This report summarizes the 2012-13 Resource Planning Process at the end of the academic year in June 2012. The data and plans contained within are based on information available at this time. It is acknowledged that there is a high level of uncertainty about the state fiscal situation. Therefore, the final campus budget plans for 2012-13 may be substantially different than what is contained in this report. However, this plan is being published to document the work done by the 2012-13 RPP Task Force.
MEMBERSHIP OF THE RESOURCE PLANNING PROCESS (RPP) TASK FORCE
A representative task force of the campus leadership was charged with the role of advising the President on matters related to the General Fund budget allocations for the coming fiscal year. The membership is comprised of two non-voting co-chairs, and ten voting members representing faculty, staff and student leadership. A representative of the California Faculty Association (CFA) Local Chapter and a representative of the staff unions are invited to participate as observers, and four individuals are appointed as staff support to the Task Force.

SOURCES AND USES PLAN
This plan prepared by the Office of Administration and Finance provides the Task Force with the perspective of the University's 2012-13 General Fund budget outlook. The plan is updated as new information becomes available.

BUDGET PLANNING SUMMARY
This section provides a comprehensive summary of the budget planning process utilized by CSULB for the upcoming 2012-13 budget year.

APPENDIX
GUIDELINES FOR BUDGET SUBMISSIONS
A copy of the March 12, 2012 communication from the Task Force to the division heads outlining the guidelines to be used in the campus' 2012-13 budget planning process, along with some of the State and System budget information upon which the initial planning parameters were based.

ENROLLMENT DATA
A display of the actual student enrollments for 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12 as well as the preliminary enrollment targets for 2012-13 based on Governor's proposed budget.

SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS
A schedule of the eight separate occasions on which the Task Force convened. Five working and planning meetings were held from October, 2011 through May, 2012. Four separate open hearings for the operating divisions were conducted in April and May, 2012 for a total of eighteen hours of deliberation.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS
A collection of definitions of various terms and phrases specific to CSULB and the CSU used in the RPP Task Force report.
CO-CHAIRS’ MESSAGE
To: F. King Alexander, President
From: Donald Para, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mary Stephens, Vice President for Administration and Finance
Date: June 11, 2012
Subject: 2012-13 RPP Task Force Budget Recommendations

The purpose of this memo is to transmit the budget recommendations of the 2012-13 Resource Planning Process (RPP) Task Force. The final state budget and CSU funding will not be known until late November 2012 due to the potential trigger reduction tied to Governor Brown's tax increase initiative. However, the RPP Task Force believes it is important to communicate current plans to the campus based on what we currently know.

In the past decade CSULB has made remarkable gains in academic quality and student success. The campus remains committed to our pursuit of excellence. Our academic purpose remains graduating students with highly-valued degrees. We are committed to the mission of continued excellence, but the budget crisis we are facing is of unprecedented magnitude.

Executive Summary

The following summarizes our understanding of the budget situation:

- CSULB’s 2012-13 state funding will not be finalized any earlier than November 2012 because the Governor’s budget plan depends upon a ballot measure to determine whether certain taxes will be increased, allowing the state to avoid further budget cuts.
• The CSU budget is even more uncertain than usual, with potential effects ranging from a status quo budget to a massive budget cut depending upon the outcome of the November 2012 tax increase initiative. If the tax initiative is not approved by voters, the CSU is subject to a “trigger” reduction of $250 million effective January 2013.

• CSULB’s share of the trigger reduction is $20.8 million, based on the Governor’s May Revise budget. With the addition of mandatory cost increases and current year budget cuts that have been mitigated with one-time funds, we could face a budget problem of $32 million for 2012-13.

• Campus budget planning by RPP has been completed based on a $27 million budget problem, the best estimate that was available during the spring semester before the release of the Governor’s May Revise budget.

• Even if the trigger reduction is not enacted, the campus must implement budget reductions for 2012-13 because one-time restoration funding that has mitigated prior budget cuts is being exhausted.

• While temporary funds will buffer the full impact of cuts in 2012-13, the campus will have to plan for further cuts in 2013-14, by which time the restoration funding will be exhausted.

**Background**

California continues to struggle with extremely challenging fiscal circumstances. The Governor’s January budget proposal assumed a re-emerging state budget deficit of about $9.2 billion for 2012-13. A key component of the Governor’s January budget plan relies on voter approval of a tax measure that would temporarily raise income taxes on high-income earners and increase the state sales tax. If voters do not approve the tax measure, a series of trigger cuts would go into effect, including a $200 million reduction in state support to the CSU. There is great uncertainty whether voters will approve the tax measure and prevent the trigger reduction. The CSU Chancellor’s Office has assumed the tax measure will not be approved by voters and has given campuses budgets that reflect the anticipated $200 million reduction.
**Current Budget Outlook**

Governor Brown recently released his May Revise budget for the coming year that reflects a worsening state budget situation. The May Revise now projects a state budget deficit of $15.7 billion, primarily due to continued weak state revenues. Despite this deterioration in the state budget, the May Revise does not include a direct base funding reduction to the CSU. However, the potential trigger reduction to the CSU has been increased from $200 million to $250 million should the November tax measure fail to be approved. We do not know at this time how the Chancellor's Office plans to address this increase in the trigger cut.

The CSU is actively working to make the Governor and legislative leaders aware of the vital connection between the CSU and the state's economic and social future, and the need to avoid very damaging budget cuts. However, it is not operationally feasible for the CSU to simply wait on the state and its uncertain budget process. The CSU has an obligation to be prepared for a mid-year trigger cut that would reduce state support for the CSU by $1 billion over two years. Accordingly, the CSU Board of Trustees is currently reviewing a variety of cost reduction and revenue enhancement strategies that may help address this unprecedented budget problem.

**Preliminary Campus Budget Outlook and Planning (Spring Term Planning)**

While we do not know the final amount of budget cuts, CSULB most certainly faces budget reductions this coming year. We know the $100 million mid-year reduction to the CSU in December 2011, once thought to be a one-time cut, is a permanent reduction. CSULB’s share of that reduction is $7.7 million. We also know that we have unfunded mandatory cost increases for the coming year that are estimated to be $4 million. And if the trigger reduction is enacted following the November election, we know the campus share of that cut is $15.6 million based on a $200 million trigger cut. The sum of these reductions and unfunded costs is $27 million. This projected $27 million campus budget problem was the basis for RPP budget planning this spring.
Fortunately, we have some remaining one-time restoration funds received in fall 2010 from the Schwarzenegger administration to help mitigate the budget problem. Because these restoration funds were allocated to campus divisions with instructions to spend very frugally, a portion of these funds will be carried over into next year to allow for a “soft landing” from the final 2012-13 budget cuts. However, we must be mindful that the use of one-time resources to mitigate permanent reductions in 2012-13 only pushes the budget problem into 2013-14.

**Results of Divisional Budget Planning**

The projected $27 million campus budget problem was allocated to the operating divisions on a pro rata basis. The divisions were asked to develop budget reduction plans including the use of their remaining restoration funds to help mitigate their share of the projected 2012-13 reduction. Below is a summary at an aggregate level:

- The divisions have already implemented permanent budget reduction actions in the current year totaling $5 million.
- A total of $7 million in one-time funds will be utilized in 2012-13 to mitigate some of the budget problem. This only pushes the problem into 2013-14.
- Therefore, the divisions have developed plans to implement permanent budget reductions totaling $15 million in 2012-13 if necessary.

A comprehensive summary of the 2012-13 budget planning process is contained in *CSULB Budget Outlook (Roadshow III) -- May 2012* which can be found on the CSULB Budget Central website. This report contains additional background information, planning parameters, key budget considerations, budget strategies, potential actions to manage reductions, and potential consequences.

