



**California State University, Chico**  
**Academic Affairs**  
 FY 2001-2002

	<b>2001-2002 Campus Budget Plan</b>	<b>Five Percent Reduction Scenario</b>
<b>PERSONAL SERVICES</b>		
<b>SALARIES AND WAGES</b>		
Faculty	\$ 47,528,704.00	\$ 2,376,435.20
Non-faculty	22,734,343.00	1,136,717.15
Temporary Help	868,972.00	43,448.60
Overtime	141,532.00	7,076.60
Shift Differentials	11,899.00	594.95
<b>Subtotal, Salaries and Wages</b>	<b>71,285,450.00</b>	
<b>BENEFITS</b>	11,429,462.00	571,473.10
<b>Subtotal, Personal Services</b>	<b>82,714,912.00</b>	
<b>GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES</b>	8,601,906.00	430,095.30
<b>WORK STUDY</b>	929,543.00	46,477.15
<b>WORK STUDY MATCH</b>	(230,919.00)	(11,545.95)
<b>Subtotal, Baseline</b>	<b>92,015,442.00</b>	
<b>REDIRECTION</b>		
Redirection In - Permanent	49,102.00	2,455.10
Redirection In - One-Time	-	-
Redirected Out	(734,293.00)	(36,714.65)
<b>Subtotal, Redirection</b>	<b>(685,191.00)</b>	
<b>RESERVES CONTRIBUTION</b>		
University Initiatives	(64,157.00)	(3,207.85)
Contingency	(200,490.00)	(10,024.50)
Revenue Stabilization	(80,944.00)	(4,047.20)
<b>(345,591.00)</b>		
<b>Subtotal, Provost</b>	<b>\$ 90,984,660.00</b>	<b>\$ 4,549,233.00</b>

(11-16-01)



**California State University, Chico**  
**Academic Affairs**  
**FY 2002-2003**

GF BASE TOTAL*		BUDGET REDUCTION LEVEL				
COLLEGE/UNIT	2001-2002	1%	3%	5%	10%	15%
AA S&W Benefits	11,425,893	114,259	342,777	571,295	1,142,589	1,713,884
Acad Sen	107,063	1,071	3,212	5,353	10,706	16,059
AGR	2,476,452	24,765	74,294	123,823	247,645	371,468
BSS	10,491,230	104,912	314,737	524,562	1,049,123	1,573,685
BUS	5,575,666	55,757	167,270	278,783	557,567	836,350
CME	11,107,442	111,074	333,223	555,372	1,110,744	1,666,116
ECT	5,092,684	50,927	152,781	254,634	509,268	763,903
ENR	3,525,542	35,255	105,766	176,277	352,554	528,831
GRAD	1,598,213	15,982	47,946	79,911	159,821	239,732
HFA	11,790,691	117,907	353,721	589,535	1,179,069	1,768,604
HR	1,323,759	13,238	39,713	66,188	132,376	198,564
Inst Res	211,149	2,111	6,334	10,557	21,115	31,672
IR	9,915,323	99,153	297,460	495,766	991,532	1,487,298
NS	9,084,265	90,843	272,528	454,213	908,427	1,362,640
OVPAA	1,779,999	17,800	53,400	89,000	178,000	267,000
RCE	311,274	3,113	9,338	15,564	31,127	46,691
UED	752,014	7,520	22,560	37,601	75,201	112,802
UPE	363,936	3,639	10,918	18,197	36,394	54,590
OVPAA: EXH III	4,052,065	40,521	121,562	202,603	405,207	607,810
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>90,984,660</b>	<b>909,847</b>	<b>2,729,540</b>	<b>4,549,233</b>	<b>9,098,466</b>	<b>13,647,699</b>

(11-16-01)

\* Includes Workstudy; may have to be excluded



**California State University, Chico**  
**Academic Affairs**  
 FY 2002-2003

**Five Percent-Level Reductions for Academic Affairs**

**\$ 4,549,233.00**

*Please rank order each item as follows: 1= Cut first; 2= Cut next; 3= Cut third; ... 15= cut next to last and 16=cut last.*

*Below please indicate the budget cuts you would recommend to accomplish the AA reduction target of \$4,549,233.*

AA Budget Item	Proposed Reductions	↓	↓
<b>Units' Response to 5% Reduction Scenario</b>			
TT Faculty	\$ 1,121,294.00	_____	_____
PT Faculty	1,120,967.00	_____	_____
Administration	247,572.00	_____	_____
Staff	571,739.00	_____	_____
OT/Th	63,000.00	_____	_____
Operating Expenses	590,538.00	_____	_____

