

2021-2022 Academic Senate Minutes
October 25, 2021

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Fifty Senators were present.

Ex Officio: Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, McKee, Kaur Absent: None	CHHS Representatives: Present: Sen, Smith, Schultz-Krohn, Baur Absent: None
Administrative Representatives: Present: Day, Del Casino, Papazian, Wong(Lau), Faas Absent: None	COB Representatives: Present: Rao, Tian Absent: None
Deans / AVPs: Present: Lattimer, Ehrman, d'Alarcao, Shillington Absent: None	COED Representatives: Present: Mathur, Muñoz-Muñoz Absent: None
Students: Present: Chuang, Cramer, Walker Sandoval-Rios, Allen, Absent: Kumar	ENGR Representatives: Present: Sullivan-Green, Saldamli, Kao Absent: None
Alumni Representative: Absent: Walters	H&A Representatives: Present: Khan, Frazier, Hsu, Han, Massey, Kataoka Absent: None
Emeritus Representative: Present: Jochim	COS Representatives: Present: French, White, Switz Absent: None
Honorary Representative: Present: Peter Absent:: Lessow-Hurley	COSS Representatives: Present: Hart, Sasikumar, Wilson, Raman, Haverfield Absent: None
General Unit Representatives: Present: Monday, Yang, Higgins, Masegian Absent: Lee	

II. Land Acknowledgement: The land acknowledgment is a formal statement that recognizes the history and legacy of colonialism that has impacted our Indigenous peoples, their traditional territories, and their practices. It is a simple and powerful way of showing respect and a step towards correcting the stories and practices that have erased our Indigenous people’s history and culture and it is a step towards inviting and honoring the truth. Senator Chloe Cramer read the Land Acknowledgement.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 There were no minutes for approval.

IV. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair McKee announced the meeting would be recorded for the purpose of preparing the minutes. Only the Senate Chair and Senate Administrator will have access. Please keep yourself muted unless speaking. Only Senators may speak and vote in the Senate meetings. Roll call will be taken by the Senate Administrator using the participant list, so be sure your full name shows. Please type “SL” to speak to a resolution in the chat. If you wish to speak to an amendment please type, ”SL Amendment” into the chat. If you have a longer amendment, please type it into the chat and send to AVC Massey. Remember that the chat is visible to all and even the direct chat is visible to the Chair and Senate Administrator in the saved version of the meeting, so be cautious.

B. From the President:

No Report.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

There were no Executive Committee minutes.

B. Consent Calendar:

There was no consent calendar.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

VI. Unfinished Business: None

VII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)

A. University Library Board (ULB): No report.

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA): No report.

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS): No report.

D. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R): No report.

E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G): No report.

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

A. University Budget Presentation 2021-2022 by Vice President Charlie Faas:

We had a change in our budget office leadership, Susan Jaynes has stepped up and Kathleen Prunty stepped into some big shoes when Marna Garnes retired in June. I can honestly say I’m thrilled to have both of these two on my team. They are strong leaders.

This year and last year kind of blend together with pandemic-fueled issues including vaccines and cargo ships sitting out in the Pacific Ocean messing with

our supply chain and overseas students not being able to go overseas and now overseas students are starting to come back to SJSU. The stock market did horribly over the last few years and now has rebounded beyond everyone's expectations. The same thing can be said for the state of California's financials. Everybody thought the state was going to be in pretty bad shape financially for several years, but we got a pretty good budget out of the state through the governor. Our faculty trustee Romey Sabalius did a great job of getting us that money. We are very happy with the position we are in. On top of that we got the CARES funding to help us work our way out of COVID.

The good news is that the state is hearing us as well as the city. Education is extremely important for all the recovery that is going to be happening after COVID. This state and federal government have highlighted this. The federal government has put a trillion dollars in the economy for the state and community colleges.

We continue to have a shortage of adequate housing in the Bay Area. There is not much relief in the short term. That definitely impacts SJSU and other local colleges. One of the positive things that came out of the pandemic is the recognition the state has of the CSU and its importance to the state as well as the recognition the city of San José has of SJSU's importance to the local economy.

The governor provided a budget that is two-fold. First there are monies that are coming from the state legislature and then there are other monies that come from tuition and fees. As a percentage, 35% to 40% of our funding comes from tuition and fees and 60% to 65% comes from the state. The key highlight here is that we had a huge budget cut last year, and that money has now been reinstated. We are also getting some funds for the Graduation Initiative 2025. This is for helping our students graduate at a faster and more timely rate.

What does this mean to SJSU? Our budget is about 50%-50% when it comes to tuition and fees vs state money. Of this, we got \$19 million reinstated. However, the Board of Trustees took away \$8 million for CSU system-wide priorities. We added about \$22 million to the SJSU budget as far as our general fund goes.

