

2023-2024 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 16, 2023

- I. The meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m. Prior to that time, Chair Sasikumar requested all senators to sign in using the QR code and/or on the roll call list. Chair Sasikumar thanked Dean Meth and the MLK Jr. Library for the meeting room. Vice Chair Hart confirmed the Quorum. 43 Senators were present.

Ex Officio: Present: Curry, McKee, Multani, Rodan, Sasikumar, Van Selst, Absent: None	HHS Representatives: Present: Baur, Chang, Sen Absent: None
Administrative Representatives: Present: Del Casino, Faas, Teniente-Matson Absent: Day, Lee	COB Representatives: Present: Chen Absent: None
Deans / AVPs: Present: d'Alarcao, Kaufman, Meth, Shillington Absent: None	EDUC Representatives: Present: Mathur, Munoz-Munoz Absent:
Students: Present: Brown, Chevis-Rose, Gambarin, Guzman, Mejia, Tikawala Absent: None	ENGR Representatives: Present: Wong Absent: Kao, Sullivan-Green
Alumni Representative: Absent: Vacant	H&A Representatives: Present: Blanco, Frazier, Kataoka, Lee Absent: Han, Sabalius
Emeritus Representative: Present: Jochim	SCI Representatives: Present: French, Heindl, Muller Absent: Shaffer
Honorary Representative: Present: Peter Absent: Buzanski, Lessow-Hurley	SOS Representatives: Present: Hart, Haverfield, Pinnell, Raman Absent: Buyco
General Unit Representatives: Present: Flandez, Johnson, Masegian, Pendyala Velarde Absent: None	

- II. **Land Acknowledgement:** Senator Flandez read the land acknowledgement.

- III. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes:** None

IV. **Communications and Questions**

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Sasikumar announced that the rest of today's meeting was devoted to the presentation of the budget and a presentation from Academic Affairs. Chair

Sasikumar then welcomed the new student representative, senator Chevis-Rose, and the new H&A representative, senator Blanco.

B. From the President: None

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee: None

B. Consent Calendar: None

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

VI. Unfinished Business: None

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

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

B. University Library Board (ULB): None

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

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS): None

E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R): None

VIII. Special Committee Reports:¹

**Notes: All reports were made using slides. In the following minutes, the title of each slide is given in square brackets.*

**A. University Budget Report by CFO and VP of Administration and Finance
Charlie Faas**

[Senate Budget Presentation 2023]

budgets are difficult at universities even in the best of times, and we are not in the best of times. We are trying to create a sustainable financial model to operate and teach our students.

The Board of Trustees passed a tuition increase of 6% over the next 5 years. We recognize that it is not easy for everyone, but it is necessary. Two years ago, the Governor made a compact to provide a 5% annual growth funding into the CSU, but it is contingent on graduation rates and growing enrollment; it is not a guarantee.

[Agenda] Today, I will talk about: Current financial status, how we got here, our current budget, and where we go from here. There is a QR code for a budget model that you can download after this meeting and simulate the budget.

[Current Financial Situation] Current deficit: Today we have approximately a \$15 million structural deficit. Last year, it was \$37 million. Working with the Budget Advisory

¹ The minutes for Section VIII are aligned with the left margin for space consideration.

Committee, Cabinet, and President, we took that 37 million down to the 15 million. Structural budget is what we spend in a year, and the key is to reduce the normal spending. We do not use the one-time money to solve the structural budget problem.

Operational reserves: As shown in the CSU Transparency portal in the Chancellor's website, we had about \$188 million worth of reserves five years ago. We had the same amount this past year, but the operational part has shrunk.

Labor negotiations: About three of the unions have either settled or about to settle, but the CFA is not there yet.

Tuition: There will be a 6% increase. It will not impact this year; it will start next year.

Enrollment fluctuations: We are about 99.6% of the plan in the fall. We will focus on what we need to do to regrow our California enrollments. International enrollment also dropped by 1000, resulting in significant loss of revenue.

