

2022-2023 Academic Senate Minutes
October 24, 2022

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

II.

<p>Ex Officio: Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Chuang, McKee Absent: None</p>	<p>CHHS Representatives: Present: Sen, Smith, Chang, Baur Absent: None</p>
<p>Administrative Representatives: Present: Perez, Wong(Lau), Faas, Del Casino, Day Absent: None</p>	<p>COB Representatives: Present: Tian Absent: None</p>
<p>Deans / AVPs: Present: Ehrman, Kaufman, Meth, d’Alarcao Absent: None</p>	<p>COED Representatives: Present: Mathur, Muñoz-Muñoz Absent: None</p>

Students:
 Present: Chadwick, Saif, Treseler, Rapanot, Herrlin, Sheta
 Absent: None

<p>Honorary Representatives: Present: Peter, Buzanski, Lessow-Hurley Absent:</p>	<p>COSS Representatives: Present: Sasikumar, Haverfield, Pinnell, Hart, Raman Absent: None</p>
<p>General Unit Representatives: Present: Monday, Higgins, Masegian, Flandez, Lee Absent: None</p>	

III. Land Acknowledgement: Chair McKee read the history of the land acknowledgement and Senator d’Alarcao presented the land acknowledgement.

IV. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 There were no minutes.

V. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair McKee asked the Senate to take a moment of silence for SJSU freshman and football player Camdan McWright who was struck and killed by a bus On October 21, 2022.

Chair McKee announced that today's meeting is a budget only meeting and that no regular business will be conducted during this two-hour session

B. From the President:

VI. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee: There were no minutes.

B. Consent Calendar: There was no consent calendar.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VII. Unfinished Business: None

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

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

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

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

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

Among the areas that have impacted us include community colleges. When they are giving away free tuition, we don't get those freshmen. The UC is taking people right out of community college even more so now, so we are losing some of the transfers. Then there is a lower number of high school seniors. That is a national trend. We have been trying to bolster that some by going down to Southern California and this is where we get about 15% of our enrollment. Then also our international students are down. We were at a high a number of years ago and hoped to get to 3,000 and now we are in the 2,000 range. Also, improved graduation rates take away from our enrollment as well. That's great because we want to our students to graduate, but it does impact enrollment. While we are trying to open up new sections, we are also seeing recruiting and retention issues with faculty. The pay rate and cost of living here are very challenging.

Last fall we asked for \$673 million for the CSU System. The governor came back and gave SJSU \$211 million, which is less than half of what we asked for. We got a couple of other things in June like the Graduation Initiative (GI) 2025 and special needs things. That's positive, but it paled in comparison to what we were asking for. When you look at the headlines you see that the CSU got a 5% compact and that is wonderful, because we've been asking for consistency in budget planning for many, many

timeframe that leads into the governor's budget. In the past, we waited until too late into the cycle in January before we were going to impact the governor's budget. By waiting we were adjusting to a set of numbers the governor had already put out. This is really, really important, because now we are asking

Historically, this has been 51%, but due to the 11% increases this year it is at 78%.

We have our \$480 million operating fund and overall three quarters of a billion dollars is our total expenditures on the campus. Our lottery number was at \$2 point something million last year, and rounds up to \$3 million this year. A little bit more in the lottery funds this year. Everything else is more or less the same. Some of these things are increasing coming out of the pandemic. We have more people in housing. We also have more people parking on campus and those types of things. However, everything else is more or less the same.

Questions and Comments:

Q: On page 13, I have a question about basic needs. I understand that basic needs is only a one-time fund, but where specifically is this money going to?

A: It is going into Student Affairs and some goes to Academic Affairs, but Vice President Day is the lead on this and determines where it will be spent. This year it is one-time funds from the Chancellor's Office, but we have been told it will be ongoing dollars, so we anticipate next year it will be part of the base budget. What that means if you get one-time money, you typically don't want to hire people with that. You want to spend it on activities or meals or rooms or that kind of thing. However, next year VP Day will have more flexibility for those kind of things.

Q: I was noticing that Athletics is being subsidized with SSETF funds and I was wondering about this subsidy. Can you explain?

A: Sure, the Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) fund within Student Success Excellence in Technology Fee (SSETF) has historically been funding part of the Title V rules as far as how IRA dollars can be spent. With that there is money that goes back to the campus, and there are free tickets to events also for faculty and staff. This is somewhat typical. It is approximately the same number that comes out of San Diego and Fresno as well. The difference between us and San Diego and Fresno is they have more generated revenue, though we are doing better on our generated revenues. We are up \$1 million this year. We hope to be at a couple million dollars next year. Our women athletes did extremely well this weekend in golf and the football team is 2 for 2, so we are hoping for

next Senate meetings. We aren't giving out as much because a lot of our students aren't in as much need as some of these other campuses.

