

FY 20 Academic Affairs Budget Narrative

The CSU is in the process of examining the issue of tenure-density across the system. This includes efforts to establish a standard definition for tenure-density, developing a new metric for calculating tenure density (FTES/FTEF), disseminating campus and system data on an annual basis, and using this information to secure resources to better serve CSU students. Campuses have been asked to develop campus-specific tenure density plans based on the needs and resources of the campus.

To this end, the division of Academic Affairs is submitting its budget request with attention to various cost drivers that affect the division, their relationship to the question of tenure density and our capability to meet our GI2025 goals as these pertain to retention and graduation rates. One of the most obvious factors affecting tenure-density is rapid enrollment growth. Over the past five years, enrollment has grown by about 25%. It is no secret that, system wide, enrollment funding has not kept pace with enrollment growth and CSUCI is not exempt from the impact of this growth. However, in response to enrollment growth, CSUCI has also hired a significant number of new tenure-track faculty (between 2015 -2018, CSUCI increased the number of TT faculty by about 28%). Despite the growth in TT hiring, a recent report from the Chancellor's Office shows CSUCI has the lowest tenure density in the system. How do we account for and respond to this? Our budget request will represent a commitment to improving tenure-density and efficient use of precious resources, always prioritizing student success.

While growth in FTES continues to be a challenge to be met, there are other cost drivers that significantly affect tenure-density on our campus. These include reassigned time, low-enrolled and under-enrolled classes, and inefficiencies in planning and scheduling of classes. To date, there has been little fiscal control over how reassigned time has been authorized, tracked, and distributed. This should not surprise us as there has never been a formal process in place that outlines the conditions under which reassigned time should be issued or if, in fact, there are resources to backing the amount of release time issued.

As a general rule, when TT faculty are reassigned from instructional responsibilities, NTT faculty must be hired to meet the staffing needs of classes, leading to an increased dependence on NTT faculty. According to the CBA, all TT faculty have a 15 unit/semester workload, but 3

units/semester are understood to be service units (Table 1). In other words, each TT faculty member has a 24 unit/year teaching workload and a 6 unit/year service workload.

Table 1*

	Chair	New TTF	FERP	Recurring
TTF Total Base Workload	30	30	30	30
Service Time	6	6	6	6
Two Year CBA Release Time	0	6	0	0
Annuitant Workload Adjustment	0	0	12	0
Release Time	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Maximum Instructional Capacity	12	18	12	24
Instructional Capacity % of Total Workload	40%	60%	40%	80%

* www.calfac.org

There are, of course, exceptions to this expectation across departments and disciplines. For example, accreditation requirements lead to lower teaching loads in the nursing program. New TT faculty received a collectively-bargained reduction in teaching assignment for their first two years. Thus, actual teaching loads may vary from program to program. Some of this is expected and needs to be part of our fiscal planning. But quite a lot of reassigned time that is absorbed by Academic Affairs has not been planned or budgeted for. The Provost office has begun to actively manage and fund a generous amount of reassigned time starting with the FY 2020 budget cycle. An allocation will be provided to each school for this purpose. The Dean will be given flexibility as to how this resource is distributed across faculty lines.

In addition, release time policy and procedures are being developed and will be implemented, in consultation with the Deans and Faculty Affairs, at the start of AY 2019/20. These guidelines will inspire greater accountability and oversight of reassigned time.

Other factors also affect our tenure-density and the ability of our students to make progress toward graduation. As a point of comparison we look toward our sister-campus, Monterey Bay. The point of comparison is to look at a campus that shares some similar characteristics with CSUCI (it would not make sense, for example, to look to CSUSD which has little in common with CI except that we are both part of the CSU system!). CSUMB is also a relatively new campus, enrolling about 600 more FTES than does CSUCI. Though they have

more students than we do, they have fewer faculty (TT & NTT combined) and yet have a significantly higher tenure density. How to understand this? One reason is that more of their TT faculty are in the classroom.

CSUMB also practices efficient scheduling and staffing of classes. For example, in 2018, CSUMB had an enrollment of 7065 FTES. They served these students with a compliment of 250 FTEF. Their SFR was 28.3:1; their average class size was 27.4; they offered 64 small classes, and served their student's needs with 670 unique classes. In comparison, in the same year CSUCI had an enrollment of 6424 FTES (641 fewer students). Our SFR was 21:1, our average class size was 25.2; we taught 114 small classes, and we offered 771 unique courses (100 more courses than did CSUMB). This all costs us money—money that could be used to hire additional TT faculty, support faculty and student research, and high-impact practices that contribute to student success. As a campus, we need to begin to be more strategic in our approach to building schedules, staffing classes, and managing enrollment. **We do not have to replicate what CSUMB does, but we can learn from them.** The information outlined above, along with other comparable information, can be found [here](#).

As we constructed the Academic Affairs Budget Request for this year, we paid attention to the priorities that were identified in our new planning process. We consulted with the Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Committee who reviewed and ranked the budget requests submitted by the division and sought out comment and feedback from the Academic Affairs community. We looked within our own budget to reallocate resources to support priorities and identified one-time dollars that could be used to support immediate and short-term priorities.

We are committed to good stewardship of our resources, careful planning for the future, and transparent and collaborative processes that will guide the division. We continue to allocate resources

Here is a **preliminary** list of items funded by both the Institution and Academic Affairs:

Permanent new resources:

- 4 new TT faculty lines
- 3 new Academic Advisors
- 1 Graduation Advisor
- 1 Financial Aid Specialist
- Convert PT dollars to TT faculty lines for 12 new faculty hires over 3 years

Temporary new resources:

- Provost's Travel pool for TTF
- Enrollment growth contingency fund to support additional sections **over target** to meet student need

Reallocation of existing permanent Divisional resources:

- SRI Staffing
- Early Childhood Studies Support Staff
- Curriculum and Articulation Systems Analyst

Temporary reallocations from Divisional resources:

- Articulation and Catalog Consultant
- Education Advisory Board Student Mgmt Tool
- Financial Aid Software Inflation
- Student System Document Processor (ASAll)
- Library Digital Infrastructure
- Student Assistants- Graduate Center
- Dir of Student Success and Community Engagement
- RSP - Annual Subscription Services: SPIN, GRC, CITI, Triple8 - TOTAL
- Writing Multiliteracy Center ISA Peer Tutors and Student Assistance.
- UNIV Student Research
- Learning Resource Center Students
- Center for Community Engagement – Service Learning Mgmt System