State financial picture: The state budget is declining now and for the next few years. Until the state budget recovers, it will be difficult for the CSU to ask for more money.

[What got us here]

Rising costs: The pandemic, which caused all kinds of expenses, and inflation, caused more money to be spent by everyone at the institution. Our expenses are up across the board.

Enrollment: It has been down considerably. Last year, we were down by over \$10 million in revenue due to the shortfalls in enrollment.

Transformation 2030: We tried to accelerate our strategic plan. It includes expansion of Research and Innovation, more Athletics spending to be a part of the Mountain West, and creating new divisions in the past few years.

[All milestones & challenges have associated costs] There are many positive things that have happened (e.g., providing basic needs & mental health, hiring tenure-track faculty) – our pride points. There are challenges (e.g., IT cost due to the pandemic) as well. Decrease in number of international students means significant revenue decrease (i.e., $\$16,000 \times 1000 = \16 million drop) for multiple years.

[SJSU Enrollment vs. Target] In 1999-2020, the enrollment was growing and exceeding the target. In the next couple of years, during the pandemic, the target went up but the actual enrollment went down. When the tuition rate remains flat and the budget is based on the number of students coming in, we lose revenue.

[Enrollment Headwinds] Over the past number of years, the number of high school seniors has declined across the country. Fewer students go to community college and

they go to the UC, so our transfer number was down. We are seeing fewer international students. We are improving graduation rates, which is great, but it impacts the budget negatively. Decrease in retention also impacts our revenue.

[Budget 101]

[State Funding], [2023-24 State of California Budget] & [2023-24 State of California Budget Higher Education] This is the instructional part. The state gives money to the CSU system, not to us directly. The State has a \$226 billion budget, and 10% of it is for higher education. Of the \$2.6 billion, the CSU gets 20-21%.

[CSU – 2023/24 Budget Request] The compact is for \$240 million, it is 5%, though the Board of Trustees requested 11%. A part of it was the \$1.6 million for compensation that we asked and got denied. We got \$240 million at the system level.

[Tuition & Fees] About 10 plus years ago, tuition was \$5472. This year, it is \$5742, up by \$270. It has been basically the same revenue for 10-12 years. On campus fees, these fees were all approved by students in various years by votes. The votes were based on the HEPI (Higher Education Price Index) index. Fee growth went from \$1650 to \$2250 now. It is an average 3% growth over time. If we did the same on tuition, we would not need to burden our students with the 6% over the next 5 years. We are doing a catch up here. All expenses are going up but the revenue is the same.

[The Picture at SJSU] We have about \$450 million worth of revenue. Half of the operating fund revenue is state allocations: 40% for in-state tuition and 5% for international tuition. We also have another \$300 million from Auxiliaries, Enterprises (mostly fee-based), and self-support.

[Additional Funding Sources] We have about a \$200 million endowment. That is 5th best in the CSU. 4% goes out mostly to scholarships for students. Though we are one of the best, that money does not go to the General Fund; it will go to students and specific projects that donors specify. Associated Students have student fee revenues. On enterprise funds, PaCE and Research Foundation, we get a fee that comes back, but that is a very small amount.

[SJSU General Operating Fund Revenue] & [SJSU Operating General Fund Expense Budget] 52% is from the state and 39% is from tuition fees. 63% of the expenditure is for Academic Affairs. The percentage went up because we transferred about \$10.5 million of enrollment management from the Student Affairs and we did \$20 million reductions throughout the university.

[SJSU Operating Fund Expense Budget] 51% of our expense is for labor salaries, and another 27% is for benefits. This 78 to 80% is reasonably fixed.

[Impact of Potential Salary/Benefit Examples] We have \$370 million worth of salary and benefits. 1% salary increase means \$3.7 million impact on our General Fund budget; 5% increase, \$18 million; and 12%, which is what the CFA is negotiating for, will have a \$44 million impact. Our \$15 million structural deficit would go up accordingly. When it comes to making sure people are paid fairly and reasonably, it needs to be done, because without faculty and staff, we don't have an institution.

