CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING 03/08/2022   APPROVED BY COMMITTEE 04/12/2022
Sub. To Exec. Comm.   Approved by Exec. Comm.
Sub. To Acad. Senate   Approved by Acad. Senate
POLICY ITEMS

Members Present:

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

Excused: Michael Doron, Elizabeth Debach

Guests: Ranjit Philip, Ryan Conlogue

Call to Order

The virtual meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m. by Katherine Stevenson.

1. **Approval of the Agenda**

   The agenda was approved. MSP – Tonyan/Godard

2. **Approval of the ERC Meeting Minutes of February 8, 2022**

   The February 8, 2022 meeting minutes were approved. MSP – Dermendjian/Velazquez-Vargas

3. **Chair's Report**

   Stevenson reported on the UPBG meeting on February 11, 2022. Donahue presented the same information on the Governor's budget that Juarez shared with ERC at the last meeting. The only difference is that he had more details on the items that were requested by the CSU Board of Trustees for the $715.M request that talked about the base and one-time money, concerns about inflation, maintenance for new buildings, GI 2025, Basic Needs, and the SB169 unfunded mandate. They talked about the Governor's $304.1M that offers an additional 5% at $211M for compensation and health benefits. This is going to be a real struggle to meet the campus compensation commitments and benefits costs, based on the CFA agreements and other bargaining units.

   Then Provost Walker reported on the Compact. The first few drafts of the compact worked in directions that were very different from GI 2025 but that changed in the last

versions. A lot of work was done behind the scenes for the compact to reflect the emphasis of GI 2025. The Compact focuses on intersegmental action, workforce development, and online course offerings. There was a good discussion about gaps between compact funding and BOT request.

Winterhalter presented the CSUN Budget Process Timeline again which the Committee has heard before and Stevenson has added the ERC workflow. There was a nice conversation on how to blend the Committee workflow with the budget timeline. Discussion followed on the intersegmental action and how the Committee would work towards its priorities.

Stevenson attended the Academic Technology Committee (ATC) and there was a discussion on the Proposed Computer Science requirement of laptops. The argument is that is it would be similar for students who are enrolled in Music and are required to have their musical instrument as part of their class. The Computer Science students use laptops are part of their school work. Computer Science is coming forward with this requirement rather than sneaking it in as a hidden requirement not in the catalog. The proposal seeks to ensure that all of our students can have the resources they need to succeed, regardless of social positionality. They talked about logistics as well. ATC is not ready to share this with our Committee as they are still re-drafting the policy statement. They will come back to us for feedback and probably have us consider having a joint recommendation to the Senate. Discussion ensued on costs, loan programs in the Library available on campus, etc.

Stevenson presented to ATC the proposed ERC charge as well as the proposed workflow in conjunction with the budget timeline. ATC had a very positive reaction and applauded the approach we are taking of being proactive with our interactions with the university and with other committees. She suggested that the Committee should finalize the charge and resubmit for consideration to the Faculty Senate.

She also outlined the Committee's workflow for the rest of this semester. She stated that at this meeting, the Committee is hearing from IT, the Centers, and Special Projects Rubric, and should identify which organizations the Committee needs to hear from to understand priorities. In April, the Committee will hear from CECS and CSM on lab facility needs, will finalize the Centers and Special Rubric, work on the workflow by identifying who to invite in May, identify the mechanism to collect information from the identified organizations and design a timeline for gathering and organizing the information. In May, our Committee prepares for next year by electing next year's Chair and determining the subcommittees and subcommittee chairs, finalizing the mechanism to collect information, finalizing the timeline for gathering and organizing information and submitting any needed IR requests. This will help us get ready to work on priorities for the coming year.

4. **Executive Secretary's Report**

Juarez reported that in response to the UPBG meeting in February that discussed the possibility of there being additional one-time funding for deferred maintenance, Academic Resources put out a call to Directors of Finance and Operations to provide lists of deferred maintenance requests, classroom issues, and equipment maintenance (refresh). The deadline for the initial review is May 1st, before the Governor's May Revise.

Academic Resources continues to spend down the HEERF budgets, as follows:

- o For Fall 2021 reduced capacity (classes with an on-campus component; reduced capacity for social distancing) a total of 363 sections; estimated expenditure transfer of $2.8M salary and benefits
- o Currently working on Spring 2022 – low-enrolled sections – these were the courses that would have been canceled but remained to help meet FTES targets

The Division of Academic Affairs did not meet the overall campus-determined FTES target and returned $1.6M to the University. However, the Division did exceed the CSU target for the campus. There is no determination yet on how or if the $1.6M shortfall will be transferred to the college budgets.