Last year we had a \$92 million problem. Last year I told you about all our concerns and how we were going to have hiring freezes and there was the threat of layoffs and furloughs. Obviously, that didn't occur here. As a matter of fact, we continued to hire faculty while other campuses had layoffs. We did that with a 20% budget cut last year.

The Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund (HEERF) money coming from the federal government under the CARES Act amounted to \$168 million. Those funds must be spent by March of 2022. However, we have to actually spend the

money and then get reimbursed for it. It is kind of a unique way of budgeting to spend the money before you get it.

There are various perceptions of what our surpluses are. Our chancellor has said the state investment in the CSU was the best ever. We've seen the California Faculty Association (CFA) talk about massive levels of reserves. While the state was very generous, it fell significantly short of what our needs actually are. We are very thankful for what we got, but we still need a little bit more. Last year was a dip and not the canyon we thought it might be in terms of the budget — “dip” meaning it was one year vs the canyon meaning two, three, or four years. Last year I talked to you all about the \$161 million we had of reserves. The chart you are looking at is a chart you can pull off the Chancellor's Office transparency portal. It shows where reserves have been over time for this campus. SJSU shows \$240 million in reserves this year. This amount contains an incorrect inclusion of the ISB Capital Project Fund in the amount of \$52 million. When you look at the bottom of the chart, it should have said \$187 million instead of the \$240 million. What I want to spend some time discussing now is the \$100 million of operating reserves we have on this campus. With the \$187 million in reserves, there is a laundry list of encumbrances. There is a general operating fund health center facilities reserve and you can read down the list of categories. Of the \$187 million, \$39 million is all that we have that we get to use for operating fund items. The other items that go down the list include some mandatory costs like the library capital reserve and financial aid related costs, etc. The \$39 million is what is usable. When people see the \$240 million they think we are rich and let's go spend that money when the reality is that we only have \$39 million to allocate or spend. Most of the \$39 million is getting used this year and is geared toward the five areas listed in our Transformation 2030 Strategic Plan.

The next chart looks at how we distribute funds by division. You can see that 65% goes to Academic Affairs. There is very little change year-over-year in the distribution to divisions with the exception of Athletics this year, which did go up by a point over last year. This is mainly because of salaries and benefits for the various coaching staff we put in place over this last year or so. We continue to be at or near the mid-point of the various schools that we compete against in Athletics spending. By no means are we a leader in spending with regards to Athletics. When you look at the breakdown of salaries and benefits on the campus, we are consistent year-over-year. Each year about 75% to 76% of our funding is spent on labor-related costs. When we look at faculty salaries vs Management Personnel Plan (MPP) vs. staff, these percentages are pretty consistent year-over-year. We have about \$450 million in operating funds. When you add in all the other various entities that we manage across our business, it adds up to over \$700 million. This is all pretty consistent year-over-year. There is some growth here in the operating fund. There is some restoration in certain areas like housing. Housing has jumped to 85% occupancy whereas we were at 22%-23% last year.

SJSU was designated \$168 million in HEERF funds. About \$70 million was spent on direct payments to students. There were also housing refunds that were sent to students. About 5% went to information technology in support of students such as WiFi and computers. A big chunk of the funding also went to personal protective equipment (PPE) and cleaning. We were also allowed to claim revenue losses such as from parking fees, housing, and operating the dining commons last year. In addition, we had to open up lots of additional course sections and they were left open even with low enrollment. We were also allowed to claim the budget cuts we took last year. As of today we have drawn down about half of the \$168 million. Another ¼ of the \$168 million is in process and we have plans for the rest of the \$168 million. We will make sure all these funds are utilized.

We really focused on basic needs and mental health with the HEERF funding. We made sure this was a priority for everyone. We opened up a CARES Office on the first floor of Clark Hall. If you haven't seen it please visit. We have created mental health programs including suicide prevention, crisis intervention, and therapy.

We have also spent HEERF funding on university policing. We are essentially a mini city on the SJSU campus. We spend 1% of our budget on policing, whereas the city of San José spends 40% to 50%. We are also the only urban campus in the CSU. This presents a whole different set of circumstances than any of the other CSU's face.

There is also a chart of our HEERF spending for Title IX. This year we added funds for operations and O&E. This way if we have incidents and need to bring in extra help from the outside, we have funds to cover it.

I want to talk a little about our economic output which is about \$700 million. That translates into \$4 billion statewide and \$1.8 billion in the valley here. I see as I meet with our mayor, councilmembers, community members, and developers that they are thrilled we are back on the campus even in a limited way and that housing is up to 85% occupancy. This translates into students eating and shopping in the local community. The recognition we are getting from the city now shows that they hadn't realized how important the campus was to them and kind of took us for granted.

