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The Senate was called to order @ 2:04 pm.

Members present:

**Officers:** Deutschman, Ornatowski, Bober-Michel
**Arts and Letters:** Csomay, Donadey, Imazeki, Putman, Graubart, Blanco, Mattingly, McCall
**Business Administration:** Fleming, Peter
**Coach:**
**Education:** Butler-Byrd, Cadiero-Kaplan, Duesbery, James-Ward
**Emeritus Faculty:** Shackelford
**Engineering:** Ozturk
**Health and Human Services:** Verity, Kahan, Rauh
**Imperial Valley:** Cordero (for Ponce)
**Lecturers:** Williams, Justice
**Library:** Rhodes
**MPP I and II:** Richeson
**Parliamentarian:** Eadie
**Professional Studies and Fine Arts:** Testa, Hopkins (for Durbin), Humphrey, Pauley, Lindemann, Cirino
**Sciences:** Atkins, Ponomarenko, Interlando, Xie, Beck, Baljon, Shen
**At Large:** Ely, Weston
**Staff:** Thurn, Aguilar (Imperial Valley), Attiq
**University Services:** Rivera
**Administration:** Welter, Brooks, Prislin (for Enwemeka), Schellenberg, Bohonak
**Associated Students:** Aguilar
**CFA:** Toombs
**ASCSU:** Wheeler

1. **Agenda** (Bober-Michel)
   Deutschman explained that the Senate must approve waiving the 4-day notice rule.
   MSP
   MSP To approve the agenda for April 5, 2016.

2. **Minutes** (Bober-Michel)
   MSP To approve the minutes for March 1, 2016 (Donadey abstained).
3. **Announcements** (Deutschman)

Deutschman explained that the Associated Students review (Cathie Atkins, Chair) will be extended to Fall 2016. The team felt it important to monitor and report on the transition from one leadership group to the next, and that process is just now getting underway.

Schellenberg offered a brief recap of the WASC visit and next steps—including the reporting process. In June, the WASC Commission votes on SDSU’s reaffirmation of accreditation and the duration of its reaffirmation. See the WASC website for additional details: [http://wasc.sdsu.edu/dus/wasc/](http://wasc.sdsu.edu/dus/wasc/).

Among the areas or themes covered in the closing report (and likely revisited in the final) are these: a fresh look at General Education, diversity, professional development, educational effectiveness (assessment) and information management/data sharing.

Deutschman provided highlights of SDSU’s announcement of interest in the Qualcomm site, should the Chargers relocate to Los Angeles or move to a new stadium in San Diego (location yet to be finalized). See: [https://sdsupresident.wordpress.com](https://sdsupresident.wordpress.com) for details.

4. **Academic Affairs** (Brooks for Enwemeka)

Brooks thanked everyone for their help with WASC – focusing in particular on the Steering Committee.

We’re in a 48-hour blackout period as CFA and CSU attempt to re-open negotiations. On Wednesday we will know if the strike is “on” or a settlement has been reached. News about the strike, should it move forward, will be available on the web: [http://sdsu.edu/strike](http://sdsu.edu/strike). Faculty with questions or concerns are encouraged to contact the Office of Faculty Advancement.

**Wheeler:** Said he hopes administrators will join us on the picket line.

5. **SEC Report/Referral Chart** (Ornatowski)

Ornatowski reported no new referrals. One remains in process (to AP&P regarding changes to the academic integrity policy).

6. **New Business: Action Items**

6.1 **Faculty Honors and Awards** (Deutschman for FHA)

The Committee recommended Senate approval of emeritus status for several people including: Leland Beck, Angela McIntosh, Richard Newman, and Andrews Szeto. The Committee also requested emeritus status for Ghada Osman, who resigned her position due to serious health issues.

At long last, the Committee received the letters of support necessary to recommend emeritus status for two lecturers: Jarleen Littrell and Greg Voigt.

**Toombs:** Said he wasn’t sure Littrell’s total years of service were clear.
Donadey: Wanted to recognize Leland Beck

MP To approve the report.

6.2 Sense of the Senate Resolution: Frequency of full RTP reviews (Ornatowski)
This resolution extends the discussion we had on this topic @ the March Senate meeting. The idea is to more formally see what Senators prefer relative to the length of initial and successor contracts (for probationary faculty) and the scheduling of multilevel performance reviews during the probationary period.

Ornatowski read the resolution aloud.

Wheeler: Asked that the CSU/CFA chapter be added to the second paragraph (Resolved: That this resolution be distributed to the SDSU President, Provost, Deans, Associate Deans, and the CSU/CFA chapter).

MP To approve the resolution.

6.3 Staff Affairs/Recognition of Retirements (Thurn)
Doug commended Lisa Thurn and Debra Bertram for being proactive about recognizing staff.

MP To approve the report.

6.4 Student Learning Outcomes
Schellenberg reviewed the Committee’s report, including a change to the Committee’s name (Student Learning Outcomes and Program Assessment Committee, or SLOPAC). The Committee feels that the policy file description no longer reflects our actual practices; it’s time to update the reality of what is going on.

SEC expressed some concerns, however, and offered a friendly amendment to Section 3.0 (although the language still may need some work).

Donadey: Offered two other amendments: to membership (1.0; # of members is incorrect) and 4.0.i (remove integral).

Baljon: Expressed concerns about the end of Section 2.0 – the term focused area. It may contradict RTP language, suggesting that assessment will now have to be a concerted effort.

Shackelford: Said: this could add undue stress for junior faculty.

Csomay: Suggesting replacing shall with may.

Baljon: Said this worked for her.
Imazeki: Indicated that the Committee would not consider this a friendly amendment.

Schellenberg: Said: the phrase is shall encourage, not require or demand. It just reinforces the importance of assessment.

Kahan: Said it’s time to change what is already there – and noted that some faculty have been discouraged (by Personnel Committees) from focusing on education and learning.

Donadey: Suggested Faculty may disseminate ... and then add a period after learning. Kahan concurred.

Imazeki: Noted that this is part of a larger discussion that needs to happen within Senate and the University at large. We need to promote scholarly research around teaching and learning … not just disciplinary areas of expertise.

Baljon: Believes upper-level administrators discourage this approach, so they should be at the table as this conversation moves forward.

MP To accept the report (as amended).

7. **New Business: Consent Calendar** (Committee Reports)
   MSP To receive reports on the Consent Calendar.
   MSP To adopt the Consent Calendar.

Pulling 7.2 and 7.3.

7.1 ASCSU (Ornatowski, Wheeler, Eadie)

7.2 CFA (Toombs)
Toombs provided an update – recapping key points from the fact-finder’s report. A public meeting was held yesterday, and the strike is “on” for now (notwithstanding the blackout period).

Toombs noted how proud he is of everyone for all their support, and he remains hopeful that a settlement will be reached before the strike date.

Deutschman encouraged all of us to read the report carefully, saying it was “very digestible.” He pointed to a number of issues (large v. small schools, cost of living issues, etc.).

Toombs said that some Academic Senates within the CSU have passed resolutions to support the strike.
Kahan: Asked: what will be media’s reaction to the strike? What’s the plan to counter negativity?

Toombs: Said he’s not sure the reaction will actually be negative. This really isn’t about a raise – but simply getting us back to where we were prior to the recession. It’s a rare opportunity to take advantage of the up-tick in the economy (which could die at any moment).

7.3 Library (Herman) – 2:45 time certain
Deutschman explained the parameters for this discussion (length, topics, etc.).

Herman provided some background/context, emphasizing that the library budget is flat, resulting in some serious problems. For example, there’s a skyrocketing use of interlibrary loan, book purchases are down, and we can’t keep up with the cost of subscriptions. One we’ve already lost is Lexis/Nexis.