**Recommendations of the Resource Planning Task Force**

- RPP recommends that the $27 million reduction be levied to all campus operating divisions pro rata as prescribed in planning. Consistent with the direction adopted by the Chancellor’s Office, the campus should assume the November ballot is
unsuccessful and the trigger reduction is enacted. Non-personnel related division reduction plans should be implemented with the start of the fiscal year.

- The Governor’s May Revise increased the potential trigger reduction to the CSU from $200 million to $250 million. As of this writing, we do not know how the Chancellor’s Office will address this increase in the trigger reduction. However, we have received notification from the Chancellor’s Office that our share of the $250 million potential trigger reduction is $20.8 million. Should this occur, our cumulative budget problem would increase from our planning figure of $27 million to $32 million. For more information about the May Revise, please see CSULB Budget Outlook -- May Revise 2012-13 which can be found on the CSULB Budget Central website.

- Because the increase from $27 million to $32 million developed so late in the campus’ planning cycle, it is the recommendation of RPP not to require divisions to resubmit formal plans based on this change. Rather, the vice presidents should develop their respective division reduction plans over the summer to accommodate their portion of this change.

California remains in the midst of extremely challenging fiscal circumstances and the state budget situation remains mired in unprecedented uncertainty. Because of the contingent nature of the trigger reduction, it will be the end of the fall semester before we have a final budget for 2012-13.

Depending on how uncertainties are resolved, it is possible that immediate actions will be necessary. Unfortunately, the RPP Task Force is not in a position to provide more definitive conclusions at this time.

**Enrollment**

For 2012-13, the campus funded enrollment target has been established at 26,875 resident FTES, the same as our 2011-12 target. At this time, the campus enrollment plans for 2012-13 are based on enactment of the $200 million trigger reduction to the CSU and closed admissions to all students for Spring 2013. Despite these conditions,
we are anticipating our resident FTES to come in approximately 1.0 to 1.5 percent over target for 2012-13. Because of higher student tuition fees, in the short term this increased enrollment contributes positively to our net budget.

Fortunately, at CSULB enrollment management decisions have allowed us to avoid the academic program eliminations and large scale class cancellations seen at other CSU campuses. In contrast, CSULB has worked in a very orderly yet aggressive manner toward efficient class sizes and has essentially no undersubscribed programs.

**Concluding Thoughts**

The RPP Task Force recognizes that in order to mitigate the projected budget reductions the divisions are once again relying on significant one-time restoration funds in 2012-13 for which there is no replacement funding source for 2013-14. While this provides a bridge to 2013-14, eventually permanent budget cuts will be required. This mitigation allows a softer landing but it is crucial that the additional time is used for careful planning and implementation.

Due to consecutive years of budget cuts, significant new reductions will become progressively more difficult and harmful. Students will be negatively affected by fewer class offerings, reduced services, higher fees, reduced graduation rates, and increased time to degree. Continued reductions of temporary and permanent staff positions as well as adjunct faculty are likely. There will be severely limited capacity to implement new programs, projects, initiatives, special requests, appeals, and ad hoc reports. We believe that managing workload is critical to employee morale and the positive campus environment we have worked so hard to create.

The Task Force commends all divisions for their thoughtful, creative and proactive efforts. Essential services have been examined and efficiencies have been maximized. While necessary, the Task Force recognizes that reduction strategies will force the elimination of many less critical services and will slow the delivery of crucial services to
students and campus constituents. Our university, however, has made virtually all of the reductions that can be made without beginning to affect core mission activities.

The Task Force would like to acknowledge the continued hard work and resolve shown by the entire university community. CSULB remains a premiere institution of higher education. This would not be possible without the energy, creativity, dedication and positive attitude of our faculty, staff and students.

C: Associated Students Officers
All CSULB Employees
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2012-13 SOURCES AND USES PLAN
## Sources and Uses Plan

### Sources:

#### 2011-12 General Fund Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 Net State Support</td>
<td>$131,395,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 Revenues and Reimbursements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University Tuition Fee</td>
<td>$177,063,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Receipts</td>
<td>$21,962,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2011-12 General Fund Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$330,420,738</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2012-13 Net Budget Plan Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to retirement rate</td>
<td>(1,012,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year permanent General Fund reduction ($100m for CSU)</td>
<td>(7,653,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund &quot;trigger&quot; adjustment and other minor adjustments</td>
<td>(21,869,250)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Adjustment to Revenues and Reimbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State University Tuition Fee increase ($498/yr)</td>
<td>15,489,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Tuition</td>
<td>(825,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Receipts adjustment</td>
<td>(206,895)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL 2012-13 GENERAL FUND SOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$314,342,593</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uses:

#### 2011-12 Internal Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division budgets</td>
<td>$176,893,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-wide budgets</td>
<td>151,727,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdD and MBA funding commitment</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2011-12 Internal Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$330,420,738</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Changes to 2011-12 Internal Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty compensation adjustment</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment increase instructional cost</td>
<td>1,070,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division budget reductions</td>
<td>(22,340,765)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted 2011-12 General Fund Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$309,260,593</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2012-13 Expenditure Requirement Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERS retirement rate change</td>
<td>(1,012,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and dental benefits rate changes</td>
<td>1,121,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy rate changes &amp; consumption</td>
<td>329,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management premium increases</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University Grant (incremental increase)</td>
<td>4,534,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL 2012-13 GENERAL FUND USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>314,342,593</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SURPLUS / (DEFICIT) for 2012-13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>-$</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2012-13 Sources and Uses Plan estimates the impact of budget decisions made by the State, by the CSU System Office, and the Long Beach campus on the resource allocations for the upcoming year. The plan is based on the CSU $250 million “trigger” budget reduction scenario and incorporates planning parameters that have been provided to the campuses by the Chancellor and the CSU February Budget Allocation letter B2012-01 dated February 10, 2012. The plan does not include any changes that could occur with legislative proceedings that take place before the final budget is passed.

The following notes provide an explanation of the numbers shown on the plan. Other related notes and recommendations on the budget strategy and selected topics can be found in the sections following this plan.

**SOURCES**

**2011-12 General Fund Base Budget**
Net state support and budgeted revenues and reimbursements detailed in the 2011-12 CSULB Internal Budget Document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 Net State Support</td>
<td>$131,395,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents portion of the University's state budget supported by tax revenues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 Revenues &amp; Reimbursements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University Tuition Fee</td>
<td>$177,063,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents portion of the University's budget supported by undergraduate, teacher credential and graduate student tuition fees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Receipts</td>
<td>$21,962,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents portion of the University's budget comprised of fees and miscellaneous reimbursements for services. Examples include student health center fee, application fee, non-resident tuition, transcript fees, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 2011-12 General Fund Budget** $330,420,738

**Net Budget Plan Changes**
The net budget plan changes in the campus’s General Fund allocation is based on CSU...
budget allocations detailed in the CSU system coded memorandum B2012-01 on the 2012-13 Governor’s Budget Allocations.

Adjustment to retirement rate  <$1,012,100>
Change in employer-paid contribution rates in order to maintain actuarial soundness of the system and meet defined benefit pension obligations.

Mid-year permanent General Fund adjustment  <$7,653,700>
CSULB’s share of the $100 million base reduction that occurred mid-year of 2011-12.

Base General Fund “trigger” adjustment  <$21,869,250>
CSULB’s share of the potential $250 million base “trigger” reduction to the CSU for 2012-13 should the November 2012 tax increase initiative not be approved by voters. Also includes minor General Fund adjustments by the Chancellor’s Office.