Last year University Advancement had a \$25 million fundraising goal. They hit \$27.6 million. Of that \$27.6 million, 40% does not show up as cash as it is in the form of planned giving. That is a promise to give and a binding agreement. We will see those funds later on.

The last couple of slides have to do with planned projects. The first slide talks about the Alquist Building directly across from the Hammer Theatre. This is a massive project for us. We are planning on presenting to the full Senate in about a month or so to give more insight into the project. We are planning on presenting to the Board of Trustees in January 2022. When you look at our campus and the development that is happening, we are the largest landowner in all of San José. Google folks are assembling a big tract of land and will pass us for land ownership in San José. Adobe is building a new Tower that will pass us as well. Then there is a little J. Paul development. Each if these groups are within a mile of our campus. They will be occupying jobs and high-end market-rate housing. It is going to take everything we have for us to get a set of Towers built so that our faculty and staff can have an affordable place to live with a walking distance commute. I can't think of a higher priority for the next 20-30 years. Watch in the coming weeks as I come back to speak to you more.

The budget was sent out to you last Friday. It is also on the Administration and Finance website. Faculty recruiting and retention as well as start-up packages are all included in this budget. We still need to get our students graduated as we begin to repopulate the campus.

Questions:

Q: I'm concerned about a couple of trends in the reports. The first is the surge in salaries for Athletics and the second is the share of the budget for Academic Affairs. Two years ago, the share of the budget for Academic Affairs was 61.8% of the budget. Last year it was 60.9%, and this year it is 60.0%. When you are talking about \$400 million a couple of percentage points is a lot of money. It seems a little odd this would be happening when salaries in Athletics went up from about \$7 million to \$10.6 million in one year. I can hardly believe these numbers are real so can you please enlighten me as to what they mean?

A: Part of this is that we never had a Research and Innovation Division before. This singlehandedly bridges that gap. It is not as big a change as the way you were stating it. We are looking at all facets of our Transformation 2030 Strategic Plan and every dollar we spend towards that plan.

[Chair McKee] VP Faas will these slides be posted?

A: [VP Faas] Yes, these slides will all be posted on our website after today.

Q: Speaking about the 50% for salaries and 25% for benefits, I remember Charlie Reed used to give us warnings all the time that the cost of benefits went up and up every year so my question is whether that ends up coming out of our budget as continuing costs or where does that come from?

A: [VP Faas] It is a little bit of both. What you see is that 48% of our salaries are budgeted for benefits. When you are budgeting that high of a number, hopefully that is taken into account year-after-year. This particular year, we actually went down in benefit costs by a couple million dollars. Looking at our slide, we actually reduced our benefits by \$3 million. Typically it has gone up at

a steep rate. That rate has gone down some. I think that is more of a statement of how much money is in the pool so therefore it isn't growing as fast.

Q: You mentioned that SJSU is roughly at the midpoint when it comes to spending on Athletics?

A: [VP Faas] No, in some sports it is at the mid-point, but for most sports it is below the mid-point.

Q: Spending is only half the equation. The other half is revenue that is being brought in. I'm curious as to how we compare in terms of revenue Athletics is bringing in with other campuses?

A: [VP Faas] We continue to be weaker than I would like on our ticket and sponsorship sales. This year is our year to renegotiate ticketing, apparel and sponsorship media rights. This is a good year coming off our Mountain West football championship last year, and significantly increasing attendance this year. This will allow us to have a much better negotiated deal going forward. Our peers in San Diego and Fresno have had a longer tradition of winning and attendance. We are starting to get back to that with our attendance this year. By the way, the increase in salaries is \$1.2 million. Just so we are clear on the size of the increase.

Q: How long do you think it will be before the Athletics program brings in as much as it costs?

A: [VP Faas] I don't know if we ever get to the point where it brings in as much as it costs. I can probably count on one hand the number of programs across the country that are money makers. I just don't see that happening here. We will try to make it happen. However, Athletics provides an entrance into the university from which other donations come. For instance, Chuck Davidson wouldn't be naming the College of Engineering without his support for SJSU football.

Q: I have a question about the payments we must make as a result of the sexual abuse cases investigated by the Department of Justice. How will this be paid? Have any provisions been made for the possibility of future cases and additional payments that haven't been settled yet?

A: [VP Faas] I think most of that is addressed on the website. Most of that is covered on the insurance side and is not directly impacting our budget. I can't comment on where future stuff is going to go. I can tell you we try to be prudent and I keep my eyes on it. That is the best answer I can give you right now.

Q: On the breakdown on HEERF there is a line item that says "state apportionment". I have no idea what that is. Can you tell me?