Shackelford: Said it appears that the purchase of books is so volatile. Why the cycle? Seems like the library over-depends on one-time funds.

Deutschman: This happens to the Colleges as well – a great reliance on one-time funds.

Donadey: Wondered why the data provided by the Provost is so different (larger budget, stable base) than Herman’s numbers.

Prislin: Said: no one can disagree that the library should be better funded. But what other unit shouldn’t be better funded as well? It’s our reality. The library was reduced at the same time as Academic Affairs. We definitely are interested in building the base budget and last year it was raised about $100K (plus one-time funds) and will be again this year. But it can’t be a confirmed in perpetuity because we can’t predict the future.

She handed out the Provost’s report – which detailed hiring increases within the Colleges, etc.

Testa: Said he was trying to understand electronic v. brick-and-mortar.

Deutschman: Explained that these days the library is less about books than computers, etc.

Herman: Said: it’s not true that books are a thing of a past.

Testa: Asked: so the footprint of books must match the electronic resources?

Herman: Reiterated the high cost of subscriptions.
Testa: Asked: what are other CSU’s doing? How are they pursuing alternate resources?

Herman: Argued that it isn’t fair to compare us to the other CSUs. We have different aspirations. He agrees with Prislin, but believes we must have better funding to help all our new hires.

Baljon: Said she recently attended a CTL workshop on big data—and suggested that library staff should be helping with grants.

Verity: Asked: what increase are you looking for? He seeks more precision on what the library really needs to function well; this request can’t be open-ended; there’s no open checkbook here.

Herman: Said: that’s a different discussion. Today’s goal was only to show present conditions at the library. What is needed? That is a longer conversation with a lot of players at the table.

Wheeler: Wondered what library monies derive from IRA (especially in comparison to what goes to athletics).

Cadiero-Kaplan: Said she’s heard from newer faculty that as expectations for promotion go up, they need library resources; she definitely will share this report with faculty.

Several people asked about how database use is tracked.

Weston: Said there is some tracking; with Academic Search Premier, for example, he reviews searches v. downloads. Yes, some databases are well-used. The more specific they are, though, the less usage. Annual reviews can show up or down usage. He’s talked to different department and programs – which seems to help boost usage. He added that the library considers what audience might be attracted to a specific set of databases so that all reviews are in context.

Testa: Felt that the #s don’t quite tell the story. We also need to consider how much time is lost when faculty have to look around and search and search and search.

Weston: Unfortunately – some models do allow for charging by use. He described a big fiasco with Wiley (CSU dropped the broad license) that resulted in the library having to switch to a different subscription model. So-the path is CSU to private consortia to our own unique negotiations.

Deutschman: Said we’ll post the library’s strategic plan, and complimented Herman on for leading the charge.

7.4 Staff Affairs / minutes (Thurn)
7.5 University Relations and Development (Carleton)

8. Other Business

9. Other Information Items

10. Adjournment

MSP The Senate adjourned @ 3:30 pm.
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The Faculty Honors and Awards committee recommends that the Senate approve emeritus status for:

- **Leland Beck**, Professor of Computer Science, August 20, 2016, 36 years
- **Anne W. Graves**, Professor of Special Education, August 19, 2016, 26 years
- **Angela S. McIntosh**, Associate Professor of Special Education, December 30, 2015, 14 years
- **Richard Neumann**, Professor of Teacher Education, Imperial Valley Campus, May 21, 2016, 25 years
- **Andrew Y. J. Szeto**, Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering, May 31, 2016, 33 years

The Faculty Honors and Awards committee also recommends that the Senate approve emerita status for:

- **Ghada Osman**, Professor of Arabic and Chair of the Department of Linguistics and Asian/Middle Eastern Languages. Resigned on August 19, 2016, after 13 years.
  
  *Ghada was forced to resign when her doctor ordered her to reduce her activities significantly. Emerita status is not generally given to faculty that resign, but it is warranted in this case.*

In addition, The Faculty Honors and Awards committee recommends that the Senate approve emeritus status for these lecturers (supporting letters are attached):

- **Jarleen (Charlie) Littrell**, Lecturer, School of Teacher Education, 29 years
- **Greg Voigt**, Lecturer, School of Exercise and Nutritional Sciences for over 20 years
MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 1, 2016

TO: Jarleen (Charlie) Littrell, Lecturer (Red ID # 808625708)
School of Teacher Education (STE)

FROM: Joseph F. Johnson, Jr., Professor and Dean
College of Education

RE: Retirement from San Diego State University

We are in receipt of your memo of November 1, 2015 in which you express your desire to retire from San Diego State University effective January 1, 2016.

I accept your decision and I am pleased to join your colleagues in the School of Teacher Education and the College of Education in thanking you for your many years of outstanding service to San Diego State University dating back to the fall of 1987.

Your request for the awarding of emeritus status has my support and is being forwarded to President Hirshman for his consideration.

Again, we are grateful for your service to the College of Education and look forward to your continuing involvement.

c.c. Elliot Hirshman, President, SDSU
Joanna Brooks, Associate Vice President for Faculty Advancement
Nancy Farnan, Interim Associate Dean
Nadine Bezuk, Director, School of Teacher Education
Dr. Yusuf Ozturk,
Chair, Faculty Honors and Awards committees
San Diego State University

March 3rd 2016

Dear Dr. Ozturk,

Greg Verrill recently retired from SDSU after 20 years of service to the university. Greg served as a full-time lecturer during and taught many courses in Athletic Training as well as core courses in growth and Development and Applied Kinesiology, all of which are required for the degree in Kinesiology and Athletic Training. Based on students' evaluations and peer assessment, Greg was a very talented teacher who was able to simultaneously motivate, excite and educate students. His teaching effectiveness was formally recognized with him being named (on multiple occasions) as the students' choice of Most Influential and Outstanding Professor. Greg provided unqualified support for our teaching mission and played a central role in making sure our pedagogical goals were accomplished.

Greg's teaching contribution should be enough to warrant the award of Emeritus faculty, but I believe it is important to note, that for the majority of the time Greg was part of our faculty he was able to maintain the highest standard of teaching effectiveness while battling malignant brain cancer. Treatment required years of multiple surgeries and other forms of therapy that would sideline a 'normal' person. Quite frankly, his ability to tackle this form of cancer while maintaining his teaching was truly inspirational to his peers and students alike.

I am requesting that Greg's teaching effectiveness and service to the School of ENS be acknowledged by the award of Emeritus faculty.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Roger Simmons, Ph. D.
School of Exercise & Nutritional Sciences

Cc: Joanna Brooks, Associate Vice President for Faculty Advancement
San Diego State University
Sense of the Senate Resolution

Resolved: That it is the sense of the San Diego State University Senate that the option of changing SDSU’s Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) practice to appointing and reappointing probationary faculty to an initial and successor three-year contract, with departmental periodic evaluations in years 1, 2, 4, and 5 and multilevel performance reviews in years 3 and 6 is preferable to the option of appointing and reappointing probationary faculty to a series of two-year contracts, with departmental periodic evaluations in years 1, 3, and 5 and multi-level performance reviews in years 2, 4, and 6 or tenure year; and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be distributed to the SDSU President, Provost, Deans, and Associate Deans.

