California State University, Chico
Academic Senate
(530) 898-6201, Zip 020
MEMORANDUM

UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE MINUTES
April 27, 2018, 8:00-10:00, K-207/209

University Budget Committee meetings are recorded. Traditionally the written minutes consist of a summary of topics discussed. For more detail, listen to the audio file here. Time stamps for each agenda item are provided in parenthesis for convenience. CSU, Chico is committed to making its resources accessible for all audiences. If you have accessibility-related difficulties with any of these documents, please email oats@csuchico.edu.

Wyrick called the 4th meeting of the academic year to order at 8:06. He noted that we swill skip the minutes and will hold a 5th meeting May 14, 1:00-3:00. (4:04-4:54)

1. Approve Minutes of March 1, 2017.
None.

2. Approve Agenda. (4:54-4:59)
Agenda was approved.

3. Announcements (5:00-6:35)

- Wyrick reported that the E.C. asked that we have another UBC meeting this year because as of today we don't have enough information to give advice about the budget since the May revise is not out yet. We have heard that the May revise will be issued this next week and that we could meet and give more informed feedback about what looks to be a ungenerous budget.

4. 2018-19 Budget Overview. (6:36-28:48)
Hutchinson welcomed everyone and said that she appreciated earlier morning meetings [Slide 1]. She also said she would discuss our deficit spending habits. She hoped the conversation about budget prioritization today would prompt people's thoughts and hoped they would continue to share their ideas.

She reported that the student votes about the referendum about raising student fees have come in and she was proud of the student turn-out. Some 5,200 voted and over 60% said "no" to increases. She said the vote was advisory and she will meet with the AS Government Affairs Committee (GAC) Monday to go over the vote and consider our financial position. She will also meet with the Campus Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC) on Wednesday, and collect all the information she has been gathering from the forums and online survey and make her decision on Thursday, May 3.

[Slide 2] She noted this is the 2018-19 budget request we have seen all year: our total request was $282,893,000 and the governor returned with a proposal of $92,100,000 with added enrollment growth of $19,900,000, for a total of $112M. The resultant budget gap between our request and the Governor's response is $171M.

She said the hope is that all the advocacy we have done this Spring and will continue to do up to the May revise, and the Chancellor's letter of April 20 taking a tuition increase off the table will help the Governor make good sense of all this and fund our proposal fully.

The second column shows how large our budget gap will be given our fixed costs. Employee compensation costs the CSU $122,100,000 and other mandatory costs increases are $30,888,000 for a total of $152,988,000. Since our operating fund budget is $6,029,701,000, this means that the difference between our mandatory costs and the Governor's proposal will leave a <u>budget gap of $61M.</u>

Chico state will be assigned a share of this expense which will mean a gap of about $2,24M that we really don't have.

[Slide 3] Hutchinson described the letter of March 29 from Ryan Storm, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget emphasizing that the budget gap of $61M is equivalent to about 1% of the total operating budget of the CSU.

[Slide 4] Lists all the campuses in the CSU and what their share of the potential shortfall will be. Chico's 2017-18 operating budget was 221,722,232 and our total campus share of the potential shortfall will be $2,237,000.

The final two entries show the amounts the Chancellor's Office itself will bear for their special programs. <u>The Chancellor's Office</u> $159,492,253 and <u>Systemwide Provisions</u> $ 107,679,876 (which includes debt service).

Jeni Kitchell, Director, University Budget Office, explained that the column about the <u>Campus Share of Potential Shortfall</u> showed the amount that each campus should prepare to absorb (this is 1%of their operating budget). The 3.67% figure shows Chico's share of the total systemwide 1% based on our enrollment and size of our campus.

[Slide 5] provides a link to the news release of Chancellor White on April 20 when he declared that a reliance on tuition increases to fund our budget will not be contemplated this year. Hutchinson observed that this allows students, faculty and administrators to unite clearly to advocate for more funding for the CSU. It is time for the state to invest more in public education.

[Slide 6] depicts the Next Steps for 2018-19 budget planning. We will keep focusing on advocacy until the May Revise as we know that the state department of finance is currently putting the final touches on the budget now. Our May UBC meeting will be about looking at the information that has been shared all year, the $2,237,000 potential shortfall we will have and some ne tine spending. The final budget will come out in June and our final marching orders from the Chancellor will come out in June as well.

