

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING 10-10-2017 APPROVED BY COMMITTEE 11-14-2017
Sub. To Exec. Comm. _____ Approved by Exec. Comm. _____
Sub. To Acad. Senate _____ Approved by Acad. Senate _____
POLICY ITEMS _____

Members Present:

Lindsay Brown, Nazaret Dermendjian, Michael Hoggan, Linda Noblejas (recording), Amalie Orme, Jerald Schutte, Diane Stephens, Setareh Torabian-Riasati, Yarma Velazquez-Vargas

Members Excused:

Dianne Bartlow, Greg Knotts, Sally Spencer

Guests:

Provost Yi Li

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with the addition to discuss the Faculty Senate motion regarding Executive Orders 1100 and 1110.

3. Approval of the Minutes from September 12, 2017

The minutes of the September 12, 2017 meeting were approved unanimously.

4. Chair's Report

Dermendjian reported that he brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate, per the Committee's charge last meeting, two issues that have resources implications for the University. The first one is the increase in average unit load (AUL) and how it will impact the campus without the corresponding tuition fee increase or additional appropriation from the State. The other item was the resource implications of Executive Orders 1100 and 1110. He stated that Faculty Senate made a motion that was passed stating that Faculty Senate and its Standing Committees will not participate in the implementation of EO 1100 and 1110. There was a request made for reconsideration so the first motion that passed was frozen and will have more discussion at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

He also reported that he attended the University Planning and Budgeting Group (UPBG) meeting. At the meeting, Vice President Donahue brought four issues:

- a. Increase in average unit load and the additional sections.
- b. Resident first time freshmen and first time transfers increased even with impactation. The tier I yield has been higher.
- c. International student headcount has decreased by at least 250. International students have a different fee structure than regular students so approximately there is a \$2.3 million decreased in revenue.
- d. General Fund for 2017-2018 for the CSU totals \$450.2 million. The central operating reserve is \$65.8 million.

Dermendjian also noted there was discussion about the increase in student average unit load from 12.3 to 12.7, capital expenditures, capital improvements, etc.

5. Executive Secretary's Report

Stephens reported that the University Budget is not yet finalized. The Cabinet is meeting to discuss and finalize in the next week. It has been a tight year for the campus and that makes it difficult for planning. The University is dipping into the reserves to cover the compensation increases that were not funded by the CSU. The model of hiring is also in the influx in terms of the based budget.

At the recent UPBG meeting, there were two subcommittee reports. Stephens, who is a member of the Cost of Instruction (COI) Committee, reported that the group is working toward creation of a model, and eventual dashboard, to help better understand the cost behavior of the University, the slopes of the changes in the budget when there is no revenue and cost goes up, when students take more units, the output of FTES per our input, etc. Another group is looking at options to revamp the budget process and timelines for the university. Stephens and Eichten, of the Budget Office, will prepare a comprehensive recommendation for the budget process for the campus. The draft will be brought to UPBG and she will also share the draft with this Committee. It will include a lot of things, the what, the why, the when, the how, the priorities, etc. Stephens stated that it is important to recognize the principles that undergird our budget planning. She asked everyone to engage in an exercise to write three principles behind a good and successful university budget process on the 3x5 notecards that she distributed. She thanked everyone for their participation. Discussion ensued.

Hoggan stated that there are a lot of acronyms and terminologies that are not clear to him regarding the budget process. He requested that a glossary of terms be provided as it will be helpful for the members. Stephens will pull together some information from previous presentations done on budget and will create a glossary of terms and information pertaining to the budget to be useful for the members.

6. Resource Implications of Initiatives and Academic Affairs Budget – Provost Yi Li

Dermendjian stated that the committee invited the Provost to address the Executive Orders and all the changes coming down from the Chancellor's Office and their resource implications.

The Provost stated that one thing that is quite substantial for the budget implication is the entire structure of instructional cost. When you look at the cost structure on average, educating students with the same number of units for seniors versus freshmen are different. This is because of the cost and number of lecturers teaching general education, versus full-time faculty teaching major courses, Capstone, electives. Coupled with that, we have student transfers and student retention going up. The campus has been successful for freshmen retention. Our projected first year retention has gone up from 78% to 80.5%. The funnel becomes flatter and the impact of that is huge. It is time for the University to look at the cost of instruction per unit of seniors versus sophomores. We have to be mindful of the shift as we actually become more successful.

The secondary implication is the more we become successful, the more complicated our enrollment management will be. The University is currently overenrolled and the more students we retain, the more challenging it is to manage the enrollment, as we do not want any particular cohort of students to be too small. For example, for Fall 2016, we were able to manage it substantially but we had to do it with some consequences in the meal plan, housing, etc. We want to maintain a constant smaller incoming stream of new students. For this Fall, to make up, we increased our incoming students by 1000+. We will continue to look at this with Institutional Research so that we can make recommendations to the Cabinet for next year's enrollment target. The increase of average unit load is another multiplier. If students take more units, the campus has to offer additional sections, have large classrooms and we really need to manage that with the same tuition. So far, the campus has not seen a substantial increase yet in Average Unit Load. We see about 2% increase in unit load and that is still manageable.

For Executive Order 1110, the current Stretch Writing on campus is compliant with the EO. On the area of Math, in terms of cost, it is not clear yet. The current Developmental Math has its own program. The Director of Development Math, Stevenson, hires her own staff to teach and most of them are lecturers. According to EO 1110 and if the campus goes that route, anything baccalaureate should go to the Math Department. That structure is still too early to tell. He has met with the Dean and the Chair and they both agree that it is too early to plan but there is a potential that it will open up the eligibility for the entire department. That means tenure-track faculty or senior faculty can apply. In terms of FTES, it probably will not be a major impact.

Discussion ensued on questions regarding average unit load increasing without additional state funding and if there is a way to balance it, consequences of over-enrollment, ways for TUC to support students and maintain sustainable, meal plans and housing for students, social justice implications with resources, students having equal chance for success, remediation, student faculty ratio, challenge of convincing the public the importance of public higher education, general education versus college degree, pathways that will provide passion to students that will lead them to success, etc.

Dermendjian suggested that the members check the FAQ link on Executive Order 1100, [Executive Order 1100 -FAQs](#)

7. Executive Order/Faculty Senate Resolution

Schutte stated that at the last Senate Executive Committee meeting a motion to not participate in the implementation of EO1100 and 1110 was voted down. It was brought up in the full Faculty Senate at the last minute and a call of the question. The vote was called and passed. Stepanek invoked the parliamentary procedure that allows for anyone who votes for a motion to have that vote reconsidered. Because of that, the motion was put in abeyance to the next Faculty Senate on October 26. Schutte stated that he spoke after that and explained why the Statewide Academic Senate did not pass a resolution to ignore EO 1100. He wanted to share the background on how they came about the decision. He said that he will put his thoughts in writing and post it on Faculty President Swenson's blog. He sent a copy to Dermendjian and will also send a copy to all ERC members. He stated that the reason the Statewide Academic Senate did not support the motion to not participate in the implementation of EO 1100 was to have a seat at the table, to have both a say in the policy and implementation and respond to the lack of support from Sacramento for CSU initiatives such as GI 2025.

Discussion ensued.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Notes:

The next ERC meeting will be on Tuesday, November 14, 2017 from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. in UN 211.

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