Rationale

Current SDSU Retention, Tenure, and Promotion process calls for offering probationary faculty an initial two-year contract and then a series of successor one-year contracts through tenure, with periodic evaluation at the department level in year one and full performance review (including a fully developed WPAF with One-of-a-Kind File) at departmental, college, and university levels in years two through six to determine eligibility for reappointment. This practice is out of alignment with that of other universities in our peer and aspirational cohorts. In addition, the current practice now generates an annual RTP workload of 100 cases per year, which with anticipated new faculty hires is projected to grow to 300 cases per year by AY 19-20. This will have a measurable impact on faculty, faculty committee, administrator, and staff workloads at the department, college, and university levels. Finally, neither the SDSU Senate Policy File nor the CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement requires SDSU to maintain this precise appointment and reappointment schedule.

Other CSU campuses normally conduct multi-level performance reviews and contract renewals in years 2, 4, and 6. Peer and aspirational institutions nationwide normally conduct multi-level performance reviews and contract renewals in year 3 and tenure in year 6.

The SDSU Senate Executive Committee (at its February 16, 2016 meeting) and the SDSU Senate (at its March 1, 2016) meeting discussed the possibility of a shift (without changing the CBA or the policy file or the campus practice of allowing probationary faculty to go up for tenure at any time) from annual multi-level performance reviews for probationary faculty with fully constituted WPAFs to annual department-level evaluations with opportunities for face-to-face mentoring and consultation and multi-level performance reviews only in either reappointment years 2, 4, and 6 or 3 and 6.
The first option would mean appointing and reappointing probationary faculty to a series of two-year contracts, with departmental periodic evaluations in years 1, 3, and 5 and multi-level performance reviews in years 2, 4, and 6 or tenure year.

The second option would mean appointing and reappointing probationary faculty to an initial and successor three-year contract, with departmental periodic evaluations in years 1, 2, 4, and 5 and multilevel performance review in years 3 and 6. This option may also allow for the flexibility of reappointing after year three to a one- or two-year successor contract with possibility of renewal, if warranted.

In either option, nothing shall prevent probationary faculty in any year of their appointment from requesting performance review in consideration for the award of tenure and promotion to associate professor.

Informal polls both of the Senate Executive Committee and the Senate appeared to indicate a preference for the second option: appointing and reappointing probationary faculty to an initial and successor three-year contract, with departmental periodic evaluations in years 1, 2, 4, and 5 and multilevel performance reviews in years 3 and 6.

This resolution formally expresses this sense of the SDSU Senate.
TO: University Senate  
FROM: Lisa Thurn, Chair, Staff Affairs Committee  
DATE: March 7, 2016  
REF: Staff Retirements for July 1, 2015 through March 1, 2016

ACTION ITEM:

The Staff Affairs Committee moves that the Senate recognize the following staff upon their retirement, and thank them for their contribution to the mission of San Diego State University:

Elizabeth R Alvarado, Student Services Professional, Student Affairs EOP And Ethnic Affairs, 41 years  
Gayle Anne Anderson, Administrative Support Coordinator, Chemistry Department, 15 years  
Anita M Armstrong, Administrative Support Coordinator, Sciences Deans Office, 39 years  
John W Baxter, Administrative Support Coordinator, PSFA Deans Office, 11 years  
Robert Bonano, Carpenter, Sciences Deans Office, 24 years  
Kathleen Borsos-Wooley, Administrative Support Coordinator, Education Deans Office, 18 years  
Barbara J Bowler, Student Services Professional, Enrollment Services - Records, 34 years  
Emily R Carter, Analyst/Programmer, Business Information Systems, 26 years  
Frank L Castro, Facilities Worker, Support Team Shop, 38 years  
Marc Culver, Administrative Analyst/Specialist, Project Management, 32 years  
Paula J Davila, Administrative Support Assistant, Business Operations, 19 years  
Bayani R Decastro, Custodian, Custodial Services, 20 years  
Dieu-Ly Doan, Custodian, Custodial Services, 13 years  
Barbara J Evans, Student Services Professional, SA Student Disability Services, 38 years  
Lena P Fortenberry, Custodian, Custodial Services, 28 years  
Alicia Q Garcia, Administrative Support Coordinator, Spanish & Portuguese Language & Literature, 44 years  
Aubrey P Greenhouse, Reprographics Specialist, Reprographic Services, 31 years  
Xiao-Ming Guo, Information Technology Consultant, Library Administration, 16 years  
Jeffrey E Herr, Administrative Analyst/Specialist, Project Management, 32 years  
Kendrea G Hilend, Administrative Support Coordinator, Psychology Department, 20 years  
Nancy J Kavanaugh, Graphic Designer, Business Admin Dean's Office, 13 years  
F Le Roy Lafferty, Analyst/Programmer, Chemistry Department, 37 years  
Donald D McKee, Information Technology Consultant, Enrollment Services - Admissions, 21 years  
Dennis Mitchell, Irrigation Specialist, Irrigation Shop, 15 years  
Sandra A Neer, Information Technology Consultant, Library Administration, 39 years  
Nick Palanza, Analyst/Programmer, Enrollment Services - Admissions, 20 years  
Martha E Pedroza, Admin Support Coordinator, Education Deans Office, 19 years  
Gene A Perry, Groundsworker, Grounds Shop, 36 years  
Carol M Phillips, Information Technology Consultant, Library Administration, 45 years  
Amy L Raymond, Administrative Analyst/Specialist, Environmental Health & Safety, 38 years  
AnnMarie Sagle, Administrative Analyst/Specialist, PSFA Deans Office, 11 years  
Maria E Santos, Student Services Professional, Student Affairs Financial Aid & Scholarships, 31 years  
Linda G Schmalzel, Student Services Professional, Admin Rehabilitation & Post-Sec Education Department, 38
years
Anthony E Slimp, Instructional Support Tech, Sciences Deans Office, 11 years
William D Smith, Analyst/Programmer, Provost's Office, 35 years
Ratnasamy Somanathan, Instructional Support Tech, Chemistry Department, 30 years
Susan E Soto, Library Services Specialist, Library Administration, 31 years
Jill A Tavolazzi, Confidential Administrative Support, Provost's Office, 38 years
Teresa Ventura, Library Services Specialist, Library Administration, 28 years
Robert D Wallace, Administrative Analyst/Specialist, Sciences Deans Office, 11 years
Phyllis J White, Administrative Analyst/Specialist, Student Affairs Student Testing Assessment & Research, 33 years

Note: Future motions regarding retiring staff will be presented on a quarterly basis.
Date: 5 April 2016

To: Senate

From: Student Learning Outcomes Committee

Action: Revision of “Student Learning Outcomes Committee” and “Assessment” Sections of the University Senate Policy File

At our last meeting, the members of the Student Learning Outcomes Committee unanimously approved the proposed changes to our committee’s description and the assessment section of the University Senate Policy File.

These changes modify the committee member structure to reflect current collaborations and updates the language to reflect current processes related to assessment across campus.

Page 122 of University Senate Policy File (July 2015)

**Student Learning Outcomes and Program Assessment Committee (SLOPAC)**

1.0 Membership (13): 9 faculty, one from each College, the University Library, and the SDSU-IV Campus; Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies; Assoc. V.P. Student Affairs (or designee); Instructional Technology Services representative (ex officio); Center for Teaching and Learning representative (ex officio); two undergraduate students.

2.0 Functions

2.1 The Committee shall provide oversight for the program assessment of student learning outcomes, Degree Learning Outcomes, and shall evaluate student learning assessment plans and progress for all degrees and programs, including those programs accredited by external agencies.

2.2 The Committee shall annually review reports on student learning outcomes from all degrees and programs assessment reports for each degree on a regular basis and provide feedback to the respective programs.

2.3 The Committee shall provide the Senate, and, when relevant, the Graduate Council, with an annual report regarding the progress of the state of program assessment student learning outcomes assessment for across the university all degrees and programs, including those programs accredited by external agencies.

