

# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

## EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING 11-14-2017 APPROVED BY COMMITTEE 02-13-2018  
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, Michael Hoggan, Greg Knotts, Linda Noblejas (recording), Amalie Orme, Jerald Schutte, Sally Spencer, Diane Stephens

### Members Excused:

Setareh Torabian-Riasati, Yarma Velazquez-Vargas

#### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m.

#### 2. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

#### 3. Approval of the Minutes from October 10, 2017

The minutes of the October 10, 2017 meeting were approved.

#### 4. Chair's Report

Dermendjian reported that the Committee went into Executive Session to discuss Executive Orders 1100 and 1110 after the meeting last month. The members proposed a resolution and requested online voting. It passed, but not unanimously, and the resolution was sent to Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate also received additional resolutions and worked all of them into one resolution that was discussed on the floor during the meeting. The Faculty Senate was held this time in the Northridge Center Complex to accommodate students and CSUN community members. There was a big presence of the student body. The President announced that she worked with the Chancellor's Office to get some of the EO 1100 challenges to Section F waived. Dermendjian reminded everyone that at the last Faculty Senate there was a motion for CSUN faculty not to participate in the implementation of Executive Orders 1100 and 1110. That passed and there was a motion for reconsideration but that failed and the original motion that passed stood. As of today, there will be a Task Force for GE Reconsideration and the President asked him to serve. Schutte is also on the Task Force. He will keep everyone abreast and will probably report about it in the December meeting.

He stated the he was asked by Dermendjian to represent this Committee at the Senate Executive Committee for the purpose of finding a resolution to the motion that was ultimately brought to the floor of the Faculty Senate. The motion that this committee passed and the motion of the Senate Executive Committee were integrated and they were able to keep about four or five points in the motion that was finally presented on the floor. The students were given a lot of time to talk and there were only about 15 minutes for the faculty to discuss this motion reconsideration. The motion failed and the original motion not to participate in the implementation remained. Discussion opened and there was one faculty member who moved to strike all the points except two things and the vote was called. That motion was completely defunct.

There were some indication by the Faculty President, President Harrison, and the Chancellor's Office that the vote not to participate has wide ranging implications. For instance, the Senate body and all its Standing Committees are restricted from discussing anything to do with the implementation of EO 1100 and 1110. It has put President Harrison in a tight position because she has gotten the Chancellor to agree to leave Section F in our catalog and just make logistical changes to conform to the 48 units for upper division courses. Since the campus voted for non-participation, the campus will not have a say or input, even if the EO gets implemented. The proponents of the non-participation believe that they can still negotiate with the Chancellor's Office. There are 16 campuses that passed resolutions and the others are still making them but only CSUN passed a resolution not to participate. Bartlow stated with the way it happened, she said that is it not a gag order. The majority of the faculty did not see the value of the orders from the Chancellor's Office and they saw harm and that is why they rejected it. Dermendjian commended the way our students spoke eloquently and passionately during the meeting. He stated that he was a very proud faculty member because of the students' courage and their mindset to present their arguments.

The next meeting is on December 12 and last year, Dermendjian stated that the committee had a lunch meeting. He asked if everyone wants to do the same at an earlier time or keep the same time with a regular meeting. It was decided that the meeting time will start at 12:30 p.m. with lunch and Noblejas will check on the room availability.

## **5. Executive Secretary's Report**

Stephens reported that the University Budget was approved last month but none of the one-time funding requests from divisions were funded. The enrollment growth funding was authorized. She noted that the campus received over \$6M from the CSU for the Graduation Initiative 2025 work. The base portion of that (i.e., \$5.9M) will be used for faculty hiring for 2018/19 and 2019/20. There will be savings in 2017/18, which will be reallocated over multiple years to fund the ongoing GI 2025 projects. It will allow the campus to have flexibility to see what is working well and what programs and projects the campus can adjust over time.

Stephens also talked about the Lottery Budget. The University normally receives an approved Lottery Budget in the summer but this year, the University received a little bit more funding so there is a debate on how these funds will be used and also discussion on changing the distribution schema. A portion of the campus Lottery funds are designated for instructional and replacement equipment. In the past, the distribution of these funds was strictly based on inventory and then it changed to include both inventory and enrollment bases. But with Asset Management no longer capitalizing and tracking low dollar value inventory, we modified the distribution to 1/3 inventory, 1/3 FTES and 1/3 computer equipment purchases. Academic Affairs made a decision to add a fourth component, which is laboratory sections this year. All four components will eventually be getting 25% of the budget. The deans approved this plan last week.

