Minutes – Senate Executive Committee
November 18, 2014
Susan K. Weber Conference Room
2 p.m.

Committee Chairs: Bliss, Butler-Byrd, Moore, Packard, Schellenberg. Parliamentarian: Snively. Senators-at-Large:

The SEC was called to order at p.m.

1. Agenda (Bober-Michel)

MSP Approved the revised agenda of November 18, 2014.

2. Minutes (Bober-Michel)

MSP Approved the minutes of September and October SEC.

3. Announcements (Ely)

• December Senate meeting: President Hirshman will attend/speak and Student Affairs will present the
second part of its report.
• Call for nominations for CSU trustee (2-year term/2015-2017); specific criteria to follow via email.
  January 16 is the deadline after which nominees will be forwarded (for review) to the Academic Senate
  CSU Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee.
• Request from Senator Putman (at the November Senate meeting) about evaluating the no smoking
  policy. The Environment and Safety Committee feels it’s premature, however, to judge impact; not
  enough time has passed since implementation of regulations/rules. Still being discussed is whether or
  not a referral makes sense and the nature of it.

4. Academic Affairs (Benkov for Enwemeka)

• Student Success Fee projects: $450,000+ funded for this year ($300K from the fees themselves plus an
  additional $150K from other sources).
• Budget: CSU has asked for $237 million – but Governor Brown countered with $119 million.
• New contract: Faculty will receive raises of about 2% and some equity measures are included in the
  agreement as well. There is also a provision for assigned time for exceptional service and we in the
  Senate have to approve policy on it.
• Student hiring. There are ongoing discussions on how to ensure that students sign in before they begin
  working. HR must have their I9s submitted; failure to do so could lead to huge fines for the university.
  It probably means we have to start hiring earlier (not so close to the start of a semester).

  Papin: Had a question about SSF funding.

  Benkov: Clarified that $150K came from Academic Affairs.

  Schellenberg: Faculty Affairs will take the lead on crafting the assigned time policy – and we’ll go
  from there.

  Chase: Asked if decisions about next year’s student portion of the Student Success Fee (10%) will be
  made in Spring 2015. Otherwise, he said, we lose a lot of time and students have but a few months to
  implement their plans.

5. Officer’s Report

5.1 Officer’s Report (Ornatowski)
**Information:**

**Referral Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Referred by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitution and Bylaws</td>
<td>October 20, 2014</td>
<td>Bring the Policy File section on &quot;Fee Advisory Committee, Campus&quot; (PF p.66) in line with EO 1054 &quot;CSU Fee Policy&quot;</td>
<td>Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution and Bylaws</td>
<td>October 20, 2014</td>
<td>Review Staff Affairs Committee proposal regarding Staff Excellence Awards</td>
<td>Officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ornatowski:** Noted his presentation to the ASCSU @ the Academic Conference (Nov 13 and 14 in Long Beach). Added that Chancellor White invited guests to his house and was very sociable.

**Toombs:** Said that the hotel was changed due to union dispute – and attendees respected that.

**Chase:** Spoke of the Chancellor’s support for the CSU. Many small initiatives/proposals are coming out but they are competitive and White sees this process as cumbersome and perhaps not equitable.

6. **Old Business**

7. **New Business: Action Items**

7.1 **Executive Session: Honorary Degree Committee (Chase)**

MSP Move to executive session.

MSP Move out of executive session.

7.2 **Committees and Elections (Rhodes)**

**Action:**

The Committee on Committees and Elections moves approval of the following appointments and reappointments or replacements to committees with terms to end as noted:

**Academic Resources and Planning**
Suchi Ayala, HHS (term ending May 2017)

**Bookstore Advisory**
Sue Osborn, Staff (term ending May 2017)

**Campus Fee Advisory**
June Cummins, A&L (term ending May 2017)

**Graduate Council**
Bill Tong, SCI, completing Joanne Lobato term (term ending May 2017)
Satchi Venkataraman, ENG (term ending May 2017)
Larry Verity, HHS (term ending May 2017)

**Library and Information Access**
Claudiu Dimofte, BUS (term ending May 2017)

**Press Editorial Board, San Diego State University**
Stuart Aitken (term ending May 2017)  
Paul Ganster (term ending May 2017)  
Roberto D. Hernández (term ending May 2017)  
Yetta Howard (term ending May 2017)  
Joseph Thomas (term ending May 2017)  
Ed Blum (term ending May 2017)  

**Student Health Advisory**  
Kurt Lindemann, PSFA (term ending May 2017)  

**Sustainability**  
Matthew Lauer, A&L (term ending May 2017)  
Keven Jeffrey, LIA (term ending May 2017)  

**Undergraduate Council**  
Peter Torre, HHS (term ending May 2017)  
Mounah Abdel-Samad (term ending May 2017)  

**University Research Council**  
Susan Levy, HHS (term ending May 2017)  
Henry Stuart, PSFA (term ending May 2017)  

7.3 **Faculty Honors and Awards (Valdes)**  

**Action:**  
The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee recommends that the Senate approve emeritus status for:  
Sheila Dollente, Lecturer of Liberal Studies, November 10, 2014, 22 years  
Richard Helzer, Professor of Music and Dance, August 17, 2014, 28 years  
Sharon M. Lightner, Associate Professor of Accountancy, July 1, 2012, 35 years  

8. **New Business: Consent Calendar (Committee Reports)**  

8.1 **ASCSU (Wheeler)**  

**Information:**  
The report will be available for the Senate on 12/2.  

8.2 **California Faculty Association (Toombs)**  

**Information:**  
CFA Report:  

**Bargaining**  

CFA Members have voted to approve ratification of the Tentative Agreement. See the statement below from CFA President Lillian Taiz and Bargaining Team Chair Andy Merrifield:  
“November 10, 2014  

Dear Colleagues,
The ballots have been counted and the results are in: 91% of CFA members voting have chosen to ratify the Tentative Agreement with the CSU administration.

After 10 months of negotiating, CFA and CSU management reached a tentative agreement that we believe sets faculty on the path to recovery in terms of salary, protects benefits and provides improvements to working conditions that will directly impact our students’ success. The vote was held online November 1-9, and every valid ballot was counted.

The agreement still needs to be ratified by the CSU Board of Trustees, and is scheduled to be voted upon on Wednesday, November 12. When the contract is ratified by the Board, it becomes legal and binding and will remain in effect until June 30, 2017.

As a requirement of the agreement, CFA and CSU management will meet again to negotiate the salary structure for years two and three of the contract.

The ratification of the Tentative Agreement is phase one of our efforts to resolve problems with our broken salary structure. Phase two will focus on encouraging the launch of campus-based Equity Programs on all the campuses. Phase three comes this spring as we reopen negotiations on faculty pay for year two of the contract.

If the contract is ratified by the CSU Trustees on Wednesday we anticipate that the process of implementing salary adjustments will begin. It is our understanding that paychecks should be adjusted by January or February 2015.

