

2019/2020 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 28, 2019

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Associate Vice Chair Roxana Marachi. Forty-five Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Rodan, Curry,
Frazier, Mathur, Parent
Absent: Van Selst

CHHS Representatives:

Present: Grosvenor, Sen, Chin
Absent: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett

Administrative Representatives:

Present, Wong(Lau), Faas, Papazian,
Del Casino
Absent: Day

COB Representatives:

Present: He, Khavul
Absent: None

Deans:

Present: Ehrman, d'Alarcao, Stacks,
Lattimer
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi

Students:

Present: Kaur, Delgadillo, Gallo,
Trang, Birrer, Roque
Absent: None

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Sullivan-Green, Kumar, Okamoto
Absent: Ramasubramanian

Alumni Representative:

Absent: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Khan, McKee, Kitajima, Coelho
Absent: Riley

Emeritus Representative:

Absent: McClory

SCI Representatives:

Present: White, Cargill, Muller French
Absent: None

Honorary Representative:

Present: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Wilson, Jackson, Hart, Lombardi
Absent: None

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Higgins, Masegian, Monday
Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

There were no minutes for approval.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Reminder to participate in President Papazian's performance review, Chancellor White previously sent information to the campus about how to submit a letter for the review.

Chair Mathur encouraged Senators to nominate their colleagues for one of the four faculty awards. The call for nominations for these awards has been sent and nominations are due to the Senate Office by October 31, 2019.

B. From the President of the University:

Trustee Jane W. Carney is on campus today. It is a great experience getting to meet and take the Trustees across campus.

Chancellor White has announced his retirement sometime next year. The exact date is unsure. The trustee search committee has already been formed and our faculty trustee Romey Sabalius is on that committee.

Senators will be receiving an announcement about staff awards soon. There will be three awards and they were developed by the staff. When you see that announcement, please nominate your extraordinary staff.

Questions:

Q: Thank you for the staff awards.

A: This was something discussed by the Senate leadership and I'm glad this has finally emerged. These are the first ever staff awards given out campus-wide. They will be given out at the Staff Service Recognition Event in March 2020. We may decide to add other awards next year.

[Addendum to the minutes: Chair Mathur has expressed her thanks to the Senate Administrator and the Professional Standards Committee (PS) for their efforts surrounding Staff Awards. The Senate Administrator made two referrals over the course of several years asking the Professional Standards Committee to look into establishing staff awards similar to the faculty awards on campus. The Chair of the PS Committee spoke with two different Chiefs of Staff over the course of two years and presented her with samples of staff awards from other campuses to assist in establishing staff awards.]

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

B. Consent Calendar –

There was no dissent to the consent calendar as amended by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

V. Unfinished Business –

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

- A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – No report.**
- B. Professional Standards Committee (PS) – No report.**
- C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) – No report.**
- D. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – No report.**
- E. University Library Board (ULB) – No report.**

VII. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.

- A. Vice President for Student Affairs – Not Present.**
- B. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) – No Report.**
- C. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation) – (Report distributed electronically)**
- D. CSU Statewide Academic Senators – No Report.**
- E. Provost – No Report.**
- F. Associated Students President – No Report.**
- G. Vice President for Administration and Finance – No Report.**

VIII. Special Committee Reports –

IX. New Business –

Vice President Charlie Faas gave a presentation on the University Budget for 2019-2020. This has been a fantastic year and probably as good as it gets budget-wise. We have parceled out the funds consistent with our Strategic Plan. One of things we have been trying to do on this campus for the past three years is a multi-year budget. The CSU CFO has been trying to push the governor to go this way, but the governor has been reluctant and still wants a yearly budget. The good news is that Governor Newsom is a lot more positive about the CSU and that is why this year we have seen a lot more funding this year than we have seen in the past. The other side is that with the climate the way it is in the business world right now, the recession is kind of out there. No one is sure when it is going to hit, but we know that it will. That is why we are keeping some reserves. With this governor being more financially conservative, he will probably give out more one-time money over the next couple of years than base money and given where the recession is, maybe that isn't such a bad thing.

