



Governor's Budget 2003-04
California State University Impact



General Fund Increases	CSU Version	CSU, Chico Impact
Additional Fee Funding	172,997,400	5,820,600
Enrollment Growth (16,000 FTES)	150,880,000	949,500
GF Increase in PERS costs	0	
GF Increase for Annuitant Benefits	0	
GF Increase for Lease Revenue Costs	0	
Total GF Increases	\$ 323,877,400	\$ 6,770,100
General Fund Reductions		
GF Unallocated Base Reductions	(24,000,000)	
In Student Services	(53,197,000)	(2,463,000)
In Academic & Institutional Support	(58,091,000)	(2,585,000)
In Outreach Funding	(12,596,000)	(61,800)
In CalTeach Funding	(2,000,000)	
In Bilingual Teacher Recruitment	(2,000,000)	
In Public Service Funding	(450,000)	
Additional Unallocated Base Reductions	(118,752,000)	(6,609,000)
Change in SFR 18.9 to 19.9	(53,542,000)	(2,345,200)
In Student Fellows Program Funding	(1,444,000)	
Mandatory Cost Funding Increase	(78,609,000)	(3,549,877)
Permanent Reduction Long-term Needs	(43,000,000)	
Campus Unfunded Needs		(1,443,346)
Total GF Decreases	\$(447,681,000)	\$ (19,057,223)
Net Change	\$(123,803,600)	\$ (12,287,123)

Understanding the Budget: Academic Affairs

Actual expenditures for Academic Affairs 2001-2002

1.	Instruction (tenured, t-t, permanent)	\$45 million
2.	Non-faculty (staff, chairs, vice provosts, deans)	\$25
3.	Operating expenses (equipment, postage, travel)	\$10.5
4.	Workstudy (cannot be cut)	\$1.2
5.	Benefits (cannot be cut)	\$13.3
6.	Other (contracted services, summer OE, etc.)	\$1
	Total	<u>\$96 million</u>

Anticipate a reduction of 10% (\$9.6 million)*

* This number will change

Reductions:

1. Cut instructional budget, per Governor's mandate, by \$2.345 million. This would require a 19.9% reduction from all non-faculty lines.
2. Assume instructional lines are protected; therefore the reduction to (2, 3, 6) from which reductions could be made is \$36.5 million. This would require a 26% reduction from all non-faculty lines.

If the instructional budget is "protected" at \$42,922.041, then the remaining reductions would need to be allocated as follows:

Academic Affairs	\$7.6 million
Business and Finance	\$2.4
Student Affairs	\$1.3

N.B. There are also unallocated increased costs (e.g., utilities).

If student fees are not increased, we would be required to reduce the all-university budget by another \$6 million. This would result in, at a minimum, a reduction in the number of courses by 1300 for the academic year.

2898 sections per semester are needed to meet the FTES target (per the Governor's Mandated SFR).

T/TT faculty teach 2184 sections per semester at a cost of \$31 million.

Temporary faculty teach 714 sections per semester at a cost of \$14 million.

Understanding the Budget: Academic Affairs

Page 2

Planning assumptions:

- **We must meet our FTES target with substantially fewer resources**
- **The reductions are permanent cuts to the base budget.**
- **The fiscal crisis of the state will not be solved in one year.**
- **The Governor's mandated reductions require sacrifice of everyone (students, faculty and staff.)**
- **The Governor's mandated reductions will require a restructuring of the institution and a change in the level of services we provide to students in and outside of the classroom.**
- **We will work to achieve savings this year in order to use one-time funds to mitigate the transition to a lower base budget.**

WHAT ARE THE QUESTIONS WE NEED TO ASK AND ANSWER IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE MANDATED REDUCTIONS AND STILL PRESERVE THE CORE INSTITUTIONAL MISSION?

**POSING QUESTIONS AND SEEKING ANSWERS:
BUDGET REDUCTIONS IN ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

N.D. These are suggestions only and their potential impact will vary widely in scope.

1. Should funds be provided for faculty and staff development?
 No. (If not, do we modify RTP requirements, job expectation?)
 Yes. How much? Source of funds?
2. Should we curtail all in and out-of-state travel?
 No.
 Yes. By what logic?
3. Can we achieve new savings in:
 energy use? (Current expenditure is \$5 million.)
 printing?
 O.E.?
4. Should we continue all of the on-line offerings?
 Yes.
 No. Which ones would we not support? Who should make the decision?
5. Should we continue to provide the same level of technical training and support to faculty and staff who use?
 WebCt
 Horizon Live
 The portal
6. Should we support only those academic technologies that enhance efficiencies in the classroom, e.g., allow us to transmit information/content to students in a paperless environment?

***Posing Questions and Seeking Answers:
Budget Reductions in Academic Affairs***

Page 2

7. For library acquisitions:
 Do we continue the same level of support? (\$1 million).
 Buy only on-line journal subscriptions?
 Buy only monographs?

8. Do we continue support for co-governance (Senate, AWTUs, etc., \$75,000)?
 Yes, at what level of support?
 No.

9. Can we achieve new efficiencies by limiting:
 Committee work (at what level, e.g., department, college, university).
 Other?

10. Can we achieve great efficiencies in managing the university?
 Combine offices?
 Combine resource centers?
 Other?

11. Can we achieve greater efficiencies in the curriculum?
 GE writing requirement?
 Maximize use of large lecture rooms?
 Increase class size?
 Block enroll beginning students in at least three courses?
 Eliminate some of the themes?
 Reduce hours required for degree, when the hours are above 120?
 Other?

12. Should we reduce the current allocation of non-reimbursed AWTUs, which is 59.3 FTEF per semester?

*Posing Questions and Seeking Answers:
Budget Reductions in Academic Affairs*
Page 3

13. Should we examine workload for all categories of faculty including FERPers?
14. Other questions?

NOTE: Please direct questions you would like answered to Diane Wright. A website will be created for the budget in Academic Affairs and answers about the budget will be posted to this website.