

2024-2025 Academic Senate Minutes
October 14, 2024

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 2:14 p.m. after the senate group photo was taken. 42 Senators were present.

Ex Officio: Present: Curry, Lacson, Sasikumar, Van Selst, Rodan Absent:	HHS Representatives: Present: Baur, Chang, Sen Absent:
Administrative Representatives: Present: Del Casino, Faas, Teniente-Matson Absent: Dukes, Fuentes-Martin	COB Representatives: Present: Chen, Pruthi, Vogel Absent:
Deans / AVPs: Present: d'Alarcao, Kaufman, Meth, Shillington Absent:	EDUC Representatives: Present: Mathur, Munoz-Munoz Absent:
Students: Present: Gambarin, Joshi, Kehra, Nwokolo, Plazola, Sadawarti Absent: None	ENGR Representatives: Present: Elahi, Kao, Wong Absent: Sullivan-Green
Alumni Representative: Absent: Vacant	H&A Representatives: Present: Han, Frazier, Kataoka, Lee, Riley, Shojaei Absent:
Emeritus Representative: Present: Jochim Absent: None	SCI Representatives: Present: Heindl, Madura Absent: Shaffer, Muller
Honorary Representative: Present: Absent: Peter, Lessow-Hurley	SOS Representatives: Present: Buyco, Pinnell, Meniketti, Raman Absent: Hart
General Unit Representatives: Present: Flandez, Masegian, Pendyala Absent: Velarde	

II. Land Acknowledgement:

Senator Riley read the land acknowledgment.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes: None

IV. Communications and Questions

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Sasikumar's update featured the following:

- Acknowledging the death of past senator Peter Buzanski

- Recognizing that for the first time in many years, we have a full complement of senators from the College of Business. The newest senator is Dr. Sarika Pruthi from the College of Business.
- On Thursday at 3:30, there will be an informal get together for those who identify as international faculty. This meeting is the result of collaboration between one of the Senate committees—the Faculty Diversity Committee, and the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.

V. Executive Committee Report: None

V. Unfinished Business: None

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation): None

VII. Special Committee Reports:

A. University Budget Report by CFO and VP of Administration and Finance Charlie Faas

The town hall proceedings [September 26, 2024] are posted on our website, for those who did not have a chance to view or attend. This is my ninth year coming up here and doing the budget for everyone. This is about the spirit of transparency, spirit of shared governance. I have the honor and privilege of co-chairing the Budget Advisory Committee with Tabitha [Hart], who's not with us today. A whole group of really smart folks that are part of this Budget Advisory Committee is meeting a couple times a month now, and working on these issues. I appreciate what they have brought to the table. We've done three different town halls/ budget summits over the past 13 months. So I hope you've enjoyed those. I hope you've been part of those. And then lastly, one of the things that I've instituted here is I'm going to have office hours, the first Tuesday of each month up in Clark 540.

This year for the first time in five years, thanks to tremendous work that's gone on we get to this difficult spot of balancing our budget. Across the state, we continue to face lots of hard issues. The state budget that the governor has put together is fraught with issues and concerns, and it flows down to us. Recruitment for students is as competitive as ever. We are on the good side of that, but we need to continue to stay on the good side of that. And technology continues to rapidly change. Our campus is doing really well with any number of these things as we're addressing these challenges. These next 6 to 12 months, as we're getting ready for next year, are going to continue to be very challenging for all of us. The state budget, as I'm going to get into, is in play. And the governor has made some remarks that he is looking at reducing our budget, challenging us in different ways. It is unusual that the governor and the state legislature will lead with that so far in advance. But it gives us some headlights into where we're going here in the future.

The chart shows you by division going across all divisions, the dollars. And then on the bottom, the percentages over those two reductions that happened over the past two years. So the net version of this is Academic Affairs had about a 10% reduction to their budget. All the other divisions took about 16% as we went through. These reductions then enabled us to balance our budget and to have a break even budget.

This more traditional slide talks about revenues and then expenses. We're at \$482 million budget, general fund budget. It's a balance between revenues and expenses, about half (52%) of state appropriations that come in from the state of California for our budget. The other part is tuition. And

that tuition is driven by a tuition rate times an enrollment number. So there's a couple of different components there. On the expense side, three quarters, almost 80% of our budget is headcount driven. Again, no real changes here. This is pretty consistent. A couple of the numbers that have grown slightly over this past year are - the utilities number is up slightly and that's everyone seeing this in their homes with utility rates going up. And then financial aid is up as well. And that's because of the first year of our tuition increase. A chunk of that tuition increase goes into additional financial aid for our students. As part of our expenses, when we get the compact that we got this year from the governor, the governor says, and the CSU says there are certain things that you're gonna do with that compact money: we partially funded salary increases, benefits, health benefits, CAL-NAGPRA, NAGPRA, Title IX, Veterans Aid, and GI 2025 Student Success were all mandated expenses that came in with revenue. And they were part of our expense model here as well.