I started last year's budget presentation with some pictures and thought I would do so again this year. The Science Building is happening and is on budget and on schedule. Dean Kaufman is very happy about it. To do this, we had the AS House moved from one end of campus to the other and that was a feat in itself. We broke ground on the South Campus Parking Garage and the new Athletic Field two months ago. This will be a welcome addition to parking. We are anxiously awaiting the handover of the Ahlquist Building. All these new buildings equal our strategic plan. It is about research space and new academic space. Also, more parking means better access for all. Finally, the Ahlquist Building means affordable housing for faculty and staff.

We did a three-year budget. The reason you do a three-year budget is that when you start with a group like Research and hire a VP of Research and Innovation, he then hires an admin so maybe this year his organization is small, but next year it will grow and the year after it will grow more. If we aren't keeping an eye on what we say yes to this year and what that means in year two, three, and four, we have a problem. With Transformation 2030, we are making sure everything is part of the 10-year plan. Funding faculty startups means making sure that is within the base budget. Research growth means making sure it is funded.

There were a lot of things that used to be funded in Academic Affairs through salary savings. Last year we changed the way we did the budget. This year we put those funds in a holding area and now what you are seeing is the fruit of those efforts as we begin funding things.

Graduate Studies involved getting those doctoral programs funded. We have also carved out funds to improve spaces on campus. Data Analytics has a small amount we are funding this year (\$50,000), but this will increase next year.

The philosophy is you fund the positions with O&E and that 5% is all that will remain in the divisions. The divisions can do what they want with that.

We have \$20 million of new base funding. Most of that is compensation and benefits. However, part is for enrollment growth and increasing graduation rates.

We have \$250,000 to study the Ahlquist Building to see how we can best build there and how we can make it low cost housing for faculty and staff.

The way we added funds to this year's budget is by adding goals. In goal one is the graduation initiative, faculty startups, and establishing a research division. We also have a net of 23 faculty positions being added.

The second goal is to excel and lead. This includes the graduate and doctorate programs, acquiring the Ahlquist building, looking at our fundraising campaign and ensuring it is funded while in the quiet phase, and adding to the IT Infrastructure. We are also getting our message and branding awareness out there. We will be getting streaming equipment for our football and other athletic teams. In addition, installing coordinating cameras that interact with each other. Today, we have nine different camera systems around the campus. For deferred maintenance, we put in \$1 million and we get \$20 million back from the Chancellor's Office.

We have added \$400,000 this year, next year and the year after we will add about \$800,000 to \$900,000 to the mix. We have to get the Audiology lab started this year. We have \$750,000 that was part of our base budget this year that goes toward refreshing, updating, and modifying classrooms. We added about 50% to that budget and hopefully another 50% in a year or two. We are continuing to refresh all our classrooms. We have

a lot of campus infrastructure that has aged and we need to do some fixing up until we are able to build new buildings.

Academic Affairs has 62% of our budget and the rest goes to the other divisions. We have a base or operating budget of \$400 million, but with the auxiliaries and all other funds it is about \$700 million. This is about a 5.5% increase year over year. Salary and benefits are 77% of our budget. We have very little wiggle room when it comes to changes here.

We have an aging campus. We are proud to be the first CSU Campus and the oldest campus in the West, but that comes with a little bit of a price. In the past few years, we have built the new Student Union, the Spartan Recreation and Aquatic Center (SRAC), Campus Village 2 (CV2), and a new Science Building. However, there are so many really old buildings and labs, etc. Our next step is to get campus-wide input to determine what our master planning should be. There are many buildings built between the 1910 to 1960 including Dudley Moorhead and the Engineering Building. We have a limited amount of funds coming from the Chancellor's Office to help us from a facilities perspective. We have the bond that will be on the ballot. Hopefully, that bond will pass and there will be about \$2 billion that will be divided among all the campuses, but we need a lot more than that. The Event Center is a 1980's building. We just got \$8 million over 20 years for a naming rights partner and that will give a facelift to the building, but when I look at Sweeney and MacQuarrie Halls, they need help also. The Master Plan will tell us what spaces we need and what spaces we need to grow.