Adjustment to Revenues and Reimbursements
State University Tuition Fee increase  $15,489,000
This increase is due to a $498 per year rate increase for full-time undergraduate students and commensurate increases for graduate and credential students effective Fall 2012. This revenue projection is contingent on achieving our 2012-13 college year enrollment target of 27,413 resident FTES.

Non-Resident Tuition  <$825,200>
This decrease is due to a projected reduction in the number of non-resident students from the budgeted enrollment.

Other Receipts  <$206,895>
This decrease reflects a reduction in budgeted revenue due to steady decreases in headcount growth.

Total 2012-13 General Fund Resources  $314,342,593

USES

2011-12 Internal Budget
The budgets for operating divisions and university-wide programs as detailed in the 2011-12 Internal Budget document.

Division budgets  $176,893,111
Represents budget allocations for all operating divisions.
University-wide budgets  $151,727,627
Represents budgets for general, necessary, or unavoidable costs that benefit the entire campus rather than a particular division.

EdD and MBA funding commitments  $1,800,000
Represents budget commitments to the EdD and MBA programs due to the special fees that have been established for these programs.

2011-12 Internal Budget  $330,420,738

Changes to 2011-12 Internal Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty compensation adjustment</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents incremental full year costs of faculty salary adjustments awarded during 2011-12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment increase instructional cost</td>
<td>$1,070,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding provided to Academic Affairs to support instructional costs related to the increase in enrollment target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division budget reductions</td>
<td>&lt;$22,340,765&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents the reduction in division budgets required to offset the decrease in General Funds contained in the Governor’s Budget for CSULB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJUSTED 2011-12 GENERAL FUND BUDGET  $309,260,593

2012-13 CHANGES IN CAMPUS EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENTS
Represents budget changes to division and university-wide allocations.

Directed / Earmarked by System Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERS retirement rate change</td>
<td>&lt;$1,012,100&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents change in employer-paid contribution rates in order to maintain actuarial soundness of the system and meet defined benefit pension obligations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and dental benefits rate changes</td>
<td>$1,121,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents permanent increases in employer-paid health and dental care costs due to annual premium increases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy rate changes &amp; consumption</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the estimated cost of increases in electricity, natural gas, and water/sewer rates. The estimate is based on the campuses’ proportional share of custodial square footage included in the 2011-12 Capital Planning Design and Construction facility database.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management premium increase</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents insurance premium cost increases related to the campuses’ participation in the CSU Risk Management Authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University Grant (SUG)</td>
<td>$4,534,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent budget adjustment associated with the financial aid set aside of 33 percent of increased state university tuition fee revenues. This adjustment is a preliminary projection of changes that will occur in campus fiscal year 2012-13 budgeted SUG allocations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total 2012-13 General Fund Uses                | $314,342,593 |
| Surplus / (Deficit) for 2012-13                | $ - 0 -      |
Budget Outlooks and related documents provide a comprehensive summary of the budget planning process utilized by CSULB for the upcoming 2012-13 budget year. These documents contain:

- A summary of the Governor’s January Budget Proposal for the CSU and the resulting planning assumptions for CSULB
- A recap of CSULB budget planning assumptions and shortfall estimates under two different scenarios.
- A brief description of CSULB’s current budget situation, key unknowns, and required enrollment plans.
- A description of key budget considerations, budget strategies, potential actions to manage reductions, and potential consequences
- A recap of final thoughts related to 2012-13 budget planning and suggestions for the campus community

“Budget Roadshows” were presented to various campus groups in order to provide a current overview of the budget situation for 2012-13:

January 24, 2012:  Academic Senate Executive Committee

February 1, 2012:  College of Liberal Arts

February 3, 2012:  College of Health and Human Services

February 7, 2012:  College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

February 13, 2012: College of Theatre Arts

February 14, 2012: College of Liberal Arts Student Council

February 21, 2012: University Resources Council

February 22, 2012: Associated Students, Inc.

February 27, 2012: Open Presentation to Campus

Continued …
February 28, 2012: Presentation to Campus
February 29, 2012: Housing and Residential Life

March 2, 2012: Open Presentation to Campus
March 2, 2012: Presentation to Staff Unions
March 7, 2012: College of Business Administration
March 9, 2012: Staff Council
March 14, 2012: Department Chairs' Budget Briefing
College of Liberal Arts
March 22, 2012: University Relations and Development
March 27, 2012: Information Technology Services

April 2, 2012: College of Education Faculty
April 24, 2012: Controller’s Office

May 3, 2012: Department Chairs’ Advisory Council
May 9, 2012: Student Health Services
May 10, 2012: Academic Senate

June 19, 2012: Board of Directors, CSULB Alumni Association

All budget roadshows and additional relevant budget information can be found at
HTTP://WWW.CSULB.EDU/ABOUT/BUDGETCENTRAL/
CSULB 2012-13

BUDGET PLANNING SUMMARY
Gov’s Proposed 2012-13 Budget

- Jan 05, 2012
- Addressed $9.2b budget deficit
- Depends on successful November 2012 initiative on temporary tax increases
- No change to CSU budget if initiative passes
- $200m "trigger" reduction to CSU if initiative fails, effective January 2013
CSULB’s Current Budget Situation

- As planned, current year reductions are being backfilled
- Backfill from one-time “restoration” funding from last Schwarzenegger budget
- Enabled CSULB to (as much as possible):
  - Preserve classes
  - Preserve vital services to students
  - Protect permanent employees
- Hope had been that 2012-13 state budget would provide permanent restoration of 2011-12 cuts
- Restoration is no longer a possibility
CSULB’s Current Budget Situation

- CSU CO has assumed November initiative fails
- Will provide campuses with reduced 2012-13 budgets on July 1
- We must plan based on reduced budget
- Hope for some mitigation but...
- Many new Trustees on CSU Board may not support significant additional fee increases
Budget and Enrollment

- CO no-penalty enrollment range: -2% to +5% of target
- Campus plan: 27,176 resident FTES (1.2% over current target)
- Spring closure directed by Chancellor
- Higher fall, lower spring; annual average similar to 2011-12
- With higher fees, in the short term, enrollment increase contributes positively to net budget
- Important to achieve enrollment goals due to budgetary reliance on tuition fee revenue
- Fall enrollment decisions completed
- Achievable campus plan
Key Unknowns

- Final state tax receipts (but...current receipts through May are projected to be $3b below forecast)
- May revised Governor’s budget (May 14th)
- Voter approval of Nov 2012 tax increase initiative
- Trustee tuition fee actions, if any
## Potential Range of Reductions FY 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior reductions mitigated with temporary resources</td>
<td>-$9.9m</td>
<td>-$9.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012 $100m mid-year permanent reduction</td>
<td>-$7.7m *</td>
<td>-$7.7m *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2012 $200m trigger reduction ???</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-$15.6m *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded mandatory costs</td>
<td>-$4.0m</td>
<td>-$4.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross budget reduction</td>
<td>-$21.6m</td>
<td>-$37.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation: fee increase net SUG</td>
<td>$10.2m</td>
<td>$10.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year cumulative budget reduction</td>
<td>-$11.4m</td>
<td>-$27.0m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Unexpected developments in January 2012

- **Scenario A** = November tax increase initiative succeeds, avoiding $200m trigger cut
- **Scenario B** = November tax increase initiative fails and Trustees do not enact an additional tuition fee increase
Scenario B Budget Reduction Planning

The Scenario B budget problem corresponds approximately to the complete elimination of one of the following:

- About 1,800 classes and 36,000 needed seats for students
- The entire College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
- The (two) entire Colleges of Engineering and Business
Scenario B Budget Reduction Planning

- Campus operating divisions were asked to submit budget reduction plans based on the $27m two-year cumulative problem.
- The divisions have already implemented permanent budget reduction actions in the current year totaling $5m.
- A total of $7m in one-time funds will be utilized in 2012-13 to mitigate some of this problem. This only pushes the problem into 2013-14.
- So the divisions have developed plans to implement permanent budget reductions totaling $15m in 2012-13.
Scenario B Budget Reduction Planning (cont’d)

- Even without additional cuts in 2012-13, cumulative affect of prior reductions are mounting:
  - All divisions operating with far fewer positions
  - Less support from student assistants
  - Reduced services and service hours
  - Reduced operating expenditure funds severely limits travel, equipment purchases, training, supplies, etc.

