

DEO Report on Student, Faculty, Staff, and Administrator Data

Introduction: In the spirit of SDSU's strategic plan goals to increase tenured/tenure-track faculty and staff levels to meet critical and strategic needs and to invest in the recruitment and retention of faculty and staff in order to promote student success across the university, this report provides information regarding the faculty, staff, administrator, and student body at SDSU in three areas: (1) changes in numbers of members in each of these four categories between 2008, 2011, and 2015; (2) demographic changes for these four categories during the same period of time; and (3) areas of concern for which recommendations may be forthcoming.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND MAJOR AREAS OF CONCERN:

- ➔ Between Fall 2008 and Fall 2015, semesters with similar numbers of full-time equivalent students (FTES) and units attempted:
 - SDSU lost 241 staff members (14.43% loss)
 - SDSU lost 164 faculty members (8.8% loss):
 - 105 tenure-line (11.8% loss).
 - 59 lecturers (6% loss): 43 full-time (24% loss) and 16 part-time (2% loss).
 - SDSU gained 105 graduate teaching assistants (19.96% increase).
 - SDSU gained 46 administrators (17% increase).
- ➔ Numbers of faculty and staff have not recovered from losses during the great recession, whereas numbers of graduate teaching assistants and administrators have increased.
- ➔ Percentages of tenure-line (TT) faculty have remained similar for female and underrepresented