She said she has spoken about deficit spending this year and how this is unsustainable and irresponsible. She said that annually we have been spending roughly $6M out of reserves. The base budget is annually reoccurring funds. The $6M has been spent for good programs and activities that support our students, but it is out of one time money. The reserves are for unaccounted emergencies or other things we must address. This is unhealthy and eventually detrimental to the institution.

We need to come together with discipline to cut around $8.4M. She will send out a budget letter later today to the campus to call for us to engage in more cost saving measures and become more prudent for the next year. She hopes to develop a three to five year plan to eliminate deficit spending or reduce it significantly.

These moments are the perfect time to engage in strategic planning and figure out where we see ourselves in the next 5-10 years which will help us prioritize. The WASC effort, the climate surveys, the listening tour will all help inform this process which will help us develop the campus master plan that will finally help us develop the Fiscal plan so that we are very clear about where we are prioritizing our resources from this day forward.

UBC can help with this exercise about prioritizing and send a letter to cabinet with your plans to help cabinet after the next meeting.

Zartman observed that the deficit could be worse (if one calculates our share of the potential system budget deficit differently) and Hutchinson said that was true and or things might be a little better after the May revise. She said what is constant for us is the roughly $6M we have been spending for a long time.

The previous administration had to navigate us through the Great Recession, and there were decisions made with the hope that we would see funding returned to the CSU. We have been having to support ourselves with these one-time funds. Luckily, we had healthy reserves but the CO and National Association of College Administrators and Business Officers say that optimally an institution should have 5-6 months in reserves and best practice is to have a year of operation costs in reserves and we have less than 3 months.

Stivers added that there seems to be amnesia about the funding that used to come before 2008 and this has compounded the problems yearly as the problems get worse. When Governor Brown came into office, the state had no rainy day fund or savings at all and at one point they were writing IOU's. Now the fund is about $13B which is to his credit. Now, we are asking if he could spare $500M to pay for education. Stivers thought there was some discretionary money available now.

Hutchinson said that when she arrived in 2016 she asked interim CFO Jim Hyatt to do a deep dive on the budget which took about six months. Then, in the Spring, we have hired a new cabinet and they have done a deep dive into our budget and divisional budgets and are understanding the complexity of our institution. We have started exercises in our divisions with our deans and directors about how to engage in cost savings at the same time we preserve the quality of instruction.

5. Guiding Principles for Budget Prioritization and Revenue Generation Exercises

(28:29-1:05:06)
Wyrick reminded the committee that we engaged in two exercises at the last meeting to think about University strategic priorities and the University values. He wanted to recap some of those conversations.

<u>An Exercise in Budget Prioritization</u> [Slide 1]. The question was can we rank order our priorities based on our mission statement and the key values we have already articulated? [Slide 2] With the hope that we can send Cabinet some guiding principles in how to go about potential budget cutting, we divided into work groups to brainstorm [Slides 3-4]. The rough notes of these groups as they tried to rank order our core priorities was handed out (seven groups met).

Wyrick summarized his own impressions of the work in order to invite comments.

1) He thought there was less of a focus on the budget implications of the exercise than there was in considering this a preliminary effort in rewriting the strategic plan
2) He thought all the groups implied that our values and priorities could do with some substantial rethinking. He thought there are interesting commonalities, but it is harder to distinguish how these impact student outcomes (ie. how they might impact student success or other kinds of efforts we are considering to focus on students as our primary mission).

Wyrick asked if anyone had feedback.

Sistrunk wondered about the notion that public entities should have reserves and keep building these up. A different way of looking at surpluses might be articulated: we gave you that tax money, why are you keeping it so that you can just save it away? How big should strategic reserves be? Hutchinson answered that the CO and CABO both say that 5-6 months reserved operating expenses is reasonable.

Stivers discussed unlooked for emergences that might come up. He recalled the emergency that just struck CSU Fresno when their power grid, which is antiquated like Chico's, went off line for 3-5 days. Theirs, like ours, was aluminum based which went out of use 35 years ago. Hutchinson pointed that Fresno had to come up with some 1$100M to keep running.

Ford wondered if we could properly define all the elements of this budget so that we can understand what all the real costs are. For example, he said, every year we engage in the process of describing our roll-over funds. Sometimes those consist of actual encumbrances –a faculty start-up is an obligation committed to and other times it's something else. So, to determine what the real cost of instruction is we need to properly separate out things. If we don't have a common understanding we will have trouble.