Questions:

Q: I'm very glad to hear about the Ahlquist Building and affordable housing, but I have junior faculty in my department right now that are facing serious hardship in terms of being able to afford housing. Some are living on campus, but they are concerned that on campus housing is priced at market value. Is there any room in the budget for housing allowances to help junior faculty that are here and to attract stellar candidates?

A: There is a long and short answer. This is clearly a priority for me and the administration. We recognize what is happening in the valley now is off the charts ridiculous. When you ask someone making \$80,000 to \$90,000 a year to afford to live here it is very difficult. That is why we are trying to go as fast as we can with the Ahlquist Building, but we have to be careful that if we give discounted rates to someone it becomes a taxable event. We are open to looking at everything. VP Day and I will be looking at things we can do. We will be looking at rates and what we have available and making sure those rates are set not based on the market, but to keep pace with our expenditures.

Q: Keep in mind that we only had a 2.5% cost of living increase last year.

A: Understood.

VP Faas introduced and thanked the members of the Budget Advisory Committee and Co-Chair McKee.

Q: I think you are overlooking the impact this has had on lecturers. In a recent Lecturer Council Survey, lecturers overwhelmingly talked about what terrible pay they had and how it has impacted their lives. They talked about not being able to marry and have a family. People are living in terrible circumstances, but their commitment to the students keeps them working here.

A: When I spoke about faculty and staff housing, that meant all faculty.

Q: I think when I saw the prices for housing it was about \$2,000 to \$3,000 a month which is way beyond a lecturer's wages.

A: Okay.

Q: As we build new buildings, do we increase our base budget?

A: It is never enough, but yes.

Q: One of the concerns I have about our Strategic Plan is that it really doesn't speak to the hard times, which is not very strategic. I'm wondering if there is anything built into this budget so that if there is a turn in the economy and our budget, people aren't being laid off and construction isn't stopped and the lights permanently go out?

A: If we have as big a recession as we had the last time, it would be very, very difficult. Part of what my team has been pushing for has been putting money away for a rainy day. Last year we had a state audit that said you are putting away too much money and accused us of hiding things. The analysis turned out to be only a few month's worth of reserve. If there is a major recession, then the CSU is going to have hard things to deal with. We are ready to deal with those, but we can never say we're protected. That would be irresponsible of me to say that.

Q: Is there an order of priority if we have to deal with things like that, or will it be across the board?

A: I'm sure it will not be across the board.

President Papazian: We will be very strategic about it, but will prioritize people and programs.

Q: My question is about the pie chart on the salaries, it shows salaries at 52%. Can you give me a breakdown of where those percentages are as far as faculty, staff, and administrators?

A: I don't know, but we will get the answer for you. The bulk of that is faculty.

Q: Why does most of the SSETF fee go to Athletics? I find that very odd. Very little of that goes to Student Success.

A: It is the same percentage that has been going there for years.

Q: I find it odd that we get about \$21 million and almost half goes to Athletics, and it grows each year?

A: About \$8 million goes to Athletics and it grows by whatever the percentage is that goes to Athletics with any increase in funds. It is the same number it has been.

Q: Is there any auditing on the purchase of cameras, because I have noticed several cameras in the same hall that don't have different angles and I'm wondering what safeguards there are to ensure there is useful spending?

A: Once a month on Friday afternoons, I get a band of people together from all divisions, IT, and the police force to talk about campus security including the different things needed, things being done, policies, what cameras are needed, and where they should be placed. Those two cameras may look like they are aimed the same, but one may be aimed on the line in the student union and the other on the cash register. What we want to make sure is that we have consistent quality in all the cameras.

Q: Looking at the spreadsheet on spending and comparing it to last year, there is one division that had less money allocated to it this year than last year and that was Student Affairs. It appears that we made up for it in total funds from other areas like SSETF and housing funds. Can you comment on the rearrangement? Can you explain to the Senate what housing funds are as well?

A: The Student Affairs area includes the base budget, housing, wellness, and other satellite areas. Those funds don't get to comingle. For instance, housing funds go to housing and that is around \$50 million. That \$50 million, and it goes up about 3.5% per year, is based on occupancy, tenancy, and sometimes it is triple or double occupancy or open occupancy so the actuals will change versus what the budget is, but 3.5% was the raise in costs we did year over year in the housing space.