A: [VP Faas] Yes, it is the money we got from the state. This year we got \$19.3 million from the state. Last year they took away money from us, so this is what we got from the federal government for the money taken from us by the state. This is one of the allowable items on the HEERF list.

C: [VP Faas] I would like to give a shout out to the members of the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC). They helped me prepare for this meeting.

Q: You mentioned there were funds available for chair leadership development. Can you provide a little bit of context and background as to how the funds were spent to support chair development?

A: [VP Faas] I will let Provost Del Casino touch on that in his Academic Affairs budget presentation next.

Q: Thank you for the presentation. I appreciate the need to build-up our reserves and believe that is what saved us during the pandemic. My question pertains to page 4 of the budget book. There is an item that says "compensation adjustment" in the amount of \$82,000. Can you clarify what that compensation adjustment means? Then on page 9 under Athletics, there is also an item that says "compensation adjustment" for football and basketball that is a little over \$1 million. Can you talk about what each of these compensation adjustments pertain to and why there is such a difference?

A: [VP Faas] The first one is for past bargaining for the university police union for \$82,000. These funds were held at the CSU system level and were just released. During the pandemic they walked away from the negotiation table and just came back. They were without a contract for two or three years and hadn't seen any increases and this was part of the money they would have gotten two years ago. The \$1.2 was for compensation changes in football and basketball and we also hired a new track coach. Winning the Mountain West Championship was a great thing, but it cost us some money regarding resigning rent to a longer term contract. This is bringing rent and salary up to maybe the mid-point in the Mountain West. It is significantly lower than San Diego State or Fresno's coach salaries. We also brought in Coach Tim Miles to lead our basketball program and bring a national reputation in. At the same time we took the opportunity to upgrade the women's basketball program.

Q: On slide 6 it shows a 65% increase for work study. Is that funding coming from the chancellor's office?

A: [VP Faas] I'll have to get back to you on that one. I do not know. Last year we had significantly lower work study students and that is probably the answer, but let me get back to you.

Q: I have a question from the budget book regarding SSETF funds. Can we get a breakdown of that? Are any of those funds being used to acquire accessibility technology that would allow instructors to make all of their course materials accessible?

A: [VP Faas] I know we are spending money on accessibility. We talked about this in the BAC meeting last week. I will find out what is in the SSETF money is being utilized for. I know we specifically added dollars this year into accessibility, but that was more for tools.

Q: On page 8 in the budget book there is a loan from the chancellor's office for \$7 million. Can you tell us what that was for?

A: [VP Faas] We have been lucky in that we have been able to acquire some different funds for things like parking garage rebuilds, the Science Building, housing, etc. at 2.25% interest so it is essentially free money. The campuses had the opportunity to borrow last year from the chancellor's office at this really low rate for budget shortfalls, mainly in the football and Athletics space. I'm a fan of debt at low interest to use as reserves.

Q: I did not fully understand what our \$39 million in reserves would be spent down on this year, so can you talk about what level of unencumbered reserves will be available when the new president comes in?

A: [VP Faas] It all depends. We aren't going to go through the entire \$39 million. My job is to make sure we have money to operate this university in a good and responsible way. A couple of years ago we were able to put some money away, but we've had a couple of years of rain. We need to grow the university, but we don't spend past our means. That is not something we are going to do. We will use some of the \$39 million, but not all of it.

Q: In the first couple of slides, there was mention of \$0.8 million that would be allocated for AB 1460. Can we get clarification on how SJSU will be using these funds?

A: [VP Faas] Again, I'm going to punt that one over to Provost Del Casino. It is part of his presentation.

Q: I don't recall hearing you mention anything about admin staff pay or salaries or increases for sports staff so can you speak to this?

A: [VP Faas] Essentially the percentage of spending for admin/faculty/MPP salaries stays the same year-over-year. There is a slight increase in MPP salaries this year and that is because of the Title IX work that is going on this year and the personnel we've added in the CDO's area.

Q: I think you really highlighted with all the companies buying property downtown how expensive it will be for faculty and staff to live on campus. I was wondering if there is any consideration for the overall increase in cost of living for students as well?

A: [VP Faas] We are looking at adding Campus Village 3 (CV3). This would expand from Washburn all the way over to Joe West Hall. We also need to continue to raise the concern with our legislators that the Bay Area cost of living is significantly different than other parts of the state such as Fresno. We have to be able to offer below rate housing for our faculty, staff, and students. I just saw an ad today for \$1,700 rent for a one bedroom and that is ridiculous.