- Current levels of service cannot be sustained
Scenario B Budget Reduction Planning (cont’d)

• Some consequences of proposed budget reduction actions*

Administration and Finance:

• Ongoing, routine operations will be affected by longer response times, decreased customer support, and longer processing times, e.g. admission and financial aid, purchasing requisitions, facility and telecom work order requests

• Can no longer keep up with multiple projects, special tasks, process exceptions, and innovations at the same pace as in the past

• Will likely take more risk in the areas of compliance

• Facility closures during the summer

* - not exhaustive, not in any particular order
Scenario B Budget Reduction Planning (cont’d)

- Some consequences of proposed budget reduction actions* (cont’d):

**Student Services, University Relations & Develop, Athletics:**
- Decreased services and longer response times in disabled student services and counseling and psychological services
- Potential decline in fundraising, resulting in less student support and program funds for faculty
- Reduction in:
  - Outreach to external constituencies, such as alumni and community
  - General operating budgets for sports teams
  - Support for student cultural events
  - Outreach efforts related to LB College Promise and President’s Scholars program

* - not exhaustive, not in any particular order
Scenario B Budget Reduction Planning (cont’d)

- Some consequences of proposed budget reduction actions*
  (cont’d):

- **Academic Affairs:**
  - Students capped and rationed in the number of courses each can take
  - Continuing students will take longer to complete degrees
  - Graduation rates will decline and time to degree will increase
  - Laboratory and information technology equipment will become out-of-date
  - Instructional environments will deteriorate as classroom and laboratory maintenance are reduced

  * - not exhaustive, not in any particular order
Provost’s Announced Actions

• Reduce travel, assigned time
• Repurpose lottery and CCPE to backfill operating funds
• Award promotion salary increases (contractual) but suspend TIPs (Associate Professors) and FPAs (Full Professors)
• Complete current tenure-track faculty searches but authorize few for Fall 2013
• Limit staff hiring
• Support Research, Scholarly, Creative Activities (RSCA) but repurpose F&A to cover costs
• Limit initial registration to 13 units to manage enrollment demand
• Repurpose Student Excellence Funds to shelter advisor jobs
• Suspend admissions to grad programs with issues identified in Program Review, low grad rates, or low demand
Actions Under Consideration

- Moving summer chair compensation to self-support, because summer school has moved to self-support
- Examining UG programs with issues identified in Program Review, low grad rates, or low demand
- Examining additional grad programs with issues identified in Program Review, low grad rates, or low demand
- Moratorium on new programs, curricular changes
## Potential Negative Consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced access to classes</td>
<td>Reduced travel, equipment</td>
<td>Probable reductions, Reassignment/retooling, Reduced travel, equipment purchases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced services</td>
<td>Reduced tuition fees</td>
<td>Quick adaptation to new business practices required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher graduation rates</td>
<td>Increased time to degree</td>
<td>Severely limited capacity to implement new programs, projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced graduation rates</td>
<td>Increased time to degree</td>
<td>Severely limited capacity to handle special requests, appeals, customized reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced equipment purchases</td>
<td>Reduced travel</td>
<td>Quick adaptation to (use of) new business practices required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced morale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring Semester 2013

• If Nov tax initiative is not approved by voters...
  • Support (e.g., for travel, assigned time, equipment, operating $) will remain at (low) levels similar to Fall because...
  • ...We are already planning on the assumption that the November initiative fails

• If Nov tax initiative is approved by voters...
  • Funding to some activities will be restored but...
  • ...Some cuts will still be required due to the structural deficit that constitutes part of our problem

• Either way...
  • Enrollment will be significantly down because campuses are closed to Spring admissions
  • Fewer lecturers will be needed for Spring instruction
Fiscal Year 2013-14

• We have no knowledge of what the Governor’s 2013-14 state budget proposal might bring
• We are likely to have additional cuts to make because temporary funds will have been exhausted
• CSULB preliminary enrollment target has been reduced 3 percent which reduces revenues
• Unfunded mandatory cost increases
Looking Ahead:  
Is our Budget Challenge Cyclic or Longer-Term?

- Global recession triggered state revenue problems, but...
- Public costs of benefits & health care will continue to rise due to US demography, competing for public funding with education
- US position in the global economy is less competitive and will continue to erode due to growth in Asia
- Willingness of voters to support taxes for public education has shifted markedly
- Appears unlikely that our budget will return to prior levels any time in the next few years
- Beyond that we cannot even speculate
## CSULB Annual Budget Process

- Has served campus well during prior difficult periods
- Is admired by CSU campuses, others
- Involves broad representation on Resource Planning Process Committee (RPP):
  - Academic Senate Chair
  - Senate Council Chairs
  - CFA President
  - Staff representative
  - Administrators
  - Student President
- Efforts are made to keep campus well informed
  - Roadshows
  - Emails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Date</th>
<th>Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Gov’s Jan budget message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Feb</td>
<td>Planning parameters based on Gov set by Chancellor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Campus Resource Planning Process (RPP) Committee begins;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>RPP charges CSULB’s four divisions with developing plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-Apr</td>
<td>With leadership from vice presidents, plans are developed inside each division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>RPP issues recommendations to President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-Aug</td>
<td>President finalizes budget plan (timing depends upon circumstances)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Together we have all helped CSULB become a place of high quality and great experiences
We are justly proud of The Beach
We do not wish to retreat on our remarkable achievements
We are facing the greatest budget challenge ever for the campus
We are understandably concerned about our future
Protecting students, faculty, and staff as much as possible is a priority
We will continue to work together to get through these budgetary challenges
What can you do to help?

- Talk to your friends and neighbors about the November initiative
- Acknowledge that we are all going through a time of great uncertainty and discomfort and allow for rising tensions among all of us
- Stay positive and be patient

GO BEACH!
Budget Central

Budget Central Home

March 19, 2012

Provost’s Letter to the Campus Community

CSULB Students, Faculty and Staff:

The CSU and CSULB budgets for next year depend upon Governor Brown’s November ballot initiative that would increase sales and income taxes. Voter approval is very uncertain. Should initiatives fail, the CSU will face a $200 million reduction. The CSU Board of Trustees will include many new Governor-appointed members who may not be willing to approve a fee increase large enough to mitigate the reduction.