SSETF and its volatility does not impact the base budget for Student Affairs. Pat (VP Day) and his team make sure they ask for what they need. They had some base reserves and they didn't have to ask for as much. There was also a little bit of rearrangement when it came to Student Success.

Q: On page 11, there is a very useful chart that compares expenditures across five campuses like us in size. This chart is very useful. However, the title of this chart hasn't been changed for several years, so it says "Comparison of CSU expenditures 2017 and 2018." Then at the bottom it also has 2017 and 2018 SSETF, so has this data been updated since 2017-2018?

A: This is the last data that we have been able to access for the campuses from 2017-2018. The information from 2018-2019 is not ready yet.

Q: I was impressed that we are almost in line with these other institutions. However, what is institutional support? This is the one area we are significantly different than other campuses. What is it and why are we different?

A: This is direct costs and overhead for IT.

Q: So, it's good we are low?

A: Yes.

Q: My question pertains to security. Last year or the year before you said we were looking at facial recognition technology. Given how controversial it is, are we going along with it, and if we are can you give us an update on it?

A: We're nowhere with it. There are uses for it and applications we could use, but right now there is enough concern that we are not going to go down that path until we have a good technology base to go off of and the public perception has improved. We are not going to lead on this one.

Q: Is there one point person on this campus for which security is their main task?

A: You could start with me (VP Faas) or drop down to the Chief of Police.

Q: I'm asking more about purchase of and placement of cameras?

A: A couple years ago we had major problems in our parking garages, and one of the first things I did was put up cameras in all our parking garages.

Q: I'm not questioning what you did. I'm just wondering if there are people with special expertise in these areas of placing cameras?

A: Of course, but that goes back to the team that meets every Friday afternoon.

We have the Chief of Police in there, our IT people, our emergency operations, and facilities teams, etc. That groups works together to decide where the most optimal place to place the cameras is. This is based on actual and perceived data. We also work with our communications team.

Q: I'm wondering if there are other areas, such as purchasing, that have oversight to ensure there isn't overspending?

A: Sure. Kathleen Prunty is responsible for outsourcing on our campus. She is tasked with making sure that no one else is going out and purchasing cameras for our campus. She makes sure we get the best prices we can get. She makes sure there is no single source and we are getting the best value for our money.

CDO Wong(Lau): I just wanted to respond to the question about expertise. When we need outside expertise we are quite comfortable bringing in outside help.

A: (VP Faas). Thank you. Whether that is sourcing a food service group, or building a new dorm, or faculty/staff housing. Last year we brought someone in to look at housing to see where our security issues were.

Q: We have cameras in the classroom and no one seems to know whether they are being tracked, but that isn't my main question. There was an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education about what Sacramento State is doing in terms of tracking students just last week. Apparently, they have a system that actually tracks students on campus. There was a lot of discussion in the article about using this for analytics and for understanding what student success means, and so forth. It is an opt in system, but nevertheless it is a third-party managed program. It uses the student's phones to track them. Are we considering anything like this?

A: No, we are not.

Q: Okay, because there were a lot of questions about what was being done with the data.

A: Of course, and whenever results like that are coming in you want to own that as much as possible. You don't want someone else selling to your students and your population. You don't know who is getting that information. We have no plans for anything like this.

Q: Do you have a ballpark figure of how many cameras we have on campus?

A: Well over 1,000. The only time I'm aware we have any cameras in classrooms is if there is high value equipment in that classroom, e.g. smartboard. The camera is trained on the equipment and not the students or the instructor.

Q: I think we are not talking about security cameras here, but Cisco Systems cameras?

A: Cisco ones are totally different than something like a whiteboard or smartboard camera technology.

Senior Vice Provost Carl Kemnitz gave a presentation on the budget of Academic Affairs.

We are going to focus on three areas. The first is what is new this year. What are our priorities and highlights or objectives for this year. The second part will be where I try to give you a big picture of where the bulk of our money is being spent, which is in enrollment funding and what we are doing with it there. The third part is about how we are investing in faculty.