The Bargaining Team and the leaders of CFA appreciate your unwavering commitment to teaching and the hard work of everyone in our union that led to this faculty contract. We are confident that it will be the first in many steps toward revitalizing the CSU and helping ensure high quality public higher education for all.

We know we can count on you for the faculty unity and action needed as we continue to work toward improving salaries that will allow us to both support our families and attract the next generation of exceptional professors for the CSU.

In Union,

Lillian Taiz, CFA President
Andy Merrifield, CFA Bargaining Team Chair
on behalf of the Officers, Board and Bargaining Team of the California Faculty Association”

**CFA Contact Information**

Please feel free to contact our campus California Faculty Association office at any time if we can provide assistance, whether on a contract rights issue or other matter. Our campus CFA chapter has a Faculty Rights Committee, composed of faculty volunteers, and we are available to talk with faculty colleagues about individual situations and assist in resolving issues. We can be reached at cfa@mail.sdsu.edu or x42775.

No firm information yet about contract implementation.

**McClish:** People here are tiered—based on when they were hired. Will there be equity for inversion (veteran faculty now making less than those hired after them)? People sense injustices but President Hirshman is committed to an equity program given that the general raise amount is about 1.6%.

**8.3 University Relations and Development (Carleton)**

**Information:**
The Campaign for SDSU:
The total now raised by The Campaign for SDSU is $527 million. New figures released recently by the CSU show $96.7 million raised by San Diego State in FY 2013/14. This equals 67% of general fund support from the state. Our endowment for the last fiscal year is at $190 million, a 20.33% increase over the previous year.

The following are among the many gifts received since our previous report:

From the Estate of Patrick Conway, SDSU is receiving an unrestricted gift of $4.02 million. Patrick Conway received a MA in Geography from SDSU in 1974.

Qualcomm has made a gift of $50,000 to support the Lavin Center in the College of Business Administration.

Chevron has made a gift of $16,500 to the College of Sciences to support the Geology program and to support scholarships for students studying Geology.

A gift of $20,000 from Cymer Corporation has come in and this gift will support the Mechatronics Club as well.

From the Estate of Ann Kirkland we have received a gift of $187,000 to support Guardian Scholars.

Paul and Genevieve Crecelius have made a gift of $20,000 to support their scholarship endowments in Accounting and Chemistry.

Verizon has made a gift of $35,000 to the College of Business Administration to support the Small Business Consulting Center.

The ARCS Foundation, a long time scholarship supporter of SDSU, has made a new gift of $48,750 for scholarships.

Alumna and SDSU employee Marlene DeMers has made a planned gift of $56,000 through her CalPers Retirement Account. This gift will establish an endowment to support a class and lab in the College of Sciences.

We've received a gift commitment of $160,000 from the Estate of Marilyn Ross to establish an endowment for the Library. Marilyn and her husband were students at SDSU and Marilyn's thoughts on making this gift were, "Tom and I view libraries as one of society's greatest resources and often untapped treasures."

New Campanile Foundation Board member Thom McElroy and his wife Sarah, the Honorary Chairs for SDSU Homecoming this year, are supporting the Art Program in the College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts with a gift of $10,000.

Alumnus John Scannell, a member of the New York Regional Council, has made a gift of $5,000 to support the President's Leadership Fund.

Vivian Finch has made a new gift of $10,000 to support her scholarship endowment in the College of Arts and Letters.

The Jeffrey Glazer Foundation is gifting $9,500 to Aztec Athletics.

Many thanks to the Retirement Association. Through their efforts on behalf of SDSU, a new scholarship endowment of $50,000 has been established by the family of the late Dr. Kurt and Julie Bohnsack. Kurt Bohnsack was an emeritus professor of Zoology. He taught at SDSU for 34 years and was President of the Retirement Association from 1994-1996.

Longtime supporter Becky Moores has made a $12,000 gift in kind to Student Affairs.

We have received an anonymous pledge of $15,000 to support scholarships in the College of Health and Human Services.

1949 grad Loren Hover and his wife Dorothy have made a commitment for an estate gift of $180,000. This gift will establish an endowment to support American History in the name of Loren's grandfather.

We've received a second gift distribution from the Ann Kirkland Estate for $190,803. Seventy-five percent of the gift goes to Guardian Scholars; the rest to Guardian Scholars operations.

The College of Sciences has received a gift of $10,000 from AT&T to support the Visualization Lab.

Alumnus Bill Leonard has made a gift of $15,000 to the President's Leadership Fund.

The Robert and Lillie Breitbard Foundation is gifting $25,000 to the Athletics Excellence Fund.
Nash Subotic has made two gifts to the College of Business Administration; one for $5,000 to support the Finance Department Faculty Fund and the other of $3,000 to support the Undergraduate Equity Trading Fund. And Alumnus Robert Gordon has established a scholarship endowment in his name with a planned gift of $518,409.

**Alumni Engagement:**

Homecoming 2014 began Thursday evening with 7th annual Marshall Faulk "Aztec for Life" celebration in the Conrad Prebys Aztec Student Union. Friday included the 15th annual "War Memorial Wreath Laying Ceremony" on Aztec Green. Saturday afternoon included the joint Alumni and Athletics tailgate party followed by the Homecoming game and Sky show. This year's honorary chairs of Homecoming were Sarah and Thom McElroy.

**Campaign, Presidential & Special Events:**

On Thursday, October 2, President Hirshman hosted a Reception for Joseph F. Johnson, Jr., Dean, College of Education, to introduce and welcome him to the San Diego community.

Thursday, October 23, a La Jolla Regional Council reception was hosted by TCF chair, Kit Sickels ’60 and his wife, Karen ’69, in their home. Over 50 alumni gathered for a “State of the University” update by President Hirshman and presentation by Robert A. Edwards, Bioinformatics Professor at San Diego State. Mr. Sickels encouraged alumni to get involved with their alma mater with their time and talents and to support The Campaign for SDSU.

On October 27, President Hirshman and Vice President Carleton hosted a Faculty and Staff Appreciation Luncheon to personally thank those who have contributed $1,000 plus to The Campaign for SDSU. There were approximately 100 faculty and staff members in attendance, who made roughly $6 million in contributions to the Campaign. Overall, giving to the Campaign from our campus community is estimated at $50 million, nearly 10 percent of the overall campaign total.

On October 28, President Hirshman hosted a Reception for J. Dennis Cradit, Dean, College of Business Administration, to introduce and welcome him to the San Diego community.

**Government and Community Relations:**

The groundbreaking celebration for South Campus Plaza is scheduled for November 19 from 10–10:30 a.m., at the SCP construction site (on the lot formerly known as the B Lot). President Hirshman will be present to engage with the community on this important milestone. All are welcome.

San Diego City Councilmember Mark Kersey will be on campus on Thursday, November 6 to tour the Joan and Art Barron Veteran’s Center, the Zahn Center and the Viz Lab.