**VPAA Office Candidates for Reduction**

	2001-2002 Plan / Actual		
Strategic Budget Allocations			
<i>General Initiatives</i>	500,000.00	_____	_____
<i>Performance Dollars</i>	1,000,000.00	_____	_____
Remodeling AA Space	200,000.00	_____	_____
Faculty Development	285,000.00	_____	_____
Assessment of GE	48,000.00	_____	_____
Writing Center	60,813.50	_____	_____
Provost Reserve	200,000.00	_____	_____
Enrollment Support	313,360.00	_____	_____
Program Support	400,000.00	_____	_____
One-time Transactions	662,000.00	_____	_____
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 7,384,283.50</b>		=====



**California State University, Chico**  
**Academic Affairs**  
 FY 2002-2003

*Analysis of the Anticipated Effects of Proposed Budget Reductions*

<b>Estimated Net Savings Due to:</b>	<b>Anticipated Effect(s)</b>
<b>Tenure-Track Faculty</b>	
Cancel tenure-track searches	Increase in SFR; increase in use of part-time faculty; possible loss of program continuity/reputation
Increased FERP participation	Increase in SFR; increase in use of part-time faculty
Faculty retirements / resignation - no replacement	Increase in SFR; increase in use of part-time faculty
Faculty retirements resulting in salary savings (salary gap full prof - asst prof)	
<b>Part-Time Faculty</b>	
Fewer (re)appointments; eliminate course and course sections	Reduction in richness of program offerings; loss in FTES generation; increase in teaching load and/or increase in SFR.
Tightening up of AWTU assignments	Better utilization of scarce resources.
Elimination of low enrollment courses	Better utilization of scarce resources.
Increase in class enrollment caps	Increase in SFR; better facilities utilization.
<b>Administration</b>	
Not filling vacancies in MPPs	Increase in workload of others; services strained; longer response cycles and/or functions deleted.
Change in Chair, Coordinator appointment levels	
<b>Staff</b>	
Not filling current vacancies in staff	Increase in workload of others or functions deleted. Lower service levels; specific impact varies by unit.
Voluntary reduction in time-base	Lower levels of service



California State University, Chico  
Academic Affairs  
FY 2002-2003

Analysis of the Anticipated Effects of Proposed Budget Reductions

Estimated Net Savings Due to:

Anticipated Effect(s)

OT/TH

Eliminate or reduce over-time  
Eliminate or reduce student assistants

Shift in workload or reduction of services.

Operating Expenses

Reduction in Travel (in-state and out-of-state)  
Reduction in Supplies and Services  
Reduction in Development Support  
Reduction in Copier and Printing Services

Strategic Budget Allocations

Reduction in General Initiatives

For 2001-2002 the funded General Strategic Initiatives included Faculty Computing Initiative at \$350,000; new faculty orientation supplement \$50,000 and Temp Help augmentation \$45,000. These efforts would be reduced or eliminated.

Reduction in allocation of Performance Dollars

Performance dollars to units are allocated based on accomplishments of annual unit goals, maintenance/enhancement of quality learning environments; faculty and staff development efforts; grants and contracts, other strategic priorities, and a willingness to solve problems internally. Reduction or elimination would reduce unit manager's flexibility in addressing unit challenges. Elimination would eliminate strategic budgeting within Academic Affairs.



**California State University, Chico**  
**Academic Affairs**  
 FY 2002-2003

***Analysis of the Anticipated Effects of Proposed Budget Reductions***

Estimated Net Savings Due to:	Anticipated Effect(s)
<b><i>Remodeling AA Space</i></b>	
Reduction in allocation for Shop 2 projects	Yearly the Provost undertakes so called Shop 2 projects involving the remodeling of academic space. 2001-2002 projects included MODOC 223 Complex, Bldg D, Langdon 118; Taylor Glass Blowing Lab; Carpeting Colusa 116, 124, 126, 128, 130; Smart classroom mediation; Installation of consoles and podiums and University Center upgrade for offices. These projects would be postponed by one or more years.
<b><i>Faculty Development</i></b>	
Reduction in the number and size of CELT Grants and Awards and reduction in CELT-sponsored activities	These faculty development efforts are conducted through the Center for Learning and Teaching; for details see <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/celt/">www.csuchico.edu/celt/</a> . 2001-2002 funding levels: CELT \$135,000 and LPP \$150,000. Efforts would be reduced or postponed.
<b><i>Assessment of GE</i></b>	
Reduction in support of on-going assessment efforts	Reduce or postpone assessment efforts. 2001-2002 funded the LEAP QR, quantitative reasoning, project. 2002-2003 envisions a LEAP CT, critical thinking, project.
<b><i>Writing Center</i></b>	
Eliminate support for Writing Center	Provost Office support for the Writing Center activities as per Executive Memorandum 99-03. Final year of financial support.
<b><i>Provost Reserve</i></b>	
Eliminate or reduce Provost Reserve	Lowers the ability to respond to unanticipated special / emergency needs that manifest themselves during the academic year.