Page 29 of University Senate Policy File (July 2015):

**Assessment**

1.0 Faculty shall be responsible to their students, colleagues, and the community for providing competent and ever improving instruction and programmatic quality. The purpose of assessing student outcomes Degree Learning Outcomes shall be to identify opportunities to improve teaching, learning, and academic advising at the individual, course, programmatic, and institutional level.

2.0 Student Outcomes Assessment of Academic Programs: In order to assess the extent to which students are meeting achieving academic program goals, their Degree Learning Outcomes, San Diego State University shall be committed to systematic evaluation of instructional programs. Such evaluation shall extend both to broad interdisciplinary programs such as General Education, Education and to degree-related programs within specific disciplines and departments or schools. The university shall encourage department and school faculties to engage in assessment research related to teaching and learning, and to disseminate such efforts through...
scholarly peer-reviewed venues.

3.0 The evidence of student achievement with respect to assessment shall not be used to evaluate individual faculty members or to publicly compare department, schools, or institutions. Where assessment evidence is presented within lecturers evaluations or faculty retention, tenure, and promotion process, the evaluative focus shall be on the approach that the instructor has taken to demonstrating where students are with respect to desired outcomes and the evidence-based pedagogical and curricular actions undertaken to improve student achievement.

4.0 Assessment of student learning shall:

   a. Be used directly by disciplinary faculty (a) to articulate educational outcomes goals, (b) to develop assessment methodologies to evaluate student progress toward these achievement with regard to these outcomes goals, and (c) to undertake curricular planning and revision, and improvement;

   b. Be characterized by an approach that embraces multiple methods in order to provide valid information for improving academic programs;

   c. Be driven by the faculty, who shall have the primary responsibility for deciding how to assess, that is, how to design, select, and administer assessment methods, to interpret the results, and determine how the data shall be used to improve programs;

   d. Be part of strategic planning efforts that include consideration of sufficient resources to carry out the plan;

   e. Facilitate discussion of, and agreement upon, common principles across disciplines in programs such as General Education and identify or develop assessment mechanisms to evaluate student performance;

   f. Better Articulate programmatic and instructional goals and expectations and make these public to students and the general public;

   g. Open new areas of discussion with community colleges for coordinated assessment and curricular planning to improve student access and retention;

   h. Be reported within the established university-wide relational database of general assessment information (such as writing and mathematics competency, admissions data, and enrollment patterns) (i.e., WEAVE Online);

   i. Be part of an integral component of the Academic Program Review process for departments, schools, and programs.

5.0 In addition to its primary roles of improving program effectiveness and promoting student achievement, data collected for academic assessment purposes may also be published or otherwise publicly disseminated as the scholarship of teaching and learning. If the data obtained in an assessment process are intended for eventual public dissemination, for example in the form of journal publications or conference presentations, then the data protocol shall have received prior approval through San Diego State University’s Human Research Protection Program. Interested faculty should consult with their college representative on the Student Learning Outcomes and Program Assessment Committee and the Human Research Protection Program Staff for more information. Data obtained in the assessment process (a) shall have received prior approval of the protocol from the Committee on Protection of Human Subjects if it is intended to include them in published research findings and (b) shall not under usual circumstances be available as raw data.

6.0 Student Support Services: Student outcomes assessment of co-curricular activities, which are integral to student learning, shall be necessary for a complete picture of students’ campus experience. These activities may involve the library, academic advising, counseling and career planning, housing, financial aid services, extracurricular activities, health services, and campus climate.
TO: Senate

FROM: Bill Eadie, Cezar Ornatowski, Mark Wheeler
       Academic Senate, CSU

DATE: April 5, 2016

SUBJECT: Information

Various Information

In response to the ASCSU Resolution AS-3247-16/FA (Restoring Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Funds as a Line Item in the CSU Operations Budget) passed in January 2016, the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA) funds were made a line item in the CSU operating budget (rather than, as was the case over the last few years, a discretionary item).

VC Lamb has declined to suspend the new CSU background check policy, as requested by the ASCSU. However, the CO did convene a task force to review problems reported with policy implementation. VC Lamb reported that the group found no “facts” documenting the reported problems. However, the CO has issued multiple “clarifications” of the policy to the campuses.

The “final” version of the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force report is scheduled to be presented at the March 7-9, 2016 BOT meeting (the report can be viewed at http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/mar16/finance.pdf, starting on page 45). The Financial Model Task Force recommendations appear to be a done deal; they will be implemented.

On March 3, Governor Brown announced the following appointments and reappointment to the CSU Board of Trustees:

Jane Carney, 73, of Riverside. Carney was a partner at Roth, Carney and Knudsen LLP from 2008 to 2010 and at Carney and Delany LLP from 1994 to 2007. She was an associate and partner at Reid and Hellyer APC from 1981 to 1994 and at Butterwick, Bright, Pettis and Cunnison from 1977 to 1981. Carney earned a Juris Doctor degree from the University of California, Davis School of Law. Carney is a Democrat.

Jean Picker Firstenberg, 79, of Los Angeles. Firstenberg was president and chief executive officer at the American Film Institute from 1980 to 2007. Firstenberg is a Democrat.

Thelma Melendez, 57, of Los Angeles. Melendez has been chief executive officer of educational services at the Los Angeles Unified School District since 2014. She served as chief advisor on education and workforce development in the Los Angeles Mayor’s
Office from 2013 to 2014, superintendent at the Santa Ana Unified School District from 2011 to 2013, assistant secretary for elementary and secondary education at the U.S. Department of Education from 2009 to 2011 and superintendent at the Pomona Unified School District from 1999 to 2009. Melendez was program manager at the Stupski Educational Foundation from 2005 to 2006, deputy superintendent and chief academic officer for instructional services at the Pomona Unified School District from 1999 to 2005 and director of school and family initiatives at the Los Angeles Annenberg Metropolitan Project from 1997 to 1999. She earned a Doctor of Philosophy degree in education from the University of Southern California. Melendez is a Democrat.

Lateefah Simon, 39, of Oakland. Simon has been director of programs at the Rosenberg Foundation since 2009. She was executive director at the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area from 2008 to 2011, director of the Re-Entry Division at the San Francisco District Attorney’s Office from 2005 to 2009 and a consultant and grants advisor at the Annenberg Foundation in 2004. Simon was executive director at the Center for Young Women’s Development from 1997 to 2005 and director of its Girls Detention Advocacy Project from 1994 to 1997. Simon is a Democrat.

Reappointment: Lillian Kimbell, 56, of Woodland Hills, has served on the BOT since 2014. Kimbell has been legal counsel and manager of Spanish language authors and publisher relations at Gardels and Associates since 2011. She was legal counsel and business manager at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions from 1997 to 2011 and a law clerk for the Honorable Harry Pregerson at the U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit in 1985. Kimbell earned a Juris Doctor degree from the University of California, Los Angeles School of Law. Kimbell is a Democrat.

Resolutions Passed

**AS-3236-15-FA/ (REV) Reaffirming the Principle of Shared Governance Within the California State University**
Reaffirms the principle of shared governance as articulated in HEERA and requests that the Chancellor articulate in the written response to the resolution how “shared leadership” – to which he frequently refers - conforms with or differs from HEERA and the “long accepted manner” of shared governance as defined by the AAUP Statement on Government of College and Universities.

