

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING 03-13-2018 APPROVED BY COMMITTEE 05-08-2018
Sub. To Exec. Comm. _____ Approved by Exec. Comm. _____
Sub. To Acad. Senate _____ Approved by Acad. Senate _____
POLICY ITEMS _____

Members Present:

Dianne Bartlow, Lindsay Brown, Nazaret Dermendjian, Greg Knotts, Linda Noblejas (recording), Jerald Schutte, Sally Spencer, Diane Stephens, Setareh Torabian-Riasati, Yarma Velazquez-Vargas

Members Excused:

Michael Hoggan, Amalie Orme

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with the addition of a discussion in New Business.

3. Approval of the Minutes from February 13, 2018

The minutes of the February 13, 2018 meeting were approved.

4. Chair's Report/Active Learning Spaces

Dermendjian reported that UPBG has not met since the last meeting so there are no changes in the available budget information. He stated that Faculty Senate approved the Academic Technology Committee's (ATC) resolution on Active Learning Spaces last Thursday. The resolution is aspirational rather than an action item. However, the implementation of this will have resource implications and he stated that the committee needs to be aware and to have an open discussion on the ramifications of resources. The resolution is proposing a paradigm shift with regards to flexible classrooms. The TEAL room in the Tseng College building is an example of this with movable chairs, boards to write on, specialized technology, etc. The aspiration is to apply new technology and new classroom set up versus the traditional classroom. Discussion ensued on classroom configuration, more square footage while losing capacity, funding availability, student success, Sierra Hall Annex renovation, etc. It was suggested to have data or evidence report included in the resolution rather than the specificity of the kinds of technology. He

stated that he would bring any comments or feedback from the committee to ATC or address them at the next Joint ERC/ATC Meeting in April.

5. Executive Secretary's Report

Stephens reported of the following:

a. Mid-year College Budget Review Meetings.

Academic Affairs is finishing the mid-year college budget review meetings. Most colleges are in good shape. They have been discussing plans for potential budget challenges in 2018-19 and beyond. Some colleges will be better able to adjust than others. They are talking about capacity, the levers, what can be done, what the University can provide from reserves, etc. She said that they are trying to model different scenarios as to how to handle reductions in Academic Affairs. Discussion followed about plans for changing the fee structure by the Chancellor's Office, etc.

b. Schedule Effectiveness Workshops

Workshops were held last week for deans, associate deans, department chairs, managers of academic resources, and Schedule Of Classes (SOC) coordinators on new and existing tools to gauge student demand. They also discussed capacity of 52% of open lecture room scheduled at 8:00 a.m. in Fall 2017. The utilization of lecture rooms overall just meets standards and the large halls far exceeds standard utilization. They are offering additional SOC tools training with staff in Academic Resources and interested department chairs.

c. Finalizing the last few facilities projects

Academic Affairs has no central funds available for future projects and will be using the retirement of a key staff member in Academic Resources to reorganize in support of student success initiatives. The reorganization will change from a facilities-related project management role to a role that analyses resource allocation and effectiveness including space, budget, etc. The focus will be on ensuring we have the tools in place, including fully utilizing our room reservations software, to meet student enrollment needs.

d. Northridge Academy High School (NAHS)

Stephens is working on a revised shared use agreement with NAHS. The original agreement dates back to 2002, even before the school opened. The emphasis on the amendment to the agreement is clarifying the use of fields and academic spaces for NAHS instructional needs. The revised shared agreement has been vetted and approved by the committee with both CSUN and NAHS representation. It is now being reviewed by the campus legal counsel.

6. University Budget Update – Sharon Eichten and Edith Winterhalter

Eichten presented a Powerpoint on the University Budget Update (Attachment). She gave a broad stroke overview of how the 2018-19 is looking. It is preliminary because we only received the Governor's budget in January, the first read of the budget. Once the taxes are calculated in April, we will receive a better read on the budget on the Governor's May Revise. Currently, the State of California's fiscal outlook is positive. We are not in a recession but because of what higher education is getting in terms of a bump it is almost like we are in a recession as we are only getting \$92M.

Eichten also mentioned about the Governor's Rainy Day Fund. Prop 2 that was passed in 2014, states that California has to have a Rainy Day Fund that equals to 10% of the tax revenues. The statewide target is \$13.5 billion and we are about 65% there. They are projecting that by the end of this fiscal year, the fund will be \$8.4 billion.

The Board of Trustees request to the State for the 2018-2019 CSU Operating Budget was \$263M. However, the Governor's Budget Proposal was only \$92M, which results in a budget gap of \$171M for the CSU. When you look at that budget gap, we have to eliminate the line items that were already in the budget requests (minus the \$75M for Graduation Initiative, minus \$20M for Student Enrollment Growth, minus \$15M for Infrastructure Needs) which results in a fixed cost deficit of \$61M. CSUN's *pro rata* share is 8% or \$4.9M, this is the minimum impact to CSUN in terms of unfunded mandatory expenses. We do not have funding to cover compensations commitments for all bargaining units and mandatory cost such as health/dental and retirement costs.

Eichten continued that the campus is working on a three-year budget plan and part of this process is to project what we think we will have in terms of tuition fee revenue. She showed a graph assuming the University is successful in planning to a flat headcount. The campus' average unit load (AUL) is going up and is in an upward trajectory right now. They picked a factor based on how AUL has moved the last couple of years. As AUL goes up, FTES will go up, which means that our expenses increase (i.g., need for more course sections. Our students will graduate sooner and we will have better retention rates. Unfortunately, we end up with a lot of unfunded expenses. This gives us somewhat bad news in terms of revenue that will be available versus our expenditures or costs. The three-year budget trajectory with "business as usual" shows a big increase in expenditures compared to the funding received. The primary drivers of the budget deficit increases are:

- a. the State appropriation increases cover a little more than half of our compensation commitments
- b. annual AUL growth of 0.2 or +/- 500 FTES, results approximately \$2.5M in unfunded expenses
- c. student fees are assumed to remain constant through 2020/21. This could change, but increases will likely be directly tied to student success initiatives

- d. annual decline of 200 non-resident students, FTES from 2017/18 to 2018/19

Discussion ensued with questions on what is the tipping point or the point of no return budget-wise, the challenge of not having enough tools to manage the enrollment to go down even with program impaction, the role of UPBG, why buildings are being built or various maintenance are done around campus when the University is already experiencing decreased in funding since 2014, tuition fee increase, generating revenue investments to assist with tuition deficit, Governor's leaving a legacy through the rainy day fund, raising the awareness of legislators regarding importance of higher education, etc.

7. New Business

Velazquez-Vargas raised the issue of making the work of this committee more productive. She wanted that guests provide information prior to the meeting so the members can be more prepared to provide input and not just be passive consumers. Discussion ensued on roles of the members, participation in the committee at the will of the Faculty Senate, providing recommendations to Faculty Senate but not making decisions, etc.

Motion: To request invited guests to provide ERC some reference materials at least 48 hours prior to the monthly meeting so the members can review and provide input at the meeting. MSP *

Schutte stated that he can provide summary of the bills that are affecting higher education and will highlight those that are relevant to the committee and everyone can provide feedback that he can bring to the Statewide Academic Senate.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Notes:

The next ERC meeting will be on Tuesday, April 10, 2018 from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. in UN 211

****THERE WAS POLICY RECOMMENDATION PUT FORTH AT THIS MEETING FOR THE COMMITTEE BUT NOT FOR SENATE CONSIDERATION.***