B. Academic Affairs Budget Presentation for 2021-2022 by Provost and Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance Vincent Del Casino and Magdalena Barrera, Vice Provost for Faculty Success

As VP Faas mentioned, we took a 3.5% budget cut last year. That was largely in areas such as travel, student assistants, and other kinds of things like that so it was felt in the operational areas. We also had staffing slowdowns and things like that. VP Faas and I worked together to cover core and essential sorts of strategies like Research Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) and start-ups and other things like that. At the divisional level no one saw cuts there. As a reminder, last year we launched a large number of tenure/tenure-track searches despite being in a budget environment that wasn't amenable to that. Fortunately, we rolled the dice and the budget has come back in a very positive way this year. We are also launching a number of tenure/tenure-track hires for this year. We have had more tenure and tenure-track hires in the last six years than any other campus in the CSU. Our closest competitor would be at least 50 short of the number of hires we've had. We've also invested in diversity programs to support recruitment and retention. We've made active retention offers to people in competitive searches this year. Despite all the challenges, we are also moving into an area of increased support staff advisors. And, we also got the permanent reinvestment in the RSCA program back.

You will see a difference between the Vice President of Administration and Finance's (VPAF) budget line and the Academic Affairs budget line regarding Ethnic Studies. The difference is benefits. The system gave us \$800,000 in base funding for Ethnic Studies. We realized \$540,000 roughly in actual base investment. The question is what to do with those dollars? Those are permanent dollars. They are designed for the teaching of the new Ethnic Studies program so largely in faculty salaries and so forth. We haven't spent any of this yet, so there are some one-time funds we can invest into building Ethnic Studies programming and so forth. What we are doing is having conversations with the College of Social Sciences because they are doing a lot and then with Ethnic Studies on how we think through the long-term investment. It seems like a lot of money, but it really isn't for the entire Area F. However, at least it is an investment. We have also gotten a number of permanent base program start-ups and funding for operational support including funding for student assistants and graduate students, a number of support staff positions, and so forth. We've also made some scholarship investments in Marine Science. We've got almost \$10 million in one-time funds. The faculty start-up is dollars or equipment. This includes the 2nd year of last year's group and the 1st year of this year's group. As you can see the investment is not insignificant.

The RSCA assigned time program has gotten a \$700,000 one-time investment from the system for faculty professional development including leveraging 21st century technology to prove learning outcomes. These dollars have been put into the Center for Faculty Development budget for building out what we did last summer and this winter in terms of training faculty. We are also increasing academic advising. That is coming from SSETF dollars.

This next slide gives you a sense of where the COVID response dollars went. That is the \$4 million plus the \$700,000 from the system. A lot of those funds went into structural design technology. This included various requests from departments for things like lab kits and various activities. There were some capital infrastructure improvements that were made to classrooms. There were some hybrid classroom technology investments. We were asked for some hybrid flex classrooms as well. Then there was e-campus support of instructional design investment. Finally we have the training program we talked about that included the summer and winter training programs for faculty to help continue to adjust their pedagogy. To answer Senator Schultz-Krohn's question, the chairs and directors professional development money hasn't been spent. It was set aside to have a conversation with chairs and directors about the long-term strategy to support chairs. This was a designated pot of money to support chairs. We haven't spent that money yet. We also put some money into teacher assistants' training. Some of these investments while one-time, have long-term permanent effects. Some of these things are software investments and some things can be used in the future like mobile lab kits, and then capital improvements in labs and classrooms.

The next slide shows the overall budget. The PACE dollars flow differently, but this gives you a sense of the breakdown of where we are. This is PACE dollars plus one-time dollars plus roll forward. The lottery typically goes towards the library. You can see all kinds of start-up dollars. That \$2.95 million was this year, but there are other things that went into start-up. Then there are the SSETF dollars, and then how it's split out in the division. We say 72% of the funds go to Academic Affairs but just to be clear, this does not include benefits. Benefits are managed by VP Faas. It is not part of our daily budget that we manage.

In the next slide you can see academic salaries have increased by \$4 million this year. We have a RSCA assigned time program that has been increased. There was a little bit of an increase in MPPs. One of those positions is sort of a one-time one-year thing. The other MPP hires are tied to associate deans in the college. The one additional MPP in my office, which is academic innovation, is not coming from state dollars. That is paid out of PACE funding and this slide is the operational budget. We've had about a \$.5 million increase in support staff in the division. As you can see with the recovery there is about a \$2 million increase in work study funds. Then we took a cut in O&E. That is partially tied to encumbrance roll forward restrictions. We pulled back some money that had been sitting in accounts for a long time and wasn't being spent. We did take a one-time decrease in operations due to travel. I think that was about \$835,000. We took 13% of that decrease from the Provost Office budget and then distributed the rest of the cut amongst the colleges. I take it back. VP Faas is right. It wasn't a cut. We reinvested in operations this year. We just didn't reinvest to the tune of the total amount we did two years ago. We were \$835,000 short.