SDSU Athletics, in partnership with URAD, was pleased to host a County of San Diego Aztec Spirit Day at the County Operations Center in October with SDSU alum, Supervisor Ron Roberts. Members of the Aztec spirit squad, the Aztec band, and athletics staff were present to rally the crowd and sell tickets to the October 18 Aztec Football game. On November 13, Athletics will also host a City of San Diego Aztec Spirit Day at the City Administration Building with SDSU alum Mayor Kevin Faulconer.

8.4 **Academic Policy and Planning (Chase)**

**Information Item #1:**

Deletion of the following programs were unanimously approved by APP during their 13 September meeting. The programs had either no current students or a small number of students who would be able to finish the degree with no negative impacts. The three dual or triple business degrees are being phased
out in compliance with WASC requirements, which would require that continuation of such degrees would require significant increases in earned units at one or two of the involved institutions.

14-86 Mathematics: Deletion of Emphasis in Mathematical Finance program

14-92 International Business: Deletion of CaMexUS Triple Degree program, PanAmerican Triple Degree program, SanParaiso Dual Degree program, SanDiQue Dual Degree program

14-98 Management: Deletion of Project AMIGOS Dual Degree program

14-99 Marketing: Deletion of SanMediterrane Dual Degree program

**Information Item #2:**
Please find attached the AY14/15 Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation Compendium produced by Academic Affairs and the AY14/15 Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation Report produced jointly by Undergraduate Council and Academic Policy and Planning.

**AY 14/15 SDSU ENROLLMENT, RETENTION AND GRADUATION REPORT**

*Jointly produced and approved by the Academic Policy and Planning Committee and Undergraduate Council*

In the past decade, San Diego State significantly increased the overall six-year graduation rate while narrowing the achievement gap. We accomplished these major gains through a combination of implementing policy changes, assuring access to classes, raising student expectations (e.g., unit loads), and providing support to student populations who have benefitted from learning communities, supplemental instruction, targeted advising, and engagement in high-impact practices. Notably, these major gains were accomplished while state support declined markedly and as our student body became more diverse, both ethnically and socioeconomically.

This AY14/15 Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation (ERG) Report:

1. Summarizes efforts to produce a more integrated and timely overview of ERG data,
2. Highlights key trends and patterns in ERG data focusing on recent years,
3. Shares recent graduation targets for SDSU developed by the Chancellor’s Office, and
4. Suggests a suite of opportunities and strategies to increase the four-year graduation rate while closing the four-year achievement gap, as we also continue our commitment to high levels of academic achievement.
5. This is likely to be pulled off the consent calendar; should lead to lots of discussion in the Senate. We see it as a more viable reporting structure.

1. **A New Integrated Approach to UC and APP Reporting:** Over the 13/14 academic year, Academic Policy and Planning (APP) and the Undergraduate Council (UC) collaborated with Academic Affairs to produce a compendium of enrollment, retention, and graduation measures, many of which are disaggregated with respect to admission status (e.g., Local Area, Non-Local Area, Out-of-State, and International), ethnicity (i.e., American Indian, African American, Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, Filipino, Multiple Ethnicities, White), and economic status (i.e., Pell-eligible). This initial AY13/14 ERG Compendium comprised 111 pages of graphs and data tables and was finalized in April 2014. The compendium was designed to the readily updated each year after census, and thereby provide a centralized and comprehensive resource for the production of annual reports for the UC, APP, and the Presidential Enrollment Management Advisory Committee (PEMAC) of campus and community
representatives. Building upon the efforts, the AY14/15 ERG Report was recently produced and serves as the source material for the next section of this report.

Our APP and UC collaborative efforts also highlighted the complementary nature of our ERG-related charges from the Policy File: For APP, to “annually review the previous year’s outcomes as well as any enrollment management changes proposed by the administration” and, for UC, to “produce an annual report on retention and graduation during the fall semester.” In the spirit of providing a more integrated overview of student success, APP and UC have jointly produced this report and recommend that By-Law and Policy File language be modified to codify the production of such a single integrated report.

2. **An Overview of Key ERG Findings:** The ERG Report provides a comprehensive overview of enrollment, retention, and graduation data. Highlights drawn from this data, with parenthetical reference to the corresponding ERG Compendium page on which the data appear, follow:

**Undergraduate Unit Load:**

- New FTF average fall unit load increased from 14.2 to 14.8 over the last five AYs. In contrast, new transfer student average unit load varied around 13.0 units over the last four AYs. (ERG-18)
- A disparity in average fall unit load above is also present across student levels, with juniors and seniors taking roughly one unit less than freshman and sophomores. (ERG-19)
- Since the % enrollment is only 0.3% less than the % FTES for Students of Color, the above unit differences among FTF/transfers and student levels appear more related to these factors than to ethnicity. (ERG-20)

**FTF Enrollment:**

- Compared to non-local students, local students had the same HS GPA, lower SAT Math by 34 points, and lower SAT Verbal by 34 points. (ERG-25, 26)
- As since F09, resident FTF Students of Color outnumbered Other Students (i.e., white, other/not stated/international) at 58.8%. (ERG-30)
- Local area FTF Pell-eligible students continued a decade-long increasing trend at 49.0% for F13, whereas non-local students showed a slight decline to 28.4% from what was previously an increasing trend at a decreasing rate of 14.8% to 30.0% through the previous five years. (ERG-34)
- Early Start for local students starting in 2010 essentially closed the proficiency gap between local and non-local students. (ERG-38)

**FTF Outcomes After One Year:**

- After a previous maximum divergence of up to 12% lower one-year continuation rates during F07 for local students compared to non-local students, FTF continuation rates between the two nearly converged by F10 and have thereafter shown slight parallel variations over time. (ERG-53)
- FTF one-year continuation rates generally show progressive increases across all ethnicities for students of color since 1996, and total Students of Color surpassed All Others by 0.1% in F13, essentially closing this achievement gap from a historical high of 6% between Students of Color and All Others. Note that the relatively large year-to-year variations for some ethnicities (e.g., American Indian, Pacific Islander) are largely attributable to their relatively small population sizes. (ERG-56)
- FTF GPA after one year remains relatively lower for local students (0.30 units lower), males (0.21 lower), and students of color (0.10 lower). In addition, academic probation rates after one year remain
relatively higher for these same groups (i.e., 5.4% higher for LA, 3.0% for males, and 2.6% for students of color). (ERG-59, 60)

**FTF Full-Time Graduation Rates:**
- Continuation or graduated after Years 1 to 6 by local/non-local, gender, and ethnicity all tend to show increases within categories and decreases in achievement gaps through time. (ERG-61, 62, 63)
- Similarly, FTF 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates by resident, local/non-local, and ethnicity show mostly net increasing trends through available time intervals, with some deviations including non-resident students (especially international with caveat of small population). Notably, as 4-year graduation rates for students of color and All Others have both increased over time, the All Others rate has increasingly outpaced the students of color rate, leading to a widening of an achievement gap of 12.1% for the Fall 2010 cohort (ERG-64 through ERG-69)

