

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING 12-08-2015 APPROVED BY COMMITTEE 02-09-2016
Sub. To Exec. Comm. _____ Approved by Exec. Comm. _____
Sub. To Acad. Senate _____ Approved by Acad. Senate _____
POLICY ITEMS _____

Members Present:

Damian Christian, Katherine Dabbour, Nazaret Dermendjian (Chair), Barbara Gross, Michael Hoggan, Greg Knotts, Linda Noblejas (recording), Jerry Schutte, Diane Stephens (Executive Secretary), Setareh Torabian-Riasati, Bruce Zucker

Members Absent:

Karen Kochis-Jennings

Guests:

Colin Donahue, Sharon Eichten, Steve Fitzgerald, Luis Guzman, Alex Hernandez, and Daisy Lemus

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

3. Approval of the Minutes from October 6, 2015 Meeting

The minutes of the October 6, 2015 meeting were approved.

4. Chair's Report

Dermendjian requested, for the benefit of the recording secretary, to record the meeting and subsequent meetings of the Educational Resources Committee to assist in the transcription of the minutes. The recording will be erased after the transcription is completed. All attendees agreed to the recording of the meetings.

Dermendjian informed everyone that Torabian-Riasati will be the committee representative on the Online Student Evaluation of Faculty Task Force.

The Chair reported some of the highlights of the University Planning Budget Group (UPBG) meeting that was held on November 19. He stated that the Provost emphasized transparency and communication when dealing with each other on every level. The Provost believes that universities are still the most qualified to offer education services rather than the for-profit institutions and MOOCs because of the value we bring to the community at-large. He also spoke on the challenges ahead such as impactation, his plan of having an Admission Planning Committee to monitor enrollment, discuss student success, graduate application, research and scholarly work and the needs of the students outside the classroom.

Dermendjian also reported that he attended Faculty Senate where the Provost discussed the \$100M difference between the Governor's commitment and required CSU budget. He also stated that the Provost wants to establish a Graduate Education Task Force and mentioned the two dean searches (for College of Health and Human Development and the Mike Curb College of Arts, Media, and Communication) going on campus.

Lastly, Dermendjian mentioned that the Joint ATC-ERC Meeting will be on February 5, 2016 from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. in SQ250A. A discussion on College Disrupted: How Technology is affecting the Educational Pedagogy will be on the agenda. He encouraged the members to attend the meeting.

5. Executive Secretary's Report

a. Budget Update

Stephens reported that the campus budget was approved at the end of October. Academic Affairs fared well in this year's process with additional funding of over \$18M, including:

- i. Regularized funding of over \$5.2M (without benefits)—primarily related to multi-year enrollment adjustments (~\$2.3M), regularization of miscellaneous support (~\$2M), and the Academic Affairs share of \$975K from the State Budget for Student Success Initiatives—that yields five faculty positions, two advisors, and support for the Education Advisory Board (EAB) contract.
- ii. Additional regularized funding for:
 1. Equity salary adjustments from 2014/15 (\$976K)
 2. Research Cluster Faculty Hires (\$900K)
 3. Four Tenure Track Hires (\$300K)—that helps offset our deficit our \$20+ position hiring deficit
 4. Non-resident Enrollment funding (marginal increase of \$296K)—also helps offset our faculty hiring deficit
 5. Doctorate in Physical Therapy (\$282K)
 6. Valley Performing Arts Center (\$200K)
 7. Tutoring, mentoring, academic support for athletes (\$100K)
- iii. Funding to CO Target (additional 544 FTES) at \$2.2M
- iv. Excess enrollment funding of \$9M

Stephens inquired if it would be helpful to the committee for her to provide an overview of the Academic Affairs budget in detail for ERC in the early spring, along with the Director of Academic Budget Management, Eleanor Jones.

b. Space Study

Stephens reported that some of the next steps in the Space Study last spring were to:

- i. Identify and appropriately classify by use type (classrooms, laboratories, research, faculty offices). The study did some of this, but it needs refinement and data cleanup
- ii. Prioritize space by use types
- iii. Identify underutilized spaces
- iv. Incentivize efficiency
- v. Plan for adaptive reuse

She noted that things were stalled a bit this fall while deciding whether to use a consultant for some of the space classifications and identification of underutilized spaces. The data cleanup has been slow and we are hoping to be able to start walking unscheduled spaces after the first of the year. Additionally, the campus is standardizing classifications of space using National Council on Education Statistics (NCES), Post-Secondary Education Facilities Inventory and Classification Manual (FICM) standards which are significantly different than the four decades-old CSU SFDB designations.

c. Classroom Technology Committee

Stephens reported that the Classroom Technology Committee (CTC) has agreed to upgrade the old projectors to HDMI projectors in the 98 remaining classrooms and also purchasing a few spare projectors. A subgroup of CTC has met with a vendor to once again investigate feasibility of bulb-less projectors. This solution is still exceptionally expensive, but the projector quality and brightness (i.e., lumens) has improved significantly in the past year or so. The group has recommended placement of two bulb-less projectors as pilots in one large lecture hall for which projector bulb replacement is very difficult and one conference room to cut down on the projector fan noise. The total cost of these upgrades is estimated to be under \$300,000 and funds were carried forward from 2014/15 to cover this cost.