Stephens announced it will be a challenging budget year. Academic Affairs will need to defer some facilities projects because there is not enough money. Construction costs are coming in significantly higher than anticipated.

The Campus Quality Fee fund estimates are looking low because of the reduction in headcount enrollment. The call for proposals will be out soon and the deadline for submission could be delayed to a little later in December (or early January) to give more time for people to submit proposals. When the Campus Quality Fee budget was passed, there were earmarks that were in place. There are funds for technology and technology projects, a larger portion of funds available for proposal-based distribution, and over a million dollars that goes to Academic Affairs for course material fees. The latter replaced the student lab fees with the money coming from CQF.

Stephens also reported that the Classroom Technology Committee is looking at new projector technology that is device-agnostic for wireless engagement. A video was done by a faculty member to test the Bright Link projector that can be used with any mobile device. It is wireless, Wi-Fi capable and has an infrared sensor that reads whatever touches the board. We have installed two of these projectors in Jacaranda Hall as a pilot test and there is a subcommittee working on this and other use cases for deployment in general purpose lecture rooms.

Scheduling effectiveness will include a two-pronged approach. There is a new software, Registration Planner/Degree Planner, for students that is being tested right now in the Department of Marketing. Information from the student use of the software tools will allow for schedules built around student demand. This will also mean the schedule build process will occur closer to student enrollment. Professional development will be done around this process. Institutional Research is also working on a dashboard with data that will help with this.

UPBG is meeting this Friday and there are many things on the agenda. Eichten will be talking about the budget, the Cost of Instruction Subcommittee will provide an update on their work, and the group will also talk about the budget process. She can share the slides with the committee next month if there is interest.

## 6. CSU Academic Senate Report – Jerald Schutte

Schutte stated Noblejas has uploaded both the Board of Trustees Meeting Notes of November 7-8, 2017 and draft minutes of the ASCSU Plenary Meeting on November 2-3, 2017 in myCSUNbox for everyone to review if interested. He highlighted two things. One is the financial section that the CSU is under water. The second one is the degradation of shared governance. There is a disharmony from the students and faculty and the Chancellor's Office. Chancellor White made an absolute commitment to hold a series of meetings to discuss how to change the process of policy deliberation, so faculty are consulted and also have shared decision-making power in affecting the outcomes. He made a suggestion to the Chancellor's Office to treat it as a congressional model. In this model, the Senate is the Chancellor's Office and the House of Representatives is the Faculty. The CO comes with the version of the bill and the same for the faculty and if the bill does not match, they can discuss and negotiate before the Chancellor signs and implements. He stated that the ASCSU will be meeting with Chancellor White to talk about this. In addition to this, there is the Statewide GE Task Force that is being set up. We are looking at not doing away with CSUN's Section F but to put Section F-like requirements in all the other 22 campuses so that there will be cross-cultural programs identified separately within GE.

Schutte also mentioned that the Public Policy Institute gave a report on a survey that was done in the CSU and the Chancellor's Office states that in the last ten years the percentage of people who feel that the CSU is doing a good job has increased by 19%. But along with that in their other report, there are about 700,000 jobs for which the CSU and the UC are not meeting the need. They want to do something to have students graduate faster. The conundrum is that we are trying to increase graduation rates but at the same time, the report from the Governor's Office has issued a request that the CSU look at ways to be more restrictive and to make it tougher for students to graduate.

He also mentioned that the committee recommended Shared Governance and Consultation in the CSU that passed in the first reading which acknowledges the breakdown of shared governance related to the EO's and pledges the ASCSU's commitment to identify and remedy problems in shared governance.

Discussion ensued related to EO 1100 and 1110 and on what the possible fiscal implications to our campus could be, including the GI 2025 funding. There was a question on cluster hire financing and measures of cluster effectiveness, etc.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:33 p.m.

### Notes:

The next ERC meeting will be on Tuesday, December 12 at 12:30 – 2:30 p.m. in UN 211

***THERE WERE NO POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SENATE CONSIDERATION PUT FORTH AT THIS MEETING.***