**Members Present:** Nancy Mangold (CBE, COBRA Chair), Tom Bickley (Library), Monique Cornelius (Budget, Presidential Appointee), Paul Carpenter (Kinesiology), Julie Glass (CSCI), Jiansheng Guo (CLASS), Audrey Katzman (Academic Affairs, Presidential Appointee), Glen Taylor (CBE), Claudia Uhde-Stone (Biological Sciences)

**Members Absent:** Lonny Brooks (Communication),

**Guests:** Lindsay McCrea (Associate Director of Semester Conversion), Mark Robinson (Assistant to the Academic Senate Coordinator), Sophie Rollins (Academic Senate Coordinator), Mitch Watnik (Statistics and Biostatistics), Jim Zavagno (Facilities)

1. **Approval of the agenda, amended by adding item e to Business items**  
   MSP Glass, Bickley

2. **Approval of 2016Feb24 minutes as amended**  
   MSP Katzman, Guo

3. **Reports**

   **Report of the Chair**

   Mangold reports: Jim Zavagno has been invited to the Academic Senate and answered questions regarding the classroom renovation project. One of the main questions was why the $10 Mio went to classroom renovations, rather than to other potential needs. He also answered many questions regarding the renovation itself.

   Cornelius reports: currently taking a look at financial projections, debt, and enrollment target. We will know what we can expect for this campus in regard to Budget for next fiscal year in May (typically 2nd week in May).

   **Report of Semester Conversion (Lindsay McCrea)**

   Mar 11 will be a Stirring Committee meeting. On agenda: brief review of phase 2 of semester conversion; budget information with consultants; degree audit timeline; presentation by Mitch Watnik regarding time modules.

   GE student learning outcomes signed by President; outcomes have been approved, but President noted some concerns.

   Guo: what does the term “concern” mean? Does it need to go back?  
   Glass: No, the outcomes have been approved, but the President noted “for the record” that there are concerns regarding financial issues. GE relies on certain amount of writing, which will have financial implications.
Glass is currently making edits on GE proposal developments that will be available as early as this Friday.

SLOs for overlays are now in second phase of feedback

Curriculog will go “dark” for maintenance Mar 21-23. This time will be used to make some user-friendly adjustment to the system
Glass: when will people be informed about the downtime? Some faculty may want to use the break to work on Curriculog.
McCrea: will follow up to ensure that e-mail informing faculty about the Curriculog downtime goes out.

4. Appointment:
Mangold asks:
• 1 COBRA member to Faculty Workload Task Force
  o Guo volunteers
• 1 COBRA member to Space Advisory Committee
  o Mangold volunteers

5. Business Items:
a. Academic Affairs budget presentation (Provost Carolyn Nelson and Director of Academic Affairs Budget and Communications Audrey Katzman)

Nelson, Katzman:
Let us talk about the budget, and how much money each College received. Current year, all segments received more, but more students came with that. This is required by state, if we get more money, we are required to take more students. Potential problem if we get over-target, we are not getting any funding from the state for over-target students.

The diagrams are similar to those seen at previous presentations, but the current diagram show the net-numbers of higher ed-fees. Displaying the numbers this way makes it more obvious that general fund appropriation is very similar to the fraction coming from student fees.

Costs; we see that biggest allocation (~1/3) goes to “Central University wide”; of this, benefits takes about 70%.
$690 000 for CO Student Success Initiative
other (small) allocations include phone, postage
Nelson: centralized allocation for postage, telephone etc. makes it easier for Department Chairs; don’t need to track all telephone costs etc.
Cornelius agrees, they switched to this model 5 years ago.

Question about the term “cost-recovery”. Explanation: Cost-recovery refers to shared services, e.g. Accounts and Finances lends services for housing; internal services result in internal back and forth billing.

Another pie chart shows allocation to various colleges, library.
Colleges are funded stateside via a model that takes into account instruction; looks at APR data (who teaches classes).

Mangold: are these allocations mainly based on previous budget?
Cornelius: yes; starting with base-allocation based on previous budget; when enrollment numbers come in: incremental increases

Mangold: what if new faculty gets hired
Katzman: to some degree this can be handled by re-allocation of budget (some off-set e.g. more faculty means less lecturers).
Nelson: the way the model was developed: when you hire tenure-track lecturers, you should be hiring less lecturers. In reality, new faculty will not teach a full workload
Katzman: in year 2, this will be confounded, because new faculty gets second year release time; some creativity is required to make it work.
Mangold: who makes the decision how much money should be allocated to faculty hire, Provost?
Nelson: I make the request
Mangold: who decides on the “targets”
Nelson: Chancellor Office gives targets to Academic Affairs; phone call

Last slide: Actuals – Academic Affairs
Katzman distributes hand-outs and explains that she tries to educate everybody on the nuances of Academic Affairs State Funding

Guo: if incremental allocation model is based on last year’s budget, what happens if there is extra money? Does it get allocated proportionally to all divisions?
Cornelius: No, most increases are earmarked; e.g. if increase for enrollment results in extra money, that money goes mainly to Academic Affairs.

