

CSULB – University Resources Council
Meeting Minutes – October 1, 2019
Anatol Center from 1pm to 3pm

Members present: Robert Blankenship, Dave Whitney, Praveen Soni, Ted Kadowaki, Kelly Janousek, Marianne Hata, Terie Bostic, Kevin Johnson, Ferdinand Arcinue, Praveen Shankar, Carrie Hernandez, Henry Wu, DeeDee Green, Claudia Plaza, Rosario Yeung-Lindquist, Cyndi Farrington, Chanel Acker, Yu Wang, Anna Ortiz, Lee Blecher, Heather Schmoll, Renaud Berlemont, Lisa Star, Joelle Bobadilla

Guests present: Nick Valdivia, Mark Zakhour, Dean Joshee, Richard Markus, Roman Kochan, Tim Mozia

Meeting called to order at: 1:03

1. Approval of the Agenda – Meeting of October 1, 2019
move. Second. Approved.
2. Approval of the minutes – Meeting of September 17, 2019
move. Second. Approved.
3. CSULB sources and uses of funds for the 2018-19 year, and CSU and CSULB Budget and divisional allocations for the 2019-20 year – AVP Ted Kadowaki (Continuing. Please bring the handout from the last meeting.)
4. Presentation on Financial Aid at 1 pm by Nick Valdivia

Powerpoint presentation:

Just over \$143 million was released to students for financial aid for Fall 2019. This is more than last fall.

Question: Are we losing that much money for the President's Scholarship?

Response: The program is being reevaluated. Some things might be covered or not covered for particular students, rather than covering tuition and housing for all students.

Question: Is there a way for President's Scholars to receive funding for off-campus housing.

Response: Probably not, but the structure is being reevaluated.

Comment: About 72% of our students receive some kind of financial aid; just over 50% of our students receive fee-paying awards. Some kinds of financial aid can also cover other things, including books and living expenses.

Comment: There are workshops on financial aid for students.

5. Presentation on Cost Savings strategies employed by PPFM (Physical Planning and Facilities Management) by Mark Zakhour (Director of Design and Construction Services) at 1:30 pm

Powerpoint presentation

The cost of construction is constantly increasing. They are looking for ways to save money.

Part of the solution is finding the appropriate delivery method for the project. DCS can employ 12 different delivery methods. This yields 40% cost savings.

The cost per square foot goes down as the size of the project increases. So they are combining projects to take advantage of the cost savings of increasing the scale.

A lot of contractors/vendors want to work at CSULB. They can use leverage on new hires. New people bid lower. So they advertise widely and try to take advantage of that.

They try to schedule bid periods at times when market is slow and allow a proper amount of time to bid. Contractors bid lower when they aren't as busy.

They try to increase bidding competition. The more bidders there are, the lower the bids are.

They try to use in-house design and construction whenever possible/appropriate/cost-effective. That also takes profit out of the equation.

They try to minimize unnecessary project constraints and allow for plenty of time to complete the project. Compressed scheduled, for example, cost more.

They try to communicate with the customers about the customers' goals. Open and honest conversation helps them use the right delivery methods.

They try to use multiple cost reduction strategies on most projects.

Question: How do we keep the low bidders from increasing costs later?

Answer: They actively look for the best value and not necessarily the lowest bid.

Question: Is removing project constraints causes a lack of thinking about accessibility issues?

Answer: Great topic. They never save money by removing accessibility. Accessibility is a key priority. They don't always get it right. But they do always take accessibility into account.

6. Presentation on Enrollment Data and Graduation rates at 2 pm by Vice Provost Dhushy Sathianathan

Handout: Enrollment and Graduation Report

In 2019, we awarded a new high of 8,900 bachelor's degrees. This is a 13% increase over 2015.

In 2019, CSULB plans to enroll 11,400 students. This is a 24% increase over 2017.

CSULB remains committed to local access. "Local" means the students went to a local high school. It no longer has to do with which community college they are transferring from.

The 4-year graduation rate is up.

FTES is up because students are taking more units.

CSULB is the most applied-to campus in the CSU (70,883 first-time freshmen applications in Fall 2019). And CSULB is the most applied-to campus *for transfer students* in the country (35,145 transfer applications for Fall 2019).

Question: How is the yield information useful?

Answer: It helps calibrate so that we can land at the target.

Question: When transfer students apply, do the high school performance data fall away?

Answer: Yes. If transfer students have met 60 units, that is what admissions looks at.

7. Proposed new program – Master of Arts in International Affairs, Second Reading at 2:30 pm – Director Richard Markus (No collaborative document or agreed upon amount yet, but a letter of support from Dean Joshee will be shared at the meeting)

This is the second reading, so we will have Q&A before we ask them to leave so we can discuss.

Comment: It *seems* as though there is no need for library resources. However, the library doesn't do payment plans for databases. If the library doesn't get the money, they can't buy it.

Response: They will pay for actuals.

Question: If there is an agreement to see whether this is a drain on the library, because of Interlibrary Loan use, is there a way to monitor the cohorts? When they meet the ILL threshold, can the library get CPIE to cover that?

Response: All self-support programs cover what they need. The resources are always covered.

Question: Are you saying that the library occurs fees that you'll cover it with course fees, because it's self-supported rather than stateside?

Response: The resources needed are the resources needed. It doesn't really matter if it's stateside.

Counter-response: The question is whether the costs that would be occurred on the library would be additional and whether it's really self-supported.

Response: If there is a copyright or a journal that is needed, the program will take care of that expense (not CPIE necessarily but the program itself).

Question: So the program will pay for those resources?

Answer: Yes. With consultation.

Comment: The program is designed to have 25 majors per year. Those courses they can clearly handle. But in the summer, the students are split into tracks. Then they move into working by themselves on specific projects or theses. So this is a very small scale. Further, some of those students won't be on campus, because they're online students, and those students might use other libraries. If, however, there are resources that are regularly being used, then they are willing to work with the library to deal with it.

Comment: We have lots of online students. The reality is that we provide them with resources. That also costs money.

Answer: If that happens, then they'll cover those costs.

Comment: They agree to monitor resources and cover costs should they occur.

Question: Can that be monitored?

Answer: When someone checks something out from the library, the ID number is recorded.

Discussion: Did that answer the questions?

The library wants in writing that the program will cover those expenses.

Would it help to put a procedure in place? With an invoice for example?

That would be easy to do.

The questions really have to do with how self-supported programs work. The issue is also that the library isn't in the loop on these issues. What is the precedent for this? Maybe we need a policy on this for self-supported programs in general, and the library should be involved from the beginning.

The library was in the proposal. But the program never talked to the librarians about it. There is a big discrepancy. (It sounds like they're saying: don't worry about it; they'll cover the costs.)

Motion to approve this with the amendment to make a recommendation to AS that they have something in writing stating that the library can invoice the college.

Could the library issue a bill annually?

It needs to all be documented.

What will happen once we amend it? We want to make sure that there is a specific bill sent annually to CPIE.

But maybe we need a recommendation to AS that covers all self-supported programs in general, not tied to this program specifically.

There has to be an agreement that the library ASM can send the invoice.

Vote on the amendment:

The library keeps track of the actual usage by the actual students and provides a report so that they will be reimbursed by CPIE.

Why does the AS need to get involved?

We will approve with the amendment to make a recommendation.

This is a particular problem for this program because the discrepancy is substantial.

The amendment passes with two abstentions.

Vote for approving the program as amended.

We vote to approve the program.

8. Adjourn