Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 16, 2010

Members present: Jennifer Eagan, Denise Fleming, Susan Gubernat, Mike Mahoney, Jim Mitchell, Asha Rao, Jeff Seitz, Tammie Simmons-Mosley, Dianne Rush Woods

Members absent: Mo Qayoumi

Guests: Jagdish Agrawal, Cal Caplan, Linda Dobb, Toni Fogarty, Jiansheng Guo, James Houpis, Jim Murphy, Sue Opp, Carol Reese, Gretchen Reevy, Terri Swartz, Donna Wiley

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Mitchell/Seitz) to approve the agenda

The Chair greeted the committee and today’s meeting will focus on the budget.

2. Approval of the minutes of October 12, October 26, and November 2, 2010.

M/S/P (Fleming/Mitchell) to approve the October 12 and October 26 minutes as presented.

Minutes of November 2 not yet available

3. Reports

   A. Report of the Chair

   The Chair stated that she would like to see continued community building. This can involve efforts to reach out to faculty, establish a place to eat lunch, and other mechanisms. Woods won a raffle (the prize was for guitar playing) and will host a gathering for faculty.

   B. Report of the President

   None

   C. Report of the Provost

   Houpis reported on CSUEB’s involvement in the Promise Neighborhoods project, an initiative which is based on the Harlem Children’s Hour, which was established by Jeffrey Canada. There were 900 letters of intent and 300 submitted full proposals. Our proposal (focusing on the Jackson triangle) and submitted in collaboration with HUSD and 16 other partners, was one of only 21 planning grants that were funded. Of the 21 funded proposals, only three were west of the Rocky Mountains—ours and two in Los Angeles. In addition, we are the only CSU with an accepted proposal, so we should be proud.

   Susan Rodearmel (KIN) has assumed the Lead Investigator position, since Nan Maxwell’s departure. Houpis and Rodearmel attended meetings here and on Capitol Hill; the Provost stated that he was proud of Rodearmel’s poise. A proposal for a full implementation grant is due in May. Funding may be challenging now that the House of Representatives has a Republican majority.

   Houpis stated that higher education has come under fire for being too internally focused and not adequately engaged with communities; this project is a good start. He advocated an RPT focus that includes values linked to community service and collaboration. As an institution, we need to
have a call to service in our youth; service learning should be apart of GE. The Promise Neighborhoods group believes that service learning should be more that “the icing on the cake.”

The Chair thanked Nan Maxwell and the Hire Center for their efforts. Woods stated that when she first came to CSUEB, she was involved in south Hayward, working with La Familia.

D. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

No Report

4. Appointments

M/S/P (Fleming/Mitchell) to approve YanYan Zhou to replace Mitch Watnik on the Senate during the Winter 11.

M/S/P (Eagen/Mitchell) to approve email confirmation of Steve Peng to replace Steve Ugbah on CAPR for Fall 10.

5. Academic Affairs Budget Presentation for 2010-11 (Houpis)

The Chair stated that she had requested that Deborah Brothwell present to ExCom on the 10-11 university budget, but given recent changes, including several changes in the enrollment target, the budget was not ready in time for a presentation.

Provost Houpis introduced the Academic Affairs budget model. He stated that after another meeting in December, there should be some additional clarity and a more concrete sense of available budget amounts. He added that there may still be a mid-year decision to cut funds since the state has a $6-8B deficit, which could reach up to $20B.

For purposes of this presentation, the funding model was discussed, rather than exact amounts in each category of the budget. The previous model included amounts from grants and contracts to fund courses. The Provost pulled those funds out of this model because we cannot rely on soft money for consistent, structural expenditures. In terms of funding, he stated that we want to fund costs as if there were not assigned time; otherwise parts of grants, etc., would be funded at lecturer replacement cost. For example, leaving grants out of the equation means that SCI netted $780K, so that goes into the college budget to be used for strategic services instead of being used to pay basic costs. That presents an incentive in the colleges to compete for grants. In essence, this model has nothing strategic about it; rather, it is primarily a fair way of allocating resources.