3. **Expectations for SDSU from the Chancellor's Office:** Recognizing that California will need more college-educated citizens in the future to meet the demands of the state, Tim White, California State University Chancellor, has announced CSU Graduation goals for 2025. While each university has been provided with specific targets, such as those below for SDSU, the overall goal for the CSU is to increase the six-year graduation rate to 54%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Freshman Graduation Rate Goals for SDSU Campus</th>
<th>Baseline Rate (2009 Cohort)</th>
<th>Additional Improvement</th>
<th>2025 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-Year Graduation Rate Goal (2019 Cohort)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year Graduation Rate (2021 Cohort)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transfer Graduation Rate Goals**
- 4-Year Graduation Rate (2021 Cohort) 79% 6% 85%
- 2-Year Graduation Rate (2023 Cohort) 36% 8% 44%

**Freshman Achievement Gap Goals**
- 6-Year URM/non-URM Graduation Rate Gap Goal (2019 Cohort) 7% 50% 3%
- 6-Year Pell/non-Pell Grant Graduation Rate 5% 50% 2%
Gap Goal (2019 Cohort)

4. Opportunities for Improving Student Retention, Graduation, and Achievement: Our progressive improvements over time in graduation and retention rates can be attributed to a variety of policy changes and targeted interventions with specific student populations. As we continue to strive to improve these various measures, we must appreciate that any improvement in such percentage-based measures must be gained without a decrease in either program quality or student achievement. Below we list some opportunities at the course, program, and university level with the appreciation that the development and implementation of many of these will require engagement, buy-in, and support from all three levels.

Course-level Opportunities:
• Examine classes with traditionally high DFW rates to understand the nature of the challenges to student achievement and address course-specific challenges through appropriate changes that will improve retention and graduation while maintaining (or even increasing) achievement; such changes could include course redesign, supplemental instruction, and learning analytics.
• Implement additional tutoring and mentoring within courses and the broader university through such mechanisms as the Writing Center and in-development Math Center.
• Promote and support the development and integration of High Impact Practices as appropriate within courses (e.g., community-based service learning, writing-intensive courses, undergraduate research and scholarship, collaborative assignments), especially in those courses that typically fall within students’ first 45 units.

Program-Level Opportunities:
• Promote and support program-centered discussions on the shared responsibility of students, programs, and the broader university in student retention, graduation, and achievement. Such discussions would help faculty understand how students enter their programs, why they persist or depart from their programs, and what actions and adjustments could improve their retention, graduation, and achievement. We would recommend piloting this approach with five to ten programs, with a refined process eventually integrated into the established Academic Program Review.
• Focus the role of evidence-based, action-oriented program assessment and periodic academic program reviews as mechanisms for improving the student learning experience and thereby students’ engagement and achievement, which in turn should improve graduation and retention rates across the university. Such efforts should include direct examples of student work that established expected and exemplary levels of student achievement.
• As within courses, the development and integration of High Impact Practices should also be promoted and supported at the program level (e.g., capstone courses, study abroad, internships, etc.)

University-Level Opportunities:
• Develop an integrated outreach and advising program for non-transferring students who depart after one semester or one year in good academic standing, with the program triggered on evidence of non-enrollment, ideally prior to start of classes.
• Modify the leave of absence procedure so that students must file for a leave if they stop out for one or more semesters. This process would establish the student’s reasoning and, while ultimately respecting their request, provide the opportunity to present alternatives or initiate a plan to return.
• Increase the availability and efficacy of financial aid counseling for students with financial holds. Pilot efforts in this area have already brought 17 students back to campus. Scholarship funds could be targeted to support students close to graduation.

• Continue to address bottlenecks and backlogs in course availability across disciplines through a course scheduling approach that develops steady-state course offerings that can meet student demand based on a four-year graduation plan. Strategic application of student success fee funds for critical faculty hiring would play a natural role in this endeavor.

• Engage in “intensive advising” for students who have earned more than 150 units and for students who have earned over 100 units but who are taking leaves of absence. As noted above, advising these students can help them complete a degree in a timely manner.

• Analyze the historical retention and graduation rates of students who maintained pre-major designation with 70+ units to assess the degree to which such student swirls negatively impacts time to degree; engage faculty in developing solutions for completing degrees in more timely manner.

Ely: What is the way forward?

Schellenberg: Many of the ideas are opportunities for engagement/discussion. We need to look more at the program level, not just university level. How can programs positively affect student persistence? The idea isn’t to make academics easier … but more realistic, supportive, etc.

Ornatowski: Some recommendations will jive well with the Task Force on Class Size.

Chase: This calls for system changes … not tinkering. The report tackles things at multiple levels—both short- and long-term.

Csomay: What happens with double-majors? One set of general ed requirements but more units otherwise (varies, though).

Chase: Governor wants 4-year graduation rates but many of the CSUs have students who complete school in fits and starts. Lots of complexities here; thus the report is about conversation, not dictating solutions.

Papin: NCAA bases things on 5-year graduation rates. Can our effort play off this model?

Chase: Pilot with programs going thru academic review; that’s where monitoring can really come into play. Departments will opt in. Shared responsibility.

Csomay: Heard about a student with advising issues; we have to capture this stuff.

Papin: No way to capture progress towards degree?

Multiple voices: Yes there is, but …

Schellenberg: We’ll need to bring this [APP/UC integrated reporting approach] to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

9.

9.1 Academic Resources and Planning (Deutschman)
Executive Summary

ARP received a referral from the Senate Officers in the fall of 2013 to review and assess the budget decisions made over the previous few (3-6) years and provide recommendations for improving communication about budget matters. We compiled and analyzed information from Academic Affairs (AA) as well as discussed the process of budgeting with representatives from across the colleges. Our recommendations are intended to be forward looking and proactive rather than simply trying to find fault with the past.

Over the past six years, the total number of faculty (non-FERP fell by 17%). Over this time period, the number of probationary faculty dropped by more than 50% while the number of faculty in the FERP program grew by 26%. Faculty numbers have declined across all colleges and units ranging from around 10% (A&L, BA, ENG, HHS, and SCI) to nearly 25% (EDU, IV, and Lib/SA). This freefall began to slow as budget conditions improved. Between 2012 and 2014 (2 academic years), 91 searches were approved while 31 faculty members entered the FERP program and an additional 59 faculty separated from the university for other reasons. This represents a net increase of only 1 position despite the substantial increase in hiring.

The process of centralizing hiring decisions was implemented to address a significant structural deficit in AA. Centralization meant that money freed up by faculty separations was consolidated in Academic Affairs rather than remain in the department/college. Between 2012 and 2014, $4.7 million was saved and these savings were used as one-time funds to close the deficit, add sections, and meet demand. Importantly, none of this money was used to support current, new, or upcoming PhD programs as had been rumored.

