

# **Budget and Planning Committee Minutes**

Thursday, February 27<sup>th</sup>, 2020  
10:00 –11:30 AM

## **Student Health Center, Conference Room (HCCR)**

### **I. Call to order: 10:01 am**

- Attendees: B. Street, M. Martinez, J. Kegley, A. Wan, A. Hedge, A. Grombly, D. Boschini, V. Harper, J. Stark, C. Lam, T. Davis, J. Drnek, K. Krishnan (visitor)

### **II. Approval of Minutes**

Minutes – 02/13/2020: motion, J. Kegley; 2<sup>nd</sup>, A. Wan; passed

### **III. Announcements**

1. Spring 2020 Budget Open Forum – Monday March 9<sup>th</sup>, 11AM – 12PM, Student Union MPR
  - a. Forward topics or issues to B. Street via email; this session is to look forward to the next budget cycle.
2. Summary of LMS Open Forum
  - a. B. Street has the data; will cover in discussion of the referral
3. IRPA data discussion, Kris Krishnan, Assistant Vice President IRPA (**time Certain 10:10 – 10:30 AM**)

### **IV. Approval of Agenda**

motion: A. Grombly, 2<sup>nd</sup>, A. Wan; passed

### **V. Old Business**

1. Campus Budget and IRPA data discussion
  - a. Newest revision went out this morning. Need to discuss discrepancies between data sets.
  - b. The data is being pulled from HR for the first time straight from the HR system. IRPA is cross checking the data with the Provost's Office to match the HR data against the contracts. There are still

discrepancies that are being identified and worked out, such as TT/T lines that show as full-time lecturers in some data. IRPA is going by job code and reviewing the data. Some of the discrepancies are as much as a full percentage point. Despite these issues, the trends have still gone down as a result of enrollment growth.

- c. Tenure density went up last year, but it should come down this year. Next year, the enrollment growth is projected to be level. Discussion of student enrollment initiatives and trends, especially of units enrolled for freshmen.
- d. Request for data on the average class size by discipline or school. Discussion of SFR and how university-wide measures are impacted by the fluctuations elsewhere. Further discussion on the need to review undergraduate SFR by program and school to address lack of sufficient sections, need for additional TT/T faculty, etc. Additional discussion of the differences between lower- and upper- division courses.
- e. Additions to the data include the completion of the trend line and a new column was added to calculate percentage of headcount for the whole university. Discussion of female faculty headcount. The second to last column is as a percent of the individual measure. In BPA, for example, 9% of all female faculty work in BPA, but they account for 5% of all faculty in the university.
- f. Discussion of URM/non-URM data: request to disaggregate data by school. There are individual school spreadsheets that support this information that can be made available. Further discussion of how this data should be used. Discussion of how URM is identified; this comes from the Chancellor's Office (CO). Additional discussion of the standardization of methods against other campuses and the CO. IRPA is using HR data because that is how the CO collects the data; K. Krishnan is in contact with CO to cross-check this data with the CO. It is unknown how other campuses collect and calculate this data. International faculty are counted as non-URM; once faculty become

citizens or have green cards, they count in URM/non-URM.

Discussion of how this data is collected. Asians, except Pacific Islander or Hawaiian, are considered non-URM. Further discussion of flaws in the data that does not accurately represent the diversity of existing faculty. However, this measure is only to account for under-represented minorities. The faculty do not represent the diversity of the student body; the URM data quantifies this issue, but there is still an issue of diversity of faculty in general in addition to under-represented minorities.

- g. Discussion of student data, documented status, and how they are quantified using the URM/non-URM data. There are gaps in the data that prevent us from addressing the issues that we are trying to address. Request for breakdown by race and ethnicity but not citizenship.
- h. WTUs in this data does not include release time and affects the calculation of SFR. HR time base does not back out the release time WTU. Class size will help temper the use of the SFR as a measure.
- i. Tenure density for Fall 2019 was 47%. The system average was over 50%. IRPA is checking with the Provost's Office with regard to release time because the density is much lower.
- j. Further discussion of impact of release time on SFR and how different schools generate measures. Instructional WTUs are the measures that account for the backing out of release time. It is not a measure that is used here at CSUB. Some schools and departments measure according to research status, etc.
- k. Issues at the Chancellor's Office are preventing us from gathering some data points for Fall 2019.
- l. Discussion of the drop in TT/T density. Issues like release time, and potential loss of faculty for other reasons. Impact of hiring or letting go lecturers.

- i. Where are these issues being identified on campus to explain the changes in the trends? How can we plan to rectify this if we do not know how we got here?
    - ii. Discussion of how the data is gathered and how to look at the issues given the data available. Further discussion of alternatives to analyze the data.
  - m. As we start managing according to the available data, it is important, and appreciated, that IRPA and the Provosts Office are making this data available. Discussion on the impacts of data on generating a resolution and how to develop strategies moving forward that account for what we know and what is still being worked out.
  - n. Requests for additional data points:
    - i. breakdown of class size and SFR by program, school, and lower/upper division and
    - ii. breakdown of faculty and student headcount by race and ethnicity
    - iii. Instructional WTUs for TT/T and non-TT/T
- 2. Calendar – Spring break survey
  - a. Will be open on Monday for two weeks. The data will be available in the next meeting or two. D. Cantrell to be invited for the discussion. This is not a referendum; it is just data collection to guide the resolution. Discussion of how the opinions will be weighted. Instructional faculty and students are the only constituencies that are off during that time period. The resolution from Senate will go to the Cabinet for consideration. There should also be a resolution from ASI. Further discussion of impacts on staff.
  - b. Discussion of commencement on the weekend and Thanksgiving Break.
- 3. Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas
  - a. Potential flaw with Canvas: exams and Excel spreadsheets. Canvas is very limited in what it provides in terms of assessment.

- b. Discussion of additional needs of faculty in Canvas implementation:
    - i. Additional LTI or API plugins to accommodate discipline specific needs (like spreadsheets, formulas, academic integrity, etc.)
    - ii. Implementation plan and faculty support
  - c. Editing of the document
    - i. Connections to auxiliary programs; discussion of the need to acquire software and then link it to the LMS.
    - ii. Addition of Bb extension
  - d. Motion: J. Stark; 2<sup>nd</sup>, A. Grombly; passed.
4. Referral 20 Proposal for Energy and Power Engineering Emphasis within the B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering
- a. Discussion of grammar issues.
  - b. Motion, J. Stark; 2<sup>nd</sup>, J. Kegley; passed.

**VI. New Business**

- 1. None

**VII. Open Forum (time certain 11:15)**

**VIII. Adjourn: 11:30 am**