

2018/2019 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 15, 2018

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: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo,
Lee, J., Rodan

CHHS Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Chin, Sen
Absent: None

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Day, Ficke, Wong(Lau)
Faas, Papazian (at start)
Absent: None

COB Representatives:

Present: He, Khavul, Bullen
Absent: None

Deans / AVPs:

Present: Stacks, Olin, Ehrman, Elliott
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi
Absent: Mathur

Students:

Present: Fernandez-Rios, Gallo,
Pang, Rodriguez, Kethepalli
Absent: Gill

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Ramasubramanian, Kumar, Sullivan-Green
Absent: None

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Khan, Riley, McKee, Mok, Ormsbee
Absent: None

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: Cargill, French, Kim, White
Absent: None

Honorary Representative:

Absent: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry, Hart, Trulio
Absent: None

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Higgins, Matoush,
Monday, Trousdale
Absent: Hurtado

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes– Not applicable.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

Chair Frazier requested that Senators place their tent cards on the back table before leaving and remove any trash and other items that they brought with them when they leave.

Chair Frazier requested volunteers to write the Pro and Con Arguments for the ballot for the Constitutional Amendment passed by the Senate at the last meeting.

B. From the President of the University –

The President reminded faculty to submit their colleagues for the four faculty awards

and to consider submitting both faculty and staff for the Wang Award (Note: Only Administrator III and IV's are eligible for the Wang Award from the staff).

The President's Office will be launching a Chief of Staff search in the near future.

The President is moving ahead with plans to establish and VP of Research and Information Technology position and will be putting out a call for search committee members very soon.

IV. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of September 24, 2018 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar:

The consent calendar of October 15, 2018 was approved.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

V. Unfinished Business: None

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA): None

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS): None

C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G): None

D. University Library Board (ULB):

E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

VII. Special Committee Reports:

A. University Budget Presentation by VP Faas. [See University Budget Report.](#)

VPAF taught at USF on planning and budgeting. The VPAF is working on tying in the budget with the Strategic Plan. This past year has been a special year facilities-wise. The Spartan Recreation and Aquatics Center is set to open up in the first quarter of next year. Tremendous progress has been made this year on this building. The new Student Union and the MLK Library are buildings that students will stick around for and spend some time in-between classes. This recreation and aquatics building also has the ability to get students involved in staying on campus and is a healthy option. This will get students happier, more engaged, and when they are engaged they will graduate sooner. The new Science and Innovation building is part of that strategic plan.

The Mubadala Silicon Valley Tennis Tournament brought 4,000 people per day to our campus and gave us great visibility. Serena Williams, arguably one of the best tennis players ever, brought us great visibility and recognition. She is coming back next year. What is important about that is International Marketing Group paid us a rights fee for the campus and built the stands, and the viewing deck. What this does is show us what is possible for us on this campus. We have tremendous assets here that we don't always fully utilize.

We have this same opportunity with places like our library, the Hammer Theatre, and the new science building. The new science building is an eight story building and is the first academic building to be built in 30 years on campus. These are the type of facilities we need to put on the campus. At night when the science building is lit up you will be able to see faculty, staff, and students interacting in the building. We are trying to raise the level of our game with buildings like these. VP Faas got a text from the Mayor of San José saying, “Wow, gorgeous building. Thank you. This is a great addition to our landscape here in the city.” This is an example of a relationship we have with the city.

The RSCA work that we’ve budgeted for is moving forward. Information Technology is now a standalone group that crosses over all divisions. We have a \$150 million endowment which is one of the largest in the CSU, and VP Lanning is looking to massively increase that number.

VP Faas has established the Office of Sustainability reporting directly to him. Dr. Cushing is leading that group, and about six students will be working with the group moving forward.

The housing problem in the valley is a huge issue. As every one of us retires, VP Faas is not sure how any of our replacements can find an affordable place to live. VP Faas is looking into how he can have staff/faculty housing reasonably close to the university. We also need to have more student dorms that are affordable. It is proven that when students live on campus they graduate faster and that they get more involved in campus events.