**AS-3244-16/APEP (REV) Support for Requiring a Fourth Year of High School Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning As a Requirement For Admission to the California State University**
The CSU currently requires 3 years of high school math for admission to the CSU. The resolution calls for the CSU to require a fourth year of mathematics/quantitative reasoning as part of the admissions requirements to the university. Recommends that the CSU investigate the impact these requirements may have on the success of all students, particularly those from historically underserved populations.
AS-3245-16/AA Selection of Faculty to Serve on Campus Honorary Degree Committees
At its November 2015 meeting, the CSU Board of Trustees approved an Honorary Degree Policy that, among other things, specifies the process for the selection of faculty representatives on campus honorary degree committees. The resolution asserts that faculty representatives serving on campus honorary degree committees should be selected by faculty. It also expresses concern that the Trustees’ policy authorizing campus presidents to select faculty in consultation with faculty, rather than authorizing faculty to select their own representatives, violates AS-3160-13/EX/FA Selection of Faculty representatives in Shared Governance and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities.

AS-3246-16/EX Preventing Workplace Bullying Within the CSU Community
Reaffirms ASCSU's commitment to tolerance and respect differing perspectives and urges campus senates and administration to develop and implement strategies to redress, remedy and mediate workplace bullying and promote inclusive environments throughout the CSU.

AS-3248-16/FGA 2016 Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the California State University
Adopts ASCSU positions on bills currently under consideration in the California State Legislature.

AS-3249-16/AA/FA/EX COM Concerns About Administrative Communications regarding Classroom Discussion of Possible Strike Action
Expresses ASCSU’s concern over recent communications from some CSU presidents and administrators forbidding faculty to discuss the potential strike action planned by the California Faculty Association in their classrooms. Affirms that the determination of the relevance of particular material to a class is the decision of the faculty teaching that class in the context of accepted pedagogical and disciplinary standards.

First Reading Resolutions

AS-3250-16/FGA Resolution Regarding Evaluation of Online Teaching
Recommends that campuses develop an aggregate database of specific kinds of demographic and non-demographic data (including hours worked, commute time, faculty rank and online format) about students and faculty involved in online courses for comparison with the general population of students, faculty and courses, and that the data be aggregated across campuses to provide data driven decisions regarding the efficacy and cost effectiveness of online teaching in the CSU. Recommends that campuses use the data to establish student qualifications for taking fully online courses, and potential limits on the number of fully online
courses a student may take. Also recommends that campuses use the data to establish requirements for the training of faculty teaching fully online courses, guidelines for the assignment of faculty, by rank, who teach fully online courses, with reasonable limits on the use of non-tenured track faculty. The resolution also recommends that campuses use the data to establish protocols for offering face-to-face or hybrid equivalent classes for each fully online course offered, and limit the size of fully on-line courses to match the size of the corresponding face-to-face class.

AS-3251-16/FA In Support of Increased Funding For the Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (RSCA) Program
Urges the Chancellor’s Office to increase funding for the RSCA program to a level commensurate with the original intent of and assumptions behind the program, the amount of external funding faculty research brings to the CSU, and the fact that lecturers, as well as tenure-track faculty, are now eligible to receive RSCA funding.

AS-3252-16/EX Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2016-17 Meetings:
Copies of this and other resolutions may be found at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/. Faculty are encouraged to provide feedback on the above resolutions as well as on any other matters of potential concern to the CSU Academic Senate to the SDSU academic senators Bill Eadie (weadie@mail.sdsu.edu), Cezar Ornatowski (ornat@mail.sdsu.edu), and Mark Wheeler (wheeler1@mail.sdsu.edu).

Additional Information
ASCSU website: http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/?source=homepage. Includes committee information, approved agendas/minutes, reports, resolutions, and current senator contact information.

Faculty-to-Faculty, ASCSU Newsletter: Published approximately two weeks after each plenary. Includes chair’s report, committee reports, invited articles on current events, and committee recommendations. Subscribe (delivered automatically via email) at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Newsletter/
To: Senate
From: Charles Toombs, Chapter President, CFA
Date: 31 March 2016
Re: Information Item

CFA Report:

Bargaining Update

Fact-Finding endorses our salary proposal
The neutral Fact-Finder has issued her recommendations and findings in our effort to gain a 5 percent raise for all faculty members for 2015-16, plus a 2.65 percent SSI for all eligible faculty. The result is a vindication of CFA's salary proposal and of our contention that the CSU can afford the pay raise.

Fact-Finder Bonnie Castrey, referring to general salary increases (GSIs) and step increases [SSIs], wrote, "A substantial GSI as well as SSIs to the 43% of faculty who have not had them, . . . is in the interest of students, who need caring faculty and certainly in the public interest as our country needs a well-educated population."

Recommendations from the Fact-Finder
Castrey's report is non-binding, but carries significant weight. She made four main recommendations:

1) Increase faculty pay with a General Salary Increase of 5% in THIS contract year (that is, 2015-16).

2) Provide Service Step Increases to the faculty who are eligible, equal to about 43% of the entire faculty.

3) Continue to study the faculty salary issue. Develop a list, agreeable to both sides, of comparable universities that award bachelor's and master's degrees and do a comparison using available AAUP data and including a cost-of-living comparison.

4) Develop a joint strategy and documentation to go to the California Legislature and the Governor to seek the needed state funding for the CSU budget.

Castrey was clear in her report that the CSU can and should pay these raises in this current contract (fiscal) year. She recommended, for example, that "monies should be reallocated from other projects."
CFA Statewide president Jennifer Eagan said, "For more than nine months, we have argued at the bargaining table that this package would benefit not just the faculty, but the students we teach as well. The fact-finder agreed with us here, too, and states that this package 'is in the interest of students, who need caring faculty and certainly in the public interest as our country needs a well-educated population.'"

**Next steps**
CFA leaders from our campus and every other campus met with legislators on March 30 in Sacramento to make them aware of the Fact-Finding report. We made our case so that legislators, in turn, can put pressure on the Chancellor. Short of a settlement, our next step will be to strike, beginning on Wednesday, April 13.

**E-mails to Governor Brown**
To put additional pressure on the Chancellor, we are asking faculty members to send an e-mail to Governor Brown and ask him to push Chancellor White to implement the Fact-Finder's recommendations: [https://www.votervoice.net/CALFAC/campaigns/45526/respond](https://www.votervoice.net/CALFAC/campaigns/45526/respond)

**Read the full Fact-Finding report**
With the release of the Fact-Finding report, it is time for local administrators to acknowledge what we have been saying all along: that CFA's salary proposal is fair and affordable. Please read the full Fact-Finding report at: [http://www.calfac.org/item/factfinding-report-goes-public](http://www.calfac.org/item/factfinding-report-goes-public)

**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.
Report on the State of the Library

Prepared by Peter C. Herman, Chair, Library Senate Committee, with the assistance of the Library Staff on Budget Information

Between the academic years 2011/12 and 2015/16, the university's operating fund budget increased from $346.0 million to $371.8 million.¹ State funding ended its decline and increased by $12.1 million from the last fiscal year. Much of the increased budget funding was directed towards Academic Affairs and resulted in most Colleges benefitting from significant increases in their actual spending:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Unit</th>
<th>2011/12 Actual Spending (in millions)</th>
<th>2014/15 Actual Spending (in millions)</th>
<th>Actual Spending Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
<td>$38.7</td>
<td>$42.2</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>$39.3</td>
<td>$46.7</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin</td>
<td>$15.1</td>
<td>$17.9</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs (excl Library)</td>
<td>$192.6</td>
<td>$220.7</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The budget for Athletics also rose 24.6% from $34.2 million in 2011/12 to $42.6 million in 2015/16 and Business and Financial Affairs rose 29.4% from $42.7 million to $55.3 million.