Glass: are all FTES (Full-Time Equivalent Students) units equal?
Nelson: used to be; previous Provost implemented a model in which FTES for graduate students are 12 units, for undergraduate students 15 units.
Glass: FTES and FTEF, are those weighted units? What can I do as chair to understand how to get those numbers (counting units doesn’t seem to match the official numbers). This would be helpful information to know e.g. what it means to increase class sizes
Nelson: FTES and FTEF data is generated by People Soft.

b. Time Modules models presentation (Mitch Watnik)
Watnik explains: Task force on setting up a class time scheduling system.
Class scheduling will change, as classes move from 4 to mainly 3 unit classes.
Facts to consider:
- convenient schedule for students
- flexibility for different unit courses
- improved classroom utilization
- minimum of 10 min passing period between classes

We have a great need for more classrooms, but rooms are under-utilized on some days (Friday, Saturday). Solution: encourage more Friday classes.
All models can take 12 units after 4 pm; some after 6 pm.
Models 1 and 2 call for a “University Hour”, when no lectures are scheduled (though activities, labs might)
Model Highlights:

Model 1:
- similar time modules for M, W and Tu, Th;
- includes University Time where no lectures are scheduled (3:15 – 4:00 M-Th)
- does not allow for 4-unit classes at prime time
- flexible evening patterns

Model 2:
- similar 3-unit time modules M-Th for consistency
- no University Hour
- does not allow for 4-unit courses M/W 10-2
- flexible evening patterns

Model 3
- 3 unit courses only T/Th or M/W/F
- aligns class start and end times for easier scheduling
- no University Hour

Model 4:
- most flexible
- All varieties allowed M/W, T/Th, M/W/F
- University Hour T/Th 12-1 (labs exempt)

Note: some universities with flexible schedules may put additional restraints on, such as “your department can only teach 50% of classes at prime time”.

Guo: which of these models provides maximal capacity?
Watnik: Engineering has modeled number of classes that can be accomplished. However, in that modeling, 4-unit classes got penalized. Watnik suggested new modeling based on “class time spent”; results are not yet available.
Katzman: at this time, we don’t know how many unit classes we’ll have, just estimates
Watnik: current estimate of 75% 3-unit; 25 units 4-unit classes
Katzman, Watnik: need to look at impact on parking as well
Glass: what is the drawback of flexibility?
Katzman: not as easy of a scheduling model for students and faculty

Watnik, Katzman: please put your comments on stickers
Mangold: or review time modules online
and make comments to task force

Salazar Leung: Recommendation what classrooms should get prioritized; tried to develop criteria that make sense and are objective

Methodology:
Classroom list:
Hayward Campus: 88
Concord Campus: 21

Criteria-Based Matrix, highest factor is 1=Highest Priority
• Utilization (combination of number of hours used and seats taken)
  o (>100 = 1, below 50=4)
  Mangold: where do most of our classes fall?
  Katzman: between 2 and 4
• Renovation impact (how long it will take)
  o 1 quarter=1
  o all year=3
• Building age
  o Science 1963= 1
  o Valley Business Center new, 2006=6
• Classroom type count
  o Medium=1
  o Large=2
  o Small=3
• Class room count in Building
  o The more class rooms in a building, the higher priority, e.g. Meiklejohn: 1

Tyler: the Colleges could give you some considerations, and those priorities would be very different. Instead of using the suggested scoring method, you should ask Colleges directly
Carpenter: how much money is planned for this?
Salazar Leung: about $35 Mio
Tyler: How much did we get?
Salazar Leung: $10 Mio
Carpenter: are the ranking scores weighted?
Salazar Leung: No; just added priority score; utilization category is used as a tie-breaker
Tyler: we need to find a solution that can improve the campus with the given money
Carpenter: I’d like to know what rooms are most dysfunctional
Glass: possibly spending the money on improving many classrooms a little, instead of spending all that money on very few room
Guo: possibly using a different prioritization model; we have to come up with some kind of criteria, but the "subjective needs" have to be factored in as well
In current model, some criteria should be weighted differently to be fair
Tyler: don’t overspend on one class rooms; consider what you can do with $10 Mio, not with $35 Mio that we don’t have
Zavagno: these can be 2 separate exercises; focus on a few classrooms for thorough renovation, but also look into improving many classrooms a little.
Carpenter suggests “worst classroom contest”.
Katzman: we know the faculty that taught in certain classrooms; figure out what questions to ask, then target people who teach in that class room.
Carpenter: but consider constrains (e.g. can’t knock down walls)

6. Adjournment
MSP Glass, Uhde-Stone

Respectfully submitted,
Claudia Uhde-Stone
2016, Mar 9