COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

4/10/2019 APPROVED MINUTES

Members present: Kevin Callahan (Math), Paul Carpenter (Kinesiology), Chris Chamberlain (Hospitality, Tourism, and Recreation), Ayona Chatterjee (Statistics & Biostatistics), Jiansheng Guo (CLASS), Nancy Mangold (CBE, COBRA Chair), Kim Shima (Accounting & Finance), Yung-I Liu (Communication), Rafael Hernandez (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Administration, Presidential Appointee)

Members absent: Monique Cornelius (University Budget Director, Presidential Appointee), Kyzyl Fenno-Smith (Library)

Guests: Michael Lee (Academic Senate Chair)

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P Guo/Chamberlain/P

2. Approval of 3/27/19 minutes
   M/S/P Chamberlain/Liu/P

3. Reports
   a. Report of the Chair
      Chair Mangold reported on the April 9th submission of COBRA 3: Update on CORE Building Project, which was accepted by the Senate.

   b. Report of the Presidential appointee
      1. Rafael Hernandez, Associate Provost for Academic Resources and Planning, reported that the A2E2 Cmte is going to begin it’s work for next year.
      2. Paul Carpenter asked about enrollment projections for next year. Rafael Hernandez said that the current numbers look to be 5.1% (FTES) below the CA resident goal for the current year. Next year is influenced by this semester’s new enrollments, which may have a positive impact. Therefore, the projection for next year is only off by 1% (FTES). Rafael thinks that EB can still reach its resident targets, though that may not be easy. The student unit load for last Fall was very low. Under Quarters, most classes were 4 units, so it was easy to count FTES.
Now, with various units for classes, it’s not so easy. This Spring had a much higher student unit load as compared to Fall. That said, head count went down in Spring but FTES went up, which is a good sign. The Administration is seeking to get back on track for the college level target as soon as possible. The projection was that each year, post conversion to semesters, EB would gain back 1.5% of its FTES count, but that may be too low for the needs of the university.

3. There is a concerted effort to improve our student centered processes, such as financial aid and advising, in order to encourage students to stay. Chair Mangold said that our application process is very complicated. She has to manually move the graduate admission applications along in order to ensure that students actually get accepted in a reasonable amount of time. In her opinion, the university should do a better job at admitting students.

4. Old Business:
   a. 18-19 COBRA 4: COBRA Concerns and Recommendations on Exceptional Effort Awards (referred back from Senate 3/19)
      i. Clean
      ii. With edits

   Chair Mangold reported that after receiving feedback from the Senate, some edits were made to the document. She corrected information about the source of funding for the EE Awards and complemented recipient departments for their hard work. She removed a number of “concerns” and shortened the language. In the recommendations section, she said that in the future, COBRA should receive feedback from recipient departments for their input. COBRA can summarize effective efforts that recipient departments have made in order to disperse that information to other departments.

   Jiansheng Guo suggested that in addition to “achievement” awards, money could also be given to programs that do have high DFW rates in order to help them improve over time.

   Paul Carpenter pointed out that the current award criteria does not take into account the lack of student preparation and its negative impact on DFW rates. In addition, the Administration aggregates data for a department, across all courses, where the DFW rate may vary greatly from course to course. He’d also like to see the connection between DFW rates and graduation rates. Paul will make some additional edits and recirculated for final approval.
5. Business:
   a. Basis for **GI 2025 fund allocation** and **COBRA recommendations**

In discussing COBRA recommendations for GI2025 fund allocation, Paul Carpenter suggested a clearer separation between allocations for “ongoing projects” versus “one-off” or “pilot” projects. Chair Mangold suggested that the distinction may already be clear enough.

Paul also suggested that mid and final evaluations should be done for funded projects in order to assess whether they are on track and to see if they should continue to receive funds. This can be done as part of the assessment to confirm that monies being spent are in line with legislative goals.

Chair Mangold suggested that allocated funds should be tied closely to the Principles and Priorities, but that can be difficult, because money is given to university units and not “Principles and Priorities.”

Jiansheng Guo would like to see a very brief description of the goals and methods of each funded project. Currently, we just see a project title, which doesn’t give a clear sense of what each project is actually doing and how it plans to directly help the students. Yung-I Liu agreed that the project titles are very difficult to interpret.

Chair Mangold reminded the Committee of the 6 Pillars: academic preparation; enrollment management; student engagement and well-being; financial support; data-driven decision-making; and academic barriers.

Rafael Hernandez said that as the Provost was making the allocations, close attention was paid to the principles and that the detailed proposals, which were submitted to the Provost’s Office could be shared with COBRA.

Jiansheng Guo suggested that we are spending money to solve a problem without really knowing what the problem is. The University should first conduct a thorough study in order to determine the most significant issues facing the university. Then, the university would be in a better position to prioritize how money should be spend in order to create the biggest impact.

Rafael Hernandez agreed that the university could have a better snapshot of what the pillars look like at this campus.

Chair Mangold agreed that COBRA should include a statement that CSUEB should do an analysis of the underlying issues surrounding graduation rates and the pillars. Also, instead of looking to allocate and spend all of the money at once, funds could be allocated in phases over time. She reiterated her frustration with both the application and the graduation processes for academic programs. This is a huge problem that should be addressed first. COBRA should recommend that the administration focus on 2 or 3 big issues first, instead of dealing with everything at once. The university needs to prioritize.

Chair Mangold reminded COBRA that we’re working on recommendations for the allocation process for 2019-20 monies. Rafael Hernandez pointed out that 2018-19 money is still being dispersed and that some of those projects are still
starting up. The administration needs the principles in place for the 2019-20 allocation. There will be an additional $1.4 million for 2019-20.

Chair Mangold pointed out that COBRA’s 2019-20 recommendations will basically be the same as the 2018-19 recommendations with some items being stressed. Because we haven’t received any data on the success of the 2018-19 projects, COBRA won’t be able to adjust its recommendations. For example, COBRA recommended that CSUEB allocates one time funding to undertake a comprehensive needs analysis and gaps assessment on the issues and problems related to graduation rates. COBRA continues to recommend this as a top priority of how the money should be spent. But, Chair Mangold doesn’t see any needs analysis being funded in the 2018-19 cycle.

Jiansheng Guo agreed that the university really needs to find the few key issues that can have the biggest impact and fund those in particular. This might be short term funding and CSUEB is going to be assessed for its results as part of GI2025. Ayona Chaterjee said that the university should not only perform a Needs Analysis but also an Impact Analysis. Chair Mangold suggested that Institutional Research should be involved in this process.

Paul Carpenter suggested that the COBRA document contain a preamble stressing 3 broad principles: 1. fund those pillars where it has been identified that there are the greatest gaps and spending money would be most effective 2. Experiment with one-off and pilot programs to see what works 3. Conduct good periodic assessment to ensure that the projects are effective. Perhaps there could be a GI 2025 Office so that the various efforts are well coordinated.

Kim Shima expressed concern that graduation rates may be negatively impacted by students not handing in paperwork on time. Rafael Hernandez said that the university looks at the rates on a year by year basis, so this issue probably has little to no impact on the reported rates.

The Committee then looked through the current allocation to get a rough sense of how the monies had been allocated across the 6 Pillars, with enrollment management receiving the largest chunk followed by academic preparation and data-driven decision-making.

b. Request for feedback regarding defining/clarifying the AA process for resource allocation by Provost Inch will be taken up by COBRA at a later time.

6. Adjournment
   M/S/P Guo/Liu/P