ARP members discussed budgeting, communication, and transparency within their respective colleges. It was difficult to find a simple way to express the diversity of opinions and recommendations that were collected. We compiled and grouped the comments and suggestions and present them in bullet form. This list of comments was used to develop our recommendations for best practices moving forward.

We recognize that Higher Education is changing and that SDSU will benefit from an open and constructive dialog among faculty, staff, and administrators. In the current climate of reduced budgets, faculty and administrators must remain flexible and recognize that allocation of any resource (e.g. faculty lines) must be justified based on prioritized goals and objectives. Collectively, we need to identify what information is most important to academic planning and make sure that this information is communicated at all levels of the University. Although there is no magic solution, efforts to improve communication and transparency will help engage a diverse group of stakeholders and ensure that a changing SDSU will thrive in the coming years.

Background:

ARP received a referral from the Senate Officers in the fall of 2013 (Full text in Appendix 1). The referral requested that ARP carry-out two tasks:

1) Review the budget decisions (within Academic Affairs*) made over the past few (3-6) years and assess how well the budget shortfall was handled. Through a careful examination of what decisions were made, identify what was done well and what could be improved in future economic downturns.

*Focus on Academic Affairs added by our committee

2) Provide recommendations for ways of moving forward that are transparent, provide clear communication about budget matters, and create a vision that promotes the continued growth of SDSU while maintaining the breadth and diversity of scholarship that is vital to a thriving university.

This report is the result of our committee’s work on this referral during AY 2013-2014. This final report was completed in the fall of 2014.
1) Approach:

ARP discussed the Senate officers’ referral at their fall meetings. The referral specifically tasked our committee with reviewing how the budget shortfall was handled over the last several years. The committee felt that this referral was an opportunity to learn from this budget crisis. We felt that we can only improve our decision making in the future by an honest and open look at past decisions.

Our committee focused on Academic Affairs and the budget process. We did not have the expertise, interest, or mandate to review budgeting in Business and Financial Affairs, Student Affairs, or University Relations and Development. Similarly, we did not want to get into detailed decisions within colleges. In responding to the referral, we felt that it was important to avoid a process that simply found fault with past decisions and looked to assign blame for any perceived mistakes. Our analysis and this report are intended to be forward looking and proactive rather than simply chronicle and critique past decisions.

The committee adopted a two-pronged approach:

1) Compiling and analyzing information from Academic Affairs (i.e. “centralized” information).
2) Discussing the general process of budgeting (and communication about budgeting) with representatives from across the colleges (i.e. “decentralized” information).

In the following sections, we present our findings from these two approaches and then end with our recommendations for best practices in the future.

2) Centralized Budget Information and Decisions:

Our committee’s evaluation of centralized budget decisions was motivated by concerns expressed by faculty in the Senate and in our own discussions. Some faculty felt that decisions were being made by a select few individuals without adequate discussion and input (i.e. diminished role of shared governance). Faculty also expressed concern that communication about decisions and the rationale behind decisions was lacking or inadequate. It is important to note that these concerns were not shared by all faculty, but the fact that these concerns were raised is adequate justification for the referral and the effort to produce this report.

In addressing these concerns, we summarized data from recent Faculty Affairs reports (pages 3-23, Senate Executive Committee Agenda Nov 19, 2013) as well as information provided by Academic Affairs (Dr. K. LaMaster, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs).

Over the past 6 years, the number and rank of faculty has changed dramatically due to budget cuts and what amounted to a freeze in hiring (Table 1). Over a six-year period, the total number of faculty (Non-FERP) dropped by 17%. The age-distribution changed as the number of probationary faculty dropped by more than 50% and the number of faculty in the FERP program grew by 26%.

Table 1: Number of Faculty 2008-2013. Data from Faculty Affairs.

(Definition B includes librarians and counselors)
Faculty numbers have declined across all colleges and units (Table 2). Declines have ranged from around 10% (A&L, BA, ENG, HHS, and SCI) to nearly 25% (EDU, IV, and Lib/SA). The impact of reduced faculty can be felt both in absolute terms and relative terms. For example, the number of faculty in the College of Sciences has declined by 20 positions out of 179 in 2008 (11%). In contrast, the number of faculty at the Imperial Valley Campus declined by 5 positions, but this is a 23% decline relative to the size of the faculty at IVC. The ability of a college/unit to respond to decreased faculty will be influenced by many factors including the size of the college, the number of departments, enrollment in service classes, research demands, and administrative constraints.

**Table 2: Number of Faculty by unit/college 2008-2013. Data from Faculty Affairs.**

*Note: numbers for HHS and PSFA were adjusted to reflect the move of ENS faculty from PSFA to HHS in 2010/2011.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A&amp;L</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>EDU</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>HHS</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>PSFA</th>
<th>SCI</th>
<th>Lib/SA</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our committee posed several questions to Academic Affairs (hereafter, AA) about budget decisions, separations and hiring. First and foremost, the committee was interested in how separations and searches were distributed across the University. This information is compiled in Table 3.

In the 2012-2013 academic year, 21 searches were approved (though it is important to note that 7 of these were grant/donor funded or self-funded by departments). During the same academic year, 12 faculty members entered the FERP program and an additional 32 faculty separated from the University for other reasons (including resignation, retirement, termination, death, and ending FERP). Under the best-case scenario where all 21 searches were successful, the University would see a net decline of 23 faculty positions.

Ultimately, 70 searches were approved in 2013-2014 and 63 of these searches were successful. This represents a welcome and significant increase from the previous years. Moreover, searches were approved in all colleges/divisions. During 2013-2104, 19 faculty entered the FERP program and an additional 27 retired or resigned from the University. Even with the increased hiring, the University saw a net increase of only 17 faculty members. This represents very modest progress when compared to the net loss of 134 faculty between 2008 and 2013.
The process of centralizing hiring decisions during the budget crisis was disturbing to many faculty members. The process was implemented to address a significant structural deficit in AA. This process meant that money freed up after a faculty separation was consolidated in to AA rather than remaining in the department/college. Our committee asked Academic Affairs to report how much money was saved through the centralization of separations over the past 2 academic years. In addition, the committee wanted to understand how those savings were used to close the budget deficit.

Dr. LaMaster (AVP) quantified how much money had been saved and how these savings were used. Dr. LaMaster reported that Academic Affairs realized (swept in) $2.45 million in 2012-2013 and an additional $2.31 million in 2013-2014. During the same period, the total structural deficit grew from $5.98 to $6.65 million, largely due to unfunded promotions and reduced grant funding. Permanent savings each year were used as one-time funds to offset the structural deficit, add sections, and meet demand. None of this money was used to support current, new, or upcoming PhD programs as had been rumored.

It is difficult to assess the equitability of hiring across colleges/units since each college has different strengths and needs. What is clear is that all colleges/units lost significant numbers of faculty over the past six years and searches approved through 2013-2014 only slow the freefall. There is still a significant challenge for all of us to maintain and enhance the quality of our teaching, mentoring, research, and service while trying to rebuild faculty across our programs, departments and colleges. Prioritizing new hires in a thoughtful and proactive way is vital to the University’s future. It is important that all stakeholders are able to participate in the shared governance process based on accurate information and clear objectives.