[Sources of funding for Capital Improvements/Buildings] A lot of people ask if money is taken from the General Fund to build buildings. The answer is "no" with one exception where money was taken from a State Revenue bond to build buildings. All the newer buildings around the campus have been refinanced with 2-3% interest rates. Sometimes we get money from donors for different areas.

[Interdisciplinary Science Building] This Science building cost about \$190 million; \$120 million from State Revenue bonds with 2-2.5% interest rate. We used Campus General Fund reserves of \$30 million to buy down that cost. The Research Foundation put in \$15 million. PaCE put in \$21 million, and the Student Union put \$4 million in. This was a campus-wide collaboration to fund the extra upper floors. The State gives \$100 million per building, but we asked and got \$119 million.

[Spartan Athletics Center] The Spartan Athletics Center is a \$57 million building. \$40 million is a Tower Foundation loan: we got \$20 million from donors, \$10 million Generated Revenues from the naming rights of the Stadium.

[Spartan Recreation and Aquatic center] The Spartan Recreation and Aquatic center, a \$132 million facility, was built without a dime from the General Fund. All of it came either from State Revenue Bonds and Student Union Reserves – the money the previous generation of students put forth to build it.

[Campus Village 3] This is Campus Village 3 to provide more affordable housing. We will use \$89 million of the Higher Education Housing grant and Housing Reserve. Again, nothing is used from the General Fund.

[Reserves]

[CSU Transparency Portal] This is that \$188 million back 6 years ago or so, and this year, on June 30th, has the same \$188 million. Operation was \$100 million 6 years ago, and now it is \$70 million. It is still a lot of money.

[SJSU Operating Reserve Details] All others (Health Center, Capital project Mgmt., Utilities Reserve, FD&O, Faculty Start-Up, RSCA, etc.) grew from \$50 million to \$65 million, but the General Fund Reserves dropped tremendously on this campus. We have a \$15 million deficit, so we will have to borrow whatever is available in reserves at the end of the year. This is why we are building a sustainable financial model over the next couple of years, so that we do not have to pay debt service to pay back our structural deficit.

[Budget Advisory Committee]

[Who we are] & [What we do] I thank all members of the Budget Advisory Committee. We have been meeting on a regular basis. This past year, the committee got into budget, and came up with a series of actions to reduce the \$37 million deficit down to \$15 million.

[Stepping Stones to Recovery] These actions include: \$20 million in base reductions and one-time savings; moving enrollment from Student Affairs to Academic Affairs; encouraging tuition growth, etc.

[\$20 M in Base Reductions for 2023/24] We closed some of about 300 “dormant” positions – long open positions. We also used salary savings to offset structural deficits. It does not fix the base problem, so next we will fix the base problem, by going through and cutting different areas.

[Financial Model for You to Try] & [QR code] I encourage you to download this Financial Model and input different conditions to see how revenues, teaching load, etc. will change. I will send this QR code to everyone.

[Some Final Questions] If you have ideas on reducing costs and potential new revenue opportunities, now is the time to raise your hand.

[Going Forward] We need to fix the structural deficit and stop borrowing as soon as possible to get us onto a sustainable financial model going forward. We will regrow operational reserves. Labor negotiations are TBD. The tuition increase was approved. Enrollment is at 99.6% of planned today, so we will need to make up ground in the spring. The State financial picture is not looking good, so this is on us to figure out. Thank you.

Q-A and Comments:

[C]: This is a correction, not a question. You mentioned that all campus fees were approved by students by votes. Actually, these were just a few of them; there were many IRA fees on which students were consulted but didn't vote and approve.

[A]: Thank you.

[Q]: You talked about the dormant positions that were eliminated. What were they; in what divisions were they; and how was the elimination determined?

[A]: First, the Budget Advisory Committee identified a pool of 300 positions and tasked Vice Presidents to look at the positions to have and cannot have. For example, in my finance group, I identified 8 such positions. Each VP determined what could be reduced while keeping the necessary level of service.

