

# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

## EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING 09-12-2017 APPROVED BY COMMITTEE 10-10-2017  
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, Linda Noblejas (recording), Amalie Orme, Jerald Schutte, Diane Stephens, Setareh Torabian-Riasati, Yarma Velasquez-Vargas

### Members Excused:

Greg Knotts, Sally Spencer

### Guests:

Elizabeth Adams, Janet Oh, Cheryl Spector, Clare Wong

#### 1. Call to Order

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

#### 2. Welcome and Introduction of New Members

Dermendjian welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the semester. He reminded all members that the meetings are paperless and all materials are uploaded to myCSUNbox for all to access and review prior to the meetings. He also stated that the meetings are recorded for the purpose of transcribing the minutes accurately and recordings are deleted once minutes are finalized. There were no objections to the recordings. Introductions around the table followed.

#### 3. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

#### 4. Approval of the Minutes from May 9, 2017

The minutes of the May 9, 2017 meeting were approved.

#### 5. Educational Resources Committee (ERC) Reviewer/Liaison – Cheryl Spector

Spector stated that each member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is assigned to be a liaison to a Standing Committee. It is her responsibility this year to fill that role for ERC. She noted the charge to the committee as part of the agenda. She encouraged everyone to take the charge seriously to make sure University resources are used effectively and efficiently as they impact education. Spector stated that she will be responsible for reviewing the approved minutes. She will also keep an eye on policy recommendations that she can bring to the attention of the Faculty Senate. She thanked the Committee for flagging or noting the policy recommendations in the minutes. She requested that if members are not able to regularly attend because of conflicts, she be made aware of so she can inform the Senate Executive Committee so the member can be replaced. She also added that if anyone wants to serve again on the Committee after their term or serve on another committee, they can inform her or the Chair. She thanked everyone for their service to the Committee.

Schutte inquired if there is a possibility for the role of the liaison to work in both directions so that any pending issues relevant to ERC that have not gone to the Faculty Senate floor can be shared back to the Committee. This will help the committee see the bigger picture and be better with their responsibilities. Spector stated that she will bring this request to Senate Executive Committee.

## **6. Chair's Report**

Dermendjian shared with the Committee a proposed resolution that states the minimum expectations and role of members on the committee. After discussion, the following resolution was approved with two members abstaining:

The Educational Resources Committee resolves that the following constitutes the minimum expectations of each of its members in the 2017-2018 academic year.

- a. Attend the entirety of every meeting. If unable to attend most meetings in a given semester, arrange for a substitute in consultation with the Committee Chair.
- b. Thoroughly and thoughtfully read all distributed materials prior to the meeting.
- c. Proactively search out opportunities for resource allocation and savings.
- d. Share the acquired information with colleagues in their colleges and divisions.
- e. Volunteer for subcommittees or other tasks as the need arises so that the workload may be spread fairly amongst members of the Committee.
- f. Ensure that the climate of the Committee is conducive to all viewpoints receiving a full and fair hearing.

The approved resolution will be posted on the website.

Dermendjian reported that there are certain Executive Orders that came down and there are a couple that have resource implications on the department, college, and university

levels. The first one, Executive Order 1100, relates to General Education (GE) and states that certain sections of GE that are CSUN-specific will be removed. The other recent Executive Order (1110) deals with removing the remedial courses as they are right now and repackaging them in courses that will be counted for the degree. The Chancellor's Office is mandating that these courses count toward the degree. Every unit that students take will be counted toward their degree. Dermendjian also stated that Adams will be discussing these Executive Orders today. Another Executive Order (1083) is in compliance with the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA). de la Vega has been discussing this with different groups on campus. Faculty members are considered limited reporters and not a general reporter. There is, however, no resource implication on this Executive Order. EO 1100 and 1110 have resource implications and ERC will be exploring to see how these will impact the departments and the colleges that are providing GE courses. Velasquez-Vargas clarified that Executive Order 1100 is eliminating the cross-cultural GE requirements.

