

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING 02-14-2017 APPROVED BY COMMITTEE 04-11-2017
Sub. To Exec. Comm. _____ Approved by Exec. Comm. _____
Sub. To Acad. Senate _____ Approved by Acad. Senate _____
POLICY ITEMS _____

Members Present:

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

Members Excused:

Greg Knotts, Setareh Torabian-Riasati

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

3. Approval of the Minutes from December 13, 2016

The minutes of the December 13, 2016 meeting were approved.

4. Chair's Report

Dermendjian reported that he attended the UPBG meeting on January 27. Donahue had a presentation on the CSU Budget. He stated that there is a request from the Board of Trustees of \$167.7M to balance the \$343.7M. The \$167.7M is the gap that the Board of Trustees will try to cover. There is a proposal to increase tuition by 5% and that would cover \$77.5M on the CSU level but will keep the budget still short of \$90.2M. As far as the tuition increase is concerned, there is a resolution coming from Associated Students and the Academic Senate is also planning to do so. The potential increase for undergraduate programs will be \$270 for 6.1 units and more and \$156 for up to six units. For credential programs, it is \$312 for 6.1 units and more and \$130 for up to six units. For graduate and post baccalaureate, it will be \$438 for 6.1 units and more and \$258 for up to six units.

The headcount for spring enrollment as of January 27 was 35,459 students. This may have increased since then with late registration. The FTE was 29,003. Some interesting

discussion items at the meeting were: a) undergraduate unit load currently is 12.5 units per student which is up by .22 units from last year, b) the actual FTES on January 27 was 29,003 and the projected census at that time was 29,824 FTES.

At the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, we were asked for nominations for the Faculty Senate Standing Committees. There are certain members in the committee whose term expires. If anyone is interested in continuing serving on this committee to let Dermendjian know so he can nominate you. Cours, Hoggan, and Bartlow expressed interest in serving again.

5. Executive Secretary's Report

Stephens reported on the following:

a. Academic Affairs Planning

Academic Affairs Division has the three-year planning process underway. The colleges have submitted the second draft of their student success plans and the first draft of the balance of their three-year planning documents. They have to submit their planning priorities on Research, Employees for Success and Diversity by March 10, 2017. The Provost's Planning and Professional Development Series is also ongoing. The first meeting was held in July with the deans and the central team to plan for the student success initiatives. We had the first retreat with the deans, associate deans, and some faculty from the colleges last November. The second retreat will be held on February 24 and it will include those that attended the first retreat plus department chairs, data champions and other college team members. It will be focusing on first-year experience for students.

b. Research Building Groundbreaking

The Research Building Groundbreaking was held on February 7. The project is behind schedule because of the rain, but it was a good event that was attended by the President, the Provost, faculty and staff, with good turnout.

c. Academic Resources and Planning

The office has been short-staffed. The Director of Budget Management has been out due to a long-term illness. Another staff member will be moving to a different office on campus. The office will be getting one person courtesy of Health Sciences to help out and backfill the office.

6. Statewide Senate Report – Jerry Schutte

Schutte reported that the Statewide Senate met on January 25 to 27 and he will send the minutes to everyone. He brought up a couple of things.

- a. The \$168.2M includes six different requests of which the largest portion goes to faculty salary increases, Graduation Initiative, and deferred maintenance. The rest of those requests will not be covered and will be the responsibility of the campuses.

The five percent potential tuition increase will raise \$77M. A lot of students are stating that they are being charged for the faculty pay increases. That is how the legislature looks at it as well. The Senate is trying to disentangle the issue of the raise in tuition from faculty salaries so it can be addressed strategically. The resolution from the Fiscal Governance Affairs Committee about tuition increases recognizes that tuition increases should not be spikes but rather reasoned, long term and proportioned as it was stated in the Sustainability Task Force report. The Board of Trustees had turned down this issue in the report. They do not want to be in the business of having yearly increases with no justification. The Senate's resolution is almost identical to the student resolution where they support no tuition increases.

- b. Schutte's discussion with Hertzberg's office brought up the issue of tenure density related to Graduation Initiative 2025. The original resolution back in late November from the ASCSU supports the request of the budget for GI 2025 of which half of it was to go to hiring more tenured track faculty. Historically in 2001, we have a tenure density of about 58% FTEF Statewide. The California Legislature passed a resolution called ACR 73 with a strong recommendation that by September 2001, they want a blueprint that tells how to get from 58% to 75%. Seventy five percent is the appropriate ratio for tenured and tenure-track faculty to part-time faculty. It was not given to the legislature until 2009 and it came in a form a report called Re-inventing the CSU where it talks about ways to bring the tenure density up. However, there has been no tracking in place on how money is used for tenure density. That resulted in creating a Tenure Density Committee of which Schutte is now a member.
- c. They met in September 2016 and discussed all the issues. They had a videoconference in December where the Chancellor's Office Human Resources staff created cost estimates that would take to raise tenure density. They will have a final meeting on February 22 where they will recommend the CSU take the pool of lecturers who may qualify for tenure track faculty and convert them. This will eliminate costs of hiring, setting up, etc. They will also be pushing an allocation in the GI 2025 budget for faculty tenured positions.
- d. They will push for the reconfiguration of State University Grant (SUG) money which is about \$702M that appears on the budget as income but we never receive. It is a credit from the State directly to the students with SUG grants. There is a formulation on how we would like those funds reevaluated and re-appropriated to subsidize tenure density.

He reported that there was a conference in San Diego on February 11 on Graduation Initiative 2025. It was attended by Campus Presidents, Vice Presidents, and ASCSU officers. There were formal dinners on Thursday and Friday. Diane Ravitch, former Assistant Secretary of the Department of Education was one of the speakers and talked about how to increase under-represented minorities to close the gap.

Schutte announced that President Harrison has sent out the Sexual Assault/Sexual Misconduct Prevention Survey reminder again. He asked everyone to encourage students to participate in the survey.

Discussion ensued.

7. Discussion – 2016 – 2017 ERC Priorities, Issues, and Goals

Dermendjian opened the discussion on the committee's priorities, issues and goals. He stated that this will be a standing item on the agenda for this semester.

Hoggan distributed a sketch idea in response to the discussion of the committee at the last meeting. He stated his motivation to do this is to get the sympathy of the legislators so they can provide more money towards education. He presented a "story board" that highlights CSUN. He asked everyone to review it. Discussion followed with suggestions to work with the Office of Governmental Affairs, to get accurate data from CSUN Counts, to work in partnership with University Advancement, speak about diversity, etc. Hoggan will do a mock-up board at the next meeting.

8. Issues to Follow Up

The tuition increase issue was noted to follow up after the Board of Trustees meeting in March.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

Notes:

The next ERC meeting will be on Tuesday, April 11, 2017 from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. in UN 211.

THERE WERE NO POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS PUT FORTH AT THIS MEETING.