

Budget and Planning Committee Agenda

Thursday, April 13th, 2023
10:00 –11:00 AM

Zoom

In attendance:

Present: C, Lam (chair), N. Hayes (ex-officio, for Thom Davis), A. Terrones Anderson, A. Sawyer, I. Pesco, J. Kegley, C. Vollmer, L. Hernandez, T. Salisbury, D. Wu.

I. Call to order

Meeting called to order by Chair Lam at 10:05

II. Approval of Minutes

1. Minutes from March 23rd, 2023

Item deferred to next meeting.

III. Introductions / Announcements

IV. Approval of Agenda

Kegley motions for approval, motion seconded by Terrones Anderson.
Approved by majority of Committee.

V. New Business

1. SEEC Feedback

Review of document by Chair Lam. Emphasizing the proposal now is to elevate four schools to colleges with no other structural, personnel changes. or new costs. This proposal by SEEC Committee is being made after various listening sessions with University stakeholders.

Discussion:

J. Kegley ask for clarification of rationale for the elevation of Schools.
Chair Lam reviews benefits bullet points from documents as well as concerns raised by stakeholders.

J. Kegley notes that elevation is “basically a name change,” but expresses concern about the possible impact on AV.

I. Pesco expresses support for proposal on grounds that it will align CSUB better to the structure of the rest of the CSU. Also, in response to J. Kegley's concern about AV, I. Pesco notes that other CSUs with College system have successfully navigated issue of satellite campuses.

D. Wu notes that it would be useful to have more details about the concerns of stakeholders as it would allow the Committee to better evaluate the gravity of concern.

A. Sawyer notes the support of this elevation among the Educator Preparation Programs (EPP) of SSE (ie. Department of Teacher Education, Advanced Education, Liberal Studies etc.) as it will create structure by which to create eventual School of Education and provide the infrastructure needed to better support the curricular and accreditation needs of our EPPs and also be more consistent with structure of most CSUs which almost uniformly have separate Schools or Colleges of Education.

In response to D. Wu's request for more information on concerns put forth by stakeholders, C. Lam reviews qualitative comments from Qualtrics survey of stakeholders (Faculty N=19, staff N=9, students N=9, MPPs N=4)

I. Pesco notes that SEEC met with ASI and there was general support for elevation. C. Vollmer adds student support based upon alignment with rest of CSU, possibility to add more programs, potential attractiveness to donors.

C. Lam notes that our feedback will be compiled with that of other standing committees to put together eventual resolution on School Elevation.

I. **Old Business**

a. Referral 01 – Time Blocks and Space Utilization

C. Lam reviews new mockup of potential time blocks and asks for feedback. No feedback is provided but C. Lam offers opportunity to email him before he sends memo in the coming week to Senate Executive Committee with new proposal.

II. **New Business**

a. Referral 27 – Standing Committee – Bylaws Change Section IV

C. Lam summarizes that the question before us is whether we require that candidates for Standing Committee Chair write letter of interest and

whether to require two years of senate membership as a prerequisite. In addition, do we enforce term limits?

D. Wu expresses general support for statement of interest with caveat that materials be very limited. Does not see need for term limits because everyone terms out of Senate after six years anyway.

J. Kegley expresses that candidates for Standing Committee Chair should have at least one or two years of experience in Senate and experience on committee and that letter of interest should be required. Concurs with D. Wu that there is no need to enforce term limits.

T. Salisbury notes that it should be easier for junior faculty to serve on Standing Committees and that Chairs (and members) also receive diversity training. Notes that big decisions made overwhelmingly by senior faculty with great impact on junior faculty and lecturers. Emphasizes the importance of ensuring that committee members and leaders are more “in-touch” with the experiences of students and junior faculty.

C. Lam voices support for term limits and diversity training.

J. Kegley concurs with Lam on term limits and with T. Salisbury in regards to it being easier for junior faculty to serve on Senate.

D. Wu notes that we may want to include language that also provides possibilities for exceptions to any new by-law rules.

C. Lam notes that any additional comments be made before Tuesday, 4/18 meeting of Senate Executive Committee.

b. Referral 30 – Election Attempt Limit – Revert to Appointment – Handbook Change

C. Lam notes emphasis on reversion to University-wide position if after four calls are made for a school-specific position.

D. Wu asks how widespread this issue is.

I. Pesco asks whether there is mechanism to address issues with Schools if there is a pattern of not being able to fill committees. Expresses concerns of impact on representation if certain school-specific positions not filled. Lam mentions a case of a School in past where this was issue and that it required Dean to conduct outreach to departments.

T. Salisbury concurs with I. Pesco about the need for representation and also the need to mentor junior faculty about opportunities to serve on

Senate Standing Committees and the responsibility of faculty to participate in Shared Governance.

C. Lam concurs with T. Salisbury and mentions lack of participation historically in Shared Governance at CSUB, but there also being an uptick in recent years in those running for Senate.

D. Wu concurs with need for faculty participation but also voices concerns about tenure-process for tenure-track faculty if overcommitted or pressured to serve on committees.

T. Salisbury notes that everyone is busy and that the true disincentive for junior faculty participation is fear of retaliation by senior faculty for decisions made. Also notes “atmosphere” problem on some committees including lack of diversity within certain committees that might also be depressing participation from junior faculty.

T. Salisbury and J. Kegley note preference to find ways to encourage participation rather than reversion to appointments as recommended by this referral.

T. Salisbury, J. Kegley, and D. Wu remark that four calls is excessive and can delay filling of important roles. D. Wu and T. Salisbury propose two calls as better limit.

C. Lam agrees to propose language of two call limit and pass that on to the Senate Executive Committee.

c. Referral 31 – Academic Administrator Search and Screening Handbook Change

C. Lam shares that the added language is about the process for adding search firm and specific responsibilities of search firm. For example, should search firm be involved in deliberations?

D. Wu notes danger of putting overly burdensome constraints on search firm in terms of the firm agreeing to provide this service. Suggests consultation with HR experts to ensure our language strikes the right balance.

C. Lam proposes tabling of referral to next Committee term so as to gather additional input Human Resources. No opposition expressed by Committee in taking this step.

III. **Open Forum**

No items brought forward by Standing Committee members.

IV. **Adjourn**

J. Kegley moves to adjourn; motion seconded by D. Wu. Approved by Committee at 11:24am.