The new investments for this year include assigned time for the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA). The second item involves changes in the way we are doing budgeting this year. In the past, in many of the colleges we always budgeted to the bottom line. We didn't really care whether expenses fell under Operations and Expenditures (O&E) or personnel expenses, since we were just paying attention to the bottom line. One of the things that we knew from some of the colleges was that the way they were able to get startup funds for new faculty was to scrape together whatever they could by saving money from vacancies. When the budget changes occurred last year, many of the colleges were differentially impacted. Those that were very careful in making sure they put money exactly where they spent it, found there wasn't much differential. However, those that did not were heavily impacted, and we found they did not have funds for startups. We have moved this year to a system where the operating expenses for startups are in a dedicated fund assigned to each faculty member. We put in extra funds to ensure that money is there.

In the third item, we were able to do an analysis of the last five years of expenditures and the money that was transferred between O&E and personnel accounts to true up some of the colleges and division operations. We then have a couple of things that started earlier, but are accruing new expenses. Last year we started the College of Graduate Studies and the investment there in order to build that out is seen in the line items.

The Doctorate in Nursing Practice has been a joint program up until this year when it started as a solo doctorate program so there are additional costs there. Then we are doing a search for a Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics soon. That person won't be starting until summer, but then we will be making an investment into data analytics and making sure we have the information we need to make sound decisions. That will be in the outer years of the three-year plan.

The last thing is the \$150,000 for library acquisitions. What is new there is that we are setting aside a dedicated fund to protect library acquisitions. That is an increase of 5% over last year's spending. That is dedicated funding and will increase over time.

These are the big picture new items for AY 19/20.

Questions:

Q: Research comes with lab facilities which is woefully lacking in Engineering. Often times the question is what can be done with the faculty assigned time if the labs are in such poor condition. I believe in terms of investment moving forward in the next five years, we should consider investment in the infrastructure. What are your thoughts on this?

A: I agree 100%. I think VP Faas was alluding to the investment in infrastructure as being a part of building that out. Not to mention that over time in building in funds for new faculty startups, we could build in funds for some of the lab facilities for someone new. This is something just starting now.

Q: I would like for you to consider allowing departments or colleges to have more than single year budgets, because that would allow departments to do a little bit of strategic planning. A large purchase for updates could be scheduled and planned out for over a three-year period.

A: Duly noted. Something I will add is that part of that true-up process is that we will be meeting quarterly with deans and their finance people to uncover those type of things. We have already had discussions about large equipment type purchases that need funds devoted to them, budget busters so to speak, and are trying to come up with processes to address this. Thank you for bringing this up.

What makes this a good budget year in part is that we had an enrollment increase of 570 FTES and that is where we have the richest funding, because we get funds from both the state and student tuition. The amount we got there goes into base funding. Beyond that we generally assign a goal and give the funding in advance at \$2,800 per FTES to the colleges. Even those colleges that go beyond goal, we always assure that they are going to get at least the \$2,800 per FTES. That is a student success measure. That will pay for the replacement rate to hire an additional lecturer to teach a course. The base funding takes care of both the lecturer and the tenure/tenure track faculty that have the full complement of teaching responsibilities.

Here is how this broke out by colleges. The three asterisks indicate colleges that have had a department move between them. We are handing out close to \$2 million additional dollars for that 570 FTES growth. Most of that is operations funds, but we also have CERF (now PACE), SSETF, and Lottery Funds. All that money is in the acquisitions budget. Most of the operations funds is just passed directly on to the colleges in terms of enrollment funding.

Moving towards last year, we dropped the line down between personnel costs and operating funds. However, as you can see the bulk of our costs are personnel costs as you can see. This slide shows the difference last year between what we had budgeted and allocated which was only 5% O&E and what was actually spent in expenditures. That true-up expense was really to bring that regularize to O&E, so that the allocations we now hand out to the colleges are more like what they are expected to be spending.

There are also Tower funds and Research Foundation and I've grouped together the direct expenditures and the F&A returns that comes back to the colleges.

Questions:

Q: On both of those slides, Engineering on the prior slide and Social Sciences on this slide are both way out of proportion with the other colleges. What is the reason for this?