This next slide gives you a sense of the distribution of the overall change in enrollment targets that were handed out to the various colleges. You get a sense of the change in surplus to goal. Over-enrollment is going to be curtailed by the system. Back in the day we were held to 5% above or below. We are currently at 109% of enrollment. The system has said we have to stay within 105%. This is the last year of over-enrollment. When you look at the goal numbers that in theory could decrease unless our target from the system is increased.

This next slide shows the enrollment trends. I just want to point out how we get the money. The first line is the budgeted target. As a division we get \$5,100 per FTES for that. The reason we don't get as much for the other students is that we don't get state support for them. We get \$2,800 per FTES, so you can see the difference and that comes to us as one-time dollars into the instructional budget. Then we have the actual enrollment. VP Faas and his office recalculate in the spring and give us more one-time dollars to cover that difference. You can see the dip in one-time last year.

The next slide shows the overall student headcount. We don't see it in the budget per se. We get paid neutrally for every student, so it's \$5,100 and \$2,800. However, as a university we have been impacted in international enrollment. We were down by 800 international students during that time frame. What has made up for some of this is residential enrollment which has grown significantly and some non-resident out-of-state increase. We had a bump of about 100 out-of-state students. We don't necessarily see a budget improvement, but we are seeing the same sorts of dollars. Overall, we had a pretty large bump in instructional expenditures in 2018-2019, probably tied to some of the RSCA investments we made. We've basically just grown with the students. We are projecting a tiny increase overall in the FTE instructional money coming. This includes everything.

This next slide is about staff. Between 2018 and 2021, the investment in support staff positions increased the number of staff from 401 to 439. We have added 20 academic advisor positions in the last four years. Where we have flattened is in the filled rate and where we have increased is in the vacancy rate. This is the hiring chill that everyone is feeling. On the positive note right now, we have 36 approved staff positions in the division that are under consideration. In any given year, we always have lines that are not filled. We also have quite a few vacant advisor positions. One of the things we are looking at is as we go back and invest, what are the targeted strategic positions to make sure we have so everyone feels supported? I'm not saying we shouldn't get more to invest in this area and I am advocating for more, but this is the picture and clearly you can feel the hiring chill. What I said is that we are searching for 36 positions. These are positions that are in the budget already. I'd like to turn this over now to Vice Provost Magdalena Barrera to speak about faculty and faculty hiring.

[Vice Provost Barrera] We are happy to welcome the most diverse cohort of incoming faculty we have ever had at SJSU this fall. Just under two-thirds identify as Asian, Latinx, Black, or Native American.

Since 2019, SJSU has led the CSU in new tenure/tenure-track appointments. This is really critical because it comes at a time when most colleges and universities have cut tenure/tenure-track hiring by 25% and hires of people of color have declined disproportionately especially at public and research-oriented institutions. This is according to a new study in *Sociological Science*. SJSU is leading the way by continuing to hire and with the diversity of our cohorts. This is in part a result of our search committee support. Their training addressed the impact of implicit bias. The search process has for many years included a review of initial applicant pools to make sure they reflect the kinds of diversity we would expect to see by academic field. This past cycle we also began reviewing semi-finalist pools. Where we don't see a pool that is as diverse as we might expect, it's a chance for the dean to go back to the chair of the search committee and review the outreach and diversity plan and have a conversation about whether there were any candidates that were maybe on the cusp of being considered that could be moved forward. I think these efforts will pay off over time. You can see here on our next slide our planned searches for this cycle and how they break down by college. We've got 72. This is an amazing number considering what we are seeing nationwide.

In addition to representing really critical areas within the departments for emerging research and expertise within those fields, a number of researchers fall into one of five themes that are emerging and really impact the story that we are telling in the state of California. These include data analytics and design thinking, Ethnic Studies education, health equity and health infrastructures, social and human robotic technology relations, and sustainable futures and Earth system science. In addition to some of those themes, researchers in this cycle have been invited to focus on particular aspects of Latinx and transgender experiences within academic specialties.

The next slide shows the faculty demographics across the cohort and you can see they closely align with the exception of slightly more Asian and fewer Latinx among tenure/tenure-track faculty compared to lecturer faculty overall by percentage. Then the next slide has a breakdown by gender. Again, among both tenure and tenure-track faculty there is a slightly higher percentage of women over men with the small but growing number of faculty that identify with non-binary among the choices there.

One final note I'd like to say is I know there has been some interesting thinking about what is the story that is being told through our data that we can collect about our Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) process and I want to thank our partners in University Personnel (UP) Faculty Services for almost being done collecting eight years-worth of RTP outcomes data. We are really excited to dig

into that to find out what we can learn by looking at these outcomes and especially comparing any of the outcomes from university policy S98-8 to university policy F15-8. These are the really critical years when we made this transition to a new RTP policy and we are thinking about how F15-8 has impacted tenure and promotion outcomes at our institution. We are looking to break that down in an aggregated way while not identifying any particular person but looking at what story is emerging from those numbers.

