## Subcommittee 4 Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DIVISION / COLLEGE</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danny C. Kim</td>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance (A&amp;F)</td>
<td>Co–Chair–Subcommittee, Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Stohs</td>
<td>Finance (MCBE)</td>
<td>Co–Chair–Subcommittee, Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Balderas</td>
<td>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences (HSS)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Bowers</td>
<td>Education (EDUC)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member, Chair PRBC, Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Creighton</td>
<td>Extended Education (UEE)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter de Lijser</td>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics (NSM)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike DeMars</td>
<td>Library (UL)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Edwards</td>
<td>Associated Students (ASI)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Emry</td>
<td>Human Communications (COMM)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Filowitz</td>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics (NSM)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Forkan</td>
<td>Visual Arts (ARTS)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Jarvis</td>
<td>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences (HSS)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uksun Kim</td>
<td>Engineering (ECS)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Nguyen</td>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Saks</td>
<td>University Advancement (UA)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sora Tanjasiri</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Development (HHD)</td>
<td>Subcommittee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Wong</td>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance (A&amp;F)</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Chan</td>
<td>Extended Education (UEE)</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laleh Graylee</td>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance (A&amp;F)</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kopecky</td>
<td>Academic Affairs (AA)</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berhanu Tadesse</td>
<td>Information Technology (IT)</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Tran</td>
<td>Government &amp; Community Relations (UA)</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willem van der Pol</td>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance (A&amp;F)</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subcommittee 4 split into three teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Team A</th>
<th>Members of Team B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mike DeMars</td>
<td>• Jeanne Tran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sora Tanjasiri</td>
<td>• Mark Stohs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Berhanu Tadesse</td>
<td>• David Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Matt Jarvis</td>
<td>• Joseph Nguyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greg Saks</td>
<td>• Steven Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mike DeMars</td>
<td>• Laleh Graylee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mike DeMars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Team C</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Willem van der Pol</td>
<td>• Willem van der Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mark Filowitz</td>
<td>• Mark Filowitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carol Creighton</td>
<td>• Carol Creighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Erica Bowers</td>
<td>• Erica Bowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pat Balderas</td>
<td>• Lisa Kopecky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lisa Kopecky</td>
<td>• Peter de Lijser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Laleh Graylee</td>
<td>• Laleh Graylee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charge for Subcommittee 4: Infrastructure and Resources

The Infrastructure and Resources Subcommittee is charged with preparing responses to the following questions:

1. How do we assess and articulate the resource requirements of the AMP? (Team A)
2. How do we align our physical and financial resources to support the AMP? (Team B)
3. What are the barriers that may impede the campus from delivering adequate physical and financial resources to sustain the AMP, and how do we address them? (Team C)
4. How can we respond to budget challenges? (Team B)
PREAMBLE

Given “normal” operations of the university, units (divisions/colleges, departments, etc.) tend to manage both their own physical space and their own budgets. It is thus their responsibility to manage and align all of those resources appropriately. The analyzing the physical and financial resources to support the Academic Master Plan (AMP) largely presupposes that the other elements of the AMP are already fully developed and functioning as the guide for the future of the university. In this respect, the assessing, aligning, considering the barriers, policies and challenges of CSUF’s physical and financial resources is the last logical step in the process of implementing the AMP. However, it is also the case that any serious plan for changing or creating academic units would naturally include careful consideration of such resources at the very beginning. Ideas for change or growth which ignore resources at the outset normally have little chance of success in the long-run.

