CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING 12-10-2019   APPROVED BY COMMITTEE 02-11-2020
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, Ellis Godard, Greg Knotts, Linda Noblejas-Sapuay (recording), Diane Stephens (non-voting), Kate Stevenson, Dino Vrongistinos, Yarma Velazquez-Vargas

Members Excused:

Kim Henige, Jerald Schutte

Guests:

Callie Juarez

1. **Call to Order**

   The meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m.

2. **Approval of the Agenda**

   The agenda was approved.

3. **Approval of the ERC Meeting Minutes of November 12, 2019**

   Discussion ensued that there was no mention of the objection to Rosenthal's presentation because the material was not posted prior to the meeting for the members to review. The Committee amended the minutes to reflect the objection and the apology from Stephens, on behalf of herself and the Chair, for the oversight. It was also added in New Business as a reminder to have all presentations and review materials posted in myCSUNbox no later than two business days before the meeting.

   The minutes of the ERC meeting of November 12, 2019 were approved as amended.

4. **ERC Chair's Report**

   Dermendjian reported that he attended UPBG meeting on November 22 and he provided the following highlights. On the CSU level, the Board of Trustees (BOT) has proposed to the Governor an increase for the budget of $633M to bring the CSU budget to $7.8B. That $633M will be divided into two parts: tuition money for a 5% enrollment increase and an increase in General Fund of $548.7M. The GI 2025 budget is part of the $633M

at $105M. Salaries and benefits is $177.4M, facilities and infrastructure needs is $75M, and mandatory costs are $27.3M. There is a one-time request of $515M: $500M for deferred maintenance and $15M for basic needs partnerships.

CSUN now has OpenBook for public access to the budget and it can be found at CSUN Questica-OpenBook

Dermendjian showed OpenBook online. All the different entities are represented with their corresponding budgets with the three colors representing the fiscal years. He stated that, eventually, one can view the department level details. Discussion ensued.

5. **Executive Secretary's Report**

Stephens stated that she does not have a formal report but will probably have more information at the next meeting. She mentioned that the Provost will be meeting with all the colleges for their mid-year budget reviews between January and February.

Stevenson asked that at the next meeting to provide information on the new scheduling tool that will be coming online as well as a report, if available, on feedback or comments from the other campuses that are using it or campuses that are no longer using it. Stephens stated that she might not be able to get the information on the campuses no longer using it. She continued to say that the campus is just starting on this tool and is now in a test environment between the vendor software and the campus enterprise system. The implementation was stalled a bit awaiting the connection between the campus and the vendor and the Strategic Scheduling Team will be convening in January and February. Dermendjian stated that he was part of the committee that reviewed and recommended the software. He said that Sacramento State is one of the campuses that they have interviewed that was very happy with the software and the capability that it has to schedule classes effectively. Stephens added that there is another piece that works with the scheduling tool called Platinum Analytics. It will allow the campus to look at data on scheduling, see the behavior of student enrollment, the demand data for classes from students, EAB tools, degree progress, etc. It will help us utilize our resources better and it will allow for more student-centered and cost-effective scheduling in the future. Discussion ensued.

6. **Student Faculty Ratio (SFR) Discussion – Greg Knotts**

Knotts thanked Juarez and Stephens for meeting with him and walking him through his general questions on the SFR data. He stated that this venue is a good place to begin the conversation. He added that he comes with no absolute thesis or list of suggestions, but comes with several questions. He is not sure if the data he is presenting is valuable at this juncture but he thinks it is a beginning place.

He stated that his interest on SFR came from a few places. He was the director for the New Faculty Orientation for six years on this campus. He saw a whole class of people getting hired and getting promoted. He was fascinated seeing faculty who were consistently hired in particular departments and no faculty represented in other venues. He sensed some certain amount of inequity in terms where faculty are coming from and

why. Being on ERC for a couple of years gave him a better understanding of attrition, SFR, FTES-driven budget models, faculty density, etc. His interest has grown over time. He stated that the campus plans based on current and historical present data. This year, for instance, the highest generator of jobs is in wind energy. He wonders if universities, ten years ago, made allowances for those kind of changes in socio-cultural movements, technology movements, and the way the world is moving. In higher education, sometimes we are ill-respectful of our campus because we are mopping up after the past rather than being proactive about the future. He noted what Velazquez-Vargas pointed out at the last meeting about what is going on with our disciplines right now and what we can predictably plan for the future.

He stated again that this venue is a good place to start the conversation because we have the moral authority and maybe the body that would be able to ask difficult questions and also drive change that needs to happen. He stated that some information is driven by the Chancellor's Office and there are some qualifications and categories that are no longer useful in terms of faculty workload reporting.

This information he really found very interesting and as discussed in the minutes from the previous meeting on faculty hiring for 69 tenured faculty, he asked if the university is bringing people in the appropriate way. He showed his PowerPoint presentation, [2019 SFR for ERC Discussion](#) and pointed out what the SFR data is on the campus dashboard for the last three years for tenured and tenure-track faculty. He also showed the SFR by college, headcount and FTEF of tenured and tenure-track faculty by college, differences of undergraduate and graduate SFR, and terminologies used. He added some beginning questions for the discussion (i.e., how tenure track positions are being apportioned, undergraduate versus graduate offerings, IFF and IAF--which are faculty workload reporting categories, what conversation could begin at the CO or internally at CSUN, etc.) Discussion ensued on how reimbursed and reassigned time is or is not calculated in the SFR, S-factor courses, SFR as a reporting tool that has been used since 1987, major challenges related to the data entry of faculty workload, tenure density calculations in GI 2025, published internal target versus Chancellor's Office target, how they came up to hiring 69 tenured faculty hires, etc.

It was suggested to invite Provost Walker and Special Assistant to the President and Provost Theodoulou to address the methodology used in faculty hiring at the next meeting.

7. **Adjournment**

   The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Notes:
The next ERC meeting will be held on February 11, 2020 from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. in UN 211.

* THERE WAS NO POLICY RECOMMENDATION PUT FORTH AT THIS MEETING FOR SENATE CONSIDERATION.