Members present:

**Officers:** Bober-Michel (Chair), Cadiero-Kaplan (Secretary)

**Administration:** Brooks (for Enwemeka)

**Committee Chairs:** Csomay, Attiq, Conaty, Verity, Chung, Imazeki (via Zoom)

**Senators at Large:** Atkins, Bliss, Sha

**CFA:**

**ASCSU:** Butler-Byrd

**Parliamentarian:** Eadie

**Guest:** Shackelford, Emeritus Faculty Senator

1. Agenda (Cadiero-Kaplan)
   - **MSP** To approve the December 20th SEC agenda.

2. Announcements (Bober-Michel)
   2.1 November minutes
      - **Bober-Michel** noted the document will be posted well ahead of the next SEC meeting (January 17).

   2.2 Prep for January meeting
   2.3 Excellence in Teaching Awards
      Deans have until January 20 to submit their nominees; it appears that 5 or 6 candidates are still under review (representing Arts & Letters, Education, Sciences, and Health & Human Services).

   2.4 Welter Review
      The Welter review committee has nearly completed its report.

3. Other Business
   3.1 Committee of the Whole
      3.1 Budget (Shackelford)
Shackelford’s concerns about budget methodology stem from issues of (alleged) overspending with which his College has been dealing for some time. Prior to meeting with SEC, he discussed with the Provost both his concerns and results of his recent study of the matter.

Shackelford provided a handout (appended to the Minutes) wherein he a) details budgetary situations in which Colleges now find themselves and then b) proposes revisions to the methodology driving SDSU’s budget process.

He also advocated for AR&P to proactively review all budget proposals—with the Senate then voting approval.

The idea is to provide a more open process for examining the budget. He argued that the recession is long over (though we must always be prepared for a downturn) and Colleges, as first-line service providers, should receive larger allocations based on significant upturns in out-of-state and international students. He calls this new strategy the Academic Department Reinvestment Initiative (ADRI).

**Conaty:** Confirmed (as co-chair/AR&P) that her Committee is more reactive than proactive. Members merely approve what Administration has already determined.

### 3.2 Videotaping, etc. / policy implications (Brooks)

Brooks recapped an incident in which students attending a post-election healing circle at the Student Union (and sharing personal details – including their immigration status) were surreptitiously videotaped. The video was uploaded to a variety of “news” outlets and some faculty were then listed on the anti-liberal Professor Watchlist ([http://tinyurl.com/jjjrsh6](http://tinyurl.com/jjjrsh6)).

Brooks shared a memo ([http://fa.sdsu.edu/facultyadvancement/resources.aspx](http://fa.sdsu.edu/facultyadvancement/resources.aspx)) that a) will be distributed to all faculty in mid-January and b) forms the basis for a *classroom civility* training for Chairs and Directors scheduled for January 13. In part, it highlights current regulations pertaining to classroom recording, along with guidelines that faculty can add to their course syllabi.

For those interested, MarComm staff will facilitate training sessions with faculty.

**Sha:** Reminded members that course syllabi are public; she advocates noting something like *Information is on Blackboard* rather than publishing phone numbers and office locations. **Chung** pointed out that such info is published in the Directory, though *Sha* countered that it can be suppressed.

**Brooks:** Encouraged members not to be too restrictive. She also helped distinguish between rules that apply to phone recording vs. class meetings or other events.

**Csomay:** Felt that the problem is not the recording itself but its dissemination.

**Brooks:** Explained the recent event was supposed to be a safe space for those who were participating, so we need to provide faculty with clear training (protocols, guidelines).

**Eadie:** Advised members that policy on intellectual property is currently under development at the system level; once a draft is made public, it will become a topic
for bargaining between CFA and the CSU. When approved, the policy will override what now is part of our Policy File.

Sha: Indicated that syllabi can include statements about liability, defamation, and invasion of privacy and that could cover video posting.