We also need to continue our work in diversity inclusion. The work that Kathy Wong(Lau) is doing is right up there with the best in the country.

The operating plan has been linked to the Strategic Plan.

Over the past years the Graduation Initiative has been a big part of our budget and it again this year. Almost as big is all the work we are doing on this campus. We are also looking at release time for faculty. Safety is another priority. The night safety walk is next week on South campus. We also need to correct what is broken in the budget, things that haven’t been addressed previously.

For the Graduation Initiative, we have taken the \$3.5 million from the Chancellor’s Office and effectively matched that and have continued to invest that and more in the Graduation Initiative. If we can get students out of here earlier, we look better and make progress.

AAD will discuss further, but Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) became a budget priority this year. It isn’t a big dollar amount this year, but it is the first step in this process.

For security and safety, the HGH building has been leaking for a long, long time and fixing the roof has been waiting for a long, long, time. We are putting \$1.5 million into fixing that roof. Cameras are now in every one of our garages and can track ingress and egress. License plate readers are coming very soon as well. We are continuing to look at our dorms and the library to ensure they are safe.

The VPAF has a police chief search underway and will be doing interviews at the end of this month as well as a search for a Clery Coordinator, a CSU-mandated position, reporting directly to VP Faas, and EH&S position.

Joe West Hall has been here for 50 years. Over the past two years we have upgraded and put sprinklers into the building and other safety features. It is now a good and safe building for our students to be in.

Question:

Q: The Music building doesn't have cameras and other safety features and this leaves us vulnerable to attack. What can we do?

A: VPAF noted that they are constantly doing training and role playing. We installed clocks in every classroom last year with digital readouts and speakers. This is the fastest way we've found of notifying people to shelter in place. The next thing we are doing is making sure we have S2 locks throughout the campus.

Q: I think what might make the faculty feel better is to have a more visible presence by UPD on the campus.

A: Agreed

Correcting what's broken refers to items that in the past we paid to fix with salary savings. We are trying to get these things into the budget as we move forward.

Last year was the closest we've come to breaking even with the Athletics budget. We want to make sure that the Athletics budget continues to break even and they aren't overspending.

For Space Management Planning, the VPAF wants to make sure we are doing the right things around this campus such as getting out of the 10th Street garage. Student facing services must move out of the garage. We are looking at what services don't need to be right on the campus and which services we really need in the spaces we have. Student Services should be located somewhere in the middle of the campus. In regards to the Hammer Theatre, we have a short term lease and we are working on making that a long term agreement. As far as commencement is concerned, we have added funding to the VP of University Advancement's budget to cover commencement.

The process that we went through is a three-year budget. Everything the state does is on a one-year basis. We are doing a three-year budget. We have a plan going forward for each year. We did this for every line item we have. We had \$143 million in requests. Lots of things didn't get funded, but we went through and were able to

fund about \$44 million of that \$143 million.

The CSU asked for \$280 million in additional funding from the state and we got \$190 million from the state. The bulk of that is salary and benefits based money. SJSU got about \$14.5 million from the state. We got \$3.5 million for the graduation initiative, \$13 million for benefits and compensation, so our total budget for SJSU from the state was \$372 million. The \$372 million is our operating budget, but our bigger budget is \$650 million. We are a pretty big entity.

We have more than \$400 million in deferred maintenance on this campus. We have \$2 million for deferred maintenance in the base budget this year. Three years ago we had \$0 in the base budget. We are taking steps to get better. We have a long way to go.

About 63% of our \$372 million goes to Academic Affairs. Advancement had an increase this year of about \$900,000, because we funded graduation. The rest are about the same as last year.

Question:

Q: Last year Athletics was at 2.4%, and this year they are at 3%?