Questions:

Q: I have a question that relates to recent events in my department. When we have these ideas for future programs, it seems to me that the status quo is pretty baked in in terms of the hiring priority being focused on Ethnic Studies because that is where the need is right now. What kind of program planning might we adopt that would allow forward thinking in terms of hiring?

A: [Provost Del Casino] That is a great question. The hiring priority plans do come from the college. The Provost Office does not reach below the colleges in that regard. As part of this conversation and one of the things that Ron Rogers and I have talked about is that you absolutely want to bake into those plans what faculty you need. If everyone is jammed up and the answer is we are going to add a new program then you will need more people. There is no question you will need more people. In fact, I intend to see full-time hiring there for both tenure/tenure-track and lecturers. The lecturers are bought out so that they don't have any worries about entitlements or anything like that. The School of Information has done this for a very long time with dual-funded positions where the state-side is where the entitlements lay but the money can come in from the other side. As part of the budget planning process, and I would say an opportunity for the department to hold our feet to the fire and say if we are going to do this then this is what we need, we are in. We are absolutely in and there are lots of ways to make this happen. I do think that the next question about going after new programming does at some level have to be where the college strategic plan is heading. If you are going to grow new programs and going new directions, the college needs to support it. I think those conversations have to happen simultaneously at the college level in order to think about where you go in relation to that. That is part of it. However, if people want to invite the Provost Office in to talk about these things, I will show up anytime and anywhere. I would be more than happy and excited to see different kinds of programs emerge. The challenge we have a little bit is where do we have the capacity for those programs. I don't say that because we can't invest in people, but if we start to see pressure on our enrollment strategy from the Chancellor's Office and you couple that with the reenrollment campaign that the chancellor just announced, I don't know where we are going to put those students. This is because we don't have any room within the target to reenroll students right now. Are we going to have to actually shrink our class of incoming students in order to accommodate some of these strategies, or is the system going to come with more dollars? These are great questions and I don't have answers to all of them, but I think

generating those conversations and having those strategic plans in colleges is helpful.

Q: I have a two-part question for Vice Provost Barrera. It is about what you just shared with us. The first question is what are the initial findings on how RTP outcomes correlate with race, ethnicity, and gender? And the second question is, how will the details of that report be shared with us?

A: [VP Barrera] I can be quite frank and say there are no initial findings just yet because this information was just shared with me on Friday afternoon. Also, University Personnel Faculty Services (UPFS) is still completing the numbers for three of those hiring cycles. I appreciate the time they are taking to do this, because they are making sure that the data is in there in such a way so that the data can be read across different policies and trying to align the terms that are used, etc. I will be really thrilled to bring back a full report for discussion with this group once that is fully digested and some initial findings can be pointed to for our discussion. I'm really thinking about what our steps are as a campus, given that data.

Q: How can we further increase tenure/tenure-track hiring? Many educational planners have argued that one of the most cost-effective ways to increase the tenure-track faculty is to hire the so-called temporary lecturers into tenure-track positions. Sometimes this is referred to simply as transitioning lecturers into tenure-track positions. There are many advantages to this. There are fewer moving costs and start-up costs. There is less likelihood of people leaving and certainly our excellent lecturers have a proven record of fine teaching to our students. I'm wondering what you think of this strategy Provost Del Casino? Are you pro or con? Secondly, if you are pro this, does SJSU have any plans for a program of this nature in the future?

A: [Provost Del Casino] It is a great question. I'm not sure it is a binary because it is complicated. In that question there are two pieces. First, how many tenure-track searches can we do annually, and should some of those be held out for what you are talking about? I'm not against hiring people that are really good into tenure/tenure-track jobs. There have been one or two instances where people have come in a two-for one situation and one of them is outstanding so we said let's do this. I've seen this happen since I've been here, but the thing you are talking about is a strategic internal effort. Some of this is based on departments. It is hard to dictate that from the center and say you should do x and y, so I think that is a complicating factor in all this. The question is then what can we afford? How many tenure/tenure-track faculty can we afford within the budget? For every one we hire now we have a .20 RSCA, so we have to balance that out. However, if people came with RSCA strategies of how that could work locally I'm not against that at all. It would very much have to be driven by the departments. It is harder to drive that sort of thing institutionally. I could support it like I supported 1.0 lecturers. I think all of these things need to be on the table and hashed out in the departments and colleges. I think this needs to be part of all our conversations including of the 2,100 faculty that work for us, what should the mix look like?