Suggestions

Your comments or suggestions regarding the university’s budget

Updates

2011-12 Resource Planning Process

Budget Central
Gov’s May Revise Proposed 2012-13 Budget

- This is a brief update to the campus budget report provided to the Academic Senate on May 10th, 2012.
- This update is provided because Governor Brown issued a May Revise budget.
- As of May 14th, 2012, the state budget deficit is estimated to be $15.7 billion, a substantial increase from the January forecast.
- As a result, Governor Brown changed his budget proposal.
Gov’s May Revise Proposed 2012-13 Budget

- For the CSU he increased the “trigger” reduction to $250 million, up from $200 million
- If the November 2012 initiative on temporary tax increases is approved by California voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved by California voters</th>
<th>Not Approved by California voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 2012-13 CSU budget will not be reduced</td>
<td>CSU will receive a $250 million reduction, effective January 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gov’s May Revise Proposed 2012-13 Budget

- CSULB’s share of this “trigger” reduction is projected to be $19.5 million
- This would bring CSULB’s total net budget problem to $31.2 million
- Campus leadership will continue to plan carefully for this very difficult budget situation
Gov’s May Revise Proposed 2012-13 Budget

- The May Revise is only an updated state budget proposal by the governor.
- The final budget must still be approved by the legislature. Many changes are still possible.
- Constitutional deadline for approved state budget is June 15th.
- Watch for email updates and visit Budget Central for more information (just click “Budget Central” on CSULB’s home page).
GUIDELINES FOR BUDGET SUBMISSIONS
Date: March 12, 2012
To: Vice Presidents Robinson & Taylor, Athletic Director Cegles, Executive Assistant Nakai
From: Provost Para
Vice President Stephens
Co-Chairs, Resource Planning Process (RPP)
Re: 2012-13 Budget Planning Guidelines

The Governor’s 2012-13 proposed state budget imposes a $200 million reduction to the CSU unless a November tax initiative is passed by voters. This would come on top of the unprecedented $750 million reduction levied this year.

The CSU system has given the campus a budget for next year that assumes that the $200 million reduction will occur and reflects a large new reduction to the campus. We must plan now for this very difficult scenario.

CSULB graduation rates are at historic high levels with a very diverse student population. The faculty brings distinction to the campus with scholarly and creative achievements. The university is engaged in the community and around the globe. We are making progress in sustainability. Faculty, staff, administration and students are justly proud of The Beach and our accomplishments. We hope not to retreat on these remarkable achievements but our budget challenge is unprecedented.

Sharing Budget Information
Keeping the campus community informed about our budget circumstances will continue to be a priority. The “Budget Central” web page offers information accessible from the university’s home page and the Division of Academic Affairs has created a web page to update faculty and staff about divisional budget planning.¹ Each vice president has been charged with keeping respective

¹ http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/planning_enrollment/
employees informed and organizing appropriate processes for ongoing discussions about the budget.

Planning Parameters
On January 10, 2012, Governor Brown released his proposed 2012-13 state budget that addresses an estimated $9.2 billion budget deficit. A key component of the Governor’s budget plan is reliance on voter approval of a tax measure that would temporarily raise income taxes on high-income earners and increase the state sales tax. If voters do not approve the tax measure, a series of trigger cuts would go into effect, including an additional $200 million cut to the CSU. If this occurs, annual state support for the CSU would have fallen by a total of $950 million in less than 18 months, with the likelihood of this sharply reduced level of state support continuing into subsequent fiscal years as a permanent reduction.

Because the vote is scheduled for November 2012, with a trigger reduction in January 2013 if the ballot measure fails, the campus could face the potential trigger reduction of approximately $15.6 million midway through the 2012-13 fiscal year. The CSU Chancellor’s Office has given campuses budgets that reflect the anticipated $200 million reduction. There is great uncertainty whether voters will approve the ballot initiative and prevent this reduction. This reality, combined with the long lead times necessary to implement permanent spending reductions of this magnitude, requires that we begin to immediately plan for this 2012-13 potential budget.

Current Situation
As a result of current year state revenue shortfalls, there was a mid-year reduction of $100 million to the CSU in December 2011 ($7.7 million for CSULB). Although we knew we would be subject to a one-time reduction, we were not notified that it was a permanent budget reduction until January 2012 when the Governor released his proposed 2012-13 state budget. While we have covered this reduction in the current year by using university reserves, we must now make permanent budget cuts as we approach the 2012-13 fiscal year. As mentioned above, if the November initiative fails to receive voter approval, the CSU will be cut another $200 million ($15.6 million for CSULB). Together, these two permanent reductions of $300 million to the CSU would equate to a budget cut of approximately $23 million for CSULB. We also know that next year we will have increased mandatory costs for health care, energy rates, and other adjustments totaling approximately $4 million. After adding this $4 million in additional costs to the $23 million state reduction, we have to anticipate the potential of needing $27 million to address our campus 2012-13 budget.

One factor will help to mitigate this budget reduction. We will receive additional student fee revenues resulting from the $498 per year tuition fee increase effective Fall 2012 approved by the Board of Trustees last November. One-third of this additional student fee revenue will be set aside for State University Grants to assist financially needy students. Based on our enrollment projections, we anticipate incremental net revenues of approximately $10 million from this tuition fee increase. Therefore, we project our net budget problem for only the 2012-13 fiscal year to be approximately $17 million.
Cumulative Budget Problem
Fortunately, by working together and through careful planning, our campus has been able to buffer current year budget reductions totaling about $10 million through the use of some temporary resources provided by Governor Schwarzenegger. This has allowed us to maintain our class schedule, provide essential student services, and protect many jobs. We deliberately protected campus operations based on the possibility that an improving economy and additional fee increases might enable us to avoid the deepest cuts. It is now evident that such potential restoration is no longer possible for the immediate future.

The operating divisions are expected to have enough temporary resources available during 2012-13 to again mitigate at least part of the cumulative budget problem. We must be mindful that once these temporary resources are exhausted, permanent budget reduction actions must be implemented. Therefore, we have developed two budget planning scenarios and request multi-year plans from the operating divisions to address the cumulative budget problem.

Scenario A – Based on $200 Million Trigger Reduction
This scenario assumes failure of the November 2012 tax measure and the subsequent trigger reduction of $200 million to the CSU. This scenario also assumes no further tuition fee increases for the fiscal year or any other significant mitigating actions by the Board of Trustees or Chancellor’s Office. As described earlier, these assumptions would result in a preliminary estimated campus budget shortfall of about $17 million for only 2012-13. After adding the carryover budget problem from the current year of about $10 million, the cumulative budget problem totals about $27 million in this scenario.

Scenario B – Based on $200 Million Trigger Reduction and Offset
While this scenario also assumes failure of the November 2012 tax measure and subsequent trigger reduction of $200 million to the CSU, we have included an “offset” of $7.8 million (one-half our trigger reduction). This is frankly nothing more than a guess. In this scenario, after adding the carryover problem from the current year of about $10 million, the cumulative budget problem totals about $19 million.

CSULB’s preliminary enrollment target for 2012-13 is a modest increase from our current year enrollment of 27,413 resident FTES. Importantly, student fees are now at a high enough level that enrollment growth contributes positively to our net operating budget.

Based on these campus budget shortfall scenarios of $27 million and $19 million, budget reductions have been allocated to the operating divisions on a pro rata basis (see Exhibit 1) for planning purposes. These are large reductions and the attached distribution of cuts is a very preliminary allocation made for the sole purpose of allowing divisions to start their planning process.

Divisional Planning
Budget reductions must be addressed with permanent reductions to base budget. Divisions may use temporary resources for backfill during 2012-13 but by the end of 2013-14, permanent commitments must be balanced with base budgets.

Divisions are asked to develop budget plans based on scenarios A and B, using division-specific figures in Exhibit 1. Figures representing the cumulative budget problem in the column labeled
“Two-Year Budget Reduction” should be fully addressed in budget plans. Please provide the following specific information separately for each budget year 2012-13 and 2013-14.

1. Any permanent budget reductions already implemented during 2011-12.
2. Any temporary resources to be utilized in 2012-13 as mitigation (none may be used in 2013-14).
3. Numbers of temporary and permanent employees who would be affected by reductions.
4. Services, programs, and processes to be reduced or ended.
5. Impacts of reductions on students, faculty, staff, etc.

