# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

 MINUTES OF MEETING
 12-13-2016
 APPROVED BY COMMITTEE 02-14-2017

 Sub. To Exec. Comm.
 Approved by Exec. Comm.

 Sub. To Acad. Senate
 Approved by Acad. Senate

 POLICY ITEMS
 Approved by Acad. Senate

## **Members Present:**

Dianne Bartlow, Deborah Cours, Nazaret Dermendjian, Barbara Gross, Lindsay Hansen, Michael Hoggan, Greg Knotts, Linda Noblejas (recording), Amalie Orme, Jerald Schutte, Diane Stephens, Setareh Torabian-Riasati

#### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:45 p.m.

#### 2. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

#### 3. Approval of the Minutes from November 8, 2016

The minutes of the November 8, 2016 meeting were approved.

#### 4. Chair's Report

Dermendjian stated that he sent the proposed academic calendars for 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020, 2020-2021 by email prior to the meeting. There were some issues related to Saturday classes and Schutte has already raised them and have sent his concerns to the committee. He stated that there is little flexibility due to the required number of academic days but any input or concern can still be raised and he can bring it to the University Calendar Committee meeting at the end of January. Discussion ensued regarding Honors Convocation, Commencements schedule and Final Exams conflicts, and Tuesday night classes conflict with calendar events. If there is any input for changes, he asked that everyone let him know before his meeting.

Dermendjian reported that he attended the UPBG meeting in November and Donahue presented the campus budget and will probably do a similar presentation today. He stated that he brought the committee's concern on headcount versus FTE.

He added that at Faculty Senate there was a discussion about a resolution on Dreamer students. It will still be worked on and he does not know when the first reading will be. Schutte clarified that there are two forces (the system level and the campus level) working on undocumented students and tuition increases. There is also great pressure

coming from individual campuses on creating their own resolutions on opposing tuition increases and supporting undocumented students. Schutte reported that since both those resolutions at the Statewide Senate are coming from the Fiscal Government Affairs Committee, they are in the middle of drafting a comprehensive anti-tuition statement that states the support of the resistance in spikes in tuitions.

# 5. Executive Secretary's Report

Stephens reported that she and Jones presented today at Provost's Council on the Academic Affairs 2016-17 Budget and its impact on the budget process for the Division.

They also discussed the Graduation Initiative (GI) 2025 budget and how the funding works from the CSU and the State and how it affects the campus for several years. Stephens distributed the Graduation Initiative 2025 Cash Flow Model that frames the funds that have come in to campus related to student success and the GI 2025 funding – the recurring \$900K for Student Success, and one-time funding, \$772K for Academic Preparation and \$320K for Pell and Graduation Rate and the \$3.25M for GI 2015. The model shows how funds will be used in all categories. Recurring funding is provided for the Graduation and Retention Specialist for the colleges, the AVP for Student Success, restructure of AVP for UGS, and the Staff Psychologist positions.

Stephens presented the Academic Affairs Base Budget Allocation and the 2016/17 Budget Request and Results. The allocation shows the proportions and dollar amounts related to Academic Affairs Budget. The proportion to instruction has increased this year in percentage because the Valley Performing Arts Center no longer reports to Academic Affairs. It now reports to Administration and Finance. She showed the Academic Affairs budget request summary for funding for previous year's items, new permanent funding request, and one-time funding requests that totals to \$16,224,884. The University is funding Academic Affairs \$11,768,721 leaving \$4,456,163 as unfunded requests. Recurring one-time funding is an artifact of non-resident enrollment and over enrollment funding. The biggest piece is the enrollment growth piece. We have requested funding from the University at the average new faculty salary cost for fall 2016, for the regularization of last year's enrollment growth this year for the new faculty hires for the average salary of \$77,768 per FTEF. We are being funded for \$75K per FTEF which means we are short on faculty position funding. The deans have been authorized to offer an average of \$83,136 per FTEF for hires starting in Fall 2017. We would like to see the full life cycle of a faculty member funded, including the promotions which we cover through attrition savings, affecting our tenure density.

Discussion ensued on funding regarding international students, faculty salaries, other unfunded mandates and initiatives, etc.

