CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Approved Minutes

Date: 4/9/14

Members Present: David Bowen (Science), Lonny J. Aui Brooks (CLASS), Dennis Chester (CLASS), Monique Cornelius (Budget, Presidential Appointee), Ardella Dailey (CEAS), Ching-Lih Jan (CBE), Audrey Katzman (Academic Affairs, Presidential Appointee), Nancy Mangold (CBE, COBRA Chair), Aline Soules (Library), Paulina Van (Science), Nancy White (CEAS)

Guests: Endre Branstad (Academic Senate), Sophie Rollins (Academic Senate), Mitch Watnik (Academic Senate), Brad Wells (Administration and Finance), Jim Zavagno (Facilities)

1. Approval of the Agenda
   a. MS: White, Soules. Agenda approved as revised, with the addition of wording about DCIE.

2. Approval of Minutes
   a. MS: Soules, Jan. Meeting minutes from 3/12/14 were approved.


6. New Business
   a. 13-14 COBRA 4: Consultation of Faculty on Building Development and Use. Brad Wells and Jim Zavagno described the Capital Outlay Program. The Academic Master Plan was developed by faculty and approved in 2008, and is the foundation of the Physical Master Plan. Both plans are part of the Capital Outlay Program. The Physical Master Plan has been tied up in litigation since 2009 due to environmental concerns.

   The Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 2014/15-2018/19 includes projects that are approved but not yet funded. Some of the projects listed include:
   i. Warren Hall Replacement Building (the only project funded at this time, about 100 million)
   ii. Library Renovation for seismic purposes
   iii. STEM Education Building
   iv. Corporation Yard Renovation
   v. Arts and Education Renovation
   vi. Meiklejohn Renovation
   vii. PE Field House Renovation
   viii. University Theatre/Robinson Hall Renovation

   Faculty offices are prescribed (defined) by arithmetic formulas based on full-time equivalents (one full time work station is 110 feet). Users of spaces should be involved in facility design, especially for meeting rooms and other non-academic spaces. Faculty members are being involved too late in the process (Soules, Chester). Colleges and Deans were involved early in the planning process for the new faculty office building (Wells). Re-evaluation of the formula needs to occur (Soules).

   The formulas are set by the Department of Finance (Wells). If CSUEB took over responsibility for capital funding, we could be relieved from some formulas, assuming no
G.O. Bonds are used. Some flexibility could occur as early as this year depending on negotiations.

Generating new space is a function of enrollment and formulas. CSUEB has more square footage in inventory now than is provided in the funding formulas, there is low utilization of the facilities. More students, about 18,000 and higher utilization (evening and weekend classes) are needed to justify new space. Seismic and renovation projects are realistically all we can qualify for. Roof replacements, renovations and general repairs which maintain the design purpose are not counted in the Capital Outlay Plan.

Repurposing of old buildings presents an opportunity to get classrooms upgraded to meet current requirements. Dailey stated that it is frustrating for faculty that the formulas are not department based, but are based on the State. Locks or restrictions on use of the new faculty office building (no space for lecturers) caused her department to decide to stay in the old building. There needs to be a consistent method for faculty to provide input throughout the planning and construction process.

The CSU Capital Outlay Plan incorporates and prioritizes projects for all campuses. Warren Hall is number seven on the list; the Library is twenty-four.

Four years is the average time frame for completion of new capital outlay projects. The steps (some occurring concurrently) involved in the process include:

i. Consult with the Chancellor’s Office (2 months)
ii. Initial budget developed using cost guides (1 month)
iii. Written justification prepared (1 month)
iv. Conduct Feasibility Study, hire a consultant (3 months, campus pays 50,000-300,000)
v. CA Environmental Quality Act (8 months)
vi. Select design firm and contractor (2 months)
vii. Prepare schematic design (3 months)
viii. Obtain Board of Trustees approval (3 months)
ix. Prepare preliminary plans (3 months)
x. Prepare construction documents (3 months)
xi. Construction (3 months)

What is the best time for faculty involvement and consultation? It may be too early during consultation with the Chancellor’s Office, as consultations occur frequently and the projects don’t always happen. In the written justification stage programmatic arguments are made based on uses (office space, meeting rooms), specifics are not yet available. A good check in point for faculty is the schematic design stage.

The plan for the Arts and Education Renovation needs to start now, although the project is not yet funded. Moves across campus due to opening of the new faculty office building will require renovations of old buildings. AE will not be taken offline for renovations, so careful planning is important. A committee like COBRA, or a sub-committee with campus wide representation could participate in the facility planning process during the AE Renovation process to test how faculty involvement could be formalized (Wells).

A needs assessment is being conducted now for Meikeljohn classrooms. A feasibility study needs to be done as well. The renovation process could take 1-2 years so the plan needs to be based on future projections, not current teaching practices.

b. 13-14 COBRA 5: Addressing Large Classroom Issues
   i. High priority should be given to renovating existing large classrooms to support collaborative learning.
ii. Future designs or redesigns of classrooms should be done with appropriate faculty consultation during the preliminary planning stages. COBRA would recommend suitable faculty to participate in the process.

Zavagno stated the need for representative faculty input and consensus on problems in the classroom to move forward. The ideal is developing flexible space to get the best possible solution for the most people (Wells). There are five large classrooms on the CSUEB campus. Classroom assignment is based primarily on the number of students enrolled. Mega-sections (large classes) change the type of classroom needed. Pedagogy involving group activities and more interactive teaching methods also change classroom requirements.

Van stated that there are many common threads across departments for classroom requirements for mega-sections, with one hundred and twenty or more students. Student interaction is hampered by screens only in the front of the classroom, fixed seating and sloped floors. Wells discussed the value of focus groups with students enrolled in mega-sections in terms of planning to find out what worked well and what challenges were faced. COBRA could suggest students to participate.

Katzman feels that the discussion brought up by Bridget Ford about large classrooms in Meiklejohn gives COBRA a chance to set the stage for faculty consultation. The situation provides a vehicle by which COBRA can provide recommendations for faculty input, which is a good thing. Mangold stated that Wells and other administrators like getting input from faculty so having a mechanism to make that happen will be useful.

Soules will rewrite 13-14 COBRA 4 and 5.

c. Access to MOUs – the draft was discussed and finalized.

Currently, more than forty degree and certificate programs in a variety of industries and fields are offered by University Extension. COBRA understands that MOUs are entered into by University Extension and departments and colleges for certain program offerings. These MOUs include arrangements for the sharing of net revenue generated.

COBRA recommends that University Extension provide the MOU and an academic year-end financial report of program activity to the Dean, Associate Dean, Department Chair, and Program Director of any University Extension program that is under their purview. Additional interim financial reports should be provided upon request.

d. 13-14 COBRA 7: Summary Report to the Senate on the University Expenses and Revenues Report through 12/31/13 by VP Brad Wells. Mangold took a great deal of time to make colors consistent for various expenses and revenues in pie charts throughout the Summary Report. Numbers are being double-checked by Katzman and Cornelius. MS: Jan, White. Approved.

7. Adjournment
   a. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00 p.m.