Another issue Ford observed is that every level of administration strives to have a rainy day fund, or a cushion. These cushions accumulate. His question for Stivers was: how do we tell how great our cushion really is. Individual departments, colleges, divisions, the university itself, and the system as a whole all have reserves. If everyone had a 5% cushion, that adds up to about 35% of money not being used. Thus, understanding how the surpluses accumulate over the different levels is part of getting the clarity we need to decide about our strategic priorities.

Hutchinson said that the Provost and Vice President of Advancement were going over the cushions that have been built up and trying to get people to spend their money.

Larson said that we know where all the reserves are in Academic Affairs. She said when we roll it all up to the top and accumulate it all, we are still $2.5M in deficit spending for 17-18 even if she accounts for some of the surpluses sitting out in some of the colleges. This is because of how the budget model has worked and because of some of the great management of some units (it is a combination of these). She said some of the additional information we need about the model will be provided by Jeff Bell today. She said next year the projection is another $2.5M in debt and that is without anticipating a cut.

Our annual budget is $133M. This means that the Academic Affairs budget reserves will drop to $6M in 2019. This is not a sufficient reserve. This includes all these savings that various departments and colleges have in reserve.

Ford said we still need clarity about the difference between encumbrance and surplus. He said this is tricky to define and if we were clear we could define a unit of success to move forward. We could make strategic decisions if we had this clarity.

Larson said we are making progress through the analytical work that Jeff Bell is providing. At least within the division we will understand what it costs to deliver in the different departments and colleges a fulltime equivalent unit of instruction. We have a handle on it, though we do not have the greatest data systems so that we have to make some assumptions. This information is being shared with the Deans and they should share it forward.

Jeff Bell’s reports are on the IR webpage on the left hand side.

Trailer wanted to underline how serious the situation was. He noted that a lecturer section costs $5,000. To save $1.M we would have to cancel 200 sections across this campus and move those students into other existing sections.

Larson said this seriousness has caused us to look at our off the top expenses and decide to cut our pathway coordinators assigned time in half, and this saved us $50,000, that is 10 sections of lecturing.

Wyrick wondered if we were being honest about our priorities because we say we are committee to student success and we have all these programs that do not pay for instruction. Larson recognized that he was taking about other divisions and the Cabinet will have to take this into account.

Zartman noted that sometimes reserves are for a purpose going forward which requires stewardship on the micro-level. Hutchinson said that even thinking about encumbrances required prioritization. The challenges are highly complex and if everything is a priority, we will still have to make hard decisions at the end of the day to figure out how to spend within our means.

Wyrick turned attention to the second exercise to think about Alternative Resource Generation [Slide 1]. The challenge was: what are you thinking of doing to generate alternative revenue to supplement our finances [Slides 2-4]. How will you supplement our priorities by thinking creatively? Wyrick wondered what people thought about this exercise since they have had a chance to think more about it.

Hutchinson remarked that this is where planning comes in. There are different ideas here and some are pie-in-the sky notions that will; take several years to put together, others might be more readily accomplished. As we change our culture and embrace entrepreneurial to think of other ways to bring resources to Chico differently than what we have done in the past, we will need to remember that some ideas may take 3, 5 or even 7 years to create a reasonable yield.

Wyrick thought we should focus on the things we ourselves can change.

Angela Trethewey, Dean of CME wondered about the different ways we could think about graduate programs. Some programs could be self-support, we could create add-ons and certificates and different kinds of credentials. We could broaden our notion of what a graduate program is. She thought we could be driven from the market if we were not purposeful and innovative. Senate and EPPC should think about how we enable innovative curriculum and ways of offering it to different kinds of audiences. We have huge potential.

Sistrunk thought our University's embrace of sustainability practice is really about cost savings and efficiency. It takes a short term expense to retool the older dinosaur economy and dependencies that vested interests love. Universities should be engines of innovation. Many all over the world might be interested in participating with us since we have an established reputation.

Stivers agreed that we will need to invest in long term efficiency with a little more up front costs. Our new Science building will continue to promote building efficiency. We are also looking at alternative energy (like solar) and might form some public private partnerships and see what opportunities are out there. He said work on the energy plan and construction of the new boiler chiller plant is another way we are developing more efficiency. Sistrunk wondered if there were grants and advancement opportunities here as well.