A: Last year it didn't fund the \$1.6 million for cost of attendance. That is why it shows 3%. This is the whole budget. Last year to this year there has been no change in Athletics.

As you can see 79% of our budget goes to salary and benefits. About 54% goes to salaries and 25% to benefits. Last year it was 50% to salaries and 25% to benefits. This has always been a people equation.

Questions:

Q: My recollection from an earlier version of this presentation is that when you went out to the divisions and asked about their increased budget request it was around the \$145 million mark with \$65 million being allocated, but the number here is \$44 million so where did that come from?

A: There was \$44 million allocated, but there was another \$22 million that were must fund items like the Hammer Theatre. These are items we are committed to.

Q: You noted a 5% reduction in student aid and I was wondering what this means in terms of student access?

A: Essentially we had more student aid given to us than what our students could use. There really is no impact on an aggregate level.

Q: You mentioned the funds for the deferred maintenance being so low, are we actually doing enough for the students?

A: You never do enough. Most of it is heavy lifting items that pick up over time. It is little fixes that grow bigger and bigger each year and by year 10 they require significant funds.

Q: I'm always confused in terms of Spartan Shops and Chartwells, can you explain?

A: Spartan Shops is an auxiliary, same as Associated Students is an auxiliary, and is in charge of the bookstore, food services, real estate, and the concessions facilities down at South Campus. That auxiliary remains in place. Nothing changes. The only thing we traded out is the food services. Instead of being in house it is outsourced.

Q: I get that you have an idea of being forward-looking, and you are looking at creating buildings that are inspirational to keep the ball rolling, but I have issues with money going towards academic excellence and innovation, when we have \$400 million in deferred maintenance? I can't teach in labs anymore because I've been begging FDO for three years to fix a sink, and their solution was to give me plywood around a sink. I begged them to fix that problem and they replaced it with plastic. Neither of these work well in a chemical lab. Cheryl has been working with us greatly. We are trying to recruit faculty to help us deal with the water crisis in California. This is not going to go away. This is multidisciplinary and multi-departmental. The lab that we have that would be best for this I can't even let students into, because it is in such disrepair. How can we say we are looking at academic excellence and forward looking when the basic infrastructure isn't there? FDO also charged an exorbitant \$15,000 to do the study of what to do in this space, when we are abundantly clear on what needs to be done. I understand there are some design things that come with that, but \$15,000 to do the study before anything gets done. These are the types of things that make it difficult to have any faith in this progress because I can't even provide basic academic experience and not excellence with spaces like that and I know I'm not alone with that. What are we doing to make FDO a more productive part of the university to work with? I have a mile-long list of things just in the last week that I've fought with them about. Basically, we can't get even adequate service from them.

A: If even 1/10th of what you said is accurate, then you and I need to talk because that is unacceptable. That is the answer I've given in the past and will continue to give. We've got to fix these things one at a time and will move forward. If I don't put on a chart this is where we are going, we aren't going to get there. I'm looking 15 to 20 years down the road. If we don't solve the housing problem, your sink won't matter. Your sink is important and we will work with FDO on that. The improvements we are making to the Music building are all cosmetic, but it will look nice. We are moving through the campus making these changes.

Q: On page three, there is a mention of surplus FTEF and there is a lot of it there in the projected budget. Can you explain what that is and let me know when we have surplus is that FTEF that we have gone over some mark and we are not getting support for?

A: We get funded based on our targeted headcount, but anytime we go above we get less money. All we get is tuition money. We don't get state funded.

Q: So, that leaves us at a disadvantage?

A: It is not as good as getting state funding, but it is better than getting no money. Back when most of us were going to school, if we went to a CSU 90% of the money being paid came from the state. This year 46% is coming from the state. That is up

from 44%, but is less than half what we need.

Q: On page 7 under university-wide commitments there is mention of 4th Street rent. Is that for the group that's moving off campus? My second question is what is the item called cabinet commitment?

