

Budget and Planning Committee Agenda

Thursday, March 28th, 2019
10:00 –11:30 AM

Student Health Center, Conference Room (HCCR)

I. Call to order: 10:03 am

Attendees: B. Street (chair), M. Martinez, T. Davis (ex-officio), J. Kegley, R. Dean, A. Hegde, A. Grombly, A. Lauer, C. Lam, D. Boschini (ex-officio), V. Harper

II. Approval of Minutes

- Minutes from 03/14/19 meeting
- Motion: A. Lauer, 2nd A. Hegde

III. Announcements and Information

- Spring semester Budget Forum – Proposed for April 22nd at 9AM, waiting on confirmation
 - o Date may change
- Academic calendar and Spring break
 - o Next two academic years, 20/21 and 21/22, are in draft.
 - o Spring Break to be week 8 in those years
 - o B. Street to invite K. Knutzen to BPC before the end of the year
 - o Hoping to have the calendars in front of BPC before the end of the year
 - o Chair's meeting in SS&E. Education definitely wants a say in when Spring Break is scheduled
 - o This was discussed at Executive senate, but there was a call for more feedback, however there are issues with requesting the feedback and how the decision will be made based on this and other information
 - o Staff, librarians, and counselors do not get Spring Break off like faculty and students

- ASI feedback is only from graduate students in support of keeping it in line with the school district
- The Calendar committee went with the results of the straw poll in Exec. Senate.
- Issues in the calendar include: spring break, 3 weeks for advising, Saturday commencement after finals, and request for a week long Thanksgiving break
- University hour process discussion: no further discussion
- Mr. Thom Davis (VP for Business and Administrative Services) will lead a discussion on the use of GI 2025 funding (**time certain 10:30AM**)
 - CO started funding GI 2025 in 2016
 - In 17/18, there was an additional allocation of \$2.374 million in addition to our base budget
 - There has also been one-time money
 - 18/19 \$3.167 million specifically for GI 2015. CO does not direct use of base budget, but the GI 2025 funding was to be used to “move the needle” on graduation rates at 4 years and 6 years
 - Encouraged continuation of existing practices and the initiation of new ideas to support graduation rates
 - GI 2025 covers tenure density, high-impact practices (not clearly defined) but may include IT and student success
 - In 18/19, CO looked at CSU tenure density, \$1.5 million was allocated for tenure track from the \$3.167 million. CO acknowledged that we needed to move our tenure track density. Every CSU got different funding.
 - Increasing tenure density was something President Mitchell supported with the hope for additional supporting funding from CO to continue this work.
 - In the budget book, you can see that the campus has to pull in about \$5 million each year from savings instead of moving funding out
 - There are actually 30 positions, not 29.

- 2016/2017, 12 new position control lines for faculty
- 2017/2018, 12 new position control lines for faculty
- 2018/2019, 6 new position control lines for faculty
- The average per faculty line is approximately \$125,000; it appears as if we have been hiring faculty without permanent funding, which is what has been done.
- President Mitchell committed \$2 million over two years, and this year, we spent about \$800,000. We need funding in order to continue to hire new faculty.
- GI 2025 should also support tenure density improvements
- What's the base for the additional hires instead of replacements: they are new position control lines; you can't compare these to older data from 2005. The data was based on position control which was initiated in 2016/2017, so the numbers for these expansion hires is derived from data since 16/17.
- After Q2S, there were auxiliary and part-time to full-time positions, but where is that reflected in this data? How are the faculty lines different than the staff lines? The university was funding these staff anyway: instead of transferring funding to the Foundation to fund the positions, the positions were moved Stateside.
- The data provided here is only based on GI 2025 funding and data
- Academic Affairs has not increased in the last ten years; it's only the last few years that we are starting to grow.
- There is the misconception that faculty are only asking for more faculty when it is a matter of still building back up to pre-recession levels. Discussion of how the narrative is being crafted
- Discussion of protections for migrated staff who are now subject to more protections as Stateside employees.
- When the CO clearly identified CSUB needed 11 TT faculty and we only hired 6, we responded that we have already hired 30. We've been hiring without the funding for it.