Q: I wanted to ask about enrollment as you've said that is the most important piece here. What programs have we implemented to increase enrollment?

A: I'm going to take that as a "to do." Among Patrick, Vin and I, we will come back here at a future meeting and start reporting on what those plans are and the ways we are going to try and increase enrollment.

Q: VP Faas, thank you for your report. My question pertains to spending on two fronts. One is mental health and counseling because I saw it was health services but there was no breakdown on mental health and counseling, and the other is university police. I want to know how much are we spending on counseling services and how much on police services and have these gone up or remained the same?

A: No, the police services are essentially the same. There has been no change on the police side. We are understaffed. We will continue to underfund the budget when it comes to the university police department. That said, part of what we are looking to do there and what we have talked about is having more mental health services that are within the police department so that it is not always just police responding to a 5150 or mental health crisis, but that there are also some non-uniformed folks that are responding to our students. The bulk of our 5150 mental health crisis calls are not affiliates, but our police are involved from a safety perspective for all involved. From a mental health point of view we are continuing to see more and more spending and you see that within the Wellness Center predominantly and their spending is up as well as the Wellness Center and continues to do an outstanding job in my mind as well as Vice President Day's. They are continuing to do that as well as the basic needs folks. The SJSU Cares folks continue to see their budgets increase as well. They aren't massive increases, but those are all increases in their budget.

Q: My question has to do with the student enrollment center, but not necessarily with spending. Is there any money levied towards staff and faculty for wellness centers?

A: Yes, there will be more over there. We have any number of groups around the campus that have significant staffing challenges. Housing has it, the Wellness Center has it, Facilities, Development and Operations (FD&O) has it. There are quite a few places around the campus that are having the challenges. Associated Students (AS) came to the cabinet meeting last week and that was one of the things that was brought up. How do we shorten the time of students getting an appointment, and making sure they do get an appointment? We need to make sure we are paying people appropriately and we need to make sure we are hiring as best as we can in a very difficult hiring market. I don't have a great answer for you there, other than that Vice President Day and his team know they have to hire. It is just difficult to hire.

Q: My question is related to the expenditures in the operating fund budget on page 14 about Institutional Affairs and University Advancement. It seems like they are going to be one division, or is this just temporary?

A: It's a temporary thing. The way we aligned it was this is Lisa Millora's responsibility. She has assumed temporary responsibility for University Advancement.

Q: Looking at last year's budget in terms of the expenditures and operating fund, and University Advancement was 2.5% and this year with the combination it appears to be 6.6% and even with the shift out of the President's Office, which used to be 3.9% and it's now .6% it still seems like there is a larger expenditure there. Can you explain what this means in terms of the operating fund and the budget plan? Is this in alignment with the strategic plan?

A: The Racial Justice Initiative, the Title IX Initiative, all are in those spaces. There are a number of things that are in the Human Resources budget this year as well. It ended up being something like a .3% or .4% change.

Q: Thank you for that repor

A: No, it went up because their salaries went up by the same amount everybody else's did. However, in no way was it \$6 million. You must have read that wrong.

Q: I noticed there was \$150,000 for chaperones. I was wondering how these people are being recruited? Also, what is the protocol for requesting chaperones or are they automatically assigned to every interaction between a student and trainer or doctor?

A: I'd be happy to have Athletics come and talk about how the Athletics program has changed.

Q: I was looking at the contribution to Athletics and as far back as I can remember it has been about \$9 million. The ticket sales and revenue seems to be about the same. What seems to have risen over the years is the money from the general fund. When I started thinking about this, what accounts for the proportion of money coming from the general fund which seems to have increased almost 50%?

A: Well, the only reason the SSETF or IRA money would change is if it was voted on by the CPAC Committee. The generated revenues have been more. You and I as well as Senator Peter had that discussion with the new Athletics Director last year that we were going to right that ship and bring more revenue in. I think it is up \$1 million to \$1.5 million this year. We are moving that in a better direction, but we are nowhere near where we need to be. We need to get people buying tickets and buying sponsorships. We're selling naming rights. All these things are very important. However, we are at the bottom of Mountain West Conference of teams by total spent on Athletics. We as an institution are committed to playing these sports and having Division 1 Athletics. We have to provide the funding for that but it needs to come more from generated revenue.

C: This is the same thing that has been said for 50 years and nothing seems to change.

A: Frankly, our donors feel completely differently than what you are saying. Our donors have put tens of millions of dollars into our South campus and to improve the various venues that were nonexistent for decades such as for golf. Our women's golf team is one of the highest ranked in the world. We came in second place last year. We're in first place in the division this year. When you look at women's gymnastics, a donor came in and funded the gymnastics pit. They then won the Mountain West last year. In baseball a donor came in and put up a practice field. They won 30 games and were Mountain West champions, so helping these teams is getting us the results we want. Donors are giving hard earned dollars for these facilities, because they believe in it and they see the results.

