

ACADEMIC SENATE – Budget & Long-Range Planning Committee

Spring 2017

Due: Friday, June 23, 2017

MEMBERS	
Name	College/Unit
Bieraugel, Mark	PCS
Brancart, Victor	Admin
Davol, Andrew	CENG
Hurley, Sean (CH)	CAFES
Ikeda, Kimi	Admin
Lem, Matthew	ASI
Loberg, Molly	CLA
Miller, Tad	OCOB
Rein, Steve	CSM
Tietje, Brian	Admin
Torres-Bustamante, Cesar	CAED

CHARGES	
Charge	Status/Notes
Review of Strategic Plan – resolution Spring 2017	This charge has been postponed until fall quarter due to no final draft of the strategic plan being completed.
BLRP involvement in revisitations of campus-wide allocation models.	The committee met several times during the quarter in an attempt to refine its role in the budgeting process that occurs on campus. The committee reviewed several other CSU faculty budget committees to see how they function. The committee received a budget update from David Valdez, Director of Budget and Finance. The committee also gathered information regarding the timeline and process the University uses in its budgeting process. We discovered that if the faculty would like to have a role in budgeting, it would need to start the initial process in the Fall quarter with much of the work done in the Winter quarter after the Governor releases his budget in January.

NOTES:

The committee met six times this quarter (April 21, April 28, May 5, May 12, May 19, and June 2). The purpose of these meeting were two-fold. The first was to complete the work on the Student Success resolution so that it would be accepted by the Academic Senate. This work culminated in a successful resolution passing the Senate at its last meeting of the year. This resolution can be found at: <https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/Resolutions/2016-2017/AS-840-17.pdf>.

One of the key responsibilities of the committee is the following: *“(1) The Budget and Long Range Planning Committee shall provide oversight and make recommendations concerning policy for the allocation of budgeted resources. This includes the review of matters related to the allocation of budgeted resources and representation on bodies formed to review the mechanisms by which campuswide resource allocations are made.”* Up to this time, the committee has not followed through with this responsibility as well as it could. Hence, the second focus of this quarter’s meetings were to begin understanding the budgetary process used on campus so the committee can provide a more informed role in the University’s budgeting process. While the committee was able to gain a greater understanding of the process, it struggled with how it can meaningfully be part of the campus budgetary deliberation. The committee would like to take a much greater role in the campus budget discussion, which may require the Senate to request a seat at the table for budgetary discussions. In order to achieve this, the committee first needs to figure out what aspect of the budget it should be providing input. Should the committee have voice regarding the total budget, or should it only have a voice regarding academic affairs? These are unresolved questions for the committee that need to be resolved next year.

The committee recommends that it should have two key charges next academic year. The first charge for the committee should be to develop a resolution regarding the final draft of the University’s strategic plan once the draft is completed. The second charge should be to engage the administration to develop a role for the committee in the University’s budgeting process. Under this second charge is several sub-charges including: a) develop a timeline for how the campus conducts its budgetary process; b) develop the data requirements for the committee to make informed recommendations; c) develop the scope of what recommendations the committee can make to the administration regarding budget; and d) develop a set of tasks and a timeline for the committee so it can participate in the budget discussion.