## 6. Budget – Colin Donahue, Vice President of Administration and Finance

Donahue presented the overview of the budget for 2017-2018 which is the snapshot from the last Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting. He stated that there is a gap between the

Governor's Budget versus the Trustees' request for about \$167M. The big gap is in the current commitments for \$139M for compensation. As far as FTES growth, the campuses were told to plan for zero next year across the system. We have to wait till the Governor releases his budget in January and the May Revise. He stated that the facilities and infrastructure bond funding might not be there.

The Graduation Initiative 2025 has base funding of \$75M. The CSU has received onetime funding of \$35M but there are still challenges that will be faced in the future. He will keep everyone updated on this.

Donahue stated that tuition increases are very controversial. The University will be using a small amount of its central reserve this year to fill the gap in the budget. With no enrollment growth, we will have issues next year and we have to figure things out. CSUN is in pretty good shape in the reserve position compared to some campuses but the entire system needs this long term budget to be figured out because it is not sustainable.

Donahue talked about the CSUN Operating Budget for 2016/17 that shows a drop in revenue as of Census due to the 611 FTES decline. (Attachment) The General Fund at target is \$410M. We planned pre-Census to be at 9.4% over target but we actually went down 3% that resulted in 7.2% or \$424.5M. We have lost revenue of \$6M. The overall breakdown of our General Fund Operating Budget is 44% State Appropriation, 52% Tuition Fee Revenue and 4% for other student fees. He showed the distribution of funds for all divisions including other campus expenses.

Donahue also showed the GI 2025 Expenditure Plan, two scenarios related to GI 2025 -the Potential Headcount Trend that is based on the Enrollment Reduction Agreement with the Chancellor's Office and the Potential FTES Trend while maintaining a steady headcount and the Enrollment and Budget Strategies. Discussion ensued.

## 7. Enrollment and Census – Janet Oh, Interim Director of Institutional Research

Oh reported that Institutional Research is now using new tools to help with enrollment projections. She updated everyone on the 2016-17 enrollment and also discussed why the campus was down in the new student enrollment and what the plans are for 2017. The new student enrollment trends for California residents were on the rise. Based on the negotiations between the Chancellor's Office, the President, and the Provost, the campus decided last year to aim for approximately 4,740 first-time freshmen (FTF) and 4,280 transfers (FTT) for the fall 2016. It was the first time that we have impacted for transfers and that is why we see a ~23% decrease. The goal was to decrease total enrollment by 2% even though we negotiated with the Chancellor's Office to decrease by 1%. The projected continuing undergraduate student population was about 27K with 4,740 first time freshman (FTF) and 4,280 first time transfers (FTT). The actuals showed 24,730 continuing undergraduate students with 4,350 actual FTF and 4,257 actual FTT. We were down with freshmen actually enrolling in the Fall. So overall, we were down by 3% rather than our planned 2%.

Oh shared that Institutional Research is now using Tableau to create dashboards for the campus. The dashboards can be accessed once it goes live after the holiday break. You can purchase the desktop and create dashboards at your expense but you can publish in the server in a separate partition and IR can create that for you. Oh reported that the campus was down with freshmen applications by 1,500 and was also slightly down with transfer students. She showed the dashboard for the freshmen yield with Tier 1 down and Tier 2 significantly down. She stated that the yield was down this year because the campus made decisions late for impaction. Admissions and Records also had a backlog and we did not know the target till later. The campus is making sure that it does not happen this coming year. We will auto-admit starting in January and will be using different cut-offs for the different majors that are impacted. Decisions are being made early. Discussion followed on loopholes of students switching to impacted majors, advising for students to be placed in the right majors when students are not successful in their chosen majors, why student yield is down, international students, etc.

Oh showed the capabilities of the dashboards that can help with recruitment, etc. She also noted that the campus is also down in the number of applications for Fall 2017, for freshmen about 11% and for transfers by 14%. The enrollment target is still being negotiated.

# 8. Discussion – 2016 – 2017 ERC Priorities, Issues, and Goals

The Committee decided to table the discussion at the February 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. It was also suggested to add Tenure Density to the agenda.

## 9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

## Notes:

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

# THERE WERE NO POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS PUT FORTH AT THIS MEETING.