**AY2023-2024 Budget and Planning Committee Meeting Minutes**

Thursday, April 04, 2024

10:00-11:30 AM

BDC 134A-Conference Room

1. **Call to order – 10:08**

**Attendees:** A. Grombly (acting chair), J. Florez, V. Kirkbride, R. Dugan, C. Eicher, A. Bianchi, S. Marks, D. Alamillo, N. Hayes (ex-officio), A. Hegde (ex-officio), J. Rodriguez (ex-officio)

**Absent:** D. Wu (Chair), I. Pesco

1. **Approval of Minutes**
   * 1. March 14, 2024 – no changes
        1. Motion to approve – V. Kirkbride
        2. Second – R. Dugan
        3. Motion passed
2. **Announcements**
   * + - A. Hegde reminds committee that Senate EC needs first readings by next committee, only two more meetings in the academic year.
3. **Approval of Agenda – No changes**
   * 1. Motion to approve – J. Florez
     2. Second – S. Marks
     3. Motion passed
4. **Old Business**
   1. 2023-2024 Referral 26 New Department Proposal\_Public Health\_AAC BPC FAC (discussed first)

* A. Grombley – Public Health sent responses including position control commitment from Provost Rodriguez and faculty advising; asks BPC to focus on reviewing proposal and responses for next meeting.
  1. 2023-2024 Referral 33 Academic Prioritization – AAC and BPC (discussed second)
     + - A. Grombely reviewed 1971 memo and timeline given by Chancellor’s office deadline (May 10).
       - A. Hegde - Encourages BPC committee response sent to EC by next meeting so EC can have first reading of proposal.
       - Provost Rodriguez – Suggests BPC invites AVP Jackson to the next meeting (April 18); reminds BPC that May 10th deadline to the CO is external and out of the university’s control.
       - A. Grombley – Would like to have preliminary edits in place when AVP Jackson attends; highlights questions that came up while reviewing referral – What else do we need in the policy (from 1971 memo)? Does the current policy still apply? Do we need a new policy? What principles and values should guide this? What data do we need? What criteria should be used?
       - A Hegde – Suggests that exceptions be built into the policy - How do we assess exceptions? How do we assess impact on community?
       - R. Dugan – How this will be different from university program review?
       - A. Hegde – Senate passed a policy that outlines what will happen if a program does not complete program review – if a program does not complete the review the UPRC can go to the Provost to complete the program themselves (as a committee). Thinks it is important that this committee decides how often, the self-study is too long (seven years), maybe instead of that it could be 3 years; suggests that it can be left up to the department.
       - C. Eicher – Why not leave it up to the regular schedule of program self-study?; A. Hegde informed committee that administration felt that it should be more often; maybe Academic Programs would run the report – they would collect the data and then ask the program to provide a report on the issue.
       - Provost Rodriguez – This policy is not program review; there are different policies on program review and program discontinuation. There is existing policy that can be regularly implemented, the new referral is to think about what we already do and what we are not doing to provide policy for the administration to implement; 7 years may be too long and there may not be a current alignment of program review cycles and discontinuation policy. Suggests looking at the criteria/policies we need to think about in whatever cycle we are working on so that we are guided by policy rather than administrative fiat; current and previous administration want to continue to work in the spirit of shared governance to guide us.
       - A. Grombley – The current policy does not provide a timeline, but it should be rarely used. Current policy says that it cannot be used for short-term financial woes, suggests look at current policy of program review – perhaps trend of three or four years because it is enough time to see a trend and to make changes if necessary (we need to establish a timeline).
       - A. Hedge - We can use the ideas listed in the document but leaving it broader will make it easier to adapt in the future.
* A. Grombley – Recommendations from 2012 task force should be kept, but also need we need more IRPA data (FTES, SFR, FTEF), per capita spending per FTES – what is the cost of instruction (including staff lines, equipment, spaces, etc.); need to define what we are discussing when we talk about money/space.
* V. Kirkbride – What model does the university operate under? We are not there yet – don’t have the data yet.
* A. Hegde – What triggers this process? Recommends keeping it broad so we can define them later.
* A. Grombley – Graduates? Do we want to focus on graduates each year? How many people in a cohort? What to do about programs where students take longer to graduate? New programs? When we speak with AVP Jackson, we also need to craft a memo asking IRPA for more information to facilitate this process.
* R. Dugan – What does success in scholarship mean? A. Grombley – there is software. A. Hegde – Activity Insight, but not all schools are using it. Scholarly communications – Library usually does it – no centralized scholarly communication arm. Potential equity discussion. – Why success in scholarship, instead of just scholarship?
* A. Hegde – Small programs do not always have time.
* S. Marks – We are a teaching university, should take precedence; we need x amount of quantitative, x number of qualitative factors to rationalize program/department work.
* Provost Rodriguez – More about how we define faculty success will be shared later, faculty success is intertwined with student success.
* A. Grombley – Will work with Chair Wu to make changes before next meeting; will send out notes via email.
  1. 2023-2024 Referral 11 – Academic Administrators Search & Screening - Handbook change

