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Matters Reported to the Senate: Seven proposals were submitted to URC; all were approved. What follows is a list of those proposals:

* Discontinuance proposal for one option in the Bachelor of Arts in Kinesiology: Elementary School Physical Education. This proposal, submitted by the Department of Kinesiology and the College of Health and Human Services, was reviewed and approved at our Meeting #3 held on October 7, 2008.
* New proposal for Master of Arts Degree in Education: Option in Mathematics Education. This proposal, submitted by the Department of Teacher Education, was reviewed and approved at our Meeting #7 held on December 2, 2008.
* New proposal for Bachelor of Arts Degree in Liberal Arts. This proposal, submitted by the College of Liberal Arts, was reviewed and approved at our Meeting #8 held on February 3, 2009.
* Program change proposal and degree option title change: Master of Arts in Education, option in Social and Cultural Analysis of Education. This proposal, submitted by the Department of Advanced Studies in Education and Counseling in the College of Education, was reviewed and approved at our Meeting #10 held on March 3, 2009.
* Proposal for a name change from the Department of Nursing to the *School of Nursing*. This proposal, submitted by the Department of Nursing in the College of Health and Human Services, was reviewed and approved at our Meeting #12 held on April 7, 2009.
* Proposal to elevate an existing option in Athletic Training to a Bachelor of Science in Athletic Training. This proposal, submitted by the Department of Kinesiology in the College of Health and Human Service, was reviewed and approved at our Meeting #13 held on April 21, 2009.
* Discontinuance proposal for the Civil Engineer Degree Program. This discontinuance proposal, submitted by the Department of Civil Engineering/Construction Engineering Management and the College of Engineering, was reviewed and approved at our Meeting #14 held on May 5, 2009.

Other Actions taken by the Committee/Council:

* URC established three separate task forces in Fall 2008 to examine, review, and evaluate three important institutions/practices: (1) tenure-track density and hiring, (2) University Research, and (3) University Foundation. A series of recommendations, unanimously approved by URC, resulted from each task force. Those recommendations (and rationales) were sent on April 21, 2009 to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for further action.
* URC examined existing online forms for program proposals and decided to revise the forms to meet the demands of the kinds of issues important to our mission. Four forms resulted: (1) Program Name Change Proposal, (2) Program Discontinuance Proposal, (3) Program Revision Proposal, and (4) New Program Proposal.

Unfinished Business:

* Program Proposal forms are currently being formatted into Excel. Upon completion of this process, the forms will be sent to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and posted online for future use. URC will revisit the forms after AY 2009-10 to determine the effectiveness and utility of these revisions.
* Because the use of “task forces” was new to the Council this year, the new council will want to re-examine the process to determine how to proceed. At the organizational business meeting of May 19, 2009, AY 2009-10 members argued in favor of the task force model, indicating that it provided more opportunities for council members to interact, learn, and examine issues in greater depth. Members further agreed that the task forces should focus more directly on the university budget, seeking a greater role in budget planning and setting priorities. Specific goals and objectives for the 2009-10 task forces have yet to be determined.

Internal Proceedings/Discussion Occurred:

Presentation/Reports Received:

* Regular Task Force Reports: Task Force Committee Chairs and Members.
* Establishing Task Forces: Explaining the Process: URC Chair, Pat Kearney.
* Processing the RPP Report: AVP Ted Kadowaki.
* 2008-09 Budget Status and Preliminary Outlook for FY 2009-10: Provost Karen Gould and VP Mary Stephens.
* Tenure Track Density and Hiring: AVP Holly Harbinger & Vice Provost David Dowell.
* Enrollment Issues, Planning, and Projections: Vice Provost Dowell, AVP Enders, AVP Novack.
* Tenure Track Density: AVP Holly Harbinger and Vice Provost David Dowell.
* Economic Forecast and Budget Preview: Provost Karen Gould and VP Mary Stephens.
* Lottery Committee Hearings.
* University Research: AVP Jim Till.
* University Foundation: AVP Sharon Taylor, CFO Alan Ray, Assoc. Executive Director, Brian Nowlin.
* Lottery Report.

Miscellaneous:

Issues/Recommendations to the Academic Senate: (see Appendices A, B, and C)

**Appendix A**

**Task Force #1: CSULB Tenure Track Density and Reporting of Faculty Statistics**

The University Resources Council (URC) established a task force in Fall 2008 to examine issues of tenure-track density and reporting of relevant faculty statistics. What follows is a rationale and set of recommendations resulting from our research and deliberations voted upon and passed unanimously by the council.