5. **Subcommittee Reports**

   a. **Gifts and Other Allocations**

      Knotts reported that they started the document and people have weighed in to establish the criteria in the rubric. There is a need to quantify and qualify. Velazquez and Dermendjian did their work on the scoring metrics and added details on what each number entails. They were able to qualify the scoring in their assigned tasks. Knotts asked those with assigned tasks to work on their topics. They will have a subcommittee meeting the week before the ERC meeting to work on this rubric so they can present something at the next meeting. Discussion ensued.

   b. **Road Map to the Future Project**

      Tonyan reported that she has attended some of the town halls that have been scheduled. She asked if anyone has attended any event to send her any feedback or survey information for each topic so she can compile the data. Stevenson stated that if the Committee can get the unfiltered data from all the Road Map events and surveys, it would give the committee rich data to work with. Stevenson will approach the Provost with this data request to look at the qualitative and quantitative feedback collected through the Road Map process.

6. **ERC Annual Workflow Discussion**

   Stevenson opened the discussion on the ERC workflow. She noted enrollment decreases, mental health, the nimbleness of the university, professional development for students to adapt to the academic expectations in the classroom, etc. as some of the areas of concern or things to watch for or on the Committee's list as priorities for next year.

   In the April meeting, the CSM and CECS Deans will be attending regarding lab facility needs. Stevenson said that we should identify who else to invite in May to hear their voices and concerns. It was suggested to do surveys for department chairs (working with the Council of Chairs), junior/senior faculty, and lecturers. Some questions/ideas suggested were:
   - Top five resources that are important in budget allocation
   - Computer refresh in labs and classrooms
   - Desktop refresh in offices
   - Course caps and section sizes and FTES targets
   - Top five priorities regarding workload
   - Top five criteria to be best as a faculty

   Godard inquired about what the Committee is trying to do with the data, how to measure it, and why are we doing it. Stevenson will follow up with Godard on the survey questions and by May, the Committee can have a clear idea on what we want to accomplish survey-wise and Godard can work on the survey during the summer.

7. **Technology Upgrades in the Classroom Updates**

   Philip stated that they wanted to share the work they have done across our campus classroom footprints in terms of technology upgrades over these last two years using HEERF funding across the board. IT started looking into a modular type of framework and to upgrade technology that was present in the classroom spaces to implement a HyFlex type of technology across a better set of classrooms that will not be too much of an investment. They took those classrooms and divided them into a set of 18 classroom spaces, including most large lecture halls, and outfitted them with HyFlex technology that enabled students to attend class in-person or join the class from a remote location. Additionally, 165 open lecture classrooms were upgraded with technology that can facilitate lecture-capture based capability. These broadcasting classrooms were upgraded taking into consideration the possibility of pivoting to an online format that would allow for faculty members to walk into the classroom and use the technology to have Zoom classes and students joining in from a remote location. He stated that Conlogue will speak on that and will also address the calls that were received at the beginning of the semester, what they were focused on, and how it was addressed and resolved.

   Conlogue stated that his team removed the existing equipment in the 165 classrooms, replaced digital signals up to the projector, and replaced projectors, when necessary, to digital. They installed ceiling-mounted microphones to capture instructor audio. There is also a camera mounted in the rear of the room facing the instructor and the upgrades

include HDMI and touch panel interactive technology. Primarily, the volume of the calls came on the first day the campus repopulated but it eventually dropped off significantly during Tuesday and Wednesday and the rest of the week. The faculty were surprised when they came into the classroom with the new technology in the room. They noted that they did not get the notification in January of the training nor the changes that were happening to familiarize them with the new technology. Conlogue stated they scheduled multiple training for in-person and remote in January and February and will continue to provide *ad hoc* training when faculty members reach out. He showed the data of the calls received by the Help Desk, data on how faculty are using the technology by location, and whether they are using the provided PC or their laptop. Discussion followed on not getting the notification about the training, the need to find a way to notify faculty effectively especially when faculty is on break during those months, best practices when sharing content to students, projecting information, and maintaining appropriate privacy over protected information, etc.

Due to time limitations, Philip and Conlogue will be invited again to another meeting for the HyFlex Pilot 1.0 results and to address other IT questions that the Committee might have.

8. **Adjournment**

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

Notes:
The next ERC meeting will be held on April 12, 2022 from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. via Zoom.