For permanent personnel reductions, divisions may include expected benefit savings of 38 percent as a solution. For example, say a division’s budget reduction is $2 million. If personnel reduction plans total $1.2 million in salaries, an additional $456,000 (38 percent of $1.2 million) may be calculated as benefit savings. Remaining solutions must total $344,000 in order to generate a total of $2 million in solutions.

In order to assist divisions in this exercise, Preliminary Budget Reduction Impact Statement forms for operating divisions to complete will be sent under separate cover. Please note these forms ask for budget planning information for 2012-13 and 2013-14. This multi-year information is important so that the strategies and effects of using temporary resources can be fully evaluated. It is understood that reductions of this magnitude will result in a very different campus environment and that the effects will be widespread. All potential consequences of these severe budget reduction actions must be described and shared so outcomes and expectations are fully understood and priorities can be established.

These parameters provide a basis for preliminary planning to address these reductions and are subject to revision based on changing circumstances. We expect there will be many changes, so this planning framework cannot be considered the campus’ final direction.

Thank you very much.

Attachments:
1. Division Pro Rata Reductions

cc: President Alexander
    Deans, Associate Deans, Directors and Department Heads
    Academic Senate Executive Committee
    Staff Council Executive Committee
    Associated Students Officers
    CSULB Faculty and Staff Union Chapter Presidents
    Library Reserve Book Room
    Budget Central website: http://www.csulb.edu/about/budgetcentral/
### SCENARIO A - Based on $200M CSU Trigger Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division Operating Budgets</th>
<th>Total 2011-12 Base Budget Reduction</th>
<th>2011-12 Base Budget</th>
<th>% of Total Base Budget</th>
<th>Total 2012-13 Base Budget Reduction</th>
<th>Two-Year Base Budget Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>$ (6,850,785)</td>
<td>$121,339,987</td>
<td>68.60%</td>
<td>$ (11,760,158)</td>
<td>$ (18,610,943)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance</td>
<td>(1,923,089)</td>
<td>35,558,055</td>
<td>20.10%</td>
<td>(3,446,253)</td>
<td>(5,369,342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>(616,366)</td>
<td>10,469,816</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>(1,014,725)</td>
<td>(1,631,090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations &amp; Development</td>
<td>(275,451)</td>
<td>4,840,725</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>(469,159)</td>
<td>(744,610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>(181,977)</td>
<td>3,199,213</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>(310,065)</td>
<td>(492,042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Office</td>
<td>(84,519)</td>
<td>1,485,315</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>(143,955)</td>
<td>(228,474)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIVISION BUDGETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (9,932,186)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$176,893,111</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (17,144,315)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (27,076,501)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCENARIO B - Based on $200M CSU Trigger Reduction and Offset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division Operating Budgets</th>
<th>Total 2011-12 Base Budget Reduction</th>
<th>2011-12 Base Budget</th>
<th>% of Total Base Budget</th>
<th>Total 2012-13 Base Budget Reduction</th>
<th>Two-Year Base Budget Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>$ (6,850,785)</td>
<td>$121,339,987</td>
<td>68.60%</td>
<td>$ (6,406,037)</td>
<td>$ (13,256,822)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance</td>
<td>(1,923,089)</td>
<td>35,558,055</td>
<td>20.10%</td>
<td>(1,877,256)</td>
<td>(3,800,345)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>(616,366)</td>
<td>10,469,816</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>(552,745)</td>
<td>(1,169,110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations &amp; Development</td>
<td>(275,451)</td>
<td>4,840,725</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>(255,562)</td>
<td>(531,013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>(181,977)</td>
<td>3,199,213</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>(168,900)</td>
<td>(350,877)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Office</td>
<td>(84,519)</td>
<td>1,485,315</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>(78,416)</td>
<td>(162,935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIVISION BUDGETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (9,932,186)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$176,893,111</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (9,338,915)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (19,271,101)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENROLLMENT DATA
### FTES by Colleges and Instructional Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College / Division</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>SUMMER</th>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>SUMMER</th>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>SUMMER</th>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>SUMMER</th>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>4,419</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,132</td>
<td>4,865</td>
<td>4,409</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,785</td>
<td>4,933</td>
<td>4,859.00</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4,945</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>2,141</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education / EDSS</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>2,948</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,909</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>2,799</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Math</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,079</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>4,047</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4,179</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,508</td>
<td>4,113</td>
<td>4,311</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4,403</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>10,157</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,345</td>
<td>10,122</td>
<td>10,234</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10,709</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,955</td>
<td>9,760</td>
<td>10,358</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10,524</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other University Programs*</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Colleges/Instruction</td>
<td>27,379</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27,170</td>
<td>27,257</td>
<td>27,253</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28,116</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29,097</td>
<td>27,152</td>
<td>28,147</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28,503</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Campus Enrollment Target** 26,297 (1) 26,875 (2) 27,413 (3)

**Notes:**

* Includes Educational Opportunities Program (EOP), Academic Affairs (VPAA), and Athletics Department.

(1) Campus enrollment targets include resident and non-resident students based on the Governor's Budget. Campus is funded for growth in resident students only. In 2010-11, in response to Legislative pressure, campuses were asked to downsize enrollment to the funded target or face financial penalties. CSULB's funded target is 26,297 FTES, which is a slight increase of 538 resident FTES from 2011-12. The Chancellor's Office also moved Year Round Operations to self-support (CCPE) except for MBA and EDD programs.

(2) Campus enrollment targets include resident and non-resident students based on the Governor's Budget. Campus is funded for growth in resident students only. In 2011-12, in response to state budget deficit, the Chancellor's Office announced plans to reduce systemwide enrollment if cuts to the CSU becomes larger. CSULB's funded target is 26,875 resident FTES, which is a slight increase of 578 resident FTES from 2010-11.

(3) Campus enrollment targets include resident and non-resident students based on the Governor's Budget. Campus is funded for growth in resident students only. In 2012-13, in response to state budget deficit, the Chancellor's Office announced plans to reduce systemwide enrollment if cuts to the CSU becomes larger. CSULB's planning target is 27,413 resident FTES, which is a slight increase of 538 resident FTES from 2011-12.
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### SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

#### PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, October 13, 2011</td>
<td>9:00 AM – 11:00 AM</td>
<td>BH 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, December 9, 2011</td>
<td>1:00 PM – 3:00 PM</td>
<td>BH 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, February 9, 2012</td>
<td>1:00 PM – 3:00 PM</td>
<td>BH 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, February 17, 2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>BH 302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DIVISION HEARINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, April 26, 2012</td>
<td>9 AM – NOON</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, April 27, 2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Administration and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, May 3, 2012</td>
<td>9:00 AM – NOON</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Relations and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, May 11, 2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOSSARY OF TERMS
This glossary is provided to explain various terms and phrases specific to the CSU that are used in this Resource Planning Process document, and/or to provide references to websites where additional information or explanations may be found.

The State of California’s glossary of budget terms is an additional reference (link below). However, some terms used therein may not be common jargon or applicable to the CSU. http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/BUD_DOCS/glossary.pdf

**Academic Year (AY)**
For semester campuses, an academic year includes the fall and spring semesters. The college year includes summer, fall, and spring semesters.

**Academic Year Full-Time Equivalent Students (AY-FTES)**
The number of academic year full time equivalent students (FTES) at a semester campus is calculated by adding the student credit hours for the fall and spring semesters and dividing by 24 for graduate students and by 30 for all other students. It is the average enrollment over two semesters based on a full time equivalency of 12 credit hours per semester for graduate students and 15 credit hours per semester for all other students.