[Q]: I have a question about planning for reserves. Do we find reserves by looking at our positions at the end of the year, or do we plan at the beginning of the year about how much to put into reserves?

[A]: It depends. We planned what we could grow and it depends on the fund. We also want to grow to the needed level, not for the sake of growth. We spend money where we need and put money aside for a rainy day. So, it is a balancing act. We have not had a surplus all these years, so we are using our reserves to cover our structural deficit.

[Q]: On the operating reserve slide, the legend doesn't show everything. What are these two categories?

[A]: I will check them and inform you after the presentation.

[Q]: My understanding is that Federal Student Aid covers more for higher tuition fees. Is there a possibility of raising tuition to the point where we will be able to deal a lot more with the Federal money?

[A]: That is the difficult part of the equation. About 60% of our students receive full coverage, so raising tuition fees will not impact them and only benefit the institution. On the other hand, for the other 40%, who are not or only partially funded, it will cost a lot more and we will not be the approachable public institution that we promise to be.

[Q]: You said reserves were used to pay the deficit. Can we utilize other monies to pay off some of the deficit or to build up reserves again? For example, we are running a comprehensive campaign (although we don't know what the status of that campaign is), could we develop funds from that space to fund some of the logistics of the university?

[A]: So, the question is: how "fungible" are our reserves from account to account? Fungibility to these reserves are rather limited. For example, the reserve for the Health Center cannot be used to solve our reserve problem and Tower Foundation Money from donors is for specific purposes. We rarely have unencumbered money.

[Q] (follow-up): But could we ask our donors for unencumbered funds?

[A]: Yes, that is possible.

[Q]: This year, Athletics had \$5 million more overall budget than last year. I am pleased that all of it came from self-support funds, not by raising the General Fund or student fee support. But are those self-support funds sustainable? For example, if the additional money that came from donors goes away next year, will we be reducing the budget accordingly?

[A]: There are other revenues coming into Athletics. Part of it is from Mountain West fees that includes multi-year TV revenue contract deals and other deals that have only increased over time. Another one is the implosion of the Pac-12. There is a chance for more West Coast revenue than before, and there is a limited concern about Mountain West money going away. We also saw a significant increase in sponsorship from the Playfly site. We are one of their premier accounts.

[Q]: On ways to reduce the deficit, is anyone looking at it from a bird's eye view to identify duplication of services across the campus that can be eliminated?

[A]: That is exactly the next step that the Budget Advisory Committee will have to do this year. We will look at shared services and duplication efforts across various units and groups for possible consolidations and better use of resources.

[Q]: On the Student Recreation Aquatic Center, if we have a \$100 million bond, why do we not use it for the building instead of using the Student Union funds? Can the Student Union reserve be used in a better way?

[A]: It is similar to the previous question that asked if we plan for reserves. We had a certain amount of money in the Student Union Trust account. The plan was to grow those reserves to finance a good chunk of it, but also to use what we saved over time for this building. Now \$20 million is sitting in the Student Union Reserve account, which will not be used for any other issue.

B. Academic Affairs Budget Report by Provost and Sr. VP of Academic Affairs Vincent Del Casino

Prior to the report, Provost requested that Vice Provost for Faculty Success Magdalena Barrera be recognized for the additional report after the provost's report. The Provost also announced that the presentation slides will be distributed at a later time.

[2023-24 Academic Budget]

The overall operational fund for the Academic Affairs is \$358 million, out of the \$756 million. We called out Enrollment Management, so it is under the division now.

[Campus-Wide Budget Reductions] VP Faas talked about the \$20 million budget reduction. We are 63% of the university and our budget was cut by 41% this year.

[Allocation of Reductions] We did the cut in different ways: 10% operations reduction to all units; centralized cost savings; reallocation of PaCE to cut \$1.7 million; and distribution – that is salaries and benefits – for another \$3.5 million. The library budget was maintained. We distributed cuts and preserved some of the core missions.