However, the exception to this rule has been the library:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Unit</th>
<th>2011/12 Actual Spending (in millions)</th>
<th>2014/15 Actual Spending (in millions)</th>
<th>Actual Spending Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$11.3</td>
<td>$11.9</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Data source is SDSU’s Budget Book; 2011/2012 through 2015/2016: http://bfa.sdsu.edu/budfin/genfund.htm. Data includes State, Use Fee and CERF funds; benefits are included in data but are not within the budget control of departments.
Whereas the Colleges and other sectors in this university have enjoyed increases in their budgets and actual spending of nearly 20.0% or more, the Library's allotment has been nearly static.

The Library supplements its budget through one-time funding, carry forward funds, and the student use fee. (Please see addendums I and II at the end of this report for the details on 2014/15 carry forward use and 2015/16 one-time funding.) But even when one-time funding is taken into account, the total library budget has until this year risen only incrementally:

![Total Budget by Fund 5 Year Comparison](chart.png)

Data provided by Academic Affairs; excludes carry forward and use fee. *1-Time Funding includes CERF, Lottery (equipment) and CES (15/16 only).
As the graph above shows, between 2011/12 and 2012/13, the total funding of the library rose from $7,463 million to $7,607 million. The next year, the budget inched upward again, to $7,865 million. In 2014/15, unaccountably, the library budget declined by a small amount to $7,847 million. It is only in the present budget year—2015/16—that the library’s budget went up by a significant amount to $8,311 million, thanks to an infusion of $100,000 to the base budget for library subscriptions and more money for hiring.

Furthermore, the small upticks in the Library’s budget between 2011/12 and 2014/15 came from increases in one-time funding. The total base allocation in these years actually went down three years in a row. In 2011/12, the total base allocation was $6,921 million; in 2012/13, $6,623 million; and in 2013/14, $6,568 million. In 2014/15, the base allocation rose to $6,661 million, which was still below the amount allocated in 2011/12.

In short, while nearly every other sector of the university enjoyed robust growth between 2011/12 and the present, the Library has lagged behind, to the detriment of its collections and ability to carry out its mission.

The following graph shows a detailed breakdown of how expenses have been budgeted by category. The financial model for a library varies largely from that of a typical academic unit. The SDSU library consists of various computer lab spaces and rooms with technology which need PC/server/network upgrades, maintenance/system contracts, furniture and renovations on a rotating cycle. Additionally, for libraries to function they must have access to various systems allowing for the sharing of resources and this access is quite costly. These expenses in the library model are reflected below in the categories of information technology, equipment, work orders, and services and are often referred to as “operations” costs. Libraries can also have higher postage and courier expenses due to participation in the Interlibrary Loan (ILL) program.
In 2014/15, 48.6% of the Library’s budget went to salaries, 21.0% went to collection development and the remaining 30.4% went to operations. For this year (2015/16), the proportion devoted to salaries will drop to 46.3% of the budget, collection development will increase to 24.0%, and slightly less will go to operations (29.7%).

However, and this point is crucial, the amount of money devoted to the collection development budget dropped from a high in 2007/08 of $2.5 million\(^2\) to a low in 2011/12 of $727,294. For three years in a row (2011/12-2014/15), the collections budget remained flat at $1,465,370. This year, it rose to $1,565,370:

\(^2\) Data source is SDSU’s Budget Book; 2007/2008 through 2011/2012: [http://bfa.sdsu.edu/budfin/genfund.htm](http://bfa.sdsu.edu/budfin/genfund.htm).
It should be noted that the Student Use Fee also supplements the library’s Collections budget but is predominantly directed toward keeping the library open longer hours, computer upgrades and space renovations, as per their referendum priorities. While approximately $650,000 a year goes toward supporting collections, but this use is not a student priority and can be redirected if Associated Students so decides.

Making matters worse, the cost of periodicals/subscriptions has been steadily rising at an average rate of about 7% per year, with some popular titles rising as much as 15% per annum. As the library’s budget has remained largely static, these subscriptions take up more and more of the pie, resulting in a budget that cannot keep up with the rising costs of current titles, let alone purchase new titles. However, not only is the collections budget not
keeping up with subscription costs, it is actually 4% lower today than it was in 2013/14 while periodical subscriptions have risen by 14%:

Because periodicals take up an increasingly greater proportion of the library’s budget, the amount devoted to book purchases (still the gold standard for scholarly production in the humanities and social sciences) has declined precipitously:
The result has been a concomitant rise in Interlibrary Loan requests. In 2010/11 and 2011/12, ILL received 1330 and 1648 requests. In 2012/13, the number spiked to 4435, and since then it has gone down slightly to 4107 (2013/14) and 3394 (2014/15). The reason for the reduction is not clear, but there are still about twice as many ILL requests now than in 2010/11. It should be noted that one reason for the increase has been the collapse of the two expedited ILL services—Link+ and the Circuit. The former decided to focus on public libraries, the latter has been compromised by UCSD’s decision to replace book purchases with e-books accessed through its Ebrary subscription, and they do not circulate beyond the institution. The Library has its own Ebrary subscription (paid for by the CSU), but as the rise in ILL requests shows, Ebrary does not adequately meet the
needs of students and faculty. It should also be noted that ILL is hardly cheap, relies on the generosity of lending libraries, and often takes a long time. The shortest period between a request and fulfillment is a week. Books will often arrive weeks after the request, and sometimes, they do not arrive at all.

As a consequence, SDSU’s library no longer supports research as it once did. ILL, which used to be a last resort, is now the first place faculty and students must go if they want to read newer books. Nor is the budget crisis restricted to book purchases. The declining budget also prevents the Library from subscribing to journal resources essential for the sciences, such as the various “children of Nature” journals (e.g., *Nature Biotechnology*, *Nature Reviews Cancer*, and *Nature Genetics*), the *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, and the *International Journal of Obesity*. Other essential database resources that we need (especially if SDSU is to achieve its ambition of becoming a top fifty public research university) but cannot afford include in no particular order: *English Historical Documents*, *Gallup Analytics*, *Routledge Handbooks Online*, *British Newspapers Online*, *Thompson Reuters IP and Marketing Database*, and *ScienceDirect Reference Module (Chemical, Molecular Science, & Engineering)*. Furthermore, as costs rise and the library’s budget remains flat, it is an open question if the Library can maintain its subscription to essential (and expensive) resources, such as *Web of Science*. We stress that we are not being alarmist: for example, the Library is about lose its subscription to *LexisNexis* because

---

3 Ebrary itself has a number of other problems that make it an unsatisfactory resource. It covers only a small number of publishers and books, and important works are missing, such as Lisa Stampnitzky’s prize-winning *Disciplining Terror: How Experts Invented “Terrorism,”* (Cambridge University Press, 2014). The e-books come burdened with all sorts of restrictions, and the printed files are deliberately marred to prevent easy reading.
the CSU has decided to stop paying for it and the Library cannot afford to purchase a subscription on its own.

Finally, the decline in the library’s resources is not consistent with SDSU’s intention, as articulated in the strategic plan, “to enhance its research and creative profile” by fulfilling “its mission to generate new knowledge and attains distinction through excellence in the research, scholarship, and creative activity of its faculty.” These goals cannot be accomplished without an adequately and consistently funded library. Therefore, we strongly urge the University to very significantly increase the Library’s base budget.