A: This one I can answer off the top of my head. The Human Factors grant and there are related grants in Social Sciences. These are by far the largest grants in the university. That is why those colleges are off the charts. In the Tower Foundation funding, I don't know the specifics, but again that is a named college with a lot of interest from donors. It doesn't surprise me that it is larger.

Provost Del Casino: The other thing on the Research Foundation is that Social Sciences collect a higher indirect rate and typically get federal grants that pay the higher indirect rate. Some of the Sciences get barely anything on a federal grant, while in Social Sciences a lot of the grants are getting 48%. Their average is 24% over all, whereas some of the others like Education are single digits or just barely over double. That drives some of the differences in this chart. Also, this is just main campus only.

I wanted to wrap this up with investments in faculty. I have this broken down by college so you see where most of our faculty are. We are continuing the course with the RSCA Assigned Time program. This year it is a joint effort between Academic Affairs and the Division of Research and Innovation. All the money is spent in the colleges. Year one was last year in which all probationary faculty and 15% of tenured faculty got the RSCA Assigned Time program. This is the second year, and we have continued with all probationary faculty and increased the tenured faculty to 34% and then of course this spring we will have another cycle where we increase the number of tenured faculty one additional notch. I wanted to mention that this funding we had earlier is only for this year, because we won't incur the costs for the spring cycle.

We had a number of incoming faculty. I was surprised at how many were not specified which was a large number. Also, under the two or more ethnicities, Peoplesoft now allows for more than two designations. This is the first year we have more female faculty starting in May. Over a 15-year span we have moved from being 60 percent male and 40 percent female, to nearly 50/50 this year.

For next Fall, we are doing 73 searches. In fact, we talked about going to 75 this morning. However, we are still not making a lot of progress on tenure density. In fact, tenure density is expected to go down ever so slightly this year. One of the measures we can look at is the number of FTE students relative to the number of tenure-track faculty. That is a measure that takes into account that we are hiring more and more tenure track faculty. We have an increasing number of tenure-track faculty, but we are hiring a number of lecturers as well.

Questions:

Q: There is a slide that shows the percent of faculty by ethnicity and I'm wondering how does that map in comparison with the student population?

A: The point where I think we have the greatest discrepancy when reflecting our students is that only 17% of our students are white, while there is a much larger amount of our faculty who are white.

Q: If we are hiring somewhere around 60 to 65 tenure and tenure-track faculty each year, but our percentages of tenure and tenure-track faculty are going down is that because we are hiring even more lecturers?

A: Yes.

Q: What is the tenure density like for other campuses that are doing something like our RSCA?

A: We are in the norm. I haven't looked recently at San Diego State, but we are in the norm for the CSU. Our RSCA assigned time program is broader than some.

Q: We used to be the lowest in tenure density in the CSU when that study was done five years ago?

A: I can tell you we are in the norm now. We are not the lowest.

Q: When you look at the white faculty trending down, which I think is great, but the black faculty are staying stable, can you speculate as to why? Also, why are you not looking at long term lecturers in terms of ethnicity?

A: That is a good point. I do not want to speculate about why the African-American faculty numbers are not going up.

CDO Wong(Lau): She knew for a fact that some faculty identify as being part African-American and part Caucasian, but do not appear to show up in these numbers, and while the numbers show only three African-American faculty hires, she knows of at least five. Our system only allows a person to be identified with one category.

Q: Is there a way we can make attractive housing packages for recruitment? I mean affordable housing?

Provost Del Casino: I wish I could say there is a way and I could pull it out of my back pocket. The commitment is there and clearly we need to find a way where faculty who want to be here can be here. We need to be investing in that.

Q: Can some of that money be put towards impacted classes?

Provost Del Casino: First, we are putting a real emphasis on eliminating bottleneck classes. Before I got here, we were given a target and a goal and you were chastised for going over target and goal. We told students they couldn't go into those classes, because the college would go over target and goal. We did away with that and gave funding to open additional classes. Unfortunately, there are other constraints other than money that are part of this all. Believe it or not, money is the easiest of these problems to solve. Often it involves finding a qualified instructor, and sometimes we don't have the facilities. One of the things I will note in terms of the teaching is that we have had a 15% increase in faculty with only a 2% increase in students so we are hoping we have the faculty we need in place. (Provost Del Casino) One of the things we are asking the colleges to think of this year is a three-year hiring model. In areas that are typically bottlenecks, we can start thinking about hiring faculty and building us out. Part of the piece of the puzzle is to look at where we are growing and going.