**Base Budget**
Base budget is a term used to distinguish the fixed amount of general fund resources allocated to the campus as compared to other variable, or non-recurring resources, also referred to as non-base budget. The amount of each campus’ general fund base budget allocation is reestablished each year as authorized by the CSU Board of Trustees in the Final Budget memo. The CSU Budget Office issues this memo when the Governor signs the Final Budget. In addition, the campus is responsible for reestablishing a base budget for its variable revenues that are collected in the general fund, by setting a minimum amount that it expects to collect.

The President establishes annual changes to the university’s base budget after review of recommendations from the Resource Planning Process task force. Such changes are normally addressed in the annual President’s Budget Message, issued at the beginning of the Fall semester.

The resources available for operating divisions during the annual Resource Allocation process in the fall are comprised of the state general fund allocation and campus tuition fee revenue, such as State University Fees, non-resident tuition, application fees, etc.

Additional information may be found at:
http://www.calstate.edu/Budget/
http://daf.csulb.edu/offices/univ_svcs/budget/docs/index.html

**Campus Physical Capacity**
Campus physical capacity (CPC) is defined as the academic year FTES (or college year FTES) that can be accommodated by the capacity space currently available on a campus. CPC may be equal to or less than the enrollment ceiling approved for a campus.

Capacity of campus facilities is usually expressed in terms of student stations, annual FTE student capacity, or office space. Capacity is calculated using the appropriate utilization measures and space standards approved by the state. A campus cannot request capital outlay funding that will add physical space if the project will result in exceeding the campus’ physical capacity as published in its approved physical master plan.

As of fall, 2011, CSULB had a campus physical capacity of 25,354 Academic Year FTES.

Additional information may be found at:
http://www.calstate.edu/CPDC/SUAM/Appendices/App_B-Restructure_Campus_Capacities.pdf

See Campus Physical Master Plan
**Campus Physical Master Plan**
The campus master plan describes the physical facilities approved for planning, design and construction on land owned by the Trustees as part of a CSU campus. Once initially approved, the Trustees must approve all additions to the campus physical master plan. The campus physical master plan also includes the enrollment ceiling approved for the campus based upon the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the site.

The Board of Trustees requires that every campus have a physical master plan, showing existing and anticipated facilities necessary to accommodate specified levels of enrollment, in accordance with approved education policies and objectives. Each campus master plan reflects the ultimate physical requirements of academic programs and auxiliary activities. A related element, adopted by the Board, separate from the physical master plan, is the campus enrollment ceiling that specifies the maximum FTE for each campus at build-out.

The Campus Master Plan was approved to increase campus facilities capacity to 31,000 FTES when additional future funding becomes available.

Additional information may be found at:
http://daf.csulb.edu/offices/ppfm/master_plan/index.html
http://daf.csulb.edu/offices/univ_svcs/institutionalresearch/ep_reports/index.html

**Campus Temporary Resources**
Year-end balances held in university-wide programs are made available as a university contingency reserve to address deterioration in the budget or other emergencies that may arise. Any unspent amount at the end of a fiscal year will carry forward to address the next year's budget needs. These funds are of a one-time, non-recurring nature and are attributable to savings from a variety of programs including benefits, compensation, utilities and general reserves. Excess revenue that results from collections above the fee revenue budget requirements for SUF, NRT and Application fees also contribute to campus temporary resources.

**Carryover Savings**
The university is allowed to retain its unspent general fund budget balance at the close of the fiscal year. We refer to these balances that roll forward to the next fiscal year as carryover savings. Also referred to as division or university-wide reserves, carryover savings are published in the Internal Budget Document and are labeled as Division Carryover Savings.

Due to the Revenue Management Program (see RMP), the Chancellor's Office has established a maximum threshold amount that a campus can roll forward to the next fiscal year. If a campus exceeds this threshold, a usage plan must be developed and submitted to the Chancellor's Office.

Additional information can be found at:
http://daf.csulb.edu/offices/univ_svcs/budget/docs/
http://www.calstate.edu/BF/rmp/

**Common Financial System (CFS)**
In an effort to increase administrative efficiency systemwide, the CSU has created a Common Financial System (CFS), which is available to all campuses and auxiliary organizations. Incorporating campus financial systems into a single database reduces incompatibilities between campuses and minimizes the time and effort spent maintaining disparate systems.

**Common Management System (CMS)**
The mission of the Common Management Systems (CMS) is to provide efficient, effective and high quality service to the students, faculty and staff of the 23-campus California State University System (CSU) and the Office of the Chancellor. Utilizing a best practices approach, CMS supports human resources, financials and student services administration functions with a common suite of Oracle Enterprise applications in a shared data center, with a supported data warehouse infrastructure.

Additional information can be found at:
http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/af/cms/
http://cms.calstate.edu/

**Compensation**
To recognize the salary increase commitments of the CSU collective bargaining agreements and CSU’s Management Personnel Plan, the Resources and Requirements plan projects the amount of incremental cost of negotiated salary increases that go into effect during a given fiscal year.

**Division Reserves**
Same as Carryover Savings
Enrollment Target
The enrollment target is the total number of full-time equivalent students that a campus receives base budget funding for during a college year. The Board of Trustees will establish enrollment targets during the budget process with the intent to publicize campus enrollment targets ten months prior to the beginning of the academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011/12 FTES Target</th>
<th>2012/13 FTES Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>6,976</td>
<td>6,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td>3,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>14,683</td>
<td>14,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>9,537</td>
<td>9,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>12,467</td>
<td>12,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>18,005</td>
<td>17,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>27,704</td>
<td>27,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>7,248</td>
<td>7,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>27,968</td>
<td>27,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>17,131</td>
<td>16,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Academy</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>4,583</td>
<td>4,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>26,752</td>
<td>26,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>17,755</td>
<td>17,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>22,086</td>
<td>21,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>14,389</td>
<td>14,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>27,635</td>
<td>27,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>24,554</td>
<td>24,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>22,486</td>
<td>22,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>16,798</td>
<td>17,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>7,506</td>
<td>7,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>7,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>6,831</td>
<td>6,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>344,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>344,001</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information about the CSU enrollment management policy can be found at: http://www.calstate.edu/acadres/docs/CSU_Enroll_Mngment_Policy_Practices.pdf

EO-1000
Ensure that costs incurred by the CSU Operating Fund for services, products, and facilities provided to other CSU funds and to Auxiliary Organizations are properly and consistently recovered with cash and/or a documented exchange of value. Allowable direct costs incurred by the CSU Operating Fund shall be allocated and recovered based on actual costs incurred. Allowable and allocable indirect costs shall be allocated and recovered according to a cost allocation plan that utilizes a documented and consistent methodology including identification of indirect costs and a basis for allocation.

Final Budget
Final Budget refers to the final enacted state budget and CSU allocations. Differentiated from the preliminary budget that is developed after the Governor’s Budget and May Revision and the Legislative Budget Recommendations received by the Governor in June. See Governor’s Budget

General Fund
The General Fund has existed since the beginning of the state as a political entity. It is the government’s major source of funds used for most of its activities. Under this fund, various special accounts are created and reserved for particular activities. Chapter 942/77 provides for the treatment of these accounts as other governmental funds for Accounting and Budgeting purposes effective July 1, 1978.

Usage of this fund varies in accordance with legislative authorizations and governing statutes. Except for various constitutional and statutory authorizations without further legislative action, the General Fund is appropriated on a yearly basis. Income to the fund
varies in accordance with the governing statutes. A detailed listing is contained in the Governor's Budget and the Controller's Annual Report.

Additional information may be found at:
http://www.dof.ca.gov/fisa/bag/DofGlossFrm.HTM

**General Fund Allocation**
The amount of each campus’ State General Fund Budget allocation is established each year as authorized by the CSU Board of Trustees in the Final Budget Memo. The CSU Budget Office issues this memo when the Governor signs the Final Budget.

See also **Base Budget**

**Governor’s Budget (January)**
The State Constitution requires that the Governor submit a budget to the Legislature by January 10. It provides for a balanced budget in that, if the proposed expenditures for the budget year exceed estimated revenues, the Governor is required to recommend the sources for the additional funding.

The budget process for California defies a simple concise definition. It is a process rather than a product. It is not the development of the Governor's Budget, the Legislature's enactment of a budget, or the executive branch's administration of the budget. Rather, it is the combination of all of these phases with all the ramifications and influences of political interactions, relationships with federal and local governments, public input, natural events, legal issues, the economy, initiatives and legislation, etc. Although the size and complexity of California and the dynamics of the process make it difficult to establish and maintain an orderly process, these very reasons necessitate an orderly formalized process.

By constitutional requirement, the Governor's Budget must be accompanied by a Budget Bill itemizing recommended expenditures that shall be introduced in each house of the Legislature. The Constitution also requires that the Legislature pass the bill by June 15. It is not uncommon for the Legislature to miss this deadline.

The following web references summarize the major steps and procedures of California's budget process:
http://www.dof.ca.gov/budget/
http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/BUD_DOCS/budenact.pdf

**Health Benefits**
To recognize the costs required to cover health benefit costs for employees who are compensated from general fund accounts, the Resources and Requirements plan projects the incremental amount of funding necessary to cover the cost of employer-paid benefits that will go into effect in a given fiscal year. Health care benefit rate increases are determined by the number of CSU employee participants and the difference between the old and new employer-paid contribution rates.

**Mandatory Costs**
A typical cost of doing business that is unavoidable is referred to as mandatory. These costs normally include negotiated compensation increases, benefit costs, energy and utility cost increases, insurance premiums, worker's compensation contributions to the CSU risk pool, and maintenance costs of new building space.

**May Revision**
The May Revision is an annual update to the Governor's Budget containing a revised estimate of General Fund revenues for the current and ensuing fiscal years, any proposals to adjust expenditures to reflect updated revenue estimates, and all proposed adjustments to Proposition 98, presented by the Department of Finance to the Legislature by May 14 of each year.

2011-2012 May Revision of Governor’s Budget related to Higher Education is contained in the attached:
http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/pdf/Revised/BudgetSummary/FullBudgetSummary.pdf

**Non-base Budget Allocations**
Non-base budget is a term to distinguish one-time temporary resources which are not added to base budgets. Carryover savings are a type of non-base budget allocation.

**Non-resident Tuition (NRT)**
The additional fee assessed to students who do not meet the State of California residency requirement. Students need to meet particular requirements to pay in-state tuition (SUF), which is significantly lower than out-of-state tuition (NRT). The requirements are listed in the link below.

If students are without lawful immigration status, they must also file an affidavit with a CSU campus stating that they have filed an application with the INS to legalize their immigration status or that they will do so as soon as they are eligible. The attached link identifies current residency requirements:
Visit the campus website at:
http://www.csulb.edu/depts/enrollment/admissions/residency.html
http://www.csulb.edu/depts/enrollment/registration/fees_basics.html

One-Time, Temporary Resources
See Non-base Budget Allocations

PERS Retirement Rate Change
CalPERS uses contributions from the employer, the employee, and income from investments to pay for employee retirement benefits. Employee and employer contributions are a percentage of applicable employee compensation. The employer contribution is set annually by CalPERS based on annual actuarial valuations. The employee contribution is 5% of salary for Miscellaneous Tier 1 members and 8% for some Peace Officer/Firefighter members (Public Safety Management and Firefighters only) less an exclusion allowance for coordination with Social Security. For eligible CSU Public Safety (R08) employee Peace Officer/Firefighter members, the CSU currently pays for both the employer and employee contributions.

CSU Contribution Rates for CalPERS Retirement Coverage – Fiscal Year 2012/13
Effective July 1, 2012 the CSU retirement contribution rates for employees covered by the following CalPERS member Categories are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Category</th>
<th>CSU Employee Group</th>
<th>2012/13 Employer Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Police Officer/Firefighter</td>
<td>Unit 8</td>
<td>37.186%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Police Officer/Firefighter</td>
<td>MPP Directors &amp; Lieutenants</td>
<td>29.186%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Miscellaneous Tier 1</td>
<td>All Other CSU Employees</td>
<td>19.651%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 8% employee contributions rate paid by CSU

Revenue Management Program (RMP)
The Governor’s Budget enacted RMP in 2006-2007. The CSU has re-engineered substantial financial and reporting changes for cash flows and modified the accounting procedures for all campuses. The new RMP initiative has reduced our dependency on the State of California for fiscal tasks, increased working efficiencies and reduced delays to the year-end closing process. The CSU has new responsibilities to monitor and manage the cash flows and any potential earnings that may arise from fee collections to support campus operations. Ongoing changes as a result of new directives and best methods approach along with campus standardization of activities will continue to be issued to enhance financial operations.

Additional information may be found at:
http://www.calstate.edu/BF/rmp/rmp_home.shtml

State University Fee (SUF)
State University Fee is the amount of tuition a resident student pays to attend the California State University. The SUF for a full time student is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate Teacher Credential</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$5,472</td>
<td>$6,348</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$4,440</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>$5,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$4,026</td>
<td>$4,674</td>
<td>$4,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$3,048</td>
<td>$3,540</td>
<td>$3,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$2,772</td>
<td>$3,216</td>
<td>$3,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$2,520</td>
<td>$2,922</td>
<td>$3,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, all students pay campus fees that vary campus-by-campus and average $1,047 system-wide (see link below).
http://www.calstate.edu/budget/fybudget/2012-2013/documentation/14-mandatory-fees-table.shtml

At CSULB, the mandatory student fees total $768 for academic year 2011-12. Note that certain courses may charge other special fees that are not included in this amount.
Non-resident students pay the State University Fee, non-resident fee and campus fees. The following chronology gives the full-time (and part-time) undergraduate resident CSU SUF fee (including the total when campus fees are included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Full-time (part-time)</th>
<th>Average Total Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$5,472 ($2,736)</td>
<td>$6,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$4,440 ($2,574)</td>
<td>$5,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$4,026 ($2,334)</td>
<td>$4,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$3,048 ($1,770)</td>
<td>$3,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$2,772 ($1,608)</td>
<td>$3,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$2,520 ($1,464)</td>
<td>$3,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State University Grant (SUG)**

The State University Grant Program was established by the State of California under the Budget Act of 1982, Chapter 326. Its creation was consistent with legislative intent and recommendations contained in the Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on a New Student Fee and Financial Aid Program (December, 1981). The State University grant program is budgeted in the General Fund. The amount of SUG funds is increased annually by one-third of the marginal cost revenue estimated for enrollment growth, or one-third of the revenue attributable to a SUF rate change. Campuses receive an allocation based on enrollment targets and student need.

Additional information may be found at:
http://www.csulb.edu/depts/enrollment/financial_aid/grants.html
http://www.calstate.edu/AR/fa_programs.shtml

**University Wide Budgets**

Resources that are held centrally to cover mandatory costs that benefit the entire campus and/or campus reserves are referred to as “University Wide.” These funds are administered by various division managers who have fiduciary responsibility and accountability for the budget. Each year these division managers report to RPP. Any unspent balances at year-end are returned and made available to the entire campus.