No Action.

* 1. 2023-2024 Referral 31 Need for an Academic Testing Center

No Action.

* 1. 2023-2024 Referral 36 Faculty Hiring Prioritization- Position Control – BPC

No Action.

1. **Joint Meeting with FAC (Time Certain: 11am)**

Dezember Leadership Development Center, Room 409-411 Aera Combo Room

* + - M. Rush (FAC) – A. Jacobson (FAC) put together both committee’s edits; moving through general policy of hiring outside firm to help with search committee for administrators. FAC and BPC took different approaches; FAC small edits to document; BPC added a new section.
    - A. Grombley – Then-provost Harper and HR were not willing to cede power to engage search firm at the onset, standard contract determined before search committee formed; we do not have access to search firm intellectual property.
    - M. Rush (FAC) – Asks what level the decision is made to engage the search firm?
      * A. Hegde – This was the problem. We wanted faculty to be more involved. The contract is set through the Chancellor’s office – Our challenge is to see how we can limit the search firm’s involvement to avoid influence of the firm; we have no say in the contract and search firm selection.
    - A. Grombley – In a regular search committee, they would draft the position description; in a search firm, position description is already drafted and provided to firm, this narrows faculty influence. BPC’s recommendations wanted to limit administrative and search firm involvement in faculty deliberations of the final candidates.
    - Question from FAC – Is there only one search firm? A. Grombley – Provost Harper suggested that there is one that is typically contracted, not all administrative positions use search firms.
    - M. Rush (FAC) – In her experience on administrative search, committee felt that search firm was listening only to the provost. Can faculty committee at least be involved in the process?
    - M. Rees (FAC) – Have other CSUs raised this issues? (directed to A. Hegde)
    - A. Hegde – We use it more than other campuses our size; larger campuses use the search firm more often.
    - A. Grombley – Perhaps we need to see the contract before drafting the resolution?
    - M. Rush (FAC) – In favor of a search firm can search nationally with valuable information. Her experience was that she did have names of references. Would have been informative for faculty search committee to know the parameters before beginning.
    - Suggests looking at last paragraph that FAC edited of the faculty handbook.
    - Z. Zenko (FAC) – In what ways is point c. of 309.12 (of revised Faculty Handook section by FAC) problematic? For whom? If we approve it, and the EC approves it, then the President should approve or reject it and provide some rationale for it.
    - A. Jacobson (FAC) – We are faculty, and we should propose what is best for the faculty.
    - A. Hegde – Our job is to put the language in that we agree with, if the president does not sign it then we can always revisit it.
    - D. Alamillo – Asks if the faculty for the search committee are decided when the search firm is contracted?; A. Grombley – No. Search firms on are retainer, that decision is made before the search committee is formed and does not have control at that point.
    - M. Rush (FAC) – Applicants’ references are checked by the Provost.
    - V. Kirkbride – Are the same questions asked of the references?
      * A. Jacobson (FAC) – FAC made edits to affect the personnel choices prior to the search committee (appointing officers).
      * A. Grombley – There will be certain issues since the decision to contract the search firm is outside the control of the faculty.

M. Rush will keep track of changes and send over to BPC to see it; will contact BPC chair and put together memo.

1. **Open Forum**

No Action.

1. **Adjourn – 11:35**
   * 1. Motion to approve – M. Rees (FAC)
     2. Second – M. Rush (FAC)
     3. Motion passed