California State University, Chico  
Academic Affairs  
FY 2002-2003

Analysis of the Anticipated Effects of Proposed Budget Reductions

Estimated Net Savings Due to:

Anticipated Effect(s)

**Enrollment Support**

Eliminate or reduce Enrollment Support

Reduces Provost Office ability to respond to unanticipated fluctuations in student demands.

**Program Support**

Eliminate or reduce Program Support

Reduces Provost ability to support on-going expenditures for academic program support activities, including accreditations, testing, recruitments, Visiting Scholars Program, Presidential Scholars Program, Natural History Museum

**One-Time Transactions**

One-time Transactions

Reduces or eliminates one-time funding for a wide variety of needs. 2001-2002 saw one-time funding of such needs as Alcohol Study, Credential Analyst position, tech positions in IR, class room mediation augmentation, faculty supplement in UED, and a non-faculty and OE supplement for UPE.

(4-25-02)



**California State University, Chico**  
**Academic Affairs**  
**FY 2002-2003**

**"FTES Unveiled, Revealed and/or Demystified"**

FTES TARGETS	Funded	Actual	
2000/2001	14,084	14,232	
2001/2002	14,250	14,786	
2002/2003	14,345		YRO Target 14,585 (includes 240 FTES Summer School)

**FTES COMPUTATION**

$\text{FTES} = \frac{\# \text{ enrolled} \times \text{Student Credit Hours (SCH)}}{15}$
---

For further technical details on the computation of FTES, see VPPRA website:  
<http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/vppra/briefs.html>

**SAMPLE FTES GENERATION**

(one course with 3 SCH)

<i>Assignment</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>40</i>
One course or 0.20	<b>4.80</b>	6.00	8.00
0.40	9.60	12.00	16.00
0.60	14.40	18.00	24.00
0.80	19.20	24.00	32.00
Full-time or 1.0	24.00	30.00	40.00

<p><b>Sample computation :</b>          A part-time assignment of 0.2 or one course, with an enrollment of 24 would generate (24*3)/15 or <b>4.8</b> FTES</p>
---

**PT COST/FTES COMPUTATION**

		<i>Class Size</i>		
		24	30	40
One section at 0.2 @ Rank 2, Step 7	\$	<b>834.25</b>	\$ 667.40	\$ 500.55

**Sample Computation:**  
 The cost/FTE ratio for a part-time faculty member at Rank 2, step 7 teaching 24 students would be \$40,044 : 10 : 4.8 = **\$834.25**

**NUMBER FACULTY NEEDED FOR TARGET = 14,345**

Assumptions

- 1.0 TT faculty teaches 4 courses (3 SCH)
- 1.0 PT faculty teaches 4 courses (3 SCH)

		<i>Class Size</i>		
		24	30	40
FTES Production:				
TT Faculty		<b>19.2</b>	24.0	32.0
PT Faculty		24.0	30.0	40.0

**Sample Computation:**  
 A tenure-track faculty member teaching 4 courses with enrollments of 24 would generate  $4 * (24*3)/15$  or  $4 * 4.8$  or **19.20** FTES.

Number of faculty needed to generate target

		<i># of FTEF</i>		
If all FTES generated by TT		<b>747</b>	598	448
If all FTES generated by PT		<b>598</b>	478	359

**Sample Computation:**  
 If the target of 14,345 FTES were to be produced **only** by tenure-track faculty who taught 4 courses with an average enrollment of 24, we would need  $14,345 : 19.2$  or **747** t/tt faculty members. **IF all** courses were to be taught by part-time faculty teaching 5 courses, we would need  $14,345 : 24$  or **598** part-time FTEF.

**FACULTY PROFILE 2001/2002 (ACTUALS)**

T/TT Faculty	502	67%
PT Faculty	<u>250</u>	33%
Total FTEF	752	