University Resources Council
Minutes
October 20, 2026 @ 1:00 pm in AS-119

Members Present: Niko Garcia, Lalaine Sevillano, Soo Hyun Cho, Eileen Klink, Rajbir Singh Judge (Secretary), Dave Whitney (Chair), Jesse Dillon, Navdeep Dhillon, Michelle Gibbs, Gabriel Gardner (Vice Chair), Barton Saunders, Rico Ovalles, Marianne Hata, Staci Freeman, Terie Bostic, Claudia Plaza, Sol Virgen, Kara Perkins, Steven Rousso-Schindler Sara Moghtadernejad (alternate).

1. Approval of the agenda

   M/S/P

2. Approval of the minutes 10/6/26

   M/S/P

3. Associate Vice President Marita Swanson for Human Resource Management explained workforce data on FTE, employee headcount, and estimated annual salary expenditures, using October 1st as a snapshot since it works well to capture faculty data (MPP and Staff have greater fluctuation across the year).
4. Her presentation can be found on the URC canvas page.

   Question: The data seems to suggest that there is 1 MPP for every 3.4 tenured/tenure-track faculty member?

   Answer: The numbers included on the presentation slides indicate the counts for each position. Those numbers could be used to determine such comparisons.

   There were questions regarding the categories (MPP, FTES). MPP refers to Management Personnel Plan Employees. They are non-bargaining positions who serve at the pleasure of the President or Chancellor. They do not have a probationary period or permanent status.

   Comment from a Council Member: Concern was expressed that the ratio of tenure-track to lecturer faculty has become progressively worse as the CSU has sought to achieve its mission more cheaply.

   Question: Why has Human Resources started to share a Total Rewards Statement to each employee?

Answers: Benefits are a significant portion of compensation and employees often do not realize how much they receive in benefits. We want employees to understand their total pay especially as benefits grow more expensive.

A resource for systemwide employee data within the CSU and by campus, was shared and can be found at the link below.

https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/employee-profile

5. Interim Vice President and Chief Information Officer Bryon Jackson reviewed expenses and priorities. Annual enterprise software and service contracts cost $6.14 million, up $1.56 million (34%) from the previous fiscal year and equal to 40% of DoIT's budget; 2026–27 priorities include server, virtual lab, and data-center HVAC replacement, Title II compliance, SB122 increases, AI, information security, patching, multifactor authentication, and audit findings.
   His presentation can be found on the URC canvas page.

   Question: There was a statement that your base budget increased. Is that correct?

   Answer: All divisions receive base increases to cover the cost of compensation increases when they occur.

   Question: What is the decision-making process for software contracts (i.e. Microsoft)? Is there faculty input?

   Answer: Yes, for large purchases like our email system, we held open forums and roadshows to discuss. There are also mandates from CO or Legislature, such as Canvas or CSUBuy, which we cannot control, however we do our best to coordinate on rollout and change management activities.

   Question: Why has the cost of Microsoft gone down?

   Answer: There was a shift in storage needs and cloud utilizations last FY that currently trend towards lower costs this fiscal year; however, this is based on projections. Acutals may render higher

   There was a discussion around end-of-life devices, their replacements, and computer refresh. Questions revolved around the lack of faculty computer refreshes when the tolerance for out-of-date computers is zero. There was a suggestion from the committee about a dedicated pot for refresh. Interim VP Jackson responded that when computers are refreshed is a product of how budgeting works as divisions and departments prioritize their purchases locally. It is a question that Academic

Affairs can answer.

6. Associate Vice President Shariq Ahmed presented on the budget, projects and initiatives of Academic Technology Services. He reviewed support for Canvas, Zoom, Kaltura/MediaSpace, faculty development, workshops, classroom and event technology, computer labs, and iSpace. AY 2025–26 activity included 287,033 Zoom meetings and 5,257,844 Kaltura/MediaSpace minutes viewed. IT Support has moved to digital support: 90% of IT support occurred via Zoom. ATS purchases some licenses separately from DoIT, including Adobe, offers customizable departmental workshops, and provides 20 testing workstations at the Horn Center.

   His presentation can be found on the URC Canvas page.

   Questions about software licenses (e.g. Zoom vs. Teams), Computer Lab for testing, and Professional Development.

   Question: What do you see for cost increases on the horizon?

   Answer: Software subscription increases are expected to be 5-8% in the coming year.

   Question: Is Metaverse an Academic Affairs Initiative and could that money have been used for computer refresh?

   Answer: Yes.Faculty computer purchases are funded typically through lottery by each AA unit; the allocations are at the Deans' discretion. The Metaverse was a one-time University-wide faculty development initiative funded by AA/Provost funds in 2024 as part of the efforts toward student inclusion, at-risk student retention, and engagement by using XR technologies and content.

7. 1st reading of the undergraduate and graduate microcredentials in Environmental Assessment by CLA interim Associate Dean Nancy Hall.

   Questions regarding the difference between microcredentials and badges, as well as the undergraduate and graduate courses required, if this reproduces what already exists.

8. Vote on proposed Certificate in Technology, Influence and Society

   M/S/P

9. CSU Budget updates by Kara Perkins, AVP for Budget Administration:

   No updates at this time.

Motion: URC recommends that the URC Chair (or their delegate) be permitted to attend meeting(s) of the President's Cabinet when the Cabinet considers how to allocate the one-time fund for over-enrollment in the 26-27 AY.

Seconded.

Discussion: AVP Perkins explained that the one-time funding available in 2026-27 is due to base-budget enrollment growth funds allocated by the Chancellor's Office to CSULB in July, with the caveat that the campus increases FTES Year over Year. Since our enrollment planning process was complete for the current year when this information was shared, the campus has not planned to achieve YoY growth in 2026-27. This could mean that the CO will take back the funding at the end of the fiscal year. CSULB has not added this allocation to base-budget allocations for divisions and is treating it as one-time funding for divisions, so that budget cuts are not required if the funding is returned to the CO at year end. If the money is not pulled by the system, it can be allocated as base funding in 2027-28.

Motion passes and will be sent to Academic Senate.

10. Adjourn