Whereas, in 2001, the Legislature of the State of California recognized the need to increase tenure track density to 75% to maintain quality educational programs when it adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 73 (ACR-73); and

Whereas, in 2002, the California State University Office of the Chancellor, the CSU Statewide Academic Senate, and the California Faculty Association collaboratively responded to ACR-73 with a detailed plan to achieve 75% tenure density over eight years; be it therefore

Whereas, the tenure track density figures on our campus have been steadily declining in recent years, falling from 60% FTEF in 2002 to 57% in 2007, and dropping from a headcount calculated tenure track density of 43% to 41% over the same period (Source: CSU PIMS Database); and

Whereas, this decrease in tenure track density, if allowed to continue, could seriously compromise our ability to achieve the mission and vision of the university, namely, to be a “teaching intensive, research driven” university that graduates students with “highly valued degrees;” and

Whereas, this decrease in tenure track density has further possible negative consequences, including but not limited to diminishing university commitments to global and local engagement, undermining our campus’s progress in the areas of student success and faculty diversity, and weakening academic freedom; and

Resolved, that the University Resources Council of California State University, Long Beach, recommends that a joint Task Force made up of representatives from Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate undertake a thorough investigation into the implications of our campus’s decrease in tenure track density; and be it further

Resolved, that this joint Task Force determine standardized measures for tenure track density, including the collection, analysis, and use of such disaggregated data by rank, by college, by race, and by gender, on the CSULB campus; and be it further

Resolved, that this joint Task Force be charged to evaluate potential retirements and voluntary separations in the coming years in order to determine realistic tenure track density goals, and these goals’ implications for faculty diversity and student success; and be it further

Resolved, that this data, constituting both historical trends over the past ten years, comparing our campus with system-wide data, along with the Task Force’s recommendations for future action, be made available in an easy to read format on the Institutional Research webpage; and be it finally

Resolved, that this resolution be sent to the Academic Senate of California State University, Long Beach, for full deliberation.

**Appendix B**

**Task Force #2: University Research**

The University Resources Council (URC) established a taskforce in Fall 2008 to examine two aspects of University Research: The Office of University Research (OUR) and Research Infrastructure. What follows is a set of recommendations and rationale resulting from our research and deliberations voted upon and passed unanimously by the council.

**Office of University Research**

**Recommendation 1:** We recommend that OUR conduct a needs assessment with each of the colleges regarding pre-award support, Institutional Review Board (IRB), and OUR and college interactions. Results of this needs assessment might indicate the following:

* 1. OUR might be restructured to have an office manager,
	2. Colleges might have a person to help with pre-award budgeting and post-award fiscal management,
	3. Colleges might have IRB expert to assist faculty in IRB process,
	4. Associate deans of research and directors of development might meet regularly with the Associate Vice President (AVP) for Research and External Support

Rationale: It is a goal of OUR to increase the number of faculty applying for and receiving grants. Currently about 20% of faculty apply for grants and the success rate is about 40-60%, resulting in ~10-12% of faculty on campus having funded grants. It is likely that due to both budget constraints and the change in new faculty hires that the percent of faculty who apply for external funding will increase. The number of grants submitted and the grant funding sources vary considerably by college.

At present the time to processes a grant through OUR at preaward is highly variable. The time required from “first contact” (the nature and timing of which varies) to actual grant submission is influenced by a large number of factors. Among these factors are the unique requirements of the granting agency, complexity of the budget, availability/responsiveness of the PI, availability/responsiveness of clearance officials, number of grants “in the processing queue” and looming, firm deadlines for other submissions. The pre-award staff often must function in a triage mode because of unforeseen delays in the processing or inadequate lead-time. However, for the amount of grants and contracts currently being processed there is enough staff to manage the workload.

IRB applications have been steady over the course of several years. There is a Director of Research Compliance who is 25% time and enough staff in the office for the workload demands. The amount of time to have an IRB application approved varies considerably by the nature of the research being conducted. The IRB committee is comprised of 12 faculty which is enough people but issues arise in time to respond (supposed to be 10 days) and there is not time for the board to calibrate.

**Research Infrastructure**

Research infrastructure may be defined as **t**he tools, services, and installations needed for the research community to function and for the researchers to do their work. Categories include library research services, hardware, software, technical support and research space.

**Recommendation 1:** Research is an integral component of undergraduate and graduate education. We call for the creation of a fixed infrastructure budget to support the cost of up-keep, repair, and replacement of research instrumentation, including instrument technicians.

Rationale: The hardware and software needs necessary to perform research at a level that supports the education of students and is viable for eternal funding demands instrumentation and equipment at the cutting edge of technology. Such equipment or software packages generally have functional requirements beyond those required of their basic teaching counterpart. The funds to support acquisition of such resources are provided through Group II monies connected to new or renovated buildings, new faculty start-up funds, research grants written by faculty, operating and expense budgets, lottery funds, and SCAC awards. Most of these funding sources are one-time offerings that do not support future maintenance, repair, or replacement.

