- Sunk costs: students who won't graduate - use analytics
- Reduce students registered with reduced course diversity
- Scheduling flexibility - decrease access increases time to graduation
- Class environment changes as does faculty workload
- Does not prepare students for graduate school
- Reduces incentive of top-of-the-line professors to work here

- Reduces mentorship which could affect success in students' careers

Suggestions

- Block schedule to reduce low enrolled classes

Recommendations for Implementation

- Use the capacity of analytics to better project efforts
- Timeliness and planning - decisions need to allow for at least one year for implementation

Questions

- What are the factors that allow for increased class size?
- Have online or hybrid classes been considered as an alternative?
- Have diversity and equity been considered?
- Have faculty been surveyed on the impact of large classes?
- How does it affect student success?

3.1 Developing a Strategic Enrollment Management Plan to Guide Long-term Recruitment and Retention Efforts

Pros

- Average costing for majors

Cons

What Suggestions to Improve Idea?

- College Prep/readiness Plan
- Growth capacity
- Breaking down boundaries
- Department coordination of resources

Recommendations for Implementation

- Centralizing information/ resources

4.3 Explore partnerships and/or privatizing the Children's Center...

Pros

- Saves \$290,000 per year

Cons

- Outside facility might not be able to hire qualified students
- No other location to put the space
- Huge body of student parents who might be unable to afford privatized childcare
- Serve low income students which can't be guaranteed with private organization
- Executive Order that every CSU campus over a certain size have a child center
 - 23 CSU - 18 have center, only 5 do not and they are below that size
- Children's Center helps graduation/retention of student parents
- Less jobs for students

Suggestions

- Remove middle layer of management

Recommendations for Implementation

- Research to get number of student parents; we have the data

4.5 Gain staff & budget efficiencies...

Pros

- Identify overlaps and maybe co-support position or program
- Going into classes and doing surveys so our programs are what they want
- Be more sustainable;

- Could we find resources on campus vs. off?
- Especially related to greenhouse & by products
- Collaborative programming meetings (key people from across campus)
- Review monies we are spending and when are we duplicating services
- Understanding event policies and access
- What does assessment look like to ensure event success (stop programs not determined successful)
- Venn diagram of goals; bring programs with similar goals together
- Bringing people to the table that are in there
- Thorough evaluations; stop doing unsuccessful programs
- Take into consideration target population
 - Importance of centers and their program because one size doesn't fit all

Suggestions

- Equity: importance of different population needs

Recommendations for implementation

- Better assessment of program based on service & target population:
 - Talk to department about why they do what they do
 - Importance of respect about department expertise
- Recognize individuality while stress streamline some processes
- Co-curricular and curricular have different assessments
- Inventory and cost by area

Questions

- How is student support defined?
- Is there a list of duplicate programs?

5.2 Consolidate Auxiliary Organization

Pros

- Could be an opportunity to collaborate on program funding
- Increased communication could lead to process improvements

Cons

- Would lose focus on individual missions; possible loss of IDC return to the campus
- Would not reduce number of audits (not based on number of organizations)
- One director can't oversee all three, thus would hire MPP
- Expense for revamping space - does not eliminate space
- Boards are not paid, so does not save money there
- Decline in quality of work
- SPF IDC could be negatively affected

Suggestions

- A letter was distributed at the forum Co-Written by current Faculty/Staff PI's recommending the 'Retention of Current Auxiliary Framework and Current Leadership of the Sponsored Programs Foundation'
- Instead of consolidation, rather invest more in Advancement fundraising; invest in infrastructure
- Go to East Bay Model

Recommendation for implementation

- N/A

Questions

- How was the \$400,000 cost savings figured; justification did not seem feasible
- Does this have to be approved by all three governing boards?
- Does the Chancellor's Office know this item is in consideration?
- Do you have to merge all the boards?

- SPF's grant revenue is affected by quality of audits, so quality of audits in other organizations could negatively affect SPF revenue

6.1 Reduce Overall Travel Costs and develop a more equitable travel structure across campus

Pros

- Prof Dev / Travel is an employment recruitment tool
- Increase zoom / remote meetings & trainings
- Important to represent HSU visibility of HSU
- Importance of face to face
- Approp in many instances, dependent on topic/purpose
- Coordinate travel of groups to split transportation costs

Cons

- Different across campus in money amount for travel
- Travel is for different reasons/purposes: professional development, required training, presentations - this makes equity different
- "Have to travel"
- Expensive to leave area
- Promote a system so HSU isn't the only one on the phone
- Work on technology at meetings
- Some people go where they want to go and some other can't go where they need to go.
- Some areas don't have money for travel & professional development.

Suggestions

- Explain how savings are captured for campus?
- Hire person to monitor travel negotiates best rates
- Standardize travel accommodations allowed (car rentals, extended stay, self serving arrangements)

Recommendations for Implementations

- Ask CO to offset cost of travel to/from HSU
- 1 year stop travel across campus
- Every CSU/system has contract with hotel chain for lower rates

Questions

- Who is accountable for calling out concerns? Who isn't?

6.5 Eliminate internal chargebacks

Pros

- Would save time and reduce workload in multiple divisions
- TNS (main bill-back entity) is in support of the proposed change
- General consensus that implementing this would be a positive change

Cons

- May cause delays in routine services (maintenance)/decline in customer service
- May not work for all types of services; would need more consultation with various service providers
- May shift workloads and need more oversight for departments

Suggestions

- Create a baseline cost for services
- Allow chargebacks for services above baseline > for services / cost of doing service
- Review budget allocations yearly
- Charge for activities you want to discourage

Recommendations for Implementation

- Establish a threshold

- Leverage technology to collect information vs. shifting workloads/oversight to Dept.s
- Would need to consult with auxiliaries on frequency of billings (Monthly, Quarterly, etc.)

Questions

- N/A

4.1, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6 Organizational Redesign

Pros

- Combining services contributes to student success - less run-around; staff development; efficiency opportunities
- Reduce organizational layers to empower employees who do the work
- Co-location = efficiencies “one stop” for students, savings

Cons

- Department mergers do not save money - admin support (ref: Jenny Zorn)
- Federal requirement of separation of duties
- Possibly too diversified

Suggestions

- More self service processes; consistent info/answers
- Strategic budgeting; align to priorities use new model (not historic)
- Condense administration (merge duties)
- Process improvement > efficiencies
- Consultants in addition to admins
- Look at other CSU org charts & processes (forms, etc.)
- Redesign for access and services - student

Recommendations for Implementation

Questions