---

Addendum I

14/15 Carry Forward Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Spent in 15/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT server/support</td>
<td>2,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC furniture &amp; PC's</td>
<td>824,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library access services</td>
<td>63,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction projects *</td>
<td>570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security (cameras, Elite)</td>
<td>18,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholstery repairs</td>
<td>4,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>88,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,572,224</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All expenditures are spent except construction projects scheduled to begin May, 2016.
Addendum II

# 15/16 One-Time Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work Study</td>
<td>101,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>315,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery (Equipment)</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>11,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Allocations</td>
<td>20,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Licenses</td>
<td>3,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistants (min. wage, projects)</td>
<td>69,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLF Award</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Start-Up</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Time</td>
<td>5,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES Funding (3-year agreement)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,217,016</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addendum III

Data supplied by Academic Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMANENT BASE ALLOCATION (UOE)</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
<th>FY 2013/14</th>
<th>FY 2014/15</th>
<th>FY 2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty</td>
<td>6,165,763</td>
<td>4,510,639</td>
<td>4,455,518</td>
<td>4,578,199</td>
<td>4,910,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistant</td>
<td>5,415</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>23,192</td>
<td>334,102</td>
<td>334,102</td>
<td>334,102</td>
<td>334,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Books</td>
<td>20,124</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Book Binding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Periodicals</td>
<td>397,370</td>
<td>397,370</td>
<td>397,370</td>
<td>697,370</td>
<td>697,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Serials</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Subscriptions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>548,000</td>
<td>548,000</td>
<td>548,000</td>
<td>648,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>213,741</td>
<td>213,741</td>
<td>213,741</td>
<td>213,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BASE ALLOCATION</td>
<td>6,921,864</td>
<td>6,623,942</td>
<td>6,568,821</td>
<td>6,681,502</td>
<td>7,094,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONE-TIME ALLOCATIONS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work Study (FWS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Allocation</td>
<td>67,010</td>
<td>67,828</td>
<td>66,923</td>
<td>81,751</td>
<td>88,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Allocation</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>6,135</td>
<td>11,415</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Funds transfers</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>4,104</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FWS ALLOCATION</td>
<td>71,832</td>
<td>75,030</td>
<td>92,442</td>
<td>92,751</td>
<td>101,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF Overhead Allocation</td>
<td>217,736</td>
<td>232,981</td>
<td>253,811</td>
<td>242,763</td>
<td>315,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Allocation</td>
<td>83,923</td>
<td>81,350</td>
<td>91,125</td>
<td>108,417</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development Allocation</td>
<td>25,362</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,597</td>
<td>11,214</td>
<td>11,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUAT and Honor’s Course Allocation</td>
<td>4,072</td>
<td>4,072</td>
<td>14,916</td>
<td>10,130</td>
<td>20,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/TT Recruitment Support Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1X PEBG Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>587,576</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>526,341</td>
<td>473,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Allocations</td>
<td>137,682</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85,713</td>
<td>91,273</td>
<td>49,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from CES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ONE-TIME FUNDING</td>
<td>541,567</td>
<td>983,409</td>
<td>1,296,604</td>
<td>1,185,895</td>
<td>1,217,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUNDING</td>
<td>7,463,371</td>
<td>7,907,351</td>
<td>7,865,425</td>
<td>7,847,397</td>
<td>8,311,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIFFERENCE FROM 2011/12 TO 2015/16: 847,715 11.4%
FOOTNOTES:

[1] Reflects allocation from Academic Affairs to cover 50% of replacement cost for carpeting in 1st floor library addition.

[2] Reflects net permanent reduction of $1,655,124, made up of the following: 1) Permanent increase of $4,124 for Unit 3 Promotion funding, 2) 2012/13 permanent budget reduction (Phase I and Phase II) of $162,798, 3) 2012/13 Faculty Retirement Savings reduction of $130,248, and 4) Total of $1,357,202 transferred from the Library's non-faculty budget to the following budget categories: Student Assistant: $34,585, Supplies & Services: $31,000, Books: $179,576, Book Binding: $10,000, Subscriptions: $546,000, and Contractual Services: $213,741.


[8] Reflects permanent reduction of $297,222 from previous fiscal year.

[9] Reflects a total of $587,576 in 1x PBAC allocations to support the following: 1) Supplies & Services needs: $117,501, 2) Supplemental equipment allocation: $70,000, and 3) Purchase of journals/collections: $393,275.

[10] Reflects net permanent reduction of $55,121, made up of the following: 1) Permanent increase of $4,099 for Unit 3 Promotion funding, and 2) 2013/14 Faculty Retirement Savings reduction of $59,220.

[11] Reflects a total of $750,000 in 1x PBAC Allocations to support the following: 1) Library books, journals and periodicals: $500,000, and 2) Faculty requested publications: $250,000.

[12] Reflects a total of $65,713 in funding from Academic Affairs to support the following: 1) Sustainable collection services: $50,000, 2) Replacement chairs for conference room: $15,713, and 3) Parliamentary papers - ProQuest: $20,000.

[13] Reflects net permanent increase of $122,681, made up of the following: 1) Permanent Unit 3 and Staff compensation funding: $96,689, 2) Permanent increase of $30,000 (funds transferred from Student Assistant budget), 3) Increase of $22,404 for new 2014/15 T/TT hires, and 4) Faculty Retirement Savings reduction of $20,472.

[14] Reflects permanent reduction of $30,000. Funds transferred to the Library's non-faculty budget.


[16] Reflects permanent reduction of $300,000. Funds transferred to Library Periodicals.

[17] Reflects a total of $1,649,271 in funding from Academic Affairs to support the following: 1) Library Student Computing Center: $580,000, and 2) Critical Academic Support Needs: $449,341.

[18] Reflects a total of $1,649,271 in funding from Academic Affairs to support the following: 1) New T/TT workstations: $5,600, 2) Replacement computers for computer lab LL-260: $39,166, 3) Replacement chairs for computer lab LL-260: $13,451, and 4) Pro-rated portion of new T/TT hires salary funding: $33,066 (12-Month base funding for T/TT hires to be allocated in 2015/16).

[19] Reflects net permanent increase of $332,566, made up of the following: 1) Permanent Unit 3 and Staff compensation funding: $169,960, and 2) Permanent increase of $142,600 for new 2015/16 T/TT hires.

[20] Reflects permanent base increase of $100,000 to library subscriptions allocation in 2015/16.

[21] Reflects a total of $473,065 in 1x PBAC allocation to support the following critical needs: 1) Library subscriptions: $400,000, 2) Software licenses: $3,761, and 3) Student Assistants: $53,304.

[22] Reflects a total of $49,146 in funding from Academic Affairs to support the following: 1) PLF award: $10,000, 2) New T/TT faculty start-up support: $24,000, 3) Extraordinary assigned time: $5,148, and 4) Saboticals: $10,000.

[23] Reflects annual support from CES (established three year agreement in 2015/16, to be on-going).
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Prepared 3/12/2016
Staff Affairs Committee
March 14, 2016
Administration Building AD 225
Minutes

Attendees: Debra Bertram, Leviticus Johnson, Cyndi Chie, Carlos Sanchez, Bann Attiq, Diana Osborn, Jesica Brubaker, Todd Rehfuss, Suzanne Finch, and Lisa Heizer

Jesica Brubaker, as member of Staff Affairs, has been nominated and approved as the incoming chair of the Staff Honors and Awards subcommittee.

Staff Affairs reviewed staff positions on Senate and Senate-appointed committees in order to fill ending terms or vacancies for the 2016/2017 academic year.

The attached lists terms ending May 2016 to be extended to May 2019. Two senate-appointed committees are open: AS Facilities and Student Media Advisory. Staff Affairs will announce a campus-wide appeal towards the end of March and elect by simple majority within Staff Affairs to fill these open positions.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Thurn
Chair, Staff Affairs
TO: SEC

FROM: Mary Ruth Carleton, Vice President, University Relations and Development

DATE: March 15, 2016

RE: Information

The Campaign for SDSU has reached the $675M benchmark. The following gifts were received since the last report:

Alumnus Mort Marcus and his wife Deborah Klein have made a $10,158 gift to an internship in the College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts.