In general, but particularly in tight budget periods, the large course activities take precedence and support for up-keep, repair, and replacement of research instrumentation and equipment, which impact a smaller number of students often takes a back seat. This lack of dedicated support for the research component of the mission hinders the progress of scholarly activities. Lacking a dedicated research instrumentation infrastructure budget leaves departments and colleges scrambling to identify immediately available funding to repair or replace instruments that need repair.

Major research instrumentation holdings, while facilitating productive research programs, can become significant drains on faculty time and research funds. To allow faculty to focus on their most important responsibilities of teaching and research, it is critical that they not be overly distracted by other duties. It is most often time for research that is eroded when additional duties must be added to a full schedule. It is not in the best interest of the university, therefore, to have faculty devoting time to peripheral functions such as routine instrument maintenance. Shielding faculty from these time-intensive duties requires support staff to fill roles that do not require faculty expertise. There is a need to earmark operating funds for instrument maintenance and repairs as well as to support instrument technicians.

**Recommendation 2:** Research is an integral component of undergraduate education. We recommend a call for the revision of the CSU State University Administrative Manual resource allocation formula to include research space for undergraduate students and faculty where appropriate.

**Recommendation 3:** Recognizing the changing realities of research infrastructure, we recommend a call for the revision of the CSU State University Administrative Manual resource allocation formula for research space for graduate students.

Rationale: In many undergraduate and graduate degree programs scholarly activity is a required component of the student’s education. This requirement is often mandated by the professional societies who certify the curriculum of the department’s graduates.

In spite of the recognition of research as a component of faculty responsibility, and the importance of providing a suitable learning environment only provides research space for graduate students. It does not allocate research space for faculty or undergraduate research students. Given the importance (and in some cases, the requirement) that undergraduate students participate in scholarly activity as a component of their education, such an oversight handicaps the university as it undertakes its mandate.

A lack of research space presents a significant impediment in departments where such space is at a premium. A shortage of research space influences decisions to replace tenure-track faculty or what research specialties will be sought in faculty hires. Pressure for space creates competition between faculty as “less research productive faculty” are forced into less adequate spaces. Shortages of space and other resources make it more difficult to keep research productive faculty members.

**Appendix C**

**Task Force #3: University Foundation**

The University Resources Council (URC) established a task force in Fall 2008 to examine public-access documents regarding the CSULB Foundation. The taskforce also examined library archiving procedures for such documents. Below are two recommendations based on the findings of this URC task force. In general, both recommendations are designed to improve the flow of information from the Foundation to the campus community, including the URC. What follows is a set of recommendations and rationale resulting from our research and deliberations voted upon and passed unanimously by the council.

**1. The URC recommends that the Academic Senate Representative to the Foundation Board of Directors be available to provide information to the URC on a regular basis.** This can be accomplished in one of several ways:

1a. Ideally, the Academic Senate Representative would be a member of the URC and thus, be available to provide information during URC meetings after each Foundation quarterly meeting.

1b. If not, the URC recommends that the Academic Senate Representative be invited to a URC meeting once each semester.

1c. If both 1a and 1b become impractical, the URC shall designate one of its own members to attend the Foundation quarterly meetings. If so, it is critical that the URC member(s) who attend(s) receive a printed copy of all public-access materials and reports presented during that meeting (i.e., the Bates-stamped tabbed supplemental materials, which in recent years have been provided in white binders). The appropriate Foundation personnel should be notified in advance so that the materials are available on the day of the meeting.

**2. The URC recommends that a strong link between the Foundation and the University Archives (University Library) be maintained.** Specifically, the URC recommends that the University Archives should regularly receive (a) minutes and all public-access materials from the quarterly Foundation Board of Directors meetings (i.e., the Bates-stamped tabbed supplemental materials, which in recent years have been provided in white binders), (b) a copy of the Annual Report, and (c) a copy of the annual audited financial statements.

2a. A review of the University Archives collection on the Foundation (currently Box 23 = Auxiliary, housed in the Library’s lower level compact storage) shows variability in regard to what materials are available from year-to-year.

2b. The URC recommends that University Archives (University Library) be maintained on the Foundation’s distribution list. For electronic material, the University Archives could be cc: However there is not a separate email address at this time for University Archives and would need to be sent to kfrench@csulb.edu.

2c. The URC recommends that if the Foundation prefers to be the archive center for their public documents that a plan be established for their archive procedures (if there is not one currently).