A: Yes, that is correct. The 4th Street rent is for those moving off campus. The cabinet commitment refers to a line item for the Chief of Staff.

Q: I notice in multiple places budgets were going to come in at a deficit, but then there is a line that says, "prior year funding balance" and that either breaks even or shows a surplus. A prior year fund balance doesn't happen every year.

A: Yes, it does. It rolls forward.

Q: Can you explain that briefly.

A: If we don't spend everything we have, it rolls forward. That is the whole reason we changed the budgeting for the salaries. The reason salaries aren't globally based and are now centrally based is those salaries would just roll forward wherever they happened to be. Now they are aggregated in a central pot and that is how these initiatives get funded.

Q: At what point can we revisit the allocation of the IRA fund? Out of \$10 million, \$8 million is going to Athletics. When do we start shifting that towards the academic areas of the house? When do we start using those funds for the library instead of using the lottery funds.

A: There is a committee (CFAC) that meets on that on a regular basis.

Q: My question is about the Graduation Initiative 2025, are there any plans for after 2025?

A: The state lots of times gives us one-time money for things, but then there is no money to fund the projects for future years. That's where having a multi-year budget process comes in.

Q: Thank you for putting the Athletics budget under the category of something that is broken. I think you meant when you said they were balanced that they didn't spend more than they were given. Still compared with other campuses in the CSU they are hardly balanced. It appears 67% of their budget comes from student fees and operating funds. San Diego and Fresno are only 46%, so they are coming close to balancing their budgets by raising their own funds.

A: Those figures are correct. We have a \$28 million Athletics budget. We are the bottom school in the Mountain West Conference when it comes to funding Athletics. San Diego State is on the top. Fresno happens to be number three. Looking at those schools is a little like comparing apples and oranges, because they are spending way more on their Athletics programs.

Q: About two Athletics Directors ago, our Athletics Director said that the highest priority for Athletics was reducing that level of subsidy. Two Athletic Directors later we are still at 67%. It doesn't seem we've made any progress at all in weaning our Athletics program off our support?

A: I can't argue with the numbers that are there. We need to be more self-sustaining.

The way you do that is by having a football program that can play and win and that our students and faculty can rally behind.

Q: Under Intercollegiate Athletics salaries are listed as \$6.53 million, but on the same page last year salaries were listed at \$4.56 million. They have went up from \$4.56 million to \$6.53 million?

A: Honestly I thought it was just the opposite. Let's talk about this after the meeting and I'll show you a chart that shows the exact opposite trend.

A. Academic Affairs Budget Presentation by AVP Bradley Olin, Academic Budgets and Planning, and Joan Ficke, Interim Provost. [See Academic Affairs Budget Presentation Slides.](#)

Let me lay out some rules of the road so you know what to expect from the presentation. We are going to talk about three things; the planning priorities for the division, the demographics on why we are spending this money, and then a little bit of detail on how the division budget works.

Planning Priorities and Highlights:

We have a variety of investment areas including research areas, faculty growth, audiology program (three-year commitment), no limit enrollment, and support for our international students.

A key accomplishment has been the rollout of RSCA. This is about preserving the educational program and making sure we continue to teach our students well but also giving our faculty the opportunity to focus on the teacher-scholar paradigm. Faculty are able to bring the knowledge that they are getting from their research back into the classroom and our students then get to engage in some of that world class scholarship. This is just the beginning. It is a phased-in approach across a few years.

One thing we continue to talk about is tenure density. However, we are trying to transition away from that in terms of our faculty. Every year the Chancellor's Office produces tenure density information, but the reality is that tenure density progress doesn't capture the kind of success we are experiencing on the campus. As you can see, it has been pretty steady. Even though we are making tremendous gains in expanding our faculty ranks, we are hiring more and more lecturers to cover the growth in our student population. I think it is important that we take control of the conversation on this campus about the fact that we are doing really well.