The primary intent of the AMP is to provide foresight into the way in which future growth or change occurs. In this way, all resources can be utilized more efficiently so that our students are able to earn the degrees they desire. While physical and financial resources are crucial to creative planning, human resources (i.e., faculty, staff and administrators) are obviously essential. If a plan calls for significant growth in subject area X, yet individuals are not earning academic credentials in area X, then that restriction is at least as important as the physical and financial constraints. Hence, while the focus herein is on physical and financial resources, these comments presuppose that relevant and accurate planning has already occurred concerning human resources. The HR data would include benchmarks to support the campus at the appropriate levels.
The AMP does not necessarily aim to change the *normal university operations*. The primary goal of the AMP is for the University to become forward-looking. Normal university operations may need to be adjusted, however, as a result of the successful adoption of a long-term AMP and/or when plans for one unit have a substantial impact on other units or the whole University. The AMP is intended to be consistent with and guided by the University’s Strategic Plan. The difference is that the Strategic Plan is at a “higher level” and does not provide substantial details in how to operationalize the Strategic Plan. Further, the AMP focuses more directly on Academic Affairs, while recognizing that other University Divisions or units are also guided by the Strategic Plan. One might conceive of the AMP as the action plan for carrying out the Strategic Plan. The longer–run intention is to have a positive “feedback loop” in both directions between the Strategic Plan and the AMP, with each providing guidance for future Plans. In addition, priorities or procedures recommended by the AMP depend upon the campus’ conception of itself as a model public university.

Hence, when the AMP guides Academic Affairs and/or the broader university, *normal operations* should include the following provisions:

1. An AMP is a university plan for a set time period such as five years, with successive plans guiding the university well into the future. Revisions to any given AMP shall be made as necessary. Appropriate forecasts for both physical and financial uses and resources should be essential elements of an AMP.

2. When important plans originating with the AMP are likely to have a substantial impact on more than one unit, adjustments beyond normal operations may be necessary.
Those responsible for designing the details of the AMP and implementing those details must decide what constitutes a substantial impact.

The AMP, may for instance, recommend that a given academic program is at its optimal size, that it should not grow any further nor shrink. A variety of rationales may be provided for such a decision, such as extremely high cost in permitting growth, or future projections at the state level that the demand for graduates of the program has peaked, etc. An AMP’s recommendations are significant, in that they would represent conceiving the future of the university as being planned, vs. merely happening. The university would no longer accept students who come to us, but would rather impose a thoughtful plan on future growth or decline of academic programs. Some of this planning already occurs, in the sense of impaction of some programs.

The justification or rationale for the overall AMP is similar to that for impaction. The difference is that the AMP attempts to guide the University in advance of external decisions that are often made for us. This is the intention of labelling it a master plan.

3. Collegial, shared governance serves as the foundation for any such design and implementation.

4. Items of broad interest include the following, which should be addressed by the campus prior to a complete and final version of the AMP.

5. Multiple challenges exist for identifying the resource needs of any future academic plan, including most importantly, the fragmentary budget sources and costs relating to staffing (faculty, staff, students) at CSUF. Additionally, uncertainty exists regarding the role that performance based funding will play in determining future budgets. Currently
CSUF also lacks information on existing standards and approaches at sister CSU campuses and other comparable universities across the nation.

6. In the absence of further information about future budgets for CSU or CSUF, initial assumptions include:

a) Budgeting implications as a result of the AMP may require distribution of current resources,

b) CSUF is in a zero–growth budgeting context, which means that there are no new funds available to support the AMP,

c) Any new physical spaces will be clearly identified for consideration during the AMP budget analysis period,

d) That the process of resource identification and articulation should respect existing academic units and structures (e.g., college–based allocations of space); and

e) That the resource planning process prioritizes input from both the academic/administrative units directly involved as well as associated groups to develop a holistic approach to planning, growth, stability and sustainability of the AMP. Shifts in resources may be needed periodically to support changes due to new or evolving programs,

f) The AMP must also articulate the resource requirements associated with it. If known, the types of resources (sources and nature, i.e. state baseline funding, grant–based one–time funds, full–time faculty course assignments, temporary staff resources, etc.) should be clearly indicated. This should be done both for increased resource needs and for projected resource savings from the AMP.
The AMP provides a more proactive approach for University rather than a reaction to external forces.