Salary costs were obtained from HR and corrected for non-furlough year. Tenure, tenure-track, and FERP data came from PEMSA, as they keep track of FTEF and FTES. This means that it is important for the deans to get the numbers correctly. This model adds all tenure track WTUs across a unit, then divides by 36 to get number of FTEs for faculty. Lecturer costs are calculated by the quarter, so these are based on 15 units per quarter, or 45 units for the year. Full time lecturer teaches 15 units per quarter, 12 if they have some assigned time as part of their load. Chairs costs are broken out separately.

Once the model is in place, different sections and different course parameters will be funded in different ways. For example, SCI has not been coding classes properly; labs were not being included. For CLASS and SCI, there is a need to look at lecturers, studios, labs, and activities courses to see if activities are coded correctly as each is funded differently. Similarly, grad research space and non-instructional space numbers were not accurate and will need to be adjusted. The Provost urged all not to list TBD on the schedule as this will result in a loss of credit for course space. Also, he noted that a lot of work is being done as independent study and mentoring; he has asked the deans to create a number of courses with names such as “mentored research” or “mentored study” so as to provide allocations for space.

In coming years, we will need to do some hiring. New faculty cost more than lecturers, although this also varies by discipline. For example, new faculty cost more in Business. The average salary will trail by a year. We need to set salaries in a fair way.
Non-salary instructional cost parameters are estimates only. The Provost noted that the Chancellor’s Office requires a certain number of non-residents be enrolled at each campus.

The Provost emphasized that this model is “the first shot”; there will be mistakes and adjustments will need to be made to correct cases of overfunding and/or underfunding. The amplitude between the overages/underages should reduce each year as we fine tune.

Discussion and questions ensued regarding how the model is related to class size (still looking at the ratio), the proportion of tenure track faculty to lecturers. A drop in classroom workload should allow faculty to engage in more scholarship. We need to have a conversation about efficiency and productivity; the latter involves retention rates. The CO is concerned with target numbers as opposed to SFRs. Chairs and deans need to discuss how they will make target.

There are competing important interests, e.g., classroom size, out of classroom learning, other structural activities. Over the last five years, SCI tripled SFR.

The Provost stated that space was the biggest surprise for him during this process and that there is a lot at stake there. We also have a great deal of deferred maintenance and a need to continue to work on making the plant appealing. There are high clerical staff costs in CLASS—are all of these positions needed? Are there other priorities?

Certain departments will have higher OEs than others. Each department should be able to articulate what they need and why; everybody wants to be fair. There will not be a one-time slush fund in the Provost’s office; also, no side-deals through the Provost’s office.

Instructional and Research Equipment: suggests discussing how the money will be distributed via chair discussion; colleges should refresh their aging disciplinary equipment. That’s more than computers to take into account.

Will hold money at provost level for cross college equipment (university level)

The impact of implementing this model is that there will be more funding for Academic Affairs; other divisions are aware of this and are supportive. There will be an amount allocated (e.g., $70 per major) to determine the funding for majors. Allocations of about $800 per FTE TT for professional development will yield about a $250K in funding in additional allocations to Faculty Development.

Assessment plays a central role in understanding how well we do our job. Sharon Green will be working with Opp part time on assessment and to help develop a culture of assessment. The funding model will provide release time for designated personnel working on assessment in the colleges. Teacher Performance Assessments (CEAS) and accreditation will be funded by the Provost’s office. Income from the Ed.D. program (CEAS) was overestimated.

Deans will be held to the budget numbers that will come out of this process. Out of respect for shared governance, you will not publish anything until it goes through UPBAC and shared gov has run its course. It appears that there was no enrollment management in CLASS last year. There is no separate funding for GE. Concord costs run $8.5M; this includes the library APGS, Carol Rees, and other operations at Concord. The generation of FTES for Concord goes through the colleges.

Woods and all thanked the Provost for his presentation. Woods stated that at ExCom’s retreat, we set a priority on transparency and staying apprised of budget issues. Houpis expects additional feedback on the model from his presentation to CÔBRA.

6. Adjournment

M/S/P (Gubernat/Fleming) to adjourn at 4:06

Respectfully submitted,
Denise Fleming, Secretary