[Configuring Enrollment Management] Enrollment Management takes about \$10 million in operational funds. One of the challenges we have in Enrollment Management is that a lot of OE&E is accounted for such as management systems and OnBase. That area took a \$1.4 million cut (=10% of the budget cut) this year.

[Institutional Investments] The Academic Affairs contributed to the structural deficit of the institution through institutional investments. We invested in RSCA programs. It costs \$7.8 million, and with the \$6 million investment, we are still short for \$1.8 million. So, people ask if RSCA programs are sustainable. It is sustainable at a \$6 million level, but not yet at a \$7.8 million level. We need a long-term sustainable model.

We also allocated \$1.2 million for student assistants for the fall. With the spring \$2.4 million is committed. We will see how much is actually needed.

Contractual salary increases: The last CFA contract got a 7% raise over 2 years. This is completely funded by the system. In the contract, there were two other items not funded by the system. One is the PPI (Post Promotion Increase) and the other is additional \$4.4 million for the two SSIs (Service Salary Step Increases). The campus has to absorb them. When compared with the budget of about 2014, the instructional budget has gone up about \$50 million.

[Examining the AAD Operations] As we think where we are, we must restore Student-Faculty ratio to the previous level and evaluate and tighten up assigned times and guidelines for low-enrollment classes. We are also not effectively maximizing some of our academic spaces; there are courses that can enroll more. We are working on that. We are also trying to create shared services to cut down administrative costs and directly invest in faculty and staff.

[Student-Faculty Ratio] We are back to the fall 2018 level (25.7), but given the tight budget we need to go back at least to the fall 2017 level (26.3). That is where your RSCA programs and other money would come from.

[Assigned Time (fall 2018 - fall 2023)] Not surprisingly, College/Dept RSCA has dropped, while University RSCA has increased. We took the burden off the colleges to invest in those programs. Assigned time for Admin/Committee type of work has decreased.

[College & Department Assigned Time Cost] You can see some of the cost savings. There has been a million dollar decrease since fall 2020. Again, that is how you backstop the RSCA programs.

[Stateside Enrollment Targets] Enrollment is where the money comes from, and what I have been doing is moving the enrollment to where the enrollment is. We had no one-time enrollment money this year, so I made changes in base budgets. We got 39 FTE (Full-Time Equivalent) increase in terms of the budget. As Charlie mentioned, the 99.6% is the prediction. If it holds in spring, then it will be one of the things that are impacted. Another thing is the Average Unit Load (AUL). The number we report to the CSU system is FTES, so if we raise AUL, say, from 12.5 to 13, we will be well ahead of the target and be on the opportunity side of the funding redistribution of the system. For students, taking units below 15 means another semester in school, and it will impact students' lives. For us, if we hit 17 AUL, it will mean 102 or 103%; it will make a big difference.

[CPGE Organizational Change] We are taking the service areas out of the college and putting them into the central Provost's Office, leaving the academic programs in the college. These programs are larger than one college by headcount, and another by FTES, so although these are only two academic departments, it is not a small operation.

The infrastructure is already there, and we have not added any new MPP lines. The Associate Vice Provost – a person with an associate dean role – was named and given

more responsibility, but we have not added a new line. The Dean of the College is the same. There needs to be some state operations investment into that position, but the college has grown dramatically in terms of FTES, as there has been a big FTES investment in Professional and Continuing Education because they have taken more State-supported students. The overall goal is to make it revenue neutral as much as possible and centralize services that would produce savings.

We are going to maintain the college and program reserve levels at 90 days, which is more than what we have on the State-side. I will not be concerned about paying for administrative oversight, because they are much larger on the Self-support side with more financial flexibility than any other units in the division.

Q-A and Comments:

[Q]: You mentioned that the student-to-faculty ratio is near its historical high level, but student enrollment has been dropping. How was the student-to-faculty ratio increased?

[A]: We close small sections and classes. During the pandemic we dropped enrollment but we increased the number of faculty by hiring more people. We had smaller classes, which drove expenses in budget. So, we will manage back on class sizes.