Similar to what you've seen in the past is the Pac-Man chart here, with the big blue being Academic Affairs, 64% of our operating budget for academic affairs. That is up slightly, maybe a point from 0.9, 0.8 from last year and that's mainly because of the slide I showed you before where Academic Affairs took a 10% reduction versus all the other divisions, taking about a 16% reduction. Everything else is more or less in line with what's in the past when this got printed, it got rounded. I'm not sure why, but the Academic Affairs 63.9 and then everybody's favorite Intercollegiate Athletics is actually 3.7 down year over year.

Looking at all funds, so 482 is what our general fund is, and that's mainly what we're talking about here. But I wanted to take a moment and look at the general fund versus all funds. And so the interesting things that have happened this year, growth wise, Housing and PACE, both up \$13 to \$14 million each. And that's great student facing revenue services that we're providing to our students in those growth areas. Also, what you see in the general fund is up about 18 million year over year. And that's after taking the \$35 million worth of reductions. And so there is added spending that's happening in our general fund as we go through things.

This is my one enrollment slide that kind of ties in enrollment numbers. Vin's probably going to get into this maybe a little bit later. But it talks about base enrollment numbers that are all FTE full time equivalents and what the base is, what the surplus is. The takeaway from this chart is a couple fold. One - this is the first year that we're getting reallocations from other campuses, when other campuses are not doing as well in enrollment. We lost about 100 on our nonresidents. That number is continuing to drop. We think it's leveled out, but we'll see as we go into the spring. But the real good, positive message that we need to take forward from this presentation and going into next year is we are over in enrollment. And that's we budgeted to be over 491 on top of the budgeted amount we planned to be over. We're another 472 over that amount as well. 103.5% of target rate numbers. That's the success. That's the positive part as we go into next year and how we balance our budget. Not just this year, but going into next year and into the future.

This is a chart that I put together that talks about CSU based funding. The things that happened this year are the 6% tuition increase and that continues for the next five years. This year we got the compact of 5%. The signals the governor has sent to us is that next year the compact is going to get deferred out to the following year. And the other signal was that there's going to be an 8% base budget cut next year. Almost every other state entity got that 8% cut this year. What the government was looking to do was give us, the CSU and the UC, the time to work on addressing that 8% cut (about \$25 million that comes in, a big number). When you have the 8% and you have the deferral, the compact, it's concerning.

From a CSU point of view, we had two things happen. One, this year is a \$75 million, one time reduction that cost us \$3.9 million. That's baked into our budget. There was headlights all spring

about that. So that's why it's not a surprise as we put our budget together. Next year, the compact for the CSU is \$250 million. The question is, are we going to be responsible for enacting the things that are in that compact, or is all of it going to get pushed? We don't know yet. So as we go into December, as we go into the spring, we'll know more about what that could be. The good news here is that in May, we didn't know we were going to get the compact. Through the advocacy of people in this room, some of our CFA representatives, CSU representatives, the Chancellor's Office, presidents going to Sacramento, we got the compact funded this year. We need that to happen again. We need that advocacy. We need those things to happen so that the state, the legislature, recognizes the value that we're providing as the California State University and making sure we get as much funding as we can get. So the ask from the board of trustees last month was not just the normal 5%.

If you watch the Board of Trustees meeting, the first three items on here, I'll say are mandatory expenses that they talked about: health care premiums, life, liability insurance, utilities, all those things are going up. And we have the funds to run our base business. Anything in the yellow here is TBD. We don't know where that's going to be yet. We don't know what the compensation is in any of these models.

This is my forecast. This is what the negotiations are going to be. I'm not part of this negotiation. That's all done at the Chancellor's office level with union representatives. So in these scenarios, if there is no compact in Charlie's world, there's a logical extension that there wouldn't be a salary increase. This happens to be 3% in this model. Again, these are my assumptions. Similar to this year, there's also some mandated funding items CAL NAGPRA or Title IX or those type of things that we're told to put into the budget if there's a compact. Whenever we have additional revenue, that is more students that we have to teach. There's money that's put into the plan that goes to Academic Affairs for that teaching that goes in here. And then also with that tuition increase, as the Board of Trustees promised, there's additional money that goes into the state university grant. So what this comes out to, if anybody can see the bottom bottom line down here, is it's about a \$10 million gap right now. That's about just over 2% of what our budget is. We have another 6 to 9 months to find out where the governor is going with these numbers, and to address where we're going with that \$10 million.