- Discussion of context that the base budget and how much was spent on Academic Affairs
- In 16/17, we did not have the funding to pay for the 12 positions
- In 17/18, we did have \$2.4 million to pay for those positions
- We keep running position control lines without permanent funding, and so the expansion hires are not mitigating the existing deficit in staff and faculty funding.
- GI 2025 is primarily based on Academic and Student Affairs, so these numbers are based on these requirements
- Discussion of unfunded position control and additional staff and administrators in other units. It would be very helpful to have the full picture of the budget to build context for GI 2025.
- These expansion hires were not communicated as a plan while they were being initiated, and we need a goal and a plan to effect change on tenure density.
- Other CSUs have not been, or did not interpret GI 2025 guidelines on tenure density, as allowing for backfill of tenure track lines.
- Discussion of how President Mitchell and cabinet made the decision to hire additional faculty above an additional deficit spending. CSUB's efforts to build tenure density were from one-time funding and were not initially part of GI 2025. GI 2025 has not been attached to this work in BPC for the last three years. President Mitchell agreed to \$3 million over three years subject to funding but approved it without funding. Now that GI 2025 funding is available, it is now being used to fund the tenure density initiative. Reports to CO for the GI 2025 did not talk about tenure track expansions, but there were discussions about creating new sections of classes, but this was likely accommodated by part-time lecturers. Will require looking back at those reports for how the hiring was classified. Further discussion on how the funding was allocated and how BPC and CSUB's work in tenure density has been classified. December 2017, the impression

was given at the campus budget meeting that these expansion hires were funded by additional \$1 million. The understanding was that the expansion hires were funded.

- Further discussion about how the funding from GI 2025 is allocated to tenure density
- Discussion of the list of positions by school that are classified as expansion hires. If there are positions missing from the list, it is because they are replacements. Base year for position control would be drawn ad 15/16. Need to see SFR in relation to the TT/T lines to see if we are treading water or making progress.
- Discussion about framing the issue, acknowledging where we are, and addressing how we can move forward. In the spirit of GI 2025, we have been increasing our tenure density and we have been addressing student initiatives although we know we are not yet where we want to be.
- Food pantry is not GI 2025 funding, but there is also permanent funding for it as well. B. Street to follow up to clarify funding.
- The funding from the other 5 TT lines has been used for high-impact practices like the Kegley Center and the Dream Center, etc.
- We have not used any of the funding to fill the \$5 million deficit
- It would be helpful to see what the positions and initiatives in other areas attributed to GI 2025 are; it's a small piece of the total spend.

- CSUB Tenure Density Priority resolution discussion (**time certain**

11:00AM)

- We need to move forward with an agenda to build on tenure density
- Email B. Street with questions or requests for additional data related to tenure density, student growth, and GI 2025
- We do need to keep moving forward, but we also need to work to create and maintain transparency. We didn't ask the questions, so we ended up with a hole. We need to take the time to ask the questions so

that we do not dig a deeper hole. Discussion on supporting shared governance and transparency.

- Resolution has both a dollar amount and a percentage in addition to a strategy. The increase is not to negatively affect the SFR, but should there be a specific ratio SFR? Do we want to resolve for specific tenure density.
- Humboldt wants 75% tenure density with an SFR or 18. 58% tenure density may not move us toward the median if everyone is also moving up in tenure density.
- Discussion of effects of remediation on the decrease in the need for lecturers and the effects on tenure density.
- Suggestion that we use 75th percentile with notes that we are currently in the 25th percentile (or thereabouts) within the system.
- At 60% tenure density, we would need to hire 104.7 over a five year period. The data needs to be reviewed and updated based on enrollment growth and recent hires. We need to annual enrollment targets to generate.
- \$2 million per year to grow with assumption that \$125,000 average per faculty member. What are the implications for a dollar amount or a number of faculty? The dollar amount gives some value to the resolution. The cost of faculty in different areas are not the same. Discussion of the magnitude of the issue and making sure the dollar amount reflects the number of positions. Use \$3 million instead of \$2 million.
- Discussion of assigned time costs.
- Need to include language about available funding and budget to avoid future deficit. Put it in the rationale.
- Need a resolve that the Academic Senate and Cabinet work on a goal for an increase in tenure density and it be added to the Strategic Plan. How does it get attached to the three existing strategic goals. Discussion of how to specify this in context of the Strategic Plan.

IV. Approval of Agenda

Motion: A. Hegde, 2nd C. Lam, Passed

V. Old Business

1. Discussion on University priority spending

VI. New Business

None

VII. Adjourn: 11:40 am