A $50,000 pledge from Faculty Emerita Rebecca Moore will support The Peoples Temple Collection Endowment Fund in the Love Library.

Conrad Prebys has pledged $1,000,000 to help fund the Engineering and Interdisciplinary Sciences Complex Project.

A $26,315 pledge from Dr. Ruth Stern will help fund the Dr. Ruth Stern Scholarship in the College of Sciences.

A $25,000 gift from the Hervey Family Fund will support the Step Up Program in the College of Health and Human Services.

CBA Board Member Karen Castles Gray has made a gift of $10,000 to support the College of Business Administration.

A $16,000 gift from the San Diego Kiwanis Club Foundation will support Athletics.

Alumnus Thomas Franklin has pledged $15,000 to the Engineering and Interdisciplinary Sciences Complex Project.

Lindsay and Brownell, LLP has pledged $25,000 to support the Lindsay and Brownell, LLP VITA Scholarship Endowment in the College of Business Administration’s Lamden School of Accountancy.

Alumna Christine Bruce has made a $25,000 irrevocable bequest to Athletics.

A $10,000 gift from AMDM will help fund the AMDM Master of Science in Regulatory Affairs Scholarship in the College of Sciences.
A $9,500 gift from Mark and Debbie Lindner will help fund the Mark and Debbie Lindner Business Leadership Scholarship Endowment and the Mark and Debbie Lindner Intern Leadership Scholarship in the College of Business Administration.

A $30,000 gift from Christopher and Janice Penrose will fund Athletic Scholarships.

The Love Library Special Collections has received the following gifts-in-kind: Howard and Jill Singer, $9,750, Doug Highsmith, $5,000 and Joan Torres, $5,000.

A $10,000 gift from the Goodrich Corporation will go to the Dr. Katz Research and Capstone Fund in the College of Engineering.

Alumnus Bernard Revak has made a $98,775 gift-in-kind to the Love Library Special Collections.

Alumnus Javier Alonso has made a $108,308 irrevocable bequest to support the Civil Engineering Department in the College of Engineering.

Athletics has received the following gifts: Alumnus Cloyd Reeg, $9,200, Scott and Catherine Harman, $10,000, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman, $6,000 and Ben and Tina Bagnas, $5,000.

A $10,000 gift from Westpak, Inc. will support the Zahn Center in the College of Engineering.

Alumnus Matthew Jones has made a gift of $5,000 to the EMC Advisory Board Fund in the College of Business Administration.

A $12,000 gift-in-kind from Alumni James and Deborah Marshall will go to Athletics.

Faculty Emeriti David and Ann Johns have made a $5,578 gift to support the ISCOR Scholarship Fund.

Faculty Emeritus Thomas Davies and his wife Adele Davies, an alumna, have made a gift of $6,729 to support the Library Development Fund.

Alumnus Gerry Ranglas and his wife Jeannie have made a $12,000 gift to fund Athletic Scholarships.

A $50,000 pledge from Alumnus Kenneth Gerdau will establish the Gerdau Family Scholarship Endowment in the College of Business Administration.

Former faculty member Lawrence Baron and his wife Bonnie have made a $60,000 irrevocable bequest to support the Nasitir Endowed Chair and the Jewish Historical Society Archives Fund in the College of Arts and Letters.

A $100,000 gift from Frank McCarty will establish the McCarty Endowment in Music Composition in the College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts.
**Campaign, Presidential & Special Events:**

On Thursday, February 4, President Hirshman hosted the annual *President’s Service Award*, honoring Alumnus Walt Ekard. Mr. Ekard was recognized for his support of SDSU’s School of Public Affairs, as well as his contributions to the San Diego community. He served as San Diego County chief administrative officer, interim chief operating officer for the City of San Diego and a member of the city’s stadium task force.

On Thursday, February 18, President Hirshman and Vice President Carleton hosted the annual *Evening Celebrating Philanthropy* and recognized donors who have given one million dollars or more. Over 100 guests attended this year’s event including 16 new donors who were presented with a Presidential Medallion. Music by SDSU’s Chamber Orchestra was featured.

On Wednesday, February 24, President Hirshman hosted the annual *Scholarship Appreciation Luncheon*. Over 250 scholarship donors, scholarship recipients and campus leaders attended the event. Four students shared their academic achievements and appreciation as scholarship recipients.

On Thursday, February 25, the President and Mrs. Hirshman hosted *Pizza with the President*. This particular dinner included new members of Aztec PRIDE (Philanthropic Role in Education and Education).

**Community Relations This Month:**

**On Campus Hosted Events:**

**Aztec Women’s Basketball Pink Game: Paint the Town Pink**
- 152 tickets were distributed to area residents via online request form
- Promotion through Nextdoor.com and through announcements at CACC and CABD meetings
- VIP attendee: Marti Emerald, San Diego City CPPT
- Ian Stenehjem wrote, “Thank you. Fun game! It would be great to have more SDSU/community partnership events like this.”

**Campus Event Participation:**

**First Hostler Lecture of the Year**
- 2 confirmed neighbor attendees

**Voice Your Language (US Poet Laureate)**
- 3 confirmed neighbor attendees
- Andrew Bailey called to share, “This was the best lecture I have ever been to.” He and his six-year-old daughter later joined us at the Pink Game.

**Osher Life Long Learning Inst. Kick-off Event**
- 2 confirmed neighbor attendees
Year-to-Date:
- People brought to campus: 203
- Significant off-campus neighbor interactions: 78

Neighbor Meetings:

We welcomed three neighbors to campus for meetings/tours this month. One notable visit was with a long term resident, alumnus, current CACC/CACPB Director and former AS Executive, BJ Nystrom, who toured campus with Nicole Borunda and Tyler Aguilar.

Media Relations:

**SDSU Marketing Communications Activity Report for Feb. 2016**

![Web Communications Graph]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NewsCenter</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Annual Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page Views</td>
<td>60,732</td>
<td>445,597</td>
<td>1.1 Mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>37,273</td>
<td>269,017</td>
<td>625,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Stories**
- A Top Ranking Institution (11,657), Today's Teen's More Materialistic (1,469), SDSU Football Signs 22 Letters of Intent (1,439)

**Traffic Sources**
- Facebook (16,708), Google (14,566), SDSU (1,519), Twitter (1,114)

| SDSU Homepage   | 341,441 page views | 2,706,575 |
| SDSU Events Calendar | 6,053 page views | 52,362 |
## Social Media

### Organic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWITTER</td>
<td>Followers</td>
<td>51,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Goal</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clicks</td>
<td>3,679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Goal</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACEBOOK</td>
<td>Fans</td>
<td>94,774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Goal</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likes &amp; Comments</td>
<td>398,709</td>
<td>55,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Goal</td>
<td>398,709</td>
<td>55,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUTUBE</td>
<td>Views</td>
<td>75,471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Goal</td>
<td>75,471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most engagement this month from outside San Diego: LA/Orange County, Maryland, Massachusetts and Hawaii markets

### Paid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWITTER</td>
<td>Impressions</td>
<td>403,684</td>
<td>1,829,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Goal</td>
<td>4.7 Mill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clicks</td>
<td>5,301</td>
<td>24,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Goal</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACEBOOK</td>
<td>Impressions</td>
<td>8,414,743</td>
<td>24,241,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Goal</td>
<td>22 Mill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clicks</td>
<td>4,645</td>
<td>54,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Goal</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUTUBE</td>
<td>Views</td>
<td>67,787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Goal</td>
<td>286,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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