I wanted to look at some of the frequently asked questions that have come up in the town hall:

Was the \$35 million 6% reduction still required? Lots of people have asked, well, you got your compact funding, you got the tuition increase, you're over enrolled. Is the \$35 million cut still needed? This 35 million we knew about back in the spring. So there's no new news here. We needed to solve our structural deficit. As I talked to Ray [Buyco] at the last Senate meeting, we were partially funded the last two years for all the salary increases. So we got some money from the chancellor's office, 10 or \$11 million in each of those years. But there was a campus amount for every campus.

The salary increase is \$21 million and on top of that, the trustees put another \$5 million of health benefits. So we had \$26 million that's impacting our budget this year, but we only got funded for 15 of it from the Chancellor's office. So that's the 11 that we are writing ourselves out of our reserves, out of our operating funds. That's the reason for the 35 million.

One of the things that have come up many, many times is the different salary increases. I pulled these numbers right from the CSU website, I picked CFA, CSU EU, and MPPs. What this shows is different increases by those groups. MPPs and CSU EU starting in 18-19 mirrored each other. That's why you only see one gray line. So out of these ten, 11 years, one year of no salary increases. And that's you go across the board essentially for everybody.

Another way of looking at this, I picked \$75,000 just as a number to start the graphs with, and I said, let me lay on each of those increases by year because it matters when those increases are going. And so if I see increases going out over time, CFA essentially got over this 11 year period, 3.6% increases annually. If I annualized CSUEU slightly below that because they were a little staggered, a little bit behind 3.5 and MPPs were at 3-3.1. So these are numbers as they calculate here. And then I said, okay, everyone says what's happening here in the Bay area. It's so expensive to live here. And it is. But all of our raises are all negotiated down in Long Beach. They're all done on a system wide basis. They're not local. So if I look at national inflation over the same period, 3%. If I look at California 3.3. The numbers are moving up. They're all positive. 11 of 12 years of raises are happening. Those raises are consistent with inflation. As for the president's salary, if I go back to the Don Kassing days, if you take Don's salary and you string it up, it's 2.75% of what this president's salary has changed over the same time period.

So another one is affordability. This CalMatters chart shows that in the 1980s the state was paying for everything and the campus was only paying for a little. Then those numbers converge until you get to the Great Recession time. And then from that point in time, after that massive increase, that one year, the CSU didn't increase except for one year the tuition. And that's why you see this tuition drop as a percentage. It's dropping because the state numbers were holding or slightly growing. So now you get this convergence again. It's dangerous to be relying on the state. It's way better to be relying on enrollment and, you know, controlling our own destiny here.

So what do we do from here? How do we go forward? We need to optimize the things that are within our control. And so that's enrollment. That's being the best that we can be, teaching for our students and providing services for our students. We have four things that are really positive for us. We're done with structural deficits. We do have the increases coming in for tuition. We're one of eight campuses that are getting reallocation coming in. So we're going to see more money from those other campuses. And we're surpassing our enrollment targets. So all those are positive. The challenges here. We got our compact deferral and we have to see where that goes. And we have the governor's 8%.

Q: Who is the loan with?

A: It's from our reserves, our very, very limited reserves.

Q: Among out of state students, what is the proportion of international students and non-residents?

A: Vin and Andrew are getting into WUE and looking to change, so that we can get out of students rather than just relying on international students.

Q: What is the plan for shared services?

A: That is happening. [Chief of Staff] Shawn [Whalen] and [AVP of Finance and Business Services] Maureen [Pasag] are leading that work with Deloitte and NACUBO. They are scoping that out over the next two or so months going into December. And then the implementation will be after January.

Q: For 6% reduction, it probably means that we provide 6% less funding to those units, right? It doesn't mean that they really cut 6% of their expenses.

A: It is completely up to the division. You'll see in the budget book the amount that was targeted from each division, and how each division solved it.

Q: If you remove 6% funding, are they able to get funding from somewhere else to make up the most of the 6%?

A: We only have two revenue streams essentially - it's tuition or state funding. Those are the only two

inputs that come in. Anything that comes from the Tower or the Research foundation are not really impacting our general fund. So those cuts would have to happen within the divisions. I'm not sure where the revenue would be that would offset any of that. The only group that would have drawn funding out of some other place would have been Academic Affairs out of PACE.

Q: I appreciate the transparency of the data presented on your website. Has there been an attempt to gauge the climate on campus after the cuts and do people feel that they have the tools to understand the budget process?

A: Just about every area across the campus is feeling the pain from hiring at a slower pace. We are looking at releasing those various hires when the business case makes sense to release those hires.

Q: Are there surveys about how people feel about these effects?

A: There are some surveys. The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) has put out one or two of those surveys and we've tallied those results and the BAC reports back to the president what people are feeling.