3) The View from the Colleges (Deans, Chairs and Faculty):

Many faculty expressed concerns about inadequate transparency and communication which led to a reduced sense of shared governance. Other faculty felt that the central administration and the University community navigated the worst fiscal crisis in a generation with thoughtfulness and professionalism. Our committee approached this complex and potentially divisive issue by discussing budgeting, prioritization, and communication with representatives across the colleges/units. Our committee developed a list of questions/talking points for these discussions (Table 4). We believed that having a common reference framework would inform these discussions and improve our ability to collate and interpret the responses.

Table 4: Common questions and talking points for discussions with representatives from each of the colleges/units.
It was difficult to find a simple way to express the diversity of opinions expressed by the ARP members and its representatives from across the colleges. We compiled comments across the colleges and present them in bullet form grouped by broad categories.

Common themes:
- There is no perfect process when it comes to taking away resources.
- There was no consensus on the strengths and weaknesses of the process that was implemented.
- The cumulative effects of budget cuts were significant and severe in all colleges.
- Colleges responded to the cuts in different ways. In some colleges, faculty were an integral part of the process and (usually) agreed with the approach that was taken. In other colleges, faculty and even chairs felt that decisions were made by their dean/administration without input which led to distrust and divisiveness.
- Academic units would like more faculty (Of course!) and more control of hiring.
- The idea that there are two distinct approaches, centralized (top-down) decision making and decentralized (local) decision making is a false dichotomy. Focusing on this dichotomy obscures our ability to increase the effectiveness of communication and consultation.
- We need to understand that going back is not an option. As the budget improves, the faculty and administration at SDSU need to be forward looking and proactive.
- In the end, we will look different (and be different) as a university. We believe that a commitment to shared governance is vital to our collective interests.

Perspectives on the declining budget:
- Unused funds were retracted. This practice rewards spending to the limit. Instead, colleges/units should be rewarded for fiscal responsibility by allowing roll over (rather than the money being swept back into AA).
• Some programs decided to close degree tracks, others modified curriculum, most class offerings and/or increased class sizes in order to save resources.

• Given the lack of hiring, faculty and staff numbers per unit (department/college) changed based on individual decisions to retire or leave regardless of need and any rational prioritization.

• It appeared that some positions were allocated before the start of the academic year (“mortgaged or pre-ordered”) which decreased confidence in the fairness of the process.

• Even with limited hiring, inadequate funds were made available for approved searches to cover the cost of the search, start-up funds, and renovations of faculty space.

Perspectives on hiring:

• Lack of predictability in hiring inhibits effective long-term planning.

• Information should be made available to all schools and departments. This transparent approach means that all schools and department are on the same page. In addition, this information should be something that we’d not be afraid to read about in the Daily Aztec or the U.T.

• Humanities departments/programs expressed concern that they might not be as competitive in a distribution of severely curtailed faculty lines that emphasizes grant-funding potential.

• Some colleges mirrored the centralization process. College would set allocation based on budget and Departments forwarded requests for faculty lines. The transparency and perceived fairness of this process varied widely among the colleges.

• Local control over allocation of positions is crucial to maintain the quality of academic/research programs.

The most important part of our work was to solicit and synthesize recommendations for best practices moving forward. We hope that these recommendations will be distributed widely and discussed by the larger community in the Senate and beyond.

4) Recommendations for Best Practices:

Higher education is changing on many fronts including the nature of public funding, competition among institutions, and modality of instruction. SDSU needs to be strategic in its plans to grow and evolve. This strategic planning benefits from constructive dialog among faculty, staff, and administrators (i.e. the vision of shared governance).

Under this new paradigm of severely curtailed resources and more centralized strategic planning, allocation of resources for faculty lines need to be justified and prioritized at each level (department to college to university). Because of this, the central administration needs to communicate their priorities for faculty hiring as well as evaluation criteria to colleges and departments.

Clear communication will improve faculty understanding of and participation in the process. That is, communication should not be confined to what is perceived by some as a linear Provost-Dean-Chair-Faculty chain. In addition, communication should be multi-modal including town-hall meetings, state of the university/college/department meetings, and blogs/e-newsletters etc. Faculty should also be engaged and communicate concerns and suggestions with their chair, dean etc.

Specific Recommendations

• Faculty and administrators must remain flexible and be willing to change. What worked five years ago may no longer work and needs to be viewed with a fresh perspective.

• Any process should be fair, informed and involve many in finding solutions

• We need to identify what information is most important in academic planning, and how can these plans be used to support collaborative hires. Asking questions about future trends and opportunities, for example.
• The central administration needs to be receptive to the critical (unique) needs of individual colleges. Resource decisions need to be more thoughtful than just proportional to faculty numbers or FTEs.
• Budget information should be provided to each academic division on a systematic basis, and to meet routinely with faculty and staff about the budget whether or not there is a budget crisis so that the campus community has the opportunity for regular discussions and input.
• We should maximize the impact of linking faculty lines across disciplines, breaking down the silos.
• Colleges need to enhance communication from Deans including meetings with Asst/Assoc deans after each meeting of the All Dean’s Council, monthly meetings with chairs/directors, assemblies with all faculty and staff at the beginning of each semester or year, and email messages to all faculty and staff when needed.
• The minutes from All Dean’s Council, Chairs/Directors meetings, and key handouts should be readily available on college website.
• This report should be shared with the Provost, Deans, Chairs and Faculty.

Appendix I

The university has weathered a significant period of declining budgets that impacted all aspects of the University community. During that period, very few faculty positions opened by resignations/retirements were filled. In addition, departments and colleges were often forced to reprioritize or subsidize operating budgets and in some cases incur structural deficits. During the recessions, decisions about how to absorb cuts and ultimately what few positions to fund were made by the central administration.

Now that the funding situation is improving, we are requesting that your committee carry out the following tasks:

(1) Review the budget decisions made over the past few (3-6) years and assess how well the budget shortfall was handled. Through a careful examination of what decisions were made, we would identify what was done well and what could be improved in future economic downturns.
(2) Provide recommendations for ways of moving forward that are transparent, provide clear communication about budget matters, and create a vision that promotes the continued growth of SDSU while maintaining the breadth and diversity of scholarship that is vital to a thriving university.

We would hope to receive your report no later than the May 2014 Senate meeting. This report would then be posted to the Senate website.

9.2 Faculty Athletic Representative Report (Papin)

I. Executive Summary
WILL WRITE ONE FOR SENATE MEETING

II. The Faculty Athletics Representative.

According to the NCAA (Bylaw 4.02.2 and 6.1.3):

The Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) is a member of an institution’s faculty or administrative staff (who holds faculty rank) who is designated by the institution’s president to represent the institution and its faculty in the institution’s relationship with the NCAA and its conference(s). Duties of the FAR shall be determined by the member institution.

