

CSULB – University Resources Council
Meeting Minutes – Meeting #5 December 4th, 2018
President’s Conference Room (USU 306) from 1pm to 3pm

Members Present: Praveen Soni, Robert Blankenship, Brenda Freshman, Dave Whitney, Citali Ortiz, Ferdinand Arcinue, Ali Rezaei, Christiane Beyer, Kelly Janousek, Cyndi Farrington, Marianne Hata, Jeanine Pociask, Carrie Hernandez, Terie Bostic, Claudia Plaza, Rosario Yeung-Lindquist, Kevin Johnson, Brenda Vogel, Richard Behl

Guests Present: Provost Brian Jersky, Scott Apel

Meeting called to order at 1:05

1. Approval of the Agenda – Meeting of December 4, 2018

Approved

2. Approval of the minutes – Meeting of November 6, 2018 (Attached)

Approved

3. CSU and CSULB Budget information and updates – AVP Ted Kadowaki

Ted is not here today and doesn't have any information for us anyway.

4. Presentation on the Division of Academic Affairs resources, allocations and priorities at 1 pm – Provost Brian Jersky

Handout: Academic Affairs General Fund Budget Summary, FY 2018-19

Question: Why doesn't CHHS have operating expenditures?

Provost response:

- money pushed into personnel and have other pockets of money
- the colleges have basically the same operating costs, which is quite little
- CHHS has basically the same operating costs, but it comes from a different source of funds other than the general fund.

Question: Why is a Chair position listed for Faculty Affairs?

Provost response: It's actually a Director of the Faculty Center for Professional Development, a 12-month position, but it's listed in the Chairs category.

Question: Lecturer costs shifted to different category?

Provost response: With new governor, hopefully the bulk of the new money should go to new tenure-track faculty. Getting new money means hiring new people. CSU has asked for new money.

Question: Does the new money have to arrive before we hire new TT faculty members, or could it come from grants, etc.?

Provost response: The operating expenditures could be used to hire new people, but then we'd have to find money for operating expenditures. Some colleges have other resources, but not all of them do. CLA, for example, has basically no other source of funds for operating expenses. So we really need new money to hire new people.

- 15 units should be full time, not 12. We're trying to change that.
- Tuition—we don't want to raise it.

Question: How are the funds distributed to the different campuses?

Provost response:

- Larger campuses tend to do better, but it comes based on FTES.
- Channel Islands operates somewhat differently. Maritime charges more in fees. SLO also charges more in fees.

Question: How are operating expenditures established? What are they?

Provost response: It's more or less the expenditures that are left over after personnel. It's not a point of planning from the general fund; it's residual.

Question: If money is allocated at 12-units of FTES, wouldn't it put us at a disadvantage if we go to 15 units?

Provost response:

- That's right. That's what they've been saying.
- But we're talking about one-time funding. We would like to hire new TT faculty with new money, but if it's just for one year, that doesn't work.
- Governor Brown doesn't want to consider base funding.

Question: Is there any discussion about moving to per-unit tuition?

Provost response: There have been requests for this. The current structure does seem rather strange. It seems that it's currently too complicated to change this though.

Handout: Summary Tenured/Tenure-Track Data

FTES is paying for this. It hasn't changed much. We have basically the same amount of money

FTEF are contractually obliged to teach 12 units. Lecturers can teach up to 15 units (not all lecturers teach 15, but 15 is the full-time calculation for lecturers =FTEF).

CFA would like 75% tenure density. That would be great, but it would cost approximately \$1.6 billion.

Colleges have different levels of tenure density. There are some operational reasons for that, but that's not the only reason. And the Provost is trying to make it more even across colleges. The Provost is especially focused on hiring TT faculty in Engineering, Arts, and HHS since their tenure density is the lowest.

Question: Has tenure density continued to decline over time? Is there any chance it could go in the other direction?

Provost response: If you go back to 1949, you'll see tenure density close to 100%. Since then there has been a fairly steady decline, especially during economic recessions. It's unlikely that we'll get back to 75%, unless we find new sources of revenue somehow.

Question: How does CSULB compare to other CSUs? Does the urban location play a role?

Provost response: CSULB is slightly below average for the CSU as a whole. Bigger campuses tend to have lower tenure density. The CSU average is 56. CSULB is 53.4.

Question: We want to serve more students, but we also want tenure density. Letting in more students tends to mean hiring more lecturers. How can we navigate that?

Provost response: They can't increase FTES, but we have increased average unit load. And we only got one-time money, and we don't have a permanent funding for hiring. So we have to be careful here.

Question: Does the difference between full-time lecturers and "freeway flyers" get counted in tenure-density somehow?

Provost response: Yes, ideally, we want tenure-track faculty.

5. Presentation on the Division of Administration and Finance resources, allocations and priorities at 2 pm – Vice President Scott Apel

Handout: Administration and Finance Budgets by Functional Areas, 2018-2019

They are looking to build a new 100-million-dollar dorm. Circa 420 beds. It's been 30 years since CSULB has built a dorm.

Masterplan process to run parallel to Beach 2030, including a fiscal masterplan

Comment: PPFM is so much more expensive than licensed contractors. This is damaging.

Apel response:

- His office knows this, and his team is working on it. A consultant will be looking at it. The campus isn't funded for paint, carpeting, etc. No state agency will ever be comparable in price to contractors.

- Parking also pays for bus passes et cetera. It's not profitable. They could increase rates for students. But they can't increase rates for faculty because of CFA agreements. They are looking for other ways to monetize parking. There are some half-price off-campus parking options.

Question: Can we offer shuttles to and from areas of town in which a lot of our students reside.

Apel response: They do some of that already.

Question: Is your office doing anything to help students affected by the recent death in the Nugget?

Apel response:

- They have reached out to CAPS. CAPS is available.
- It was difficult to get the coroner to retrieve the professor's remains from the Nugget.

Question: AQMD?

Apel response:

- They want a greener campus. They don't want people driving, if it's not necessary.
- There is a sustainability team. President Conoley is committed to sustainability. Solar panels, discounted metro passes, Tesla batteries, etc.

Question: What about Saturday and Sunday classes? (And Fridays?) Will facilities be able to operate 7 days a week?

Apel response: Yes. They are working on that. There's always an MPP here on the weekends. But they can't put more resources into that until more people are here on those days.

6. Open discussion on campus resources – Financial, Physical, Human, etc.

Question: Operating funds at the department level are based on a strange fluctuating formula from CCPE about summer enrollment. Does that make sense? Is there a way to change that?

Responses:

- indirect returns
- EO 1000
- Summer enrollments seem to be going down, and so do the operating budgets and expenditures.

Next meeting February 5th, 2019.

7. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 2:56.