Our faculty ranks have expanded very rapidly. We are talking about net gains. We had a 12% increase in tenure/tenure-track faculty. We average about 21 new faculty members to our ranks per year. This is significant. This is done in a challenging environment where we are facing losses from faculty members that are retiring or leaving. This year we are looking at a slightly smaller net gain of 14. We have representation across the division as far as new faculty coming

onboard.

The no limits enrollment plan is a significant investment in terms of changing the way we move our students through their scholarly experience here. There are two diagrams. One is average unit load per undergraduate student and you can see we are above 13 units per student. This is a tremendous milestone. We will probably never get to the magic number of 15 units per student, but remember that if a student doesn't attempt 15 units per semester they won't make it in four years. As you can see we have a trend that jumped from 13% to 46% of our incoming frosh attempting 15 or more units per semester. This is a culture change. We can attribute this to advising, our "Frosh Finish in Four Campaign," and a lot of the work that has been done throughout the division and in the classrooms to ensure students know they can take a 15-unit load and be successful. These are student lives that we are affecting and every year that they stay past four means lost opportunities and affects housing, etc.

We are trying to bring attention to the graduate student population. You can see there are a number of students that are first generation college students that are attending graduate school. Nearly 20% of our undergraduate students are first generation and minority students. We know for a fact that underrepresented minority students become a challenge to graduate in a timely manner. We have the Under Represented Minority (URM) Achievement Gap and we are working really hard to find ways to combat the systematic challenges that people bring with them to the institution and help them navigate and get through.

Questions:

Q: I find it very disheartening that there is no Asian or Asian-American/Pacific Islander Student Success Center. We have an African-American and Chicano/Chicanx Student Success Center. We have a huge Asian-American student population here.

A: I can't address that. That is a cabinet decision I believe.

A: The categories that AVP Olin has to deal with are those handed to him nationally. While, we could probably be more sensitive in terms of how we report data on the campus, AVP Olin has national data to work with.

Q: She is asking about an Asian-American Student Success Center on campus, will there be one?

A: This is being addressed at the cabinet level. There is a team that includes faculty and staff (MPPs) working on a taskforce to put together support for all Asian-American students.

There is a shift based on changes to our admissions policy and the Santa Clara new Frosh number is starting to cross over in proportion to other areas. That is because we are giving preference to our local service area (Santa Clara County) first. Our admissions policies have changed and we are seeing this in this cohort. Our largest segment of students is directly from Santa Clara County.

On the faculty diversity side, our incoming cohort of 2018/2019 shows that we are making some progress in this area. There were 12 Asian, 3 Black, 10 Hispanic, 27 White, 2 (identify in 2 or more groups), and 7 not specified.

Budget Overview

We get a target enrollment from the state (25,306 this year) and anyone we teach in excess of that target, we only get to keep the tuition revenue. We have roughly 1250 students that we are going to be teaching with only tuition revenue this year. It used to be that the Chancellor had a strict cap on enrollment and the campuses were penalized if they went over that target by more than 3.5%. Since 2015, the Chancellor's Office has relaxed that ceiling. However, having it kept the legislature from coming back and saying you don't need state support you can do it on your own dime. What the Chancellor's Office has come up with is that we are helping our students get through faster by opening more sections, eliminating bottlenecks, and encouraging our students to take 15 units a semester. There is a one-time investment that the CSU secured from the legislature to use directly for instruction, such as hiring lecturers. We can't use one-time money to pay for tenure/tenure-track faculty. That is risky business. Right now we are at 106% of target.

Division Budget:

We are primarily operating fund supported (\$144 million or 76%). However, we also have lottery funding that supports library acquisitions (\$1.9 million or 1%), and then a small amount of SSETF (\$8.7 million), and CERF funding (\$35.9 million or 19%).

Questions:

Q: On the tenure density slide, I wasn't sure what you said can you clarify?