Q: The Senate is on record as asking that our tenure density rate be increased. We passed that resolution years ago. We were hiring more than a lot of universities and our tenure density did not change a bit, so I didn't hear anything in the presentation today that said whether we made any progress in the area of tenure density. Can you elaborate?

A: [Provost Del Casino] I don't think we have and here is why. We've grown as a campus in students. We've added over 100 tenure-track faculty. When President Papazian came on board the tenure/tenure-track faculty were in the low 600's and now we are more like 725. At the same time, there was this increase in the number of students. The gap got filled with more non-tenure/tenure-track faculty. This goes back to the previous question, what is the right formula to determine how many we need to hire to really increase density. It may really be a triple figure each year to really get us to 850 or something in that neighborhood. From a financial perspective, this is what is in that \$119 million budget. We have to figure out how to adjust for that. At the same time, we know salaries are not strong. The answer is I don't think we've moved the needle. The last thing is the RSCA program. The RSCA program produces 1.2 people every time you hire a new person (i.e. it produces a new course needing to be taught by a non-tenure/tenure-track faculty member. The RSCA investment has also impacted our ability to make a dent in tenure density. This is another thing I am passionate about, but the challenge is how to do it. We should also be looking at full-time faculty density. We should look at how we can take the opportunity to hire people in full-time positions as opposed to part-time. I think we have 600 faculty that teach only one class. Heidi just sent me the tenure density report and in 2019 it was 52, so it actually dropped a percentage point from the year before. My first year I authorized 90 hires. The other thing is we have about an 80% success rate in hiring. We did 72 hires this year and 64 last year. It is very, very hard to make headway on tenure density.

Q: My question has to do with the SJSU Online Initiative and I didn't see in the report. I'm assuming that is because it is not state-funded and is a self-support program. If we are talking about dual-funded positions, buy-outs, and reassigned time, can you explain how that might work?

A: Yes, the money for all of that comes out of PACE which is self-support dollars. In the context of how people work in PACE right now, some people teach a PACE course and get paid directly. For example, with summer and winter classes. Then there are some people that teach during the semester and these are courses that are PACE self-support. There are also places like the School of Information where they hire their full-time faculty on split funding, but their line is positioned within the state side. I've actually had a request this year for a couple of additional hires in a department that are split-funded. This means that your workload might be split where you are teaching, but it doesn't have an impact on your salary. You are not on that salary schedule that goes with that side of the house. There is no reason we can't do any of that and I think it is a great idea because again, it lets us invest in the long-term faculty. There is a

little risk in it and I imagine some of my colleagues might think there is too much, but I'm not worried about enrollment long term. There is no need to just move people to PACE and take them out of the state side for entitlement purposes and things like that. That being said there are people that say they will teach that course on the self-support side for self-support money and those are the summer and winter programs. In my mind, this is part of our larger enrollment strategy. Going back to the question earlier, we have to actually figure out how to invest in the faculty to teach across all these areas and then we need to support them long term. There are lots of way to do this. The salary schedule is a making of our own design. We can adjust things for how we pay people, etc.

Q: Given the comment you made about most of those decisions being made at the department level or the department level having more control, when a department is told they need to submit a hiring plan and it goes to the dean and some prioritizing decisions get made before positions are shipped up the chain where you ultimately are the decider, how can a department with its expertise and planning exercise more influence on the decision, if it is out of our hands once that gets sent?

A: [Provost Del Casino] It is a very clear question and thank you for asking. I'm going to go back to my days as a chair in Long Beach. In 2008, when there were only 14 hires, my department got two. The way that happened was that we went in with here are the strategic priorities for the university and here are how these positions are more than just our departments'. They are going to do x, y, and z. In the strategic priorities of the campus, these classes are going to build y and z. If we go back to the COACHE survey we did of tenure/tenure-track faculty and people said they wanted investments into research and interdisciplinary areas then you look at the broad stroke hiring ideas that have been cultivated over the last couple of years, you go how do we position ourselves vis-à-vis those with an interest in knowing we want to diversify the faculty. You can move up the ranks there. I don't know how many hires we didn't say yes to after they got to the Provost Office. I think we said yes to every hire. We asked some questions and we pushed some positions back down and asked them to align the positions better with the strategic priorities of the university including diversity hiring. You can see the deep institutional thought that comes from the department that says we are going to focus and bring these things in and that helps elevate it. The deans have a very powerful role there in prioritization. More so than the Provost. I have asked some questions about why something is here rather than there, but it really is the deans that do more of that work.

IX. New Business: None

X. State of the University Announcements:

A. Provost: None

B. Associated Students President (AS): None

C. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF): None

D. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA): None

E. Chief Diversity Officer: None

F. CSU Faculty Trustee: None

G. Statewide Academic Senators: None

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m.