Budget and Planning Committee
Minutes

Thursday, October 4th, 2018
10:00 –11:30 AM

Student Health Center, Conference Room (HCCR)

I.   **Call to order** 10:00am

   a. Attendees: B. Street (chair), A. Schmidt, C. Lam, J. Zorn (ex-oficio), R. Dean, A. Hedge, A. Grombly, A. Lauer, J. Kegley, M. Martinez, T. Salisbury (guest), J. Morga, T. Davis (ex-oficio), K. Krishnan (guest), D. Boschini

II.   **Approval of Minutes**

  - Minutes from 9/20/18 meeting

     o Fix "Agenda" to "Minutes"

     o Motion: J. Kegley , 2nd: M. Martinez, Passed

III.   **Announcements and Information**

  - Welcome new committee member Rechima Dean (staff)
  - [Strategic Plan Open Forum](#)

     o Most BPC members teaching at this time

  - Kris Krishnan, IRPA data requested, discussion on data and Q/A **(time certain 10:30 AM)**

  - Budget book: B. Street & T. Davis, November 1st should be released based on CSU Stanislaus model

  - Questica: B. Street & F. Gorham, a computer lab will be set aside next meeting in the library for training with T. Sherman pending resolution of software issues in Questica

  - Budget Forum: information session for Questica and the Budget Book. Building communication and transparency, planning for the middle of November

IV.   **Approval of Agenda**

  - Motion: A. Hedge, 2nd: J. Kegley, Passed

V.   **Old Business**

  1. Discussion on the priority for $1 million University funds

a. In 16/17 and 17/18, CSUB made expansion hires a priority outside the base budget. Position Control identified that salary costs for open positions were often committed to other permanent or long-term costs, but when positions became open, they were filled, and costs increased. Other staffing changes and information technology issues have generated costs to update and build efficiencies. $5.3 million has been committed beyond the budget to address these budget issues. After meeting all of our commitments this year, we have an additional $1 million.

b. Committed costs are items that were approved but were not part of the base budget. They are commitments that have been maintained on reserve. This $5.3 million is not part of the $98 million operating budget for the campus. Before position control, Academic Affairs got a lump sum in their budget. After position control, we could actually see what was left after salaries. Money was moved from one place to another to make sure expenses were covered, but we are not budgeting for what we actually need for operating expenses; we have been using carry-forward and one-time funding to meet these commitments.

c. How are budget increases in other divisions different from the need for a budget increase in Academic Affairs? The reality is that the campus has expenditures beyond its resources and has been for some time. The campus was making decisions to move the campus forward, but we now have to continue to meet these fiscal commitments. The use of carry forward funds to meet base operating expenses is not just occurring in Academic Affairs.

d. How are temporary to permanent staffing changes reflected in position control? These changes are in the base budget: they were hired from Foundation and Foundation was paid back through Stateside.

e. The $5.3 million is a campus wide responsibility; it is not just from Academic Affairs. We need to address it without placing blame; we need to move forward.

    f.   D. Boschini move to extend meeting, A. Hedge 2nd. Passed

    g.   ASI: Senior Seminars need more funding and IRA requests far surpass the budget available. Students do not have the funding available to them to meet their needs for IRA. GRASP does not have indirect funds that can be used for these IRA requests. Through the system, ASI and IRA is the primary funding source. It is not a primary function of GRASP to facilitate student travel and research, but they do assist in asking for funding for the IRA. There needs to be permanent funding to meet these needs. University Advancement also needs to be involved in addressing this issue. The IRA is funded through the CO from student fees. Students are subsidizing the travel and research of a few.

2. Discussion on full cost of instruction

    a.

VI.   New Business

3. University profile (1-4) data discussion 10:30am

    a.   Profile 4, Tenure density is usually calculated via FTEF, but IRPA provided the data in headcount to better demonstrate the trends

        i.   Data was compared to other CSUs, and data was cross-checked with Vice Provost as there are faculty with tenure-track/tenured job titles but may not actually be T/TT

        ii.   Trend is decreasing over time though WTUs are going up; an increase in non-T/TT faculty are teaching the increase in WTUs

        iii.   FTEF and Headcount, the numbers are different but the trends are similar. 51.9% tenure density by FTEF. CO calculates by comparing Fall terms

        iv.   New President was on the Tenure Density Taskforce with the CO, CO has the system at a density of 55.7% in 2016; we should use the same calculation to compare ourselves against the system. We are below the system average, but we are close.