[Q] (follow-up): So, many part-time lecturers are let go?

[A]: Yes. There will be a reduction ostensibly in the non-tenure track faculty. In fact, there has been movement in that the tenure is going up, and total Full Time Equivalent Faculty and Non-Tenure faculty going down, increasing tenure density. We are 1500 FTE down from our height, so we should have some change in the overall faculty number.

[C]: This is a critique. We have saved some money by cutting back on non-RSCA assigned time. But work in departments does not go away when assigned time is cut, and someone such as department chairs will have to do it. There will be consequences for morale in general.

[A]: Thank you.

[Q]: Who is responsible for recruiting international students? Should we invest more in that? Would it be a hopeless endeavor or would there be an opportunity?

[A]: There is an opportunity to restore international student enrollment, but you have to do it very specifically. Our advantage is our location; a lot of international graduate students want to come and have the opportunity to work. It changed not because we have not been able to recruit but we do not enroll them. Historically departments have made decisions about enrollment, and we could debate whether it is the right thing or not.

[Q]: Is the RSCA program sustainable?

[A]: We run some part of RSCA on base money and some part on one time money. It is now sustainable at a level of about \$6 million, but not at a level of \$7.8 million. By the way, the RSCA program reduced the average teaching load of a tenure track faculty; taking RSCA and other assigned time, the average teaching load is 2 courses per

semester. So (on the previous comment), I am less concerned about the reduction of the assigned time. If we want the \$7.8 million, we have to make some decisions, or it will go back to \$6 million next year. Are we then losing the faculty we have recruited? These are the questions we have to ask ourselves.

[Q]: On the roadmap to graduation, sometimes students do not take 15 units because the classes are not available. Is there technology available to make predictions on how many sections are needed for specific courses?

[A]: Yes, we have some tools coming in place to get those numbers earlier. The other thing that is happening in undergraduate education is to create different kinds of alternative load maps (vs. one size fits all type) that help students and do better jobs teaching.

[Q]: Expanding on the previously made points, the number of students that faculty have will be the same when the classes are redistributed to raise the SFR (Student-to-Faculty Ratio), so the impact of actual assigned time through RSCA is a wash-out. Also, when you reduce assigned time, it does not mean reduced workload, in fact the opposite. So, how is the RSCA program sustainable in terms of actually reducing faculty workload to allow for greater research productivity?

[A]: If we are above Fall 2017 SFR, this would be a real conversation, but we have not even passed where we were. Between 2017 and now, class caps were set at lower numbers than before. We also had an increase in administrative and other assigned times and RSCA. So, we now have a \$15.7 million budget problem. Second thing is, if you go to a place of our size with 3-3 load, the classes are larger and they have graders and other supports. So, it does not have to be the individual faculty's burden entirely. Also, three classes of 33 may be less work than four classes of 25, due to fewer preps, commute, etc. We don't have money to do everything, so I would like feedback on what we can give; Should we have a reduction of RSCA to afford smaller class sizes, or slight increase in the class size to maintain RSCA? Should we keep \$4 million for administrative and other assigned times? That is where we are at this time.

Chair Sasikumar asked if any senator would like to make a motion to extend the meeting by ten minutes. Senator Mathur moved to extend the meeting by ten minutes. The motion was supported by acclamation. The meeting was extended by ten minutes.

Chair Sasikumar acknowledged Vice Provost for Faculty Success, Magdalena Barrera, for an additional report.

Academic Affairs Tenure Track Hiring Report by Vice Provost for Faculty Success Magdalena Barrera

[2023-24 Tenure Track Faculty Hiring Trend]

[New TT Faculty AY 23-24 (N=40)] I will share with you a picture of who is in our incoming faculty class. There were 67 searches approved and we have had 40 new hires. Of them, three-quarter are Asian or White, with the majority identified as female.

We received a question on the number of international applicants and how many were hired, their RTP progresses, and separation rates. We do not have tools to obtain those data nor definition of “international” faculty. We can work on some of them for future presentations.