We are the oldest CSU campus and we have some of the oldest infrastructure. In the budget report, you'll see a number close to \$1 billion worth of current deferred maintenance that we have on the campus. The CSU has gone to the governor in the past asking for money but we haven't gotten that money. And right now, we're not going to get that money for a while until the state comes out of its funk with the sales tax. And so we're going to have to continue to soldier on here for the next few years, at least with the infrastructure that we have.

Q: Can you tell us about the work with NVIDIA?

A: We're working with NVIDIA. It's more on the advancement side of things. We're trying to work with any number of our employers for our future graduates here.

Q: Where can I find more information about the asset classes that SJSU's fund is invested in?

A: It's not part of the general fund. It is part of the \$805 million. The Tower Foundation revenues, expenditures and what the endowment percentage is that they're paying out are all available to view in the budget book. We use a group called Beacon Point. We have north of \$200 million in our endowment. We have professional advisors plus our Tower Finance committee that's investing that money for us. The bulk of my presentation dealt with the General Fund which is distinct from this. You can find more information under the Tower Foundation page or contact me afterwards.

Q: I was waiting for someone to ask the Peter Buzanski/[Romey Sabalius](#) question. Peter led the charge for the Senate to endorse a resolution that the university should cap the expenditure on athletics at one percent. The administration was not willing to go that far. Under Don Kassing it was at 2.2% and now we are at 3.7%. So the university has decided to put much higher priority on athletics than it has in prior decades. The question is whether our athletics are more dependent on our student fees and general funds than other sources of funding such as ticket sales. Athletics' revenue stream is not going up. Why is self-support in athletics not increasing?

A: There are the three components of the Athletics budget - the general fund, the IRA fee, and the generated revenues, ticket sales, sponsorship sales going to that as well. Game guarantees is one of the things that was down \$700,000 year over year. We didn't play an away game against Michigan or Alabama or Texas this year, and those are the ones that write you a million and a half dollar check. We played smaller games against Washington State or Oregon State on the road, and those are

smaller paydays. And that's one of the reasons for the drop year over year. Everything else is relatively consistent in the generator revenue. We need to fundraise, without a doubt. Part of that is you have to win, you have to put on a good game day experience, you have to have integrity in your athletics. And I think Jeff is doing those things over the past few years. And so I think it's leading us down a path that we will be doing better. We've had this conversation before.

B. Academic Affairs Budget Report by Provost and Sr. VP of Academic Affairs Vincent Del Casino

Well, let me begin by saying a few thanks. I have to thank Heidi Wong, from our office, who's done a tremendous amount. And I have to thank Marco Antonio Cruz and Christian and Kyle from Institutional Research. None of this happens, without all the hard work of all the leaders on the campus. And that goes from our department chairs and all the way through, because you're going to see some big number changes in the divisional budget. And we're teaching all those students, and that takes a lot of work. So I just want to acknowledge that work.

So just to give you some context, what I've been trying to get us to think about in Academic Affairs is all the funds that we have. And when you add all those funds together, the budget that's managed within the division is about \$382 million. You'll notice, for example, a projection of \$ 71 million for this year from [Professional and Continuing Education] PACE. That includes reserves plus the money, revenue money that's projected from Charlie's budget. We get lottery money, the overall CSU ARP fund. This includes benefits and everything on one page.

Now this is driven, as Charlie mentioned, by enrollment and the enrollment change. What's interesting is we're the largest we've ever been. But the mix is different than when we were in 2021, or even back in 2019. But you can see where we hit over 37,000. We had 28,158 undergrads. This time around, we have 27,361 by headcount. We have slightly more graduate students, and we've grown in self-support. So when you look at the total student body, it's grown, but it's grown differently. And to be honest, for example, this is amazing. I'm really psyched about it. A lot of California residents, but as we know, graduate education is more expensive. Classes tend to be smaller and things like that.

This transition translates into a full time equivalent number. And I put down here what the total numbers come from how we get to that 103.5% of California enrollment. But basically we're just over 30,000 full time equivalent. What's important here is again, lower numbers of these are undergrads, but the average unit load has gone back up. So we have a smaller head count taking more classes, equating to more full time equivalents from a funding perspective from the California State University. That's a good thing for us financially, but it puts a burden on classes and other things like that.

What has been noted as well is an enrollment trend for non-residents, which hit its peak in 2022. But nonetheless, um, we've seen a decline in overall non-resident. This is just the stateside numbers. The self-support numbers are actually we have quite a few non-resident in self-support, but on the state side, we've seen this decline. This is fall. Spring is usually lower. That's why there's a decline potentially in non-resident enrollment.