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

Stephens reported on three things:

### **a. Budget**

Over the summer, the State budget was signed on time and the CSU issued its final Budget Memo in July to all the campuses. In that budget memo, our campus was allocated an additional 100 full-time equivalent students (FTES) as part of our base enrollment target. Since we are overenrolled, this regularizes some of our over enrollment and allow us to convert some of that to tenure track faculty positions.

Also, the CSU through the funding mechanism related to the Graduation Initiative 2025, allocated to CSUN \$5,919,000. The funds are allocated for the campus' discretionary use for items related to student success; one of the first items listed in the budget memo is tenure density. Stephens noted that the budget for the campus has not yet been finalized. The President's Cabinet is finalizing its budget discussions and the President announced at the Chairs' and Deans' Retreat the desire to put that money towards faculty positions. Since those faculty will not onboard till Fall 2018, there will be a first year of savings available to us. We have proposed a spread of those funds to the multi-year projects that the campus has defined for Matadors Rising. It will allow the campus to maintain funding for several years as we undertake initiatives and test what works best to support improvements in student success; Adams and her team will evaluate the success of funded efforts.

### **b. Faculty Hiring**

The campus has modeled how many faculty positions we can hire with \$5.9M including salary and benefits at current market rate salaries. There are two

methodologies for allocation of these positions under consideration. One method allocates faculty salaries and benefits and another method covers these direct costs and also holds funds aside for life cycle costs, including subsequent promotions. While the second method yields fewer positions, it frees up funds Academic Affairs has been using for promotions for additional positions over time.

Stephens shared that since the campus is over-enrolled and has budget challenges including a shortfall that requires that we dip into our reserves, the Cabinet is considering a model that converts our over-enrolled dollars and allocates the \$5.9M based on FTES growth; this would allow the campus some savings to help cover the budget shortfall.

Stephens also noted that the Associate Vice President for Budget Planning and Management and she are working on a budget process and timeline model proposal that will be brought to the University Planning and Budgeting Group (UPBG) meeting. She will bring a draft to the committee for input and feedback.

### **c. Active Learning Spaces**

Stephens stated that late last year, Chris Sales, the Chair of Academic Technology Committee (ATC) visited ERC and discussed the work that ATC is doing related to Active Learning Spaces. They will be working with the Classroom Technology Committee (CTC), an *ad hoc* working group that she chairs. At the recent ATC meeting, they discussed active learning spaces. Stephens discussed information from the literature and from our practices on campus about what makes good learning spaces. Stephens shared her perspective that pedagogical and student success needs should drive learning space design. The resource implication for ERC relate to class size and classroom capacity, which are directly related to finances for the institution. If there are moves to change capacity with room redesign, we need to understand the implications and at the same time support what makes sense for pedagogy. She will provide more information as this topic is important in ERC's work and will discuss this in our joint meeting with ATC.

## **8. Executive Orders 1100 and 1110 – Resource Implications – Elizabeth Adams**

Adams stated that the committee probably wants to know how Executive Orders 1100 and 1110 may impact resources for the Division. She stated that there are uncertainties and it is dependent on how they are implemented; what the structure will look like is up to faculty governance. Until we know what EPC and Faculty Senate will do in adopting this, it is difficult to know the outcomes.

She stated that EO 1110 includes four pieces: Early Start Writing, Early Start Math, during the year writing, during the year Math. Of those four things, during the year writing is fine as the campus is compliant with it successful implementation of Stretch Writing. The campus will continue to offer those courses, the enrollment will continue to

be spread out, and the targets will continue to get distributed the way they are distributed. During the year Math is more complicated. There are about five GE courses that students start with in Math. These are Math 102 – College Algebra, Math 103 – Business Calculus, Math 131 – Math Ideas, Math 140 – Statistics, and Math 210 for Liberal Studies Teacher Prep. Even before EO 1110, the campus was already working on a stretch version of Math 140 that could also be used for students in 131 and 210. Stevenson wrote that course, proposed it and it passed the Math Department and will go shortly to EPC. The FTES to offer that course will come from Developmental Math FTES so there is no change short-term. That leaves us with two big groups of students, College Algebra and Business Calculus, to address. The Chancellor's Office has given us money to give to faculty to work on either stretch or co-remedial versions of those courses. There is some work being done in the Department of Mathematics to propose different frameworks before a group is convened. There are unknown major implications of this right now. There is some ambiguity on this EO and they are still getting clarifications. They are going to ask us by Summer 2019 to offer baccalaureate degree courses to students in the Summer rather than pre-baccalaureate courses through Early Start. Presumably, they will be funded the same way as Early Start is funded but they will get credit that counts toward a degree. If it is funded the same way and the campus maintains the same units in the Early Start Math and Early Start Writing, it should pay for itself. The big change may be offering the Stretch Writing in the 12-week session during the summer. The big implication of EO 1110 is what are we going to do with College Algebra and Business Calculus and what will happen to Developmental Math in terms of faculty, FTES, and their space?