Q: On page 38 under housing and student fees, it lists \$700,000. Can you speak to what that is?

A: I'm not sure I'll have to get back to you.

A: [VP Day] I'm looking and will have an answer in a few minutes.

Q: My question is about the deferred maintenance. As you mentioned, the CSU got \$1 billion. SJSU also got some one time state funding allocations on page 8. There was \$18 million for Wildfires and the Moss Landing Dock. Then there is the additional \$6.8 is that combined with these other priorities or is that separate?

A: The Wildfires, the Moss Landing Dock, and the Legacy project are run off of government requests. The \$6.8 is really for things going on around campus that you're never going to see, usually below ground work.

Q: How are the decisions made on what gets priority?

A: When we get the money in, we compile a complete list and then see what the clear priorities are. We have \$1 billion worth of deferred maintenance, so it is really triage.

Academic Affairs Budget Report by Provost Del Casino:

The budget for the Academic Affairs Division is 61.5% of the university budget. We have gotten a few other things over the years as when AB 1460 came in. We created an SJSU Online Assessment fund. We have become an Adobe anchor campus which brings funding directly to the division. We pay for academic advising through SSETF. We've got some instructional student assistant support through the general fund. At the same time this year, we have a vacancy savings target this year. We have a deficit of \$36 million and \$18 million is covered by reserves, but the other \$18 million is being covered by various reductions. Our savings target is \$5.8 million this resulted in operating fund reductions of about \$1 million. We also have a one-time tuition funding hold back. It looks like a lot of money is coming in, but most of it is one-time funds. There is one-time enrollment support, but we are not distributing it because we are not hitting the target. There is no point in distributing that \$4.4 million when we aren't meant to spend it. We had \$2 million for the division in RSCA. It worked out to \$1.4 million. The staff brought in as student assistants are being covered in different ways. This is again excluding benefits. We have about \$181 million in the Operating Fund and about \$57 million in PACE. Not surprisingly, almost all our budget is personnel-related.

We had a goal of 28,840 which we are not going to hit. We are predicting a negative change to every college but the College of Professional and Global and Education (CPGE). What that looks like is this. We had a trend where we were sort of going up. We had a budgeted goal of 26,690. We have a divisional goal shown there. However the actual enrollment is 26,043 which is why we have to hold back dollars that won't get distributed. You can see the gap that finance has budgeted us of 27,690. That's why the \$4.4 million is being held back because we have to return it.

One of the things that is thought to impact an overall target enrollment is shift in Average Unit Load (AUL). We had a nice trend up in Fall 2018 and then a

opinion, we need to increase the number of full-time faculty in all categories and that would help us as well. Also, we need to invest in the people we need to run the campus.

The other thing I want to talk about is pay. We have about \$17.5 in total pay distribution. What we did was create a new policy where at each college level they are allowed to retain 90 days of expenditures going into the next year which is about 3 months of payroll, because those dollars have been sitting around the campus for years going largely unspent when they could be used for things like SJSU Online. We also have some central academic support that we provide to the various colleges that we pay out of PACE right now. The other thing you will see is that some of the colleges have capital funds where they sock away over time dollars out of PACE that could go into larger capital projects. The other place some of this money has gone is into SJSU Online investment and revenue distribution. What we are doing that is unique from our standard CPGE is building an entirely new infrastructure for it which is where a lot of the money is going. The key here is the programs are outlining direct instruction, program administrative support, student assistants, operating expenses and then we're building out all the admissions, recruitment, success, wellness, and scholarship as well as all the marketing and recruitment efforts, and also program support and instruction design. Very importantly, and I'm highlighting it in red, is the mention of program startup. In the case of almost every single program in SJSU Online, none of them will break even the first, second, and maybe even third year, so we've collected up money to invest in that startup. Once the programs become solvent, they'll be paying back into the investment fund. In conversation with, for example, the business school, it could be up to \$1 million to launch a general business degree in SJSU Online. This pays for all the faculty time, because you've got faculty building things before you even start making any revenue coming in on any of the programs so you need a pot of money. That's sort of where we are there. I just wanted to share that going into this initially we are already seeing a national investment from students in interest in SJSU Online. That doesn't completely surprise us, but there are a lot of people out there across the country and these are just a map of inquiries from the first month and a half. Not surprisingly, most are from California, but as you can tell we are already having a reach. We are not spending any dollars to tell people. Any money we are spending to tell people is really local. It's very much a Santa Clara County focus, but nonetheless that's where we sort of are. I wanted to go quickly so I can give people time for questions, so I'll stop this part of the presentation and take questions.

Questions:

Q: What does it mean to be an Adobe Anchor Campus? What are the benefits to SJSU and what are the benefits to Adobe? Regarding SJSU Online and similar programs, at what time do you expect it to be mature and start turning a profit?