**Question 1: How do we assess and articulate the resource requirements of the Academic Master Plan?**

Generally, the AMP should establish principles and processes to ensure that resources are aligned or re–aligned in accordance with the evolving university priorities and programs (dramatic FTES shifts may result in changes in resources and spaces needed). Assessing and articulating resource requirements should be guided by these principles to provide consistent budget development across all program components of the Academic Master Plan, as well as to ensure all related needs and their ramifications have been considered. The principles could include, but are not limited to: methodologies for evaluating the costs of different budget categories such as staff, faculty FTE, and O&E; whether or not there would be differential methods to reflect natural cost differences among programs; and various benchmarks for a test of reasonableness.

Full costs of the programs should be captured, including indirect costs and those that are commonly covered at the campus level, such as employee benefits. The need for resources should be analyzed with an eye towards what funding should be, rather than what funding currently is, so that full baseline requirements may be identified to ensure appropriate consideration is given when deliberating or making decisions on the budgets (as will be covered in the next section).
In addition, campus units or subject matter experts directly responsible for the academic plans should be involved in the budget development taking into account both the short- and long-term goals of the AMP activity. Given the number of interdisciplinary programs (e.g., Freshmen Programs), there may be instances where multiple academic and administrative units (e.g., Student Affairs) could also be involved in a new or ongoing academic endeavor and thus it would be important to consider and cost out the impact on these secondary units. When multiple units are involved, processes should be utilized depending on the organizational structure and impact of the programs.

For example, to the extent that primary and secondary units are contained within existing academic structures (e.g., mainly within one college), the resource identification process can involve just these entities in estimating the budget and space needs and opportunities to support the AMP effort. In contrast, to the extent that primary and secondary units are relatively large in number, and the AMP efforts are more campus–wide than college–specific, the AMP should involve established entities with budget/resource responsibilities across campus, including at least the:

- Academic Senate (for vetting of AMP–related proposals that require campus–wide approval);
- Office of the Provost,
- Vice President for Administration and Finance Office (for detailed resource planning and analysis); and
- Planning, Resource, and Budget Committee (PRBC) (for broad resource planning and prioritization need).
Such considerations should be tied back into the other questions that the AMP addresses to ensure the AMP is feasible. Assessing resource requirements should incorporate benchmarks and outcome measures such as those in the anticipated performance based funding model.

Question 2: How do we align our physical & financial resources to support the AMP?

ALIGNMENT OF PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES

A fundamental recommendation is for CSUF to leverage the use of relevant data in making decisions about:

A. **PHYSICAL RESOURCES**: Provide details about existing buildings/facilities, using a **Space Allocation Model** (i.e., software; sample pictures below) including such information as:

1. Total square feet,
2. Uses of the building or space, e.g., computer lab only, science lab only, or multi-purpose uses,
3. Total useable space that can be devoted to instructional purposes (number of classrooms, seats),
4. CSU Space Standards,
5. Comparisons of physical usage at CSUF to national averages; along with any recommendations based upon such comparisons,
6. Efficiencies for space usage should be considered. Such efficiencies include, but are not limited to the use of: (1) Friday and weekend classes, (2) on-line classes, and (3) scheduling classes to spread enrollment more evenly across available times during
TTh and MW classes. Such considerations should also take account of trade-offs. For example, students who may normally enroll in Saturday classes are often the same students who take classes on-line.

B. **FINANCIAL RESOURCES**: Provide and improve accessibility to information about all financial resources, including the total annual budget, and sources and uses of funds, with the aim of generating full transparency. This is especially important; given that we are a public university with responsibility to the citizens of California. Trends in financial resources should also be analyzed to assist in proper budget forecasting and planning.

C. **HUMAN RESOURCES DATA**: While this data is part of other AMP sub-committees, this data directly affects both physical and financial resources. The human resources data would include staffing formulas across all positions on campus.

D. **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**: While technology continues to play an integral part in university related activities, AMP needs to create a technology infrastructure resources allocation methodology that helps to design, fund, acquire, and maintain infrastructure that can accommodate current and future administrative and academic technological computing needs of the university.