So, if you take what Charlie did and just kind of graph it out, there's some interesting things going on here. This is our systemwide budgeted target. This is what we budget as a campus, which Charlie talked about earlier. And this is what we're projecting we're hitting. So overall those are really strong numbers for us. And as you can see two years ago that gap between what we budgeted and what we

actually hit was demonstrably large. So we've reversed the trend that we had seen a couple of years ago.

So we take those full time equivalent students and we distribute them to the colleges. And we've done that in two tranches. So we've distributed everything that was budgeted. So there's enrollment that's not budgeted yet because it's over. We actually distribute that in the spring. But you can see some of the deltas and as I've talked about and this is my sixth budget presentation here, that we move enrollment around depending on how colleges are doing. We hit about 55% of the overall target in fall, which is a strong number, which is why we're projecting a higher total.

So one of the things we wanted to kind of walk through, so everybody understands it as well, is if you just take the CSU operating budget for the division without benefits, you can see some interesting trends. We've gone up in overall target, but we've actually seen a slight decline in the operating fund from year over year. This is the budget cut. But you could kind of see a trend. These were the raises Charlie was talking about.

So what was the base budget impact? So the 6% number was \$16.2 million. We had to carry over another \$3.4 million because we actually had a \$10.5 million budget cut in 2023-24. We only did \$7 million last year, so we had to make up that \$3.4. We've had some increases though, and obviously compensation adjustments which aren't all quite there, but these are the raises that have gone in. When it's all said and done it's only a net change of \$6 million, but it's fewer people being paid more on that number.

I wanted to lay out where those impacts have happened on the staffing and MPP perspective. So we moved five MPP lower in the division for about almost a 6% cut. Although we've authorized quite a few searches in the last three weeks. So there's a lot of staff movement happening. This is also controlled for the move of enrollment management, which is actually 115 positions that came over to the division last year. But you could see some of the change to hit in administrative staff.

So where did the allocations go? Let me tell you how we walked through this. I went to each college and administrative unit and I said, how can you manage this? And these are the reversal of all the plans that took place. So there was a base reduction in salaries of \$13.2 million and reduction in benefits of \$6.4. 48.5% of that comes out of instruction of the instructional budget. And this is complicated by the fact that we had new enrollment. So some of these positions came back.

There are other institutional investments that have taken place. We have maintained the RSCA program at \$7.6 million this year with 374 faculty on that program. Core funding available is \$6.4 million. The shortfall has been covered by an investment from the VPRI office as well as a PACE reallocation and some other small reserves in the office to get us to that number. We now have a kind of one time allocation per year. Charlie baked that into the budget on an annual basis of \$2 million. And then we have all these various contractual obligations. One of the things that wasn't funded by the system, for example, are these SSIs. Everybody forgets about these things. They're very important to people. They cost us about \$1.5 million a year, depending. So over the last several years, there's been 3 or \$4 million in additional costs to the campus that weren't budgeted by the system office. They budget on these straight GSIs, but not the SSIs and other things that were in the contract.

Now there's a number of CSU investments as well. So this year for the division, we were given \$300,000 for the Project Rebound program in base dollars. We were given \$1.3 million in base dollars for student success, this is going to the overall advising and success infrastructure, because we were running some of it on one time dollars without base. And then some money for NAGPRA and CAL

NAGPRA. So you can add that up and you would see. \$1.8 million more dollars in the division. That's good. But they're all very targeted and specific. And in fact, if we don't quite spend all of the NAGPRA money, it'll roll over and be ready for next year. It's the same with our Ethnic Studies money. Those are allocated dollars. I don't have any authority outside the band of where to spend them once the president designates that these things would come.

So, one of the things that we've been looking at is to restore Student Faculty Ratios. As a note, this came from the Budget Advisory Committee, a value. best practices for enforcing tighter guidelines on low enrolled courses. We have been examining assigned time for non-teaching assignments, maximizing the use of academic space to get classes to the right sizes, creating shared services across the division in order to save some staffing costs.

So here's the big drum roll number. Student to faculty ratio in 2017 was 26.6, when we were at over 37,000. But it looks like we're on track to get close to where we were. We declined precipitously, though, during the pandemic. This number is only based on the instructional portion of all the faculty. So whether or not we have the RSCA program or anything that doesn't affect this number. The SFR as well is different depending if you're tenured, probationary or lecturer. Lecturers have higher student to faculty ratios by about seven than probationary or tenured faculty. This is not completely surprising when enrollment is 25% grad students and the majority of your graduate students are taught by tenured faculty.

Assigned time adjustments have also happened. When I joined, the RSCA program had just been starting. Where there's been a decline is in college and departmental assigned time. Now some of this, to be fair, is colleges actually investing a fair amount in RSCA prior to the RSCA program, such as the College of Science. But in all seriousness, we're still not quite back to where we were in 2018. This is equivalent to about 95 full time equivalent faculty. Now, if you think about that, we have about 730 tenure track faculty. That's about 15% of the workload of those folks. When you have 375 people on the RSCA program. And this all goes back into the non tenure track faculty hiring budget.

