

---

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

Present: Curry, Lacson, Sasikumar, Van Selst, Rodan Absent:
---

Present: Baur, Chang, Sen Absent:
--------------------------------------

Present: Del Casino, Faas, Teniente-Matson  
Absent: Dukes, Fuentes-

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

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.

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











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.



### 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





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.

None

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