Q: When we are talking about the problem of growing tenure and tenure-track faculty, have we looked at how many are leaving because of the lack of affordable housing or other issues?

Provost Del Casino: The problem of having to re-recruit people after recently hiring is huge, whether it is because of a lack of affordable housing or other issues. We are just now trying to determine this. We know from the COACHE survey that housing for faculty was a real issue.

Q: How does SJSU compare with other CSU campuses in terms of affordable housing and homelessness?

Provost Del Casino: The system is finally starting to produce that data so we can look. We went up in the number of Assistant Professors.

Q: How do we compare to the other campuses?

Provost Del Casino: We are just starting to look at that.

A: I just looked at that data this morning. We are about 2% higher in terms of Assistant Professors who leave compared to the CSU system as a whole.

Provost Del Casino: I can't think of a single priority higher than making progress on faculty and staff housing. This is number one on my list.

Q: I'm looking at the fulltime lecturers and wondering why there aren't more fulltime lecturers? I began as a lecturer.

A: There is nothing preventing lecturers from being given a full load. The resistance to lecturers being full time isn't coming from the Provost's Office.

Q: Thank you for the hiring breakdown by diversity categories. Is there any kind of a parallel analysis of people leaving by diversity categories?

A: We don't have graphs, but we have recently started to drill down and look at this data. Going forward the plan is to be able to graph that data.

Q: I'm looking at tenure density system-wide and it has dropped about 11%. What is an ideal tenure density?

Provost Del Casino: I don't know the exact answer to the question. Given the structural challenges to higher education, it is hard to imagine getting 75% tenure density, which is why I think the question might be what is our full-time faculty equivalent? I 100% agree with you about the conversation. What is our strategy in relation to whether or not our full-time faculty teach 5/5 or they teach 4 and have a service obligation. I would like this to emerge organically from the conversations that I'm having with deans and department chairs about what that mix looks like. What are the gives and takes when you make those switches? If we decide to increase the number of full-time tenured faculty, but keep them at 12 WTU, what are the implications for student-faculty ratios? What are the implications for housing? The same applies whenever we increase tenure and tenure-track faculty at 25 additional faculty per year. What does that mean relative to that other pool of people and how do we balance that out? Different colleges have different strategies and different demands. The big challenge we have is that it isn't like we have a massive infusion of dollars into the institution. However, I will say we have not talked enough today about potential revenue streams. That's why when Carl and I

put this together I wanted to paste in this is why the development money is there, this is why the research money is there, etc. If we had a real degree completion strategy at the undergraduate level and can grow our undergraduate students by 10 to 15% through self-support programs, how is that funneled into the overall teaching strategy on campus. That is another piece of all of this conversation. It is an important philosophical question to which I don't have an answer, but what I will say is that we are asking people to think about what is the right mix and how we balance that for different colleges.

Q: I wonder if it would be useful to have information on how many faculty wanted to take the job, but couldn't because of the level of compensation and cost of housing, etc.? Provost Del Casino: We are putting back into the tables this year for every hire, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd asked and why they didn't take the job. We are going to try and figure that out so we can make an argument to the cabinet that we need to increase the startup funds.

C: I thought about this a lot and it seems to me the question is what does the University need? When you have this category of full-time lecturers that are hired for three years and they have been here 20 years, the question becomes what are we doing here? Then you have 1,074 part-time faculty. It would seem to me a university would want to have a fairly large tenured faculty. Perhaps that 1,074 people would be people from the community who have specific expertise and it would be worthwhile to have them come in and teach one class, but not specifically make it a day job. All those people that have been here 15 or 20 years and have a full-time load should be in the tenured ranks. When you ask about what is the ideal number for tenure density it is 100%. That is a philosophical answer.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.