A: Sure, do you want to know the amount spent on searches this year? There were 69 searches and 14 new searches. Tenure density is the ratio of tenure/tenure-track faculty to lecturers. The denominator is lecturers and the numerator is tenure/tenure-track faculty. As we bring in lecturers to cover additional FTES, then the denominator is moving alongside the numerator making it hard to push that number up. This is what the Chancellor's Office is using, but about a year ago they commissioned a study that showed this number is becoming decreasingly relevant because there are so many mitigating factors. They even suggested that campuses come up with their own measures in lieu of just using tenure density.

Q: I have a problem with that. It doesn't make sense mathematically.

A: It actually does, because at the system level they are moving away from the concept of tenure density because there are so many mitigating factors as AVP Olin said. The bottom line always will be how you mount your instructional program and who is the person you get to do that for you and how you manage that budget hill. What is happening is that at the system level they are saying that the formula AVP Olin just described with tenure/tenure-track over or under lecturers may or may not be a useful data point to try to understand how many

tenure-track faculty are involved in the institution and that coupled with the pressure to grow your enrollment means you are always going to be a little behind in terms of the hiring of tenure/tenure-track faculty.

Q: I guess I'm a little concerned with the work being on both the tenure line faculty and the lecturers.

A: I understand what drives the question. I'm trying to describe it as the variables at play in terms of making decisions on where you put your money in order to deliver the instructional program. From my perspective, the end point is always when students come in can they get the courses they need to get out. How do you manage that against some of those decisions that have to be made related to money.

Q: With more and more faculty applying for RSCA, who will be teaching those classes? Will additional lecturers be hired?

A: As more and more faculty become RSCA active, some of them will buy themselves out so there is a projection (over three years that the previous Provost did) that institutionally we can afford to do that, preserve faculty hiring, and deliver the institutional program as best as we can. Will there be some give and take in that? Yes, there will be. The projection is to create a cadre of tenure track faculty that are RSCA and grant active that provide us with a self-sustaining financial mechanism that will continue to provide the release to faculty as we move forward. Does that mean that there will not be increases in lecturer hiring? I don't know the answer to that, but the goal would be to keep it stable. The answer is that on a year-to year basis that is probably going to change here and there. We can't know that going forward.

Q: If you have more and more faculty on assigned time, then who is teaching?

A: Okay, I'll try it again. What we are going to try and do is those faculty who are scholarly and research active will have other kinds of opportunities some of which will be funded, which will give us some of the funding we can use to move forward with our instructional program. Some of those lines will be lecturers and some will be an increase in the number of tenure and tenure-track faculty.

Q: Yes, but the tenure/tenure-track faculty hires won't keep up with the need, so it seems to me that we will be hiring more lecturers?

A: Possibly. I can't say yes or no. I don't see it being a whole lot different than what we have now.

Q: I am concerned with the term and maybe the concept of "no limit enrollment." The reason we didn't have it before, as you pointed out, was to militate with the legislature to increase funding and the legislature had a long pattern of expecting us to take more enrollment and then not appropriating funding to cover it. I can't imagine what would happen if someone in the legislature starting talking about the CSU's new policy of "no limits enrollment." That would be catastrophic for our budget. Maybe I'm not interpreting or understanding this correctly. Is this something just at SJSU, or is it throughout the CSU? Where did this term come from?

A: We were sort of pioneers. My predecessor, Marna Genes, was instrumental in petitioning the Chancellor's Office to allow us to go above our target. Other campuses have blown past their target without asking permission, but we got the green light. The expectation was not that we would always be overenrolled, but that as we were able to graduate more students we could enroll more students. We are just now starting to see this effect by seeing our students taking 15 units or more. As these students graduate out, we should be able to take in more.

Q: Just from a standpoint of public relations, couldn't we keep it a secret?

A: I hear you, I don't like the phrase either. It makes me nervous. On the other hand, if we are attentive to the issues of progress to degree and attention to getting students in and out. This is a good concept for who we are and what we see in our mission, but practically and operationally I think it is a little uncertain.