Hutchinson said we are five years ahead of where we had planned to be with our commitment to climate neutrality, and that our campus will maintain its commitment to Sustainability as one its strategic priorities.

O'Donnell thought we could think how to improve our efficiency in fulfilling the requirements that EO's mandate for us to comply with the law. The committees and new hires that are sometimes necessary represent a lot of work. We should think about getting things done efficiently to save time.

Hutchinson agreed that we should work efficiently and wondered about the unfunded mandate overview Chico had undertaken. It shows many policies and responsibilities from state law or the CO that cost a great deal. She said we would continue to present this information to the CO. Wyrick asked if the list could be shared.

Patrick Newell elaborated on the energy loss at Fresno by describing how biology samples from faculty grant projects died. The CO had to help Fresno pay for repairs and he wondered if we had asked for preventive maintenance costs from them since our infrastructure is comparable to Fresno.

Stivers admitted that Chico has been asking for this kind of help over and over because disaster is imminent and our aluminum infrastructure is resistant to easy fixes. We also asked for private company help.

Wilking noted that we should be thinking outside of the box to do more interdisciplinary teaching that has impact on the community. She said beyond the faculty and student benefits of this curriculum there could be budgetary benefits and efficiencies. She said there are structural barriers to interdisciplinary teaching like the FTES model, for example. We should embrace new models and approaches so that everyone wins.

Wyrick asked the committee to continue to think about innovations and communicate about them.

6. ABC Task Force Update - Bell. (1:05:07-)
[Slide 1] Wyrick asked Jeff Bell to present the ABC Model Task Force preliminary report.

Jeff Bell explained that he is the leader of the task force looking at an allocation model for giving money to the colleges.

[Slide 2] He gave an overview of the overall university budget with an illustration showing how money flows from the CO to the colleges. In 2017-18 the CO sent $180.2M to our cabinet after the amount needed to pay for utilities and benefits was taken off the top and student tuition fees were added. Stacie Corona noted that the utility fees number in this slide is wrong

[Slide 3] This slide shows how the money flows from the cabinet to the divisions and then how it flows from Academic Affairs which pays for many other things besides the colleges to end up distributing $68M to the colleges (this amount is about 30% of the overall University budget).

[Slide 4] This slide focuses on how Academic Affairs makes the college allocations. These allocations are the part of the budget that the taskforce looked at to ask how we allocate the funds to the colleges. It is the biggest piece of the budget.

[Slide 5] The slide is titled College Allocation by Category and illustrates the way the Academic Affairs budget pays for Deans and staff and supplies and lots of other things. The bulk of the money (about 70%) goes to hiring instructors. This is the part of the budget the taskforce made a recommendation about to suggest how it would be allocated.

Jeni Kitchell asked for an example of category of funds shown on the slide called "Special Needs" which is 10% of the allocations. Jeff Bell explained that this heading illustrates our efforts to serve the North State which shows up in lots of centers. In the college of Natural Sciences, for instance, there is a Center for Water in the Environment that works with the community over issues of water. These kind of centers are expensive as they need faculty to have release time and staff to work for them. There are many museums and other centers that can be particularly expensive with heavy operating expenses (like the Farm in the School of Agriculture).

[Slide 6] ABC DE Allocation Model shows how the money has been allocated the last few years. ABC stands for Activity Based Costs and the DE stands for Delaware. The ABC allocates funds based on the average costs of different types of instruction. The measure is in terms of instruction of Fulltime Equivalent Students (FTES). The value of these courses is predicated on their different levels: GE<LD<UD<GRAD. The model funds these levels differently based mostly on the class size. For example, a graduate class cannot have a large class so that they take more money to support.

[Slide 7] The model also differentiates hierarchically the different modes or types of instruction (Lecture<Activity<Lab). Activities in a lab are the most expensive since they have more expensive equipment and they are smaller, so they cost more. Faculty work per student credit unit is different as well: Lecture counts as 1 WTU; Activity is depicted as 1.3 WTU and Labs 2WTUs. Supervision in the current model is funded the same as Lecture

[Slide 8] DE Factor: The Delaware adjustment refers to an adjustment that uses average costs accumulated from other Universities to adjust allocation for department specific expenses. This data provides an index for the cost of instruction nationwide. It is based on a numerical system for the varied things that people call their department work (which seem comparable to the model makers). There are problems when you don't have a department that fits into their classification scheme.