Now interestingly as I mentioned PACE has also been growing during the same period of time. And PACE in this context encompasses all the traditional PACE work plus SJSU online. Most of the campuses have deinvested in PACE. We now make up 14% of all the PACE revenue in the California State University. This gives the Provost office, in consultation with all the departments and everybody, financial flexibility to the tune of about \$60 million a year, 89% of which gets invested back in Academic Affairs. We've grown 18 % a year in total headcount, 25% in revenue with an expected 35% revenue. So we should be at \$75 million in three years in PACE revenue.

We're 22% of the headcount in self-support in the California State University. SJSU Online has 660 undergraduate students. There are a number of programs that this is concentrated in historically: software engineering, artificial intelligence, data analytics.

So we still have a larger AUL but we are still about 19% of the California State University when it comes to the total FTE trends and self support.

Q: Question about NAGPRA and CAL NAGPRA: My assumption is that at some point it will end.

A: In theory that is the goal: to absolutely repatriate everything we have.

Q: When that happens, what are the plans? Where will the funding be reallocated?

A: Well, that's a great question. It's a very, very difficult question to answer, in part because most of our collections are actually not for federally recognized tribes, and it makes it much more complicated to repatriate. I think in an ideal world, we'd have a 3 to 5 year time horizon to complete all repatriation.

I would think that money would probably go to our tribal relation, continued partnership. The other thing that we do, actually, if tribes come to us to work together on research, we're always going to need someone with that level of expertise. It's also possible to spend more than \$200,000, because there may be a higher cost for repatriation that we're actually not even aware of.

Q: You have a slide that includes student assistants pay. Does that include a federal work study program?

A: No. That's just a student assistant base budget that's budgeted from the general fund.

Q: Is there a plan to address the issue with student assistant allocations received after the semester begins?

A: The short answer is yes. I know we actually gave those numbers out before the semester started. I gave every college their student assistant allocation. We assumed budget of \$2 million. I believe every dean was told that the same allocation was coming to them and to plan accordingly although it wasn't in the budget memo.

Q: Why is the RSCA covered by PACE?

A: About \$750,000 of that 7.6 million is PACE, about 10%, which is a little less than 2% of PACE on the campus. We started to put some PACE in there when the program grew in order to accommodate for the fact that we have a fair number of faculty, a fair amount of faculty time in PACE. So PACE helped underwrite the library so we didn't have a big budget cut in the library last year. It underwrites a portion of the grad college. So there's a lot of things we've been able to do centrally, plus reinvest. And with the legal change that just happened with the law that just happened, we're going to have more flexibility with PACE dollars as well.

Q: Question about assigned time and cuts in the college. Will we go back to giving more assigned time to faculty?

A: When we did the analysis last year, the average instructional load for a tenure track faculty was 40%. That is a 2-2 teaching load. So when you look at the use of assigned time and the reductions of assigned time, for administration, when I finally started to dig in on this, we were spending \$2.5 million a year on administrative assigned time and the division. So do I think it should go up? Not necessarily. Do I think we should use it more effectively? Perhaps. Those are hard political conversations sometimes. But I said this when I joined in 2019, and I and I'll say it again, which is if someone told this campus that you could grow the RSCA program to what it is and not take a hit somewhere else they were selling you something that I wouldn't buy. And what you see in that chart is that we made a decision to invest in the RSCA program, and some of it had to come from somewhere. So in preservation, you know, there was a reduction in the program this year. Much to the chagrin of numerous people. That reduction could have been much worse if we decided to go further in other types of assigned time.

As we grow, it is possible that PACE and other things could underwrite projects and things like that that go on. But if we're going to be this more research intensive campus with a program at \$7.6 million or larger, it's got to come from somewhere. And Mark will tell you this. And I knew this walking in the door, having worked at a research university. You're not going to pay for that with indirects. Maybe till you get to \$200 and \$300 million a year. We looked at overload in instruction. That was a provost level area. All the other assigned time decisions I left to the academic colleges and really to the deans. And so the question again is, is there a standardization you all want from my level? Do you prefer that flexibility at the college level? It's like online and not online. I have avoided prescription because I want the colleges and departments to have flexibility. So it's all tied into that. And I think it's going to be a set of conversations at the local level.

C. 2024-2025 Faculty Trends by Vice Provost for Faculty Success Magdalena Barrera

I want to point out a minor update to the title of this portion of the presentation, as we've given it every year. Previously, it was called faculty hiring trends, but it always included information on faculty diversity.

