



## School Elevation Exploratory Committee

### NOTES for December 8, 2021

Attending Members: D. Boschini (Co-Chair), S. Frye (Co-Chair), Lea Antone, L. Cabrales-Arriaga, B. Evans-Santiago, S. Gamboa, D. Gove, A. Grombly, A. Hegde, T. McBride, M. Rees, J. Rodriguez, B. Street, D. Zhou

Absent: E. Correa, S. Magaña

#### 1. Introductions

After a welcome from D. Boschini, each member introduced themselves in turn indicating their department and length of time with CSUB. D. Boschini thanked the committee members for their time.

#### 2. Background

D. Boschini explained that this idea was introduced in 2019. First reactions ranged from strong interest to no objection to some disinterest. At that time, one thought was that as institutions grow from a small to medium to large size they expand in complexity. One model that has been discussed would include elevating schools to colleges and then, possibly, having schools within the colleges, to group programs in ways that would have an impact on the campus in terms of fundraising, research, accredited programs, etc. There are different ways to group programs to the advantage of students and faculty. We will explore the possibilities to determine whether moving schools to colleges will benefit us in a way we want to move forward. Within the colleges there would be schools and departments; exactly what that will look like is what we will discuss and recommend to the Senate and the Provost. At the end she opened it up to questions.

A. Hegde said that the Provost has guaranteed that whatever the committee recommends he will abide by and the Senate is not going to rush to a decision. We can share that with everyone we talk to.

#### 3. Provost Harper's Charge for the Committee

- a. S. Gamboa asked why a committee was established separate from the Senate. A. Hegde explained when Provost introduced the topic, he wanted shared governance with broader consultation including more faculty input.
- b. S. Frye indicated that if there is a 1:1 tradeoff, faculty to administration, that is woefully out of balance. A. Hegde said the Provost meant to indicate that ratio of 1:1 is 'at minimum.' We need to remind him that the minimum doesn't become all you need to do. The concern of adding more layers and MPPs was brought up at a Senate Exec meeting and the Provost

**Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs**

California State University, Bakersfield  
9001 Stockdale Hwy. • Bakersfield, CA 93311

reminded the group that the change may provide more opportunities for donations as people may be willing to name a school or college to help minimize the cost of these changes.

- c. B. Street suggested that we need to think not about impact right now but to really look forward to what CSUB will look like 10 or 15 years from now.
- d. Students need to continue being a top priority. A. Grombly questioned whether a student's roadmap may be impacted because of these changes. A discussion with enrollment management may help us understand how we can avoid too much disruption to the students.

#### 4. Faculty Co-Chair Selection

Steve Frye volunteered, and collaboratively appointed Co-Chair

#### 5. Discussion

- a. Guiding principles:
  - i. We should not recommend moving departments their will
  - ii. We should consider the addition of MPPs and the impact on tenure density
  - iii. Our top priority should always be students
  - iv. We must consider financial impacts now and in the future
  - v. We should adopt a timeline for changes so that there is the least amount of disruption to students, faculty and staff
  - vi. We should avoid a one-size-fits-all mentality
  - vii. We need input from entire campus community, ensuring equity, inclusion and diversity
- b. Scope of work: Determine whether the current structure should be changed
  - i. Change should not overburden one department, school, or college
  - ii. There is no boundary set on the number of schools or colleges
  - iii. Any recommended plan would need to provide a rationale for any structure that is added, removed, or changed
  - iv. Explore the possibilities to determine whether moving schools to colleges will benefit us
  - v. What would the recommended structure look like?
- c. Process:
  - i. Gather comparison information
    - 1. Chancellor's Office
    - 2. Other CSUs (including faculty to MPP ratio)
    - 3. Enrollment management (student enrollment, SFR, etc.)
    - 4. Departmental budgets
  - ii. Review previous consultant's report

- iii. What information is already on the books regarding expansion (coded memos, university handbook, etc.)
  
- d. Deliverable(s)
  - i. Campus forum to receive input from campus community
  - ii. Recommendations in a report to Provost and Academic Senate
  
- e. Transparency
  - i. Discuss openly with your departments
  - ii. Webpage already uploaded: <https://www.csub.edu/facultyaffairs/School-Elevation-Exploratory-Committee/index.html>