[Slide 9] The FTES are then calculated according to the level and mode used in each college. We are thus taking an average cost for each activity across the colleges and allocating it based on the college FTES. The colleges then give their allocations to their departments according to mode and type of instruction.

The model was not really designed to calculate appropriations for the departments. These must be applied by the colleges as they work best on average. Each department can decide how to spend more or less on the varied types and modes of courses they offer. If more resources are put toward one kind of courses (like Graduate courses) this money is then of necessity taken from other courses in the department. There must be trade-offs.

Centers do not generate FTES and don't fit into this model. Special needs allocations used for extra expenses are not accounted for in the ABC/DE model either.

[Slide 10] The advantages of the ABC model are articulated here including the attempt to be consistent across all the majors and reflect the spending decisions of colleges and departments.

Fairness dictates that the inherent value of all the majors is the same. The comparative value of courses in GE and in majors is debated as is the difference between upper division and lower division courses. The model also allows people to make strategic decisions and decide to grow specific parts of their programs.

[Slide 11] There are difficulties with the model as well including the fact that the Delaware correction is based on old data (collected 10 years ago and it may not be really comparable to our California circumstances). Assigning value to courses based on their level and mode are estimates based on data available at the time and that leaves out supervision entirely. Students can change majors more swiftly than the model can assign faculty to meet the demand for the courses they move into. Tenured faculty are specialized and don't move between different courses so easily.

[Slide 12] The taskforce is made up of 12 faculty, staff and chairs and a Dean with all the colleges represented. They worked very hard on a complex task. The group used the data of a single semester (Spring 2017) and looked at the Faculty Activity Reports (FARs) to investigate issues with the current ABC-DE model.

[Slide 13] We evaluated data from the 4,000 sections we taught in that Spring semester. It showed that actual expenses in many categories were very different from the budget amounts (ie. Lecture was cheaper than expected). Comparisons to the model used at Fresno were also evaluated (it is a more complicated model). The orange bars compared to what the model budgets (in blue) show that we are underfunding many courses. Supervision units (that include independent research, and other things with a low student faculty ratio) are much more expensive than lecture courses (though they are currently identified as equivalent in our model).

[Slide 14] We discovered that the model is not funding the actual costs of instruction which punishes units using those level and mode categories inordinately. The Delaware correction did not fund the actual expenses. The biggest gap example is in HFA that has the most expensive courses that were funded the lowest of the colleges. This only looks at the budget model relative to the costs of instruction (70% of the budget of the colleges).

Boyd noted that some colleges have expenses that change slightly from Fall and Spring. This is just one snapshot. Jeff Bell noted that the numbers are a little worse for everyone in the spring (sometimes 30% of the students graduate in the Fall).

[Slide 15] To think about building a new model the team looked at the difference between what was expended on levels of instruction that spring looking at FTES percentages and money spent. The largest category is the upper division majors classes (46%). We calculate the cost of FTES and evaluate the cost ratio.

Angela Trethewey asked if this changes a lot in Fall when the Freshman are taking many lower division classes. Jeff Bell answered that they are still taking GE courses.

Sistrunk asked about the many classes that count for the major that also count as GE classes. Jeff Bell said they are all counted as GE classes.

[Slide 16] The team also evaluated the different expenses for the modes of instruction. Labs cost twice as much as Lecture classes and Supervision is also much more expensive.

[Slide 17] To think about correcting the Delaware model the team also looked at the cost differences per WTU in the different colleges.

Trethewey asked about the impact of history on the model. One argument could be made that some colleges seem to have an efficient cost ratio. What does this mean for a model that is grounded largely on historical costs?

Larson said that some of the work of unbaking the model must come from outside the model as when we decide on new tenure track searches, for example. This can unwind some of the historical practice impacts that have so much weight in the model. Other big decisions will impact this model.

When we look at the Delaware model ECC was getting 50% more than BSS and HFA. However, when we look at the actual cost ECC is only a little bit higher than the average. The budget model doesn't reflect tenure density or a larger number of senior instructors.

Selvester asked if the team disaggregated gender to look at the pay of men versus women. Jeff Bell said HR won't give him the data about this, nor will they give him other comparisons like race and ethnicity.

Patrick Newall asked if the cost ratio included other factors like grants and Jeff Bell said this model just treated the state dollars and it does not include AWTU either.

Jeff observed that the model needs to be readjusted. We have units that are more expensive than the average across the United States and we need to reflect this in the model. We can't punish units that happen to be more expensive than national averages.