A: As an Adobe Anchor Campus we got a donation last year from Adobe of \$1 million. They gave to three campuses. This is an attempt to invest in campuses with outstanding diversity, equity, and inclusion strategies. There could be more to come as well. As a creative campus, we were identified as one of the leaders in integrating digital and creative literacy into curriculum. The benefit of that is that Adobe is ready to go anytime we want to talk about different approaches, etc. Adobe really is one of those companies that put their money where their mouth is. If you look at pricing relative to retail prices, I don't think they are making any money on their education items. This money has helped us launch the Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), Jonathan Gomez is building a digital storytelling program for faculty to integrate into their programs. We are also going to have an Adobe specialist working in the library. As to your second questions about SJSU Online, probably three years at the program level. Our goal is by year three, they typically be solvent at the program level.

Q: I want to ask a couple of questions about possible enrollment strategies. As you know, doing online well is hard and expensive. Clearly, we are chasing online dollars with self-support programs. Is there a move to try this with the state support side? In the past, the system has moved to summer enrollment. That way we somewhat artificially increase our enrollment to hit target. There is also the opportunity to use special admissions to change the status of folks to have them count. Then, of course, in the past we've also had discussions about attracting graduate students around prudential programs, so basically the question is what kind of enrollment gains are we expecting this year?

A: I think the stateside summer stuff is definitely being churned around system. I'd rather go in with honest, open enrollment. The interesting thing about online within the context of stateside is we are already seeing that at some level, because we aren't back at 95% face-to-face. We are trending about 70% to 75%. I think there is almost an organic movement towards trying to create more online pathways. I think we should do that. Really SJSU Online is targeting part-time adult learners. It is intended to be a different population. If you meet someone that is a full-time learner they really belong in our stateside program and that is where we need to put them. That is the key. Can we create enough pathways so that people can see that reflected in the campus and then make their own decision about how they get through? Graduate enrollment was up. It is up. There is a conversation about where graduate education plays into the larger enrollment picture. The challenge for us is that it's 22%. It's already, as we know, more expensive to run those programs that we barely get any more money for. That's a really hard conversation with all the other things we want to do so I think we're looking at all the strategies you identify and at the same time I'd rather grow the campus with authentic enrollment. The last thing I'll say is AUL is a big deal to me. When you take all those .2's across the number of students, I wouldn't be surprised if it added up to 2.5% or what we would need to

Q: My question has to do with the sustainability of all the initiatives. With SJSU Online, for instance, how are you tracking the success? SJSU Online is targeting older adults, but the national average age of most online students is 18-20.

A: SJSU Online is easy. In four to five years if we are in the toilet, we are going to shut it down. I don't believe that will happen. What we will do if we don't grow is not open programs. We will keep it small. The RSCA program is a much harder thing to track. This is really a philosophical question about where we want to be as a campus. Are we retaining people? Are we recruiting better people? It is really hard to track. Are they sustainable? I believe they are.

Magdalena Barrera, Vice Provost for Faculty Success

Thank you for allowing me to share some information on our faculty hiring trends and demographics. The first slide is on faculty hiring by race and ethnicity. As you may recall from last year's presentation, we had 72 approved searches which yielded 51 new faculty. As you can see from this breakdown, what is most notable for this year is our great strides in LatinX hiring. As you can see here it is just under 30% of the incoming faculty. In the next slide you will see the breakdown by gender. I want to remind folks that we have a new first-time faculty members' book that celebrates the entire incoming cohort. I hope to make this a new tradition at SJSU every Fall. I would really like to thank the university marketing for their support of this project. It starts off with some facts about faculty research and demographics and then goes college by college to introduce you to all the new faculty. It is really exciting to see this come together. In the next slide we are looking at tenure line faculty expansion over the last couple of years. What we are looking at here is a story that's being told about how we hire different demographic groups and the outcomes of our hiring. I want to go back to where we were talking about hiring this cycle having almost 30% Latino. If you look at where we were at in 1920, see how small that bar was.

I want to take a moment and talk about the different elements of what it takes to diversify our faculty year-to-year. The first point is the need to engage with real intention and purpose. You need clear guidance from leadership that is consistent and can be applied as practices and tools that are outlined and can be required as training for all search committees. It comes down to in part that deans, department chairs, and search committee chairs need to work together to make sure they carryout the best practices to the full success that we can. The second point here is our need to create a culture of accountability. How do we hold ourselves and others to what we lay out in our strategic plan, especially around diversity, equity, and inclusion? Before a candidate can be invited to campus the search committee submits the name of the candidate to the dean and to my office for another discussion about how diverse the search has remained over time. Last year we had one search that had far greater diversity than what we would have expected based on nationwide data. To our surprise,

A: The faculty hiring this year is tied to the faculty that retired, weren't retained,