The NCAA has provided some guidance on the typical responsibilities of the FAR. In a pamphlet describing the role of the FAR, it is stated:
“Working closely with the President and the Director of Athletics, the FAR works to support a campus environment in which the athletics program is maintained as a vital component of the educational program and in which student-athletes constitute an integral part of the student body. The FAR has responsibilities in several areas, including the enhancement of academic integrity, institutional control, and student-athlete welfare.”

The NCAA also notes that the FAR serves as the:

“Principal advisor to the President on all matters related to intercollegiate athletics” and helps “monitor the coordination of compliance efforts and rules education among campus entities outside the athletics department.”

III. SDSU FAR Activities and Duties

Below is a summary of duties and activities over the past year. This list is not meant to be exhaustive, but the purpose is to give a sense of my activities.

SDSU Standing Meetings and Service
- In the past year, met three times with President Hirshman.
- Met monthly with Tom McCarron, Vice President of BFA.
- Met 2-3 times per month with Jim Sterk, Director of Athletics.
- Attended bi-weekly athletics senior staff and monthly head coaches meetings.
- Met 3-4 times per month with Director of Compliance and the Director of Academic Services.
- Served on the search committee for the Director of Academic Services.
- Attended IAC and IAC sub-committee meetings.
- Attended Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) meetings.

NCAA and Mountain West Conference (MWC) Meetings
- Member of the NCAA Committee on Institutional Performance (Indianapolis)
- Member of the MWC Joint Council and FAR Group (Phoenix)

Professional Development: Attendance and Participation
- NCAA Convention (San Diego)
- FARA Annual Meeting and Symposium (New Orleans)
- D1 (FBS) FARA Annual Meeting (Dallas)
- Regional Rules Seminar (San Diego)

General Duties
- Reviewed and made recommendations on student-athlete special admissions.
- Supervised and worked with the University Eligibility Coordinator related to initial and continuing eligibility for practice, competition, and financial aid.
- Worked with Athletics Compliance Director on reviewing eligibility of International Students.
- Worked with Athletics Compliance Director on rule interpretation, and self-reported violations.
- Participated and submitted institutional waivers and appeals to the NCAA and the conference.
- Reviewed academic performance and graduation rates for student-athletes
- Coordinated the nomination process for conference student-athlete awards and honors
- Responded to request from NCAA and the conference.
- Participated in student-athlete orientations, exit interviews and surveys.

IV. NCAA Governance Model

This past year NCAA legislative activity centered on the development of a new governance model. The rational for these sweeping changes were driven by five major conferences. They are referred to as the “Core Five Conferences (Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big 12 Conference, Pac-12 Conference and Southeastern Conference and their member institutions). A year of many town hall type
discussions led to the NCAA Board of Directors approving (in August 2014) a restructured governance model. The new model includes three main bodies as described below (A, B, and C).

A) The Board of Directors
The final model expands the Division I Board of Directors (BOD) to include more presidents, but also one athletics director, one senior woman athletics representative, one student-athlete, and one faculty athletics representative. The old board consisted of 18; the new BOD has 24 members. To address diversity the BOD must have at least one ethic minority and at least one person of each gender. A single member shall not be considered to meet both minimums.

B) The Council
A new body known as the Council (40 members) will be responsible for day-today operations of the division. This body replaces what was known as the Legislative Council (32 members). At least 60 percent of these representatives shall be directors of athletics, four conference commissioners, two Faculty Athletics Representatives, and two student-athletes. There will be weighted voting--representatives from the Core Five Conferences (Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big 12 Conference, Pac-12 Conference and Southeastern Conference and their member institutions) will have four votes each, the other five (that have FBS football, including the Mountain West) will have two votes each. The remaining twenty-two conferences (non-FBS football) will have one vote each. The faculty and the students on the council will have one vote each. The Council will report to the BOD.

C) The Committee on Academics
Consisting of 20 members, including a minimum of two chancellors or presidents, one provost, four faculty athletics representatives, one director of athletics, one senior woman administrator, one conference administrator, and one student-athlete. This body will report to the Council. The current committee contains six faculty members.

D) Inclusion
Overall between the Council, Committee on Academics, and other Division I governance entities (other than sport committees) shall include representatives who comprise at least 20 percent of persons who are ethnic minorities and at least 35 percent of persons of each gender.

E) Autonomy
This is a legislative provision that provides flexibility to the Core Five Conferences (Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big 12 Conference, Pac-12 Conference and Southeastern Conference and their member institutions). They are granted autonomy in specific areas to permit the use of resources to advance the legitimate educational or athletics-related needs of student-athletes and for legislative changes that will otherwise enhance student-athlete well being.

Areas of autonomy:
1. Athletics Personnel. Personnel directly or in-directly associated with a sport.
2. Insurance. Loans or institutions providing career-related insurance products.
3. Promotional Activities. For careers and pursuits unrelated to athletics participation.
5. Pre-Enrollment Expenses and Support. Financial support in making transition from home to school, including assistance to families to visit campus.
7. Awards, Benefits, and Expenses. For student-athletes and their families.
8. Academic Support. For student-athletes academic support.
9. Health and Wellness Including insurance and other items to permit appropriate and sufficient care.
10. Meals and Nutrition. For student-athlete health and well being.
11. Time Demands. To establish an appropriate balance between athletics and other student-athlete activities and fosters participation in educational opportunities outside of intercollegiate athletics.
Future additions to Autonomy list
1) A request must come from three of the five conferences to the BOD. The item may be added upon approval of 12 of the 20 presidents or chancellors who serve on the Board.

Key Dates for autonomy governance in 2014-15
1) October 1, 2014 - Deadline will apply this year for the submission of autonomy legislation that is sponsored by at least three of the five Core Conferences.

2) December 15, 2014 - Legislation to be considered by the Core Five at the 2015 NCAA Convention will be circulated to the Division I membership.

3) January 17, 2015 – A Core Five Forum will be conducted for the 65 schools and 15 student-athlete representatives to discuss and vote on their proposed legislation.

Autonomy adoption requirement
Adoption needs simple majority of three of the five conferences and 60% (48 votes) of 80 available votes. -OR—Simple majority of four of the five conferences and student-athlete representatives (41 votes).

V. Academic Performance of our Student-Athletes.

ACADEMIC DATA WILL BE DISTRIBUTED AT THE SEC MEETING.

A) Graduation Data-
1) Freshman Graduation Rate. The freshman rate indicates the percentage of freshman that entered during a given academic year and graduated within six years. See chart below.

2) Six-year Graduation Success rate (GSR). Different from the above freshman rate by including mid-year freshman and transfer students during a given year and have graduated within six years. Also these graphs exclude students who leave school to join the military, foreign services, and church missions. These graphs represent data from different years, by sport, and also by ethnicity.

B) Academic Progress Rate (APR).

The APR is calculated as follows.