Robert Knight, Dean of HFA reported that when he arrived in 2013 there were 95 tenured faculty in HFA, 60 of them were full professors and 30 of which could have retired that year. This is one reason HFA instruction is more expensive.

[Slide 18] The team created a spread sheet to experiment with adjusting the model. He also added a fudge factor to allow continued ad hoc adjustments to the calculations.

[Slide 19] This chart shows how changing college factors tweak the model.

[Slide 20] This chart provides comparison of the new models with the old.

[Slide 21] lists the team's recommendations:

- Use an index based on the actual salaries instead of the Delaware adjustments and adjust each year
  (since this is a mix of differences in base salaries and tenure density, need to make

sure low tenure density colleges do not get “locked in” to disadvantageous model)

- Add Supervision as a mode with appropriate funding
- Rebalance the Level/Mode parameters based on more recent data
  (Need Fall and Spring instead of just Spring)

[Slide 22] Lists remaining issues.

- AWTU is poorly categorized and difficult to track
  Need better data collection and data reports
  No place for funding for most of this model (new faculty release, etc.)
- FTES can move faster than faculty
- Special needs – many disparate needs are lumped together.
  It is 10% of the total allocation going to the colleges
- Administrative and staff budget model could be improved
- Supply costs are currently funded through multiple accounts, making an allocation hard to determine

[Slide 23] lists Special Needs issues.

- Programs with mandated low SFR (Nursing, Art, etc.)
- Programs with expensive infrastructure and staff needs (AG, ECC, etc.)
- Centers, Museums and Student Success efforts

[Slide 24] Bell introduced Larson to discuss what the next steps for the taskforce will be.

- The taskforce will write out a report on their findings

Larson said that the report would go to the Deans to talk about the taskforce recommendations They will need to dig into the special allocation area to augment the model. She said there are some things inherent in the model that are feeling unfair as the world has changed. She said she would attend the taskforce meeting of April 30 to hear what they think about the taskforce continuing to work on the model.

Ford thanked Jeff Bell for the thorough presentation. He said the data analysis has been showing actual costs per FTE. It seems to him as though this is leaning toward a model to show disparate salaries across different units which he approved of. At the same time, there is variation in the student/faculty ratio. Ford asked about what conversation was about different efficiencies. Ow is efficiency independent of faculty pay encouraged by the model?

Jeff Bell said this goes back to the communication problems with the model. Many of the people making decisions do not understand the effect of scheduling on the student/faculty ratio and its impact on their budgets and their college budgets. They tend to work independently of how the budget model works. People will make poor scheduling decisions that will impact their student/faculty ratio, cost a bunch of money and then they wonder why they can’t get a hire?

Wyrick asked about whether it was very efficient to make some courses double-count as GE and major classes? The model encourages people to go toward stand-alone courses just for majors. Jeff Bell thought departments were making money off GE because it is cheaper to offer. Wyrick thought departments could make even more by double-counting their courses (to give value added to their instructor’s time). Larson thought the logic was flipped if full professors taught classes that were too small.

Trethewey said she was concerned about Ford's question about tenure density being locked into the model in a particular way. CME has 45% tenure density so it is less expensive. She is concerned that this will be built in. We also want to incentivize efficiency in the actual model so that it is not just a question of communication –we do not want to incentivize low tenure density.

Zartman asked if there were comparisons made with other CSUs. Larson noted that many other universities don not have the allocation model we do. Ours has some advantages. It is very common that allocations from one year are routinely assumed to be the same the next year.

Wyrick asked Larson to make the last comment. She said she was interested in the question of efficiency and it might be something for the taskforce next year. Tenure density can affect the speed at which we can change our faculty to accommodate changing student interests. These accommodations reside in the decisions we make about new tenure track hires. These questions are outside our model but should be based on some kind of metrics.

7. Other
None.

8. Adjourn
Meeting adjourned at 10:03 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary

General Resources for Background:

State of California, Department of Finance:
http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/BUD_DOCS/Bud_link.htm
State of California. Legislative Analyst's Office: http://www.lao.ca.gov/
CSU System: http://www.calstate.edu/budget/
CSU, Chico: http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/planning/resourceallocation/index.shtml
CSU, Chico: http://www.csuchico.edu/bud/budgetplans/index.shtml
OpenGov: https://csuchicoca.opengov.com