So we have a new class of 34 incoming tenure line faculty starting this fall. We see an increase in diversity over the prior year. We're currently undertaking our search for the Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Excellence. And while I've been stepping into that role since January one of the best aspects of that experience has been getting to run our Jumpstart New Faculty onboarding directly. All of our faculty are great, but it's nice to get to see firsthand and work with the new set of faculty, answering their questions and guiding them into what is possible here for them professionally at San Jose State.

I continue to thank University Marketing and Communication for their partnership on creating this faculty yearbook. You'll have the link if you haven't seen it already. It has an introduction and description of all of our new colleagues, and I encourage you to please look through it. To me, this is a tool that should be facilitating cross campus collaborations. When you learn about the kind of work our incoming colleagues are doing, opportunities to partner with them in support of student success and ongoing research endeavors.

So for this year, the provost has so far authorized 58 hires for the coming cycle. You see how the distribution is across the colleges. We're committed to hiring the maximum number of faculty that can be supported by our current budget model. And the priorities went to hires that can grow enrollment. How dollars associated, such as the AB 1460 funding or PACE, as you just heard, that follow our ongoing hiring themes about the future of California starts here that has five areas that the deans collaborated to create a few years ago, and we've maintained those hiring themes. Powers that integrate a focus on Black and Latinx student experiences, and address critical equity gaps within the disciplines. And then finally, a new emphasis this year and next is to help hires that connect to AI and machine learning robotics, critical technology studies conceived broadly so that this isn't just limited to STEM fields, but rather humanities and the arts, social sciences, the human impacts of how we think about AI, machine learning, new technologies that we're encountering.

This chart shows you our overall hiring success over many years. You can see that we had a high in terms of the overall success rate in Vin's first year in 2019, 2020, with 91 approved searches and 69 hires that took a hit in 22-23. Part of that is to do with the ongoing impacts of the pandemic, we're on our way back up closer to where we were prior to the outbreak of the pandemic.

We're starting to get into tenure density now. So this chart shows you changes year to year in our lecturer faculty by head count and FTEF. You could see fall 2021 was a high year in terms of both headcount and FTEF of 701. We have the numbers up through last fall. If the fall 2024 numbers become available, I'd be happy to add them to this chart so we can continue to see the shifts in the numbers of our lecturer faculty who are engaged here at SJSU.

This is a slide that you may remember from last year. We have a new column now to share how our tenure density, which is calculated as the percentage of tenure track faculty to all faculty, is on the rise. And to remember that this has to be taken in context. And so again, this remains true that we have a greater number of tenure length faculty teaching, fewer FTE than a decade ago. our growth and tenure line faculty outstripped our enrollment growth. For many years, tenure density has stayed relatively flat due to investments in those faculty. The buyouts that we were just talking about, for example, with the RSCA program. And if we accounted for that investment, these numbers might be closer to 58%. And so again, right, the definition that's used to measure our tenure density may be

out of touch with where our campus is actually headed.

So moving to faculty diversity. You can see here the fluctuations year to year in our new tenure line cohorts. So over five years we can see that some years there's a growth in say black or Latino faculty. We can see that since 2021, we have not had a single Native American hire. So I want us to think about the work that it takes year to year to really actively engage in the recruitment process. How are we expanding our known pipelines of faculty whom we could be recruiting to join us here on our campus?

So this chart shows you our tenure line instructional faculty trends and race ethnicity. Overall, it looks like maybe there hasn't been that much movement overall.

But on our next slide, if we break it down by rank, we can see the much greater diversity in terms of race and ethnicity among our assistant professor faculty versus associate and full. So what we're seeing here, the greater range of color shows the impacts of our very concerted efforts to engage in better recruitment and retention practices that support our increasingly diverse faculty. And over time, we hope to retain them and then see increasing diversification among associate and full. This is also that legacy of several years when there was no hiring at all that our campus experienced with the last economic downturn.

Here is our gender diversity across the ranks. Full professors tend to be slightly more male overall. And then that changes as we go down the line. Among our assistants, a growing number of faculty choose to identify as non-binary.

And then I want to spend a couple of minutes talking about our ongoing required training. That's for all faculty who participate in our search, faculty recruitment committees and in our RTP committees. We've got all of us having to engage with real intention and purpose of being committed towards this goal. Creating a culture of accountability for everyone involved. How are each of us holding each level of review accountable in this process? Now, this image is one that I created for a presentation that I was invited to give to chief diversity officers across the system. And it was about the work that it takes to diversify the faculty. And so I want to show you, you see here these two parallel sets of train tracks. From this perspective, it looks like these are going to converge at some point. Right. But we know that they could very well continue straight. And that's what we're experiencing when we think about the theory and language, what we say that we want to do and the practices that we put into place. We're going to take this in one direction. But how that actually gets worked out on the ground, there may always be a gap between these two tracks. And so just to acknowledge that there are those of us who have been committed to learning about best practices for diversifying faculty and retaining diverse faculty, know that it takes a lot of work. It's a journey that we might never reach. But I want you to think about this as I share with you the next slide.