**GENERAL APPROACH FOR CREATING FIVE–YEAR AMP PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES**

1. Procedural Guidelines (principles)
2. Practical Recommendations

1. **Procedural Guidelines:**
Procedural guidelines include those suggestions or principals which should guide all elements of the physical and financial resources elements of the AMP. They include the following:

a. Each College should have a “home,” clearly delineated from other Colleges on campus.

b. Some academic buildings are needed as “common access/resource,” without “ownership” by individual Colleges or Units. This also includes the consideration of having open office space for part-time faculty; along with the potential to take some current classrooms “offline” (i.e., convert them to other uses, such as student, research or other space as determined by the AMP). Some details are provided below.

c. A centralized (computer–based) scheduling of classes and all campus space should guide current and future decisions and should allow for improved planning and usage reporting.

d. A space analysis should be performed and kept current, using a well–designed Space Allocation Model.

e. **FTES–based needs** presumably guide most planning into the future. This approach is easy to measure and understand, including relationships to faculty office space (FT & PT), general classroom, equipped teaching classroom, teaching lab, and other facility usage as deemed necessary.

f. **Performance–based needs** may guide significant elements of the AMP. However, given that such needs may be difficult to measure and justify, such needs should
drive the AMP only when the needs are clearly agreed upon by those who implement the AMP. Such needs may include areas related to research & other important activities such as faculty research space, student success center, tutoring center, college–specific required area, including non–academic performance–based needs and space.

g. High priority areas/units should be identified.

h. Consideration of classroom availability when planning.

i. Compliance of CSU space standards.

j. Student financial resources should be a vital element of any AMP. This requirement includes attention to the use and pricing of textbooks, insofar as such issues affect budgeting at CSUF.

k. Space allocation for students (e.g., student clubs and areas for socializing) should be a part of any AMP.

2. **Practical Recommendations:**

   Practical recommendations are divided into three parts: (a) re–aligning the current situation, (b) planning for growth, and (c) planning for stability. Details for each part follow.

   a. **Re–align current situation:** This is with respect to both space allocation and the distribution of financial resources. This, naturally, depends upon having an accurate inventory of the resources on hand. The goal of this step is to increase the efficiency of use of all campus resources; and to re–balance resources which are not aligned correctly.
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i. The relationship of FTES and the allocation of facilities and financial resources should be clarified and transparent. Strategic decisions (performance based needs) deviating from FTES should be justified and transparent and be a part of the AMP.

ii. University Faculty need a “social space/faculty club,” as at some other CSU campuses and at many universities nationwide.

b. **Develop a Plan for Growth**: If growth, for example, is expected to be 17% within the next five years, then a well–developed plan will enable all members of the University community to understand decisions which are or will be made. Relevant parts of this plan would or should include:

   i. Recent growth trends should be considered at Unit or College levels to project future growth. All such projections should also include current market trends (demand and supply for graduates of programs). The AMP five–year plan should incorporate growth projections (positive or negative) and recommend appropriate actions; whether that means impaction, or planning for significant positive or negative growth. Demographic trends, along with State and local needs should be considered.

   For example, ECS growth based on enrollment UG/G headcount for FY 2011–12 = 5.4%, FY 2012–13 = 15.8%, FY 2013–14 = 26.4%%, FY 2014–15 = 27.5%%; with FY 2010 – Fall 2015 growth of approximately 119%. This growth was not planned and as a result, complications arose with implications both within extending
beyond the college. With a well–functioning AMP, such growth would be incorporated into action plans for Colleges, the University, and Community.

c. **Develop a Plan for Stability (after growth):** Growth will almost never occur “as planned” – CSUF will always have to take account of actual student growth (in given academic areas and/or units) versus what the University “expects or plans” to occur. When the differences between the planned vs. actual growth become apparent, the University should have a plan for how to “re–adjust.”

**Question 3:** What barriers may impede the campus from delivering adequate physical and financial resources to sustain the AMP, and how do we address them?

Ways to address the potential barriers which may impede the campus from delivering adequate physical and financial resources to sustain the AMP include the following.