[New Faculty Members 2023-2024] I hope you all have had a chance to check out our new faculty member yearbook. Thanks to University Marketing Communications for their help. It has been shared to colleges and departments so you can welcome new colleagues and find opportunities for collaboration.

[New TT Cohorts: 5-year Trends in Diversity] Between 2018 and today, there have been fluctuations in Black, Latinx, Native American faculty. Work to diversity faculty is a challenging one. We need to engage with intention and purpose. It is critical to have buy-in from college leaderships on practices and tools, including dean’s support for a search committee and training members selected for the committee. A culture of accountability is also critical and we must hold ourselves to what we say we want for a strategic plan to be able to deliver the best to our students.

We continue the practice of reviewing applicant pools to see what diversity we can reasonably expect for a particular search in the light of national data. We continue this practice with the applicants, semi-finalist, and finalist polls. This is an opportunity for search committees to work with the leadership on who is applying and how to evaluate the applicants. Searchers may return to their pools to see if someone who got cut before could be included if that can net us the diversity.

It is important to note that there is pushback that is very hard to deal with, such as questioning the purpose and value of the training. Doing better in diversity is a constant educational process. There is always something new to learn for committees. There is also a concern that focusing on certain characteristics would result in a less diverse pool. It is frustrating because it is a non-starter. Our mission is to have the most diverse pools that we possibly can. We really need to think and talk about how we support each other in the process and hold everyone accountable.

[Faculty Hiring for Appointments Starting AY 2024-25] We are committed to the max number of hiring under the current budget model. We prioritize couple of things, including hires that can grow enrollment, hirings with dollars associated with them (e.g., AB 1460, PaCE), searches within established hiring themes (e.g., data analytics, design thinking, ethnic studies), and those that integrate a focus on Black and Latinx experiences and address equity gaps in critical fields. We might also consider opportunity hires that directly support our diversity efforts.

[Tenure Density (TT/All Faculty) – in Context] From 2018 to 2022, tenure density was relatively steady, at around 52. But the reality is that we have more T/TT faculty who teach fewer FTES than a decade ago. When the buy-outs are accounted for, the density would go to closer to 58%. So, the traditional definition of density is a little out of touch or may be updated for our campus.

[SJSU Faculty by Race/Ethnicity (F23 headcount)] Between Tenure-line and Lecturers, demographic makeups are similar, except slightly more Asian and slightly fewer Latinx faculty among Tenure-line faculty than Lecturers.

[SJSU Faculty by Gender (F23 headcount)] Finally, there is a slightly higher percentage of women over men overall, with a small but growing number of faculty who identify as non-binary.

Q-A:

[Q]: What is the average work load for lecturers? How many 1.0 lecturers are there?

[A] (from Provost Del Casino): I am trying to grow a number of 1.0 lecturers; it's good for the campus. It was about 200-300 when last checked. The head count is about 1500, so there is a huge number of lecturers with 0.4 and 0.6 appointments. We put \$7.8 million into buyout. Regarding tenure density, the number no longer works for us. We have a lot of committed people. Maybe we should give them very good salaries.

[Q]: I have two questions. First, how are Middle Eastern faculty classified in terms of the racial/ethnic category? I'm asking because their needs are very different. Second, why is it difficult to recover the number of international faculty? Is it a visa issue? Anything else?

[A] (from VP Barrera): On the first question, there are a number of faculty who are not specified. I think it is partly because the category labels are imperfect and people may not feel represented by them. Another CSU campus had a campaign to encourage everyone to double check if they are specified and revisit their initial choices. This is something we can pursue in the future. Your second point recognizes the needs and concerns about visa issues. That is something we can work on.

Chair Sasikumar thanked everyone for the extra ten minutes and reminded that further questions may be sent to <senate@sjsu.edu>.

IX. New Business: None

X. State of the University Announcements:

A. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO): None

B. Statewide Academic Senators: None

C. Provost: None

D. Associated Students President: None

E. Vice President for Administration and Finance: None

F. Vice President for Student Affairs: None

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.