So I want to have you think about this. I'm going to show you two sets of comments, two kinds of colleagues that we have engaged in these trainings. And I want to ask you to reflect on which colleagues do you think are ready to guide the next generation and how San Jose State approaches faculty recruitment and RTP review.

Instructional faculty overall by race, ethnicity, both tenure line and lecture faculty. This year for the first time our tenure line faculty are starting to show greater diversity than our lecturers. Historically, and across the country, it tends to be more contingent faculty that have greater diversity within the ranks. Our current picture on the tenure line site is a reflection of the concerted efforts that the Provost Office has made to diversify the faculty in recruitment and in retention efforts.

And then the final slide has faculty by gender for both tenure line and lecturer faculty. It is here a little more closely together. Interestingly, there are small but larger than tenure line proportion number of faculty and on the lecture side, white identify as non-binary.

Q: I am really curious to hear recruitment efforts of, you know, an investigation of the faculty coming on board. What about your retention efforts? And as a follow up to that question. Do we know why people are leaving? High cost of living? Getting better offers from somewhere? What are our non-white faculty members experiences as you review the cases?

A: It's a partnership between Faculty Success and University Personnel, the unit that more formally tracks separations from the university, and who asks people who are leaving. They have an optional survey to fill out about why they're leaving. Now, it's interesting because a lot of the way that that questionnaire is framed, I think tends to speak more towards reasons why staff leave. I don't know that it's representative of reasons why faculty leave. I don't know that it's broken out by race, so we can maybe get those numbers. I will say the provost has made a real effort to retain faculty who have competitive offers and match those offers, and we've had success that way. But something that your question calls to mind is that we know we have a high cost of living. But I heard a speaker not too long ago who shared that nationwide, when faculty of color leave an institution, while they may have family reasons or, maybe they have another opportunity that's more competitive, wasn't matched, etcetera ultimately, if people like a place and feel belongingness, they stay despite a high cost of living. And we know we have colleagues here that have found ways to make it work, even though it's incredibly difficult. I think there's things that are about working at an MSI, living in this region, aside from the costs that are really attractive, and that we could be bringing more folks here and keeping them here. It might not be that high cost of living alone, but rather if they felt community and felt like they were visible and valued by their departments, perhaps they would have more impetus to say yes.

Q: Can you share disaggregated data on the category of Asian American faculty, such as South Asian and Pacific Islander faculty separately? Is there interest in hiring trauma-informed faculty?

A: That's a great question. And it's interesting you say that because there is a surge in the College of Education that I think specifically is focused on trauma informed pedagogy as an area of expertise. And so certainly that's something we keep an eye on. And is something we should definitely be pursuing moving forward.

Q: I am wondering if it's possible to do crosstabs across lines of gender, race, ethnicity, because somehow the not combined data doesn't really speak to me as much. As well, we must try to understand who our international faculty are, because, as you know, one size does not fit all.

A: I don't know if any of you have seen the National Center for Education Statistics, but in the past, they've put out a chart that brings together both by race ethnicity and by gender, broken down by race. And that is really fascinating to look at. And I'd be happy to work on something similar for our campus to have that kind of view. Thanks also, Karthika, for encouraging folks to support the international faculty mixer that's coming up this Thursday afternoon. It's actually the office for Faculty Success that's organizing it in partnership with ODEI and the Faculty Diversity Committee.

Q: Have you considered having a designated DEI person on every hiring committee?

A: That's a good question. So, you know, many, many universities do have a diversity advocate that is assigned to each search. That's something that was tried here back in 2018, 2019, I want to say through the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, I believe it was limited to 1 or 2 colleges. Folks

were trained and had assigned time to serve on all the search committees. We believe that everyone should be trained in best practices, in DEI aspects of these processes. That's why we have these required trainings. And is there a risk you run when it's assumed that it is so-and-so's job to know about this? And it's my understanding that at some universities that have that as a best practice, that oftentimes meetings happen strategically without that person's presence or, you know, finding ways to elide that voice in the process.

Q: Do you have any statistics that show base salary for faculty of color, women and men? Is there any difference?

A: Thanks for the question about salary issues. Every year when the Provost and I meet with each dean to talk about promotion and salary increases, we look at the salary data, across the college and by every department, to identify places where there does seem to be a disparity. We work with those deans and how they can put forward equity cases on behalf of those colleagues. So it is something we keep an eye on for sure.

VIII. New Business: None

IX. State of the University Announcements: None

X. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.