**Physical Considerations:**

1. Maximize utilization of classroom spaces using timely, transparent and accurate space utilization data.
2. Revisit University scheduling patterns and formats to ensure optimum utilization of space.
3. Determine priority and improve communication and planning for research, lab, classroom, student service, and support spaces and maintenance (lab equipment) of those spaces.
4. The campus master plan needs to be updated.
Financial Resources (FR):

1. Consider operational/financial impacts when determining strategic directions and possible conflicts of new initiatives, noting that potential solutions should be financially sustainable over time.

2. Reassess graduate programs to determine appropriate level of support required.

3. Evaluate facility needs, including deferred maintenance plans, to consider safety, practical and effective usage.

4. Ensure financial resources are expended effectively and efficiently; conduct appropriate analyses such as cost benefits and return on investment as appropriate prior to making financial commitments and decisions (e.g., consultants versus using the expertise of campus personnel).

Question 4: Possible ways to respond to challenges and how the budget is impacted by these?

A designated committee focused on budget and facilities shall conduct campus–wide surveys from campus constituents to assess urgent and current struggling issues for implementation of the AMP, with a focus on student success. Through an official review/approval process, this committee makes recommendations to devote CSUF resources to projects approved by the AMP. If necessary, an official decision–making procedure needs to be developed. Recommendations of “this” committee may be sent to the PRBC and then to the President for final approval. [Note – options would include that this committee be the PBRC itself or a sub–committee of the PRBC.]
Units need the University to provide updated/reliable data related to space inventory, classroom utilization, current space for research activities, etc. To support the approved projects, funding sources should be diversified (not only from state budget).
SAMPLE SPACE ALLOCATION MODEL
FOR USE AND PLANNING OF ALL UNIVERSITY FACILITIES

ENTITLEMENT CALCULATION

1. People Count
   60 faculty

2. Guideline
   160 s.f.

3. Buffer
   1.15 x

4. Allocation Per s.f.
   $33/s.f.

5. Unit Allocation
   $364,320

Vacancy: 5%
Inefficient spaces: 10%
COMMON ACCESS/RESOURCE ISSUES

FACILITIES AND FISCAL

ALL UNIVERSITY UNITS; ESPECIALLY ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Physical Resources:

* Not enough research and office space to accommodate FT and PT faculty hires
* Growing demand for flexible space to accommodate evolving external research work
* Growing requests for more student success / advising spaces
* Requests for more and flexible classrooms to accommodate supplemental instruction, advising training, larger classes; more labs are also needed
* Growing demand for student–centered spaces
* Need surge space to accommodate big moves, renovations and strategic priorities
* Insufficient meeting and special events space

Fiscal Resources:

* Insufficient funds to cover existing staff salaries and insufficient number of staff to accommodate current workloads
* Insufficient materials & supplies (OE & E) funds
* Limited and/or sporadic funding for space improvements / capital projects
* No computer lab and/or specialized equipment funding
* Limited funds for new or strategic initiatives
### APPENDIX 1 – CSUF SAMPLE BUDGET (2015–16)

#### 15/16 CSUF Budget

![Circle chart showing the distribution of funds among different sources.]

#### PLANNED SOURCE OF FUNDS (REVENUE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount FY 15/16</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Amount FY 14/15</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU OPERATING FUND</td>
<td>$371,274,536</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>$364,908,380</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUING EDUCATION (CERF)</td>
<td>28,693,009</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>28,000,000</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING FUND</td>
<td>26,914,896</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>25,062,894</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING FUND</td>
<td>12,878,439</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>12,822,262</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$439,760,880</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$430,793,536</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AUXILIARY FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount FY 15/16</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Amount FY 14/15</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUXILIARY SERVICES CORPORATION</td>
<td>35,906,493</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>37,178,421</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATION</td>
<td>565,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>597,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATED STUDENTS INC.</td>
<td>8,876,397</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>8,086,231</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT UNION</td>
<td>8,601,436</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7,933,717</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,949,326</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,795,369</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>