Q: Can we call it something else?

A: Yes, I think we can. It is an internal term. However, where the term came from is that there were students that were told that they couldn't get a seat even when a professor had a seat open, because the professor was told not to go over his limit. The student would then go to the Chair who then said it came from the Dean, and the Dean said it came from the Provost. No limits meant no artificial limits. No telling students they can't take a class for a reason that makes no sense. If you have a size limit, or other legitimate limit then that is fine. We can change that phrase, but the intent is that if the student needs the class and we have the space then we will take them. The Graduation Initiative of 2025 lists six focus points and one is increasing unit loads, so it is actually sanctioned by the Chancellor's Office at this point.

C: There is another side to tenure density, and I understand all the mitigating factors that you claim. If we can never move the marker so that there are a greater proportion of tenured faculty then tenured faculty will always bear a load that is unsustainable, because the service is done by the tenured faculty, the shared governance is done by the tenured faculty, at the same time they are teaching a full load. We are now also moving tenured faculty out of teaching and moving in lecturers. If we can't move that marker long term, it is not a profession we can recruit people into.

Q: On the slide with the SSETF of \$8.7 million, I thought it was higher than that?

A: This is the base budget and doesn't include any one-time funds.

Q: So if you included the one-time funds it would be \$9.8 million.

A: It would be larger, but I don't have the exact number.

Q: Thank you for the presentation, and really appreciate the RSCA movement. Some of the assigned time comes from coordinating programs, so I'm wondering if any thought has gone into how that fits into RSCA and whether there would be monies that fund these RSCA activities that might just cutoff those kind of coordination decisions and certain departments require release time for coordination so wondering how that fits in?

A: That is not a question for AVP Olin. What we have asked all the deans to do

is step back and take a look at what all their needs are and what they need to run their divisions, where there are accrediting requirements, etc. There are some important activities that need assigned time and some places where it can even out a little. This is the administrative responsibility of the chairs and the deans.

Q: Having access to tenured faculty is one of the things that leads to higher graduation rates as well as having involvement in research, and our lecturers typically aren't involved in research so maintaining an awareness of tenure density actually will have an impact. If you look at graduation rates across the CSU and you look at tenure density, those tenure density rates do predict graduation rates.

A: I think it is just the use of the nomenclature. I don't think there is an argument about the value of having tenure/tenure-track faculty.

Q: I think what people are reacting to is the idea that we don't have to worry any more about tenure density. The language could have improved in this presentation, but also there is the reality that tenure density actually does play a role in graduation.

Q: Looking ahead, there are two bills that just passed, SB 838 and AB 2658, which enact the ability for block-chain credentials to be used in the work force as a proxy for education credentials. There will be competition to provide these badges. My question is has the CSU been approached already, and if so what kind of opportunity would those of us that have studied this technology have to offer insights on the impacts for higher education?

A: No, it has not crossed my desk. However, the Dean of IES may be reviewing it. She is in charge of dealing with special session credential offerings that respond to market demand.

Q: Sandy Hirsh has been doing some work on this and I think it is very serious policy issue that we should be looking into.

A: The curriculum remains in the hands of faculty whether it is stackable or unstackable. Block theme is a technology that is coming into the educational sector right now and we should be paying attention to it. It puts the power in students' hands how they want to use their credentialing and how they want to port it across institutions.

Q: There are some questions about assessment and quality of the actual credential since it is a ledger system where information can be entered and can be undone, but it is never really gets deleted so those kind of things long term can end up being problematic.

C: AVP Olin thanked his staff for putting together the presentation for him for the Senate.

VIII. New Business:

IX. State of the University Announcements:

- A. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation)**
- B. Statewide Academic Senators**
- C. Provost**
- D. Associated Students President**
- E. Vice President for Administration and Finance**
- F. Vice President for Student Affairs**
- G. Chief Diversity Officer**

X. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.