

Budget and Planning Committee Minutes

Academic Senate, CSU, Bakersfield

Thursday, October 13, 2022

10:00-11:30 AM

In-Person and ZOOM

I. **Call to order** – 10 AM by Chair Charles Lam

Present: Andrea Anderson, Amanda Grombly, Vernon Harper (ex officio), Natasha Hayes (ex officio, for Thom Davis), Aaron Hegde (ex officio), Luis Hernandez, Jackie Kegley, Charles Lam (Chair), Ilaria Pesco, Tracey Salisbury, Adam Sawyer, Carson Vollmer, and Di Wu.

II. **Approval of Minutes & Agenda**

1. Minutes from September 29, 2022

Motion: J. Kegley. A. Anderson second. Approved.

2. Agenda – approved.

III. **New Business**

1. **Budget Book and Budget Forum**

C. Lam shared the Budget Book. The group was able to review the university's base budget, net operating budget, and 22-23 Budget Calendar. BPC's input is important so that the information we need to make decisions is reflected.

BPC asked for additional documentation on the monies received from the state – this year GI 2025 (included in the base budget), AB 1460 funds (included in the base budget), Operating Reserves, and General CSU system financial status were added.

T. Salisbury let the group know that the information in the budget book was incorrect.

- The money was not supposed to be used for salaries but for the setup of the department.
- A. Hegde and A. Grombly suggested that these questions be brought to V. Harper for a breakdown.
- N. Hayes reminded the group that these are recurring funds and CSUB would receive \$672,000 every year.
- V. Harper said that these slides should be accurate and asked N. Hayes to check on the numbers presented.
- T. Salisbury asked for the Budget Office to provide her an accurate spreadsheet of the budget and expenditures.

C. Lam reviewed CSUB's operating reserves and showed us how they were in comparison to like institutions. It is a strategic goal to increase our reserves and BPC should make recommendations on ways we can increase our reserves.

Chapter 7 shows the Faculty profile.

- The charts show that tenure density has been decreasing not only at CSUB but CSU wide for the past 10 years.
- BPC will ask T. Davis the number of tenure track positions are in position control.
- A. Sawyer asked what the budget priority is for CSUB – MPP or tenure track faculty.

- A. Hegde explained that Academic Senate is pushing for tenure density in order to add permanent tenure track lines to base budget/position control. V. Harper has committed that in Academic Affairs that for every MPP added, a tenure track faculty line will be added. A. Hegde suggested that maybe there should be a Senate resolution asking each Division Vice President to come up with metrics of how they would expand positions.
- A. Sawyer said that some agreed upon metrics would be good because it would be more transparent and allow the university to balance priorities.

N. Hayes went through the slides for the budget forum and solicited questions in advance from BPC.

- C. Lam pointed out that the Governor's budget does not cover the salary increases for both staff and faculty.
- A. Grombly asked for a breakdown of CARES and HERF funding – what high impact practices did we pay to support? N. Hayes let us know that the CSU received an extension to use the funds by June 2023. Once the spending is complete, they will work to finalize the documentation for the campus.

IV. Old Business

1. 2021-22 Referral 02 – Department Formation Criteria – FAC Suggestions

FAC and AAC have looked at our recommendations and would like to find a compromise. Here is what they have come back to us with:

- AAC would like the policy to have more control and our suggestions were asking for a bit more leniency.
 - Suggestion 1 – II B 1. Faculty Composition
 - New departments are required to have a minimum of three tenured faculty assigned to their unit whether through appointment, joint appointment or MOU in order to document that they will be able to fully carry out the hiring and performance review of the department
 - BPC suggestion was that it is highly recommended instead of required
 - The other suggestion has to do with the language that we crossed out about if the proposal fails to receive approval at any level, the proposal shall not proceed to the next level of review. If the group wanted to resubmit the proposal, they would have to go back to the beginning.
 - FAC suggested this compromise language – If the proposal fails to receive approval at any level, the proposal shall not proceed to the next level of review. In this case, the proposers may choose to revise and resubmit to the level which did not give approval. Any revisions of a proposal shall be forwarded to the previous levels of review; these levels have the option of sending a memo to the Academic Senate with comments on the revisions.
 - The change is that the proposers would not need to start over from the beginning but could resubmit to the level that did not approve them.
 - A. Grombly is willing to support this because it doesn't require proposers to start over. She is still worried thought that this language would create a terminal loop for proposals.
 - A. Hegde said that this compromise language is an end around and we will end up in the same situation as we were before if it is just a matter of notification, then the previous levels don't need to be notified until the final proposal is done. Under their revisions, the Senate could get involved and send it back to other levels. The Senate shouldn't be involved until it comes to the Senate for final approval.

- I. Pesco and A. Sawyer are concerned that both of these revisions are putting up institutional barriers to departments forming and could make it difficult for any new department to form. This compromise language is not flexible enough. There must be other ways to get department business done without limiting newly forming departments.
- A. Grombly mentioned that CSUB has a lot of junior faculty that are excited with new ideas and energy. If they aren't able to convince tenured faculty to work with them, the idea will go nowhere.
- J. Kegley said that the compromise language is so restrictive that we will never have new departments form. This has no flexibility.
- T. Salisbury mentioned that these revisions are deeply short sighted and feels like it is directed at Ethnic Studies. It shows that people still don't understand why we should have an Ethnic Studies on campus.
- A. Hegde can we change the language from assigned to affiliated faculty through an MOU.
- C. Lam is going to go back to FAC and suggest that we change the work from assigned to affiliated faculty. J. Kegley agreed.
- A. Hegde on III B – the Senate should not get involved with this proposal until the proposal has finally made it to the full senate. Then once it is at the Senate, no one else can interfere.
- C. Lam – what if we remove the last line that “these levels have the option of sending a memo to the Academic Senate with comments on the revisions.” J. Kegley and A. Grombly supported removing that line.
- C. Lam will bring these suggestions to Mandy Rees and see what FAC and AAC say. The group approves suggestions.

Meeting adjourned at: 11:30.

Minutes submitted by Ilaria Pesco 10/26/22