v. We have more difficulty than other campuses in the system in recruiting faculty in some of our subject areas. To be comparable, our tenure density should be higher

vi. In 2008, we were higher than the system-wide average

vii. We also look at our comparable CSUs based on size, but that date is available in Tableau as well as on Budget Central

viii. We aren't just trying to recruit more faculty; we are trying to logistically meet the demands and mission of the university

ix. What is causing the trend, loss of T/TT faculty should be replaced, so retention doesn't factor into SFR and T/TT density

x. Even though we have hired expansion hires, the increase in FTES, we still need non-T/TT to meet the WTUs demands and to cover the first 2 years of release time for new T/TT faculty to meet research demands

xi. Open positions when the data is calculated are not counted toward the calculations at census

xii. We are teaching more students now, and it is going to continue to go up

xiii. CSUB provides undergraduate students with research opportunities, but there is a chain reaction: faculty, lab space, and time

xiv. Look at the trends to determine where the money should go. We shouldn't not hire people because we don't have space, but we need to redirect funding to space. Focus on instruction in the classroom. The trend will help us look at the bigger picture despite issues that com up year to year

xv. Fall 2017 data that continues the trend, but what will Fall 2018 look like? Did the large number of expansion hires impact the trend. IRPA should have census data from Fall 2018 will be available in a few weeks. There will not be any additional faculty expansion.

<ol type="i" start="16">
Instruction cost is only faculty salaries without benefits. The increases are purely salaries. It would be important to have the data on lab space and other resources that contribute instruction costs. IRPA will put together a separate report of the data. A. Grombly will provide the library IPEDS/ACRL data for IRPA.
FTEF is calculated by WTU and salaries differ based on term. EU terms and funding change the cost of instruction because those costs are higher. Profile 4 has density by headcount and WTU not FTEF.
Fall 2018 data isn't released from the CO until November
Profile 1, SFR by FTES/FTEF example of SSE, the SFR went up marginally between 16/17 to 17/18, T/TT didn't drastically change, but there was about a 40% increase in PT lecturers to meet the demand. The trend is more important to the actual numbers; what are we doing to meet the demand? What do we need to better support the new faculty and the students? Maybe look into cross-disciplinary labs so there is shared space that is available to all students, but we also still need faculty to drive that research.
We will discuss this again at a future meeting

4. Referral 07 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal
   a. Continuing agenda item
5. Referral 09 University Hour
   a. An hour set aside when there are no specific classes are tied to faculty and student interaction
      i. CSULA proposing 3:10-4:10 daily
      ii. CSUDH MTWTh, 11:30-12:45pm starting 19/20
      iii. SLO Th 11m, only classes are scheduled by the Provost when necessary
   b. ASI: A. Schmidt has been talking with faculty and other campuses about what is available or in the works

i. CSUDH is similar in structure and student population to CSUB

ii. M-Th to provide access to students who work MW/TTh and allow Fridays for meetings

iii. Designated time for students to attend events, regroup, etc.

iv. Runner Hour 11 – 12:30, currently exists

    1. It used to exist on Wednesdays

v. Issues to consider: feasibility and frequency

vi. ASI hasn't made a specific request for frequency, but they want to provide as much availability for all students, faculty, and staff as possible

vii. Some schools have started offering later classes because students work and to facilitate this change

viii. When the timeblocks changed, some of the class availability shifted and the amount of time shifted around, also the average age and degree seeking students have transitioned from night classes to day classes

ix. Need to reach out to others to understand logisitics and feasibility before we attempt to tackle the issue

x. Have Department Chairs and Leadership Council been approached: not yet

xi. Regardless of University Hour, our classrooms our impacted, but we do need to be teaching more at night and on the weekends to relieve the impact and to demonstrate the need for a new building

xii. 11:30 – 12:30 four days a week will negatively impact space utilization calculation, but we have to move to nights and weekends, and Fridays anyway

xiii. There is a Classroom Utilization Taskforce already; they will have the best understanding of when classes are offered and when they are most commonly scheduled

xiv. Propose an alternative time on maybe Fridays

1. Busy during the week
2. Won't impact the students
3. To impact students the most, you would choose the busiest days, though this is not realistic

xv. Stretching out instruction won't create more sections, but it will allow students more time for self-care, homework, and events. Providing opportunity for students to get the most out of their student experience as possible

xvi. Fridays aren't good if faculty and students are not on campus

xvii. Can we see what analysis has been done on other campuses re: class utilization

1. Who on each campus provided data and facilitated this concept for other student governments
2. How many of the classes at CSUDH are online?

VII. **Adjourn** 11:55am