Each semester (F&Sp) a student can earn their team 2 points. One point for ending the previous semester eligible to compete the following semester. The second point is earned if the student continues on to the next semester. Earned points are added into the team total. The team total is then divided by the total possible for the team. This fraction is then multiplied by 1000. Anything under 930 will be problematic for the team.

Penalties include loss of scholarships and postseason competition. The 930 critical point has been determined by the NCAA to represent when a team will graduate at least 50% of the members. See charts below.

The NCAA requires institutions to submit Academic Improvement Plans when a team falls under an APR score of 930.

C) Grade Point Averages
D) Distribution by Major

E) Scholar athletes

Noted that academic data are not yet included in the report. In truth, there are no differences between this and last year.

• Duties of the FAR are clearer in this report, so people know whom to call about what.
• Changes in the NCAA governance structure are also covered here.

Papin: Asked if the report can move to the Senate on his commitment to add the academic information? [Yes]

Packard: Voiced concern with some low performing sports.

Papin: Explained that points are lost for changing coaches, etc.

Ely: Asked how NCAA rule changes will affect us.

Papin: Money, mostly. Now schools can pay the “true” cost of attendance, not merely what’s covered now. That will raise our commitment up about $1 million.

Packard: How will the top five conferences be affected?

Papin: Clearly – if we don’t play, our folks will go elsewhere—negative impact. President Hirshman supports the changes.

9. Campus Development Committee (Shinn)

Action Items:

September 2013, approved Schematic Design for Renovation of Zura Hall.

December 2013, approved Schematic Design for the Basketball Performance Center.


April 2014, approved Schematic Design for Plaza Linda Verde and appointed Laura Shinn, Director of Planning as chair.

Project Status Report:

Aztec Student Union – Project was completed and opened in January 2014. The CDC took a “hard hat” tour of the facility in January 2014, just before occupany.

Storm/Nasatir Renovation – Phase I, academic buildings, completed in December of 2013. Phase II, the food service building, will be completed by January of 2015.

Plaza Linda Verde – CDC approved SD in April of 2014. Project to begin construction in November 2014, and be occupied Fall semester 2016.

University Towers – Completed and opened Fall of 2014. The project completely renovated the food service area, and included changes to the first floor, site work and landscape.

Steam Line Repair – Project is a total of 5 phases with a cost estimate of $32 M and a total duration of 2-1/2 years. The first phase is complete. Phase 2 and 3 are in progress and these, along with Phase 4 and 5 will be completed over the next year.
Zura Hall Refresh – CDC approved SD in September 2013. Construction commencement in May 2014 and is underway. Target opening date Fall 2015.

Basketball Performance Center – CDC approved SD in December 2013. Construction is underway. Target opening date: Fall 2015.


Project updates shared during the year:

Conrad Prebys Aztec Student Union
Total project cost: $101.2M
203,000 GSF
Status: Complete
• Named in honor of Prebys’ $20M donation to student scholarship programs
• First LEED Platinum Student Union Project
• Student Fee Funded
• CDC toured the building in January
• Tenant improvement projects are complete.

Storm Nasatir
Total project cost: $71.5M
134,000 GSF
Status: Academic Buildings Complete; Food Court complete Spring 2015.
• Renovation and New Construction
• Added 300 and 500 seat lecture halls
• 9 classrooms were occupied for Spring Semester 2014. Remaining classrooms occupied in Fall 2014
• Project also provided upgraded office and program space
• Food Service building to open Spring Semester 2015

Zura Hall Refresh
Total project cost: $53M
134,000 GSF
Status: Under Construction
Estimated Completion Date: July 2015
• Renovation of 600 beds of freshman housing
• Fire, life safety, plumbing, accessibility and elevator upgrades,
• Reconfigure public space to accommodate living learning activities, including social, meeting and group study space.
• CDC reviewed this project in September 2013

Basketball Performance Center
Total project cost: $14.5M
23,500 GSF
Status: Under Construction
Estimated Completion: Fall 2015
• Practice and training facilities for Men’s and Women’s Basketball
• Donor Funded
• Two practice courts, locker rooms, training rooms, team rooms
• Located west of Alumni Center
• CDC reviewed this project in December 2013
Page Pavilion
Total project cost: $3.1M
4300 GSF of College space; 1500 GSF of upgraded elevator lobby space
Status: Under Construction
Estimated completion: Late 2014/Early 2015

- College of Business
- Donor Funded
- Includes accessibility improvements to restrooms (locally funded).
- Renovation and addition enclosing a previously open courtyard to provide meeting and lounge space, venue for guest lecturers and a location for students to practice interview and other business skills.
- CDC reviewed this project in January 2014

Utility Infrastructure Phase 2 & 3 (Steam Project)
Total project cost: $12.7 M (both phases)
Status: Phase 2 and 3 construction in progress
Estimated Completion Date: Phase 2 – End of 2014; Phase 3 – Spring 2015

- Replacement of 50 plus year old infrastructure
- All local funding, largest local campus investment in infrastructure in CSU.

Plaza Linda Verde
Total project cost: $143 M
Status: Under Construction
Estimated Completion Date: Fall 2016

- 600+ Freshman style beds above retail at street level
- 35,000 SF of retail space, with community and campus serving tenants such as a market, restaurants – both sit down and casual dining, and other retail
- Multi-purpose rooms, activity and program spaces and outdoor roof decks for students on the second floor
- Project includes aesthetic, bike and pedestrian improvements to College Avenue streetscape, which are currently under review by the city.

Papin: Asked if the report was going forward to the Senate. Are there schematics for Senators to see? That was the case in the past.

Deutchman: Noted some complaints in the neighborhood about the project. SDSU wants to clean up College Avenue without reducing lanes or widening the road. Mitigation: we will pay our fair share once the City of San Diego determines that’s the route to go. Some ideas about creating a median and improving the sidewalks

Verity: Asked about the engineering building; he has some concerns about it. For example, it unfolded very quickly; it feels rushed.

Shinn: September 2014 / The Committee met about this but no firm plans yet. He clarified some of the details that the Provost earlier provided—including what’s being torn down, what Centers will move in, proportion of lab to teaching space, costs ($90 million/including hard construction costs), etc.

Mission style. A design/build team has not yet been selected—final interviews late this year. Once hired, the real work begins. The Committee is working diligently and cannot yet bring this to the Senate – too many moving pieces.

Toombs: So—the design won’t really be like the diagrams we saw?
Shinn: Some of the principles or elements will remain – but the design will change. Think of it as a conceptualization to ensure the space can be utilized. Still some topography to deal with.

Verity: GMCS has incredible flooding problems. How can we ensure this doesn’t happen with the new building?

Shinn: This building will be much higher and if there’s a basement, it will be quite small. Will look into ground water and other issues to prevent problems. Not sure why the GMCS building leaks but it’s likely to do with topography.

10. Other Business

11. Adjournment

The SEC adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Allison Bobrow
Administrative Analyst

Marcie Bober-Michel
Senate Secretary