Brooks: Said the campus is likely to handle this as a student conduct issue, so including such language in a syllabi would suggest consequences to those who violate the rules. We need to create a culture where such behavior simply isn’t acceptable.

3.3 Faculty climate survey (Brooks)

Brooks explained that some SDSU faculty are working on an NSF grant targeting women working in STEM fields. They want to collect data at SDSU via the UCLA HERI Climate Survey (http://heri.ucla.edu/heri-faculty-survey/). She would like SEC approval to move forward, to better meet the researchers’ data collection timeframe (March; 2-week cycle). The Campus Climate Task Force will support the survey costs—about $800. [Note: a “demo” version is available @ https://www2.drcsurveys.com/herifacultysurvey2016/DemoTicket.aspx.]

Verity: Asked if the request should be reviewed by the Faculty Affairs Committee and Brooks agreed to forward it.

Chung: Asked for the survey results to be shared with DEO. Brooks believes the results should shared campus-wide as long as respondents can’t be individually identified.

Imazeki: Inquired as to the timeline for response from Faculty Affairs. Brooks supported Verity’s suggestion that feedback/input be provided via email.

Brooks: Noted that the survey takes about 15 minutes to complete; she suggested incentives for participation. She reitered that respondent info is anonymous.

Atkins: Added that the group from UCLA is well known, and the data will be very useful to us.

Sha: Asked why part-time faculty are excluded from participation. Brooks explained that the focus is on tenure and promotion, so lecturer input could skew the results. She agreed to ask those administering the survey if it includes branching by role; that would invite broader participation without negatively affecting outcomes.

MSP To approve administration of the UCLA HERI Faculty Survey.

4. Adjournment

MSP The Senate Executive Committee adjourned @ 4:01 pm.
Findings
After several years of budget reductions, SDSU received a very large budget reduction for 2011/12, of which $37.3M was passed on to the University’s operating divisions through “Pro-Rata” reductions in their base budgets. Academic Affairs received 74.1% of the total base reduction, amounting to $27.6M, approved by President Hirshman on August 6, 2011.

During the next several years, various one-time resources and attrition of faculty and staff were used to avoid layoffs due to the large reduction in base funding of the academic departments. The difference between the base funding levels of the Colleges and actually expenditures (base plus one-time) became known as the structural deficit. It is important to realize that, neither the academic departments’ base budgets, nor actual expenditures, were the result of anything other than the fiscal urgency at the time. The base budgets of the academic departments, outgrowths of the events of the last few years, are not based on an analysis of the funding level required to provide our students with programs of the highest quality.

There has been significant FTES growth in recent years. Between State provided marginal cost funding, related growth in Base Net SUF (State University Fee) revenue, increase in Base out-of-state Student Tuition and large increases in Base International Student Tuition, there is sufficient revenue to support substantial reinvestment in our colleges, academic departments and the library. Base funding, in the case of net SUF and tuition, is a very conservative estimate of revenue from these sources that the University is certain to realize in an upcoming budget year. Revenue from these sources that exceeds these base levels is treated as one-time funding. Net SUF and tuition revenue above base levels has produced approximately $25M in one-time funding each of the last couple of years. Historically, this is a very large amount of one-time funds.

One-time funding allocated through the University Budget Process was approximately $25M, in each of 2014/15 and 2015/16, with $10M of these funds allocated to the Engineering and Interdisciplinary Sciences (EIS) complex each year. One-time funding is especially useful for expenditures like extraordinary campus repairs, remodeling of classrooms and equipment purchases. While it cannot be used to fund permanent personnel positions, it can fund lecturers, GTAs and FERP faculty. While AA gets a substantial amount of these funds, usage of these funds is tightly defined, giving AA, and hence the Colleges almost zero flexibility to address local needs or opportunities.

Have lean budgets in the Academic Departments discouraged academic innovation?
Yes, the University’s Class Schedules have very few sections of Experimental Topics (296) and Selected Topics (496 and 596). These courses, which were common, provide electives for students and opportunities for faculty to introduce their research to students or to experiment with new or current topics of interest.
Will new tenure-track hiring provide more instructors for the academic departments?
Generally no, the funding method for new TT hires requires departments to eliminate lecturer positions for the number of sections that are to be assigned to the new hire.