Discussion ensued on questions like why change the previous plan, how to preserve Developmental Math which is successful in preparing students for college level courses, Math developing different versions of 140, what replaces the ELM and EPT as measures for placement, etc.

Adams briefly discussed EO 1100 and stated that she cannot say much about the resource implications right now. The three big issues of 1100 are Sections B, E and F. Section B is Science and the campus does not require students to take enough units in Science. The EO states that three of the units of science must be upper division. The campus does not have many upper division science courses and the enrollment in science courses is low as well. Over the last two years, we had 340 FTES combined in all upper division GE science courses, that is out of 70,000+ FTES. Our students are not taking upper division science courses. We have to develop courses non-majors can also take and pass. We also need to develop one- or two-unit classes as the numbers do not add up right. It is required by the Executive Order to have one course in the Physical Sciences, one course in Life Sciences, one lab, and one Quantitative Reasoning course; that adds up to ten. We need two floating units and we do not have small unit science courses. The College of Science and Mathematics is already looking into this and have been in contact with other campuses that have shorter courses and they are working on developing this.

On Section E, Lifelong Learning, the EO designates that there be one upper division in B, one upper division in C and one upper division in D. We no longer need to have an upper

division in E. The impact will be across the campus and we still need to figure out what to do about this.

The last one is Section F as the EO does not allow to have an extra section with GE and the campus has to figure out what to do with the content of Section F. The CO has agreed to a compromise that would preserve the FTES in Section F. In terms of how students end up taking the courses, the compromise will preserve that FTES by having a comparative cross cultural requirement that has to be met in subset of courses in C and subset of courses in D. The faculty will decide, if that is the direction the campus will take, on what goes to C and what goes to D. Discussion ensued.

## **9. Enrollment Update – Janet Oh and Clare Wong**

Oh and Wong presented the Fall 2017 Enrollment Projection Updates (Attachment). Wong showed the total headcount projected at 39,864 with 37,683 for resident students and 2,181 for non-resident students. She also showed the comparison between the non-resident students (2,181) and international students (1,926) which showed a drop of 15% and 17% respectively. The headcount for continuing undergraduates is slightly down by 4% from last year with full-time freshmen at 5,215 and full-time transfers at 4,984. She also noted the total FTES vs. Internal Target which is 3.5% above target. With the GI2025 goal to have students graduate in four years by taking 30 units per year, the average unit load for undergraduate for Fall 2017 is up by 1.1% to 12.47. Discussion followed on the similarity of the average unit load in 2013 and 2017, the cause of spike in unit load, the drop in the number of international students and the implications on the average unit load going up, concern on headcount not increasing while students taking more units and funding staying the same from the state, etc.

## **10. Other**

Additional discussion ensued, including expression of concerns about the timing of the Executive Orders and the potential effects of the orders on programs and priorities at CSUN. It was recommended to bring to the attention of the Faculty Senate the information that was received at the meeting and the concerns of the members on the resource implications. Dermendjian will contact Adam Swenson to have these concerns discussed at the Senate floor.

## **11. Adjournment**

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

### **Notes:**

The next ERC meeting will be on Tuesday, October 10, 2017 from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. in UN 211.

***THERE WERE NO POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SENATE CONSIDERATION PUT FORTH AT THIS MEETING. THERE WAS A RESOLUTION PASSED OUTLINING***

***THE MINIMUM EXPECTATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS (SEE SECTION 6 ABOVE).***