

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING 04/12/2022 APPROVED BY COMMITTEE 05/10/2022
Sub. To Exec. Comm. _____ Approved by Exec. Comm. _____
Sub. To Acad. Senate _____ Approved by Acad. Senate _____
POLICY ITEMS _____

Members Present:

Ellis Godard, Callie Juarez (non-voting), Gregory Knotts, Linda Noblejas-Sapuay (recording),
Mirna Sawyer, Katherine Stevenson, Holli Tonyan, Yarma Velazquez-Vargas

Excused: Nazaret Dermendjian, Michael Doron, Elizabeth Debach

Guests: Jerry Stinner, Houssam Toutanji

Call to Order

The virtual meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. by Katherine Stevenson.

1. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved. MSP – Godard/Knotts

2. Approval of the ERC Meeting Minutes of March 8, 2022

The March 8, 2022 meeting minutes were approved. MSP – Godard/Velazquez-Vargas

3. Lab Facility Needs – Dean Stinner and Dean Toutanji

Stevenson introduced Dean Toutanji from the College of Engineering and Computer Science and Dean Stinner from the College of Science and Mathematics. They are here to talk about the urgency around laboratory refreshment and resources since this is connected to student success and faculty success. Toutanji stated that labs are an essential part of their curriculum. Students work on projects that require lots of equipment and space. The challenges they face as a college are that their equipment is old and they are not serving the needs of our students. He suggested that the university should have a pocket of money, not one-time money, but money set aside for infrastructure and equipment annually. For faculty to do research, they also need infrastructure and equipment. He added that they have funding for the Global HSI Equity Innovation Hub to be built but need to equip this state-of-art facility with sufficient infrastructure and that will require a lot of funding. The Hub will be transformative and equipping it appropriately will allow for the collaboration planned for the space.

Stinner stated that even though their college has five buildings, they are over 50-60 years old except for Chaparral Hall. The infrastructure is a problem. Every time power goes out, they break equipment. The university was able to come up with the money to buy a generator for the science complex to provide backup power. Most of the college budget goes to personnel salaries and there is not much wiggle room for equipment and supplies. Even though some grants buy equipment, the college is responsible for service maintenance and supplies and they do not have funding. Stinner cited examples of their departments' costs for equipment repairs and also noted the inability to replace equipment due to high costs; repairs are sometimes impossible because parts are no longer available for old equipment. He stated that their faculty cannot teach science without specific kinds of equipment and instruments.

Discussion followed on questions if external funding can cover these expenses, letting the state-level folks know that the current funding is not sufficient for the university to be able to teach its students the way they deserve, and resource allocation requests to be voiced out as their priority need, and closing the equity gaps in their colleges, additional resources for the colleges to be considered as part of the Road Map, etc. Stevenson stated that there will be two other deans who will be attending the May meeting to address their college needs. She thanked both deans for their attendance and for sharing the needs of their colleges.

4. Chair's Report

Stevenson reported that she attended the UPBG meeting on April 8, 2022. Due to time constraints, she suggested for the members just review her report in myCSUNbox.

However, she pointed out that under the Risks and Challenges in her report the issue of the falling enrollment. It is a nationwide trend and there is a lot of concern about this. There are initiatives underway to grow enrollment led by Vice President Watkins that include how to grow undergraduate programs, graduate programs, first-time freshmen vs. transfer programs, international programs, etc. She wants the committee to keep an eye on enrollment growth.

Another item that Stevenson pointed out in her report is the flexibility of GI 2025 funding which is a recurring fund and the specific uses are determined by the campus. This money could be allocated to tenure track faculty or staffing. There is also about \$26M one-time campus initiatives funding that is currently unspent and some divisional reserves due to HEERF assistance. These can be used to continue to fund HEERF-like activities to continue to help the campus community.

Discussion ensued on funding for scholarships and sabbatical leaves, the frequency that faculty are allowed to take sabbaticals, policy on approving sabbaticals, benefits, annual cost, etc. It was suggested to make this topic a part of the ERC agenda for discussion in May or future meetings. Juarez suggested inviting Diane Guido to provide some insights on this.

Stevenson also informed the members that the Academic Technology Committee (ATC) statement on equitable access to instructional and computing media was voted on

unanimously by ATC and presented to Faculty President Neubauer as a formal recommendation. Stevenson stated that ATC hopes that ERC can support this statement. Discussion ensued on the clarity of the statement, what reasonable access means, etc. Stevenson will get back to the ATC chair to provide the committee's feedback and to get more clarity on how to proceed.

5. Executive Secretary's Report

Juarez reiterated Stevenson's report on enrollment projections. Her office continues to work with the Budget Office on enrollment projections. The campus is projecting fewer students in 2022-23, which is a position that CSUN has not found itself in before. The extent of the impact on the campus budget is not yet known.

She also mentioned that part of GI 2025 goals is removing administrative barriers for things like re-enrollment and students reapplying. There are multiple levels of administrative barriers at the system and campus levels. Discussion ensued on students who have reached the end of their maximum units and cannot avail of more money to finish, supporting the students that are already here and eager to finish to enroll sooner, financial aid changes, having an analysis of whether 12 units is more successful than 15 units, advocating for the CSU to the State for FTES funding, etc.

Juarez also reported that faculty hiring for start date 2023-24 is still being determined. A recommendation that came up during the discussion at UPBG regarding priorities was tenure-track faculty hiring.

Stevenson raised the question of who chairs the UPBG and who the members are. Discussion ensued. The Committee moved to request the UPBG to list its members on their meeting agenda and also to share the meeting minutes with the ERC. MSP – Velazquez-Vargas/Knotts

6. Subcommittee Reports

a. Gifts and Other Allocations

Knotts thanked Sawyer and Dermendjian for all the heavy lifting work they did on the rubric. He also thanked everyone who contributed, reviewed, and provided feedback. Knotts reminded everyone that this rubric that the subcommittee was charged with crafting is a suggestion for projects coming to the Provost for funding or money that the Provost has autonomy for assigning. He shared the document:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/19bJX510NXVCLXaucTN6tkfXXTX00ARfDeJ0FwD96rMc/edit#gid=0>

They used the seven guideposts of the Road Map and the President's listening tour outline to craft the rubric. They have various prompts for each guidepost and offered some suggestions on how it shows that it has exceeded the target, is on target, developing, or in need of development. There are also additional components that they added to the bottom of the document such as previous funding or resubmission of the project and also the impacts of the project. Incoming requests to the Provost would probably not address all of the seven guideposts but the subcommittee wanted to provide enough guidance to the Provost as she makes decisions. Discussion ensued.

Stevenson recommended that those that have not reviewed the rubric, do so and provide feedback or edits. These can be done through email exchange and if everyone agrees, Stevenson can send it to the Provost as a draft direction and request her feedback. If the Provost wishes to engage with the committee, then we are on the right track and can revisit the rubric.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Notes:

The next ERC meeting will be held on May 10, 2022, from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. via Zoom.