



California State University
Dominguez Hills

UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE

MEMORANDUM

May 21, 2012

To: Mildred García, Ed.D.
President

From: John Thomlinson, Chair
University Budget Committee

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Thomlinson".

Subject: Final Recommendations of the University Budget Committee for Fiscal Year 2012-2013

The University Budget Committee proposes a set of reductions to address the \$2,677,100 budget reduction for academic year 2012-2013. The following report lays out the process followed by the UBC and its recommendations.

We received the charge of achieving a \$2,677,100 (4.55%) budget reduction for the academic year 2012-2013. As part of the budget reduction process, instead of asking the divisions to provide a 4.55% budget reduction plan, UBC asked each division to present a baseline budget reduction plan up to 5.5%. This approach allowed us some flexibility in arriving at the total 4.55% reduction, and avoided the adoption of *de facto* across-the-board cuts. Our recommendations are based upon the charge from the President, the proposed budget reduction plan from each division, campus-wide open hearings on those reduction plans, and deliberations of the UBC. We strove to maintain student access to classes and services, and to avoid elimination of currently filled personnel positions. We were unable to achieve this completely, but we feel we minimized the impact, given the constraints under which we were operating.

The recommendations from the UBC to meet the budget reductions for the 2012-2013 academic year are as follows:

1) Use of Home Depot Center Money to Reduce Cuts. We recommend that the HDC monies, in the estimated amount of \$450,000, be used to reduce the magnitude of the budget cuts. At a time when classes and filled positions are being cut, we felt this was the best use of these funds. This decreased the overall reduction needed to 3.78%

2) Academic Affairs. With reference to the plan presented to UBC by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs (AA) on April 26, 2012 (attached to this memorandum), we moved Recommendation AA1, elimination of student assistants, to below AA9, reductions of sections. There were various reasons for this decision, foremost that engagement of students in on-campus employment is known to increase retention. That, coupled with the small amount of money involved, made this a relatively simple decision. We then renumbered the remaining

recommendations, in the order in which they were presented, and accepted (new) AA1 through AA7 and the portion of AA8 needed to reach 3.77%. The total reduction proposed for AA is \$1,376,804. We applaud the division for finding creative solutions to defray the impact of the budget cuts, and we recognize that the cut to sections, made as Recommendation AA8, means not only reduced access for students, but also a reduction in the number of part-time faculty employed.

2) Administration and Finance. We accepted Recommendations AF1 through AF3 and part of AF4 from the plan presented to UBC by the Vice President for Administration and Finance (A&F) on April 26, 2012 (attached to this memorandum). The total reduction proposed for A&F is \$499,379 or 3.79% of their baseline budget. We recognize that with these cuts, all vacant positions have been exhausted, and to achieve the required cuts, filled positions will be eliminated.

3) Enrollment Management and Student Affairs. We accepted Recommendations EM1 and EM3 and part of EM2 from the plan presented to UBC by the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) on March 22, 2012 (attached to this memorandum). The total reduction proposed for EMSA is \$278,256 or 3.79% of their baseline budget. The reason for accepting EM3 in its entirety, ahead of EM2, is because the cut has already been made. Reducing the amount cut from EM2 will allow more health service positions to be maintained and avoid over-extending the obligations paid by the student health fee account. We recognize that we are at a critical point, beyond which we will not be able to meet our obligations to students vis a vis their health needs. We applaud the division for thinking creatively in finding ways to achieve the budget reductions.

4) University Advancement. We accepted Recommendation 1, partially, from the plan presented to UBC by the Vice President for University Advancement (UA) on March 22, 2012 (attached to this memorandum). The total reduction proposed for UA is \$39,413 or 3.43% of their baseline budget. The cuts to this division mean that it may not be possible for them to fill the essential position that is currently vacant with a qualified person. We previously recommended that the Vice President for UA present their decision on whether to start implementing a gift fee at the UBC budget hearings for 2012-13. This did not happen, and while we recognize that staff shortages make any sort of analysis difficult, we feel that a justified decision on whether to impose a fee or not would have helped with the deliberations of the UBC.

5) Office of the President. We accepted Recommendation 1 as proposed from the plan presented to UBC. The total reduction proposed for the Office of the President is \$33,248 or 4.74% of their baseline budget. No details were presented, so we were unable to assess the impact of the cuts, in contrast with the very clear impacts of the cuts to other divisions.

C: University Budget Committee



California State University
Dominguez Hills

UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE

MEMORANDUM

May 21, 2012

To: Mildred García, Ed.D.
President

From: John Thomlinson, Chair
University Budget Committee

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Thomlinson".

Subject: Recommendations of the University Budget Committee for Fiscal Year 2013-2014

The University Budget Committee proposes a set of reductions to address the \$5,146,000 budget reduction for academic year 2013-2014. The following report lays out the process followed by the UBC and its recommendations.

We received the charge of achieving a \$5,146,000 (8.74%) budget reduction for the academic year 2013-2014. As part of the budget reduction process, instead of asking the divisions to provide an 8.74% budget reduction plan, UBC asked each division to present a baseline budget reduction plan up to 10%. This approach would, in theory, allow us some flexibility in arriving at the total reduction and avoid the necessary adoption of *de facto* across-the-board cuts. Our recommendations are based upon the charge from the President, the proposed budget reduction plan from each division, campus-wide open hearings on those reduction plans, and deliberations of the UBC. We strove to maintain student access to classes and services, and to avoid elimination of currently filled personnel positions. We were unable to achieve this completely, but we feel we minimized the impact, given the constraints under which we were operating.

The recommendations from the UBC to meet the budget reductions for the 2013-2014 academic year are as follows:

1) Use of Home Depot Center Money to Reduce Cuts. We recommend that the HDC monies, in the estimated amount of \$450,000, be used to reduce the magnitude of the budget cuts. At a time when classes and filled positions are being cut, we felt this was the best use of these funds. This decreased the overall reduction needed to 7.98%

2) The uncertainties of the budget situation for the 2013-14 fiscal year, and the uncertainty involved in the different divisions projecting their costs, did not give the UBC sufficient information to adjust the divisions' priorities. For example, when a division's proposed cuts are based on anticipated retirements, which have a huge uncertainty around them, it did not seem to be a productive exercise to adjust the amounts by a few thousand dollars here and there. We therefore accepted the divisions' priority lists intact, with the modification that we took each division's cuts to a total 7.98% reduction. The benefit of this exercise was less in the specifics,

and more in illustrating just how dire the situation has become. If these cuts are, in fact, implemented, it will severely hamper the university's ability to serve our students. As a planning document, this should be used to raise awareness among elected officials as to the consequences of further cuts to the CSU, particularly as they pertain to Dominguez Hills.

C: University Budget Committee