Is there an equipment budget for existing instructional and other department needs?
I have not been able to locate budgeted equipment during the last several years. Year-end Actual Spending Reports for the colleges do show equipment expenditures, which may be startup spending, lottery, etc.

When was the last time that there was substantial equipment funding to the Colleges?
On March 26, 2013, President Hirshman approved $4M in one-time funding for equipment, mostly instructional, for the Colleges. The spending proposals were generally specific requirements from the academic departments forwarded through the deans.

Academic Affairs says that Colleges are over-spending. Is this correct?
If AA feels that a Dean’s office is over-spending for administrative operations, this is a management issue for AA to address.

Are academic departments over-spending?
No, current departmental budget levels are the result of years of the University’s budgetary urgency, having little relationship to actual requirements to support high quality programs. Increased expenditures to add course sections to meet the University’s goals of shortening time to graduation have occurred, but should not be classified as overspending. Faculty funding requests are almost always rejected because the Colleges and Departments are in perpetual red ink, lacking flexibility. Actually budgetary control is so tight that academic departments are not capable of overspending. They are simply under funded.

Does Academic Affairs receive Enrollment Growth Funding?
Yes, in some fashion. The amount per FTES seems to vary from $1,800 to perhaps $7,000. Funding is sometimes base and other times one-time. Funds that were “encumbered” for University one-time expenditures for one year and “AA base” in the subsequent year are not always traceable through PBAC documents. A report needs to be produced that clarifies Enrollment Growth funding provided to AA from 2010/11 forward.

For 2015/16 and 2016/17 AA requested $1,808 per FTES (a number based on lecturer costs) while much of the required added course sections were laboratories with GTAs that can cost as much as twice that amount per FTES. Some laboratories for professional programs are even more costly to fund. Unfortunately, this created “over spending” in some departments. The affected departments were simply supporting the University’s goals to reduce time to graduation, now they are faced are additional cuts to course availability for their majors.

Does Academic Affairs have the budgetary flexibility to resolve underfunding of academic departments?
No, the University’s budget process is extremely structured and lacking in flexibility. As an example, AA had to work a funding proposal through the process all the way to the President to simply add one technician position in Engineering.
Recommendations: Academic Department Reinvestment Initiative (ADRI)

I. Recommendation: Allocation of New Base Funding Resources

Currently, the University’s Base Budget Allocation Process has two tiers, Mandatory Increases and all other Base Funding Requests.

Modify the University’s Base Budget Allocation Process in the following ways:

Tier 1: Mandatory Increases, shall be funded as needed. (No change to existing practice.)

Tier 2: Enrollment Funding, shall be provided to Academic Affairs for allocation to the Colleges, Academic Departments and Library from the following resources:

A. All State provided Marginal Cost Enrollment Growth Funding.

B. A target of 75% of Base increases in Net SUF, Out of State Student Tuition and International Student Tuition.

Tier 3: All other University-Wide requests for base funding including any specific requests from Academic Affairs.

II. Recommendation: Allocation of available One-Time Funding Resources

Modify the University’s One-Time Budget Allocation Process in the following ways:

Tier 1: Fund mandatory expenditures such as large, unbudgeted, campus repair projects.

Tier 2: Annually allocate one-time funding to provide $4M for equipment for such uses as instructional equipment and faculty, staff and departmental computer replacement through Academic Affairs to the Academic Departments.

Note: This item is modeled from President Hirshman’s March 26, 2013 approval of $4M of one-time funding for instructional equipment for the Colleges.

Tier 3: Annually allocate one-time funding to provide $1M to Academic Affairs to support flexible funding to meet local needs in the Academic Departments.

Tier 4: All other University-Wide requests for one-time funding including any specific requests from Academic Affairs.