6. Budget Update – Colin Donahue and Sharon Eichthen

Donahue stated that he wants to bring the budget out to the open as clear and understandable and to relay the information better. He presented the Budget slides to the committee from the 2014/15 figures as the point of departure to the current 2015/16 budget and the request process for the 2016/17 budget (Attachment). He stated that Academic Affairs has the biggest part of the pie chart because it is the biggest part of the

University. He explained that the tuition fee discount, which is also known as the State University Grant, though reported as budget is really not. They are discounts that we give and it is money that the university never sees. It comes right off the top of the General Fund. Donahue stated that about \$80M is held centrally for personnel benefits pool. He mentioned the distribution of funds for 2014/15 for Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, Athletics, Information and Technology, President's Office, Student Affairs, Student Health Center, University Advancement, Campus Quality Fee and Others. The other campus expenses include utilities, risk pool, space rental, deferred maintenance and reserves.

The 2015/16 General Fund Base Budget is \$390.7M (2014/15 General Fund Base Budget of \$369.2M plus \$21.5M New Base Funding). That amount plus the \$28.8M Excess Enrollment Fee Revenue equals to \$419.5M which is the Total General Fund Budget of 2015/16.

Questions were raised regarding what encompasses the different divisional budgets, the confusion on the use of the terminology "staff" which includes both staff and faculty, when the 1% decrease in enrollment by the university and the 3% increase in enrollment target by the Chancellor's Office will meet, where the funding comes from for chargebacks done by the department utilizing PPM, etc.

The Budget presentation was not completed because of the numerous questions raised by the committee members. It was agreed upon to have Donahue and Eichten back at the next meeting in February to continue with the presentation.

7. New Faculty App – Steve Fitzgerald, Daisy Lemus, and Alex Hernandez

Fitzgerald demonstrated a new product, the Faculty Application, that they have been working on with the Provost's Office, Faculty Affairs, and Research and Graduate Studies. Lemus and Khachikian are their clients. META+Lab is an interdisciplinary academic unit that is off campus and is associated with Art, Computer Science, and other academic disciplines.

Hernandez stated that to visit their product you need to type in [New Faculty App Application](#) and it will take you to the live application. There are three core components of this product –profiles, stories, and research. The stories component is the piece that humanizes the faculty. It is also a great resource for prospective faculty as it shows the culture of the campus. Lemus has conducted interviews with faculty and their stories are in this component. The research interest piece is still in development and he hopes to have it release mid-December. They are collaborating with Khachikian and Research and Graduate Studies. This component will allow faculty to identify their research interests and find other faculty with similar interests to be able to collaborate and work across disciplines, especially on grants. This is also a great tool for graduate students who are looking for faculty with their research interest. The profile section includes the faculty schedules, office hours and affiliations. The application is reading information that is already in the system through Human Resources and PeopleSoft. You can enter other

information in the profile section such as the biography, research interests, syllabus, etc. This section also includes the connection piece. The vision of the faculty application is to have one central location that they can update their information and have the ripple effect of having the information elsewhere updated as well. It will eliminate assistants manually inputting information in different places for updates. It is using a web content management system.

Discussion followed with some questions regarding the faculty app such as the nomenclature or terminologies for research interests, how faculty on sabbatical are listed, linking waitlist students, ongoing entitlement, privacy, etc.

Fitzgerald encouraged everyone to use the faculty app and to inform other faculty about the application. The more people use it the more important tool it becomes for everyone. He stated that the team can attend department meetings to provide a demonstration about this faculty app.

8. Statewide Academic Senate Report – Jerry Schutte

Schutte reported that there are two resolutions that had their first reading and feedback will be provided back to the committees who put them forward. He asked everyone to look at AS 3236 on Shared Governance and AS 3240 which is a joint resolution that calls for the development of a vision plan for ongoing tenured and tenure-track faculty recruitment and let him know of any questions or concerns that he can bring back to the committees.

He also reported that twelve of the twenty three campuses have voiced concern at the last Statewide Academic Senate on the lack of shared governance that has manifested in a number of ways particularly in Presidential searches for the CSU.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Notes:

The Joint ATC/ERC meeting will be on Friday, February 5, 2016 from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. in SQ 250A.

The next ERC meeting will be on Tuesday, February 9, 2016 from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. in UN 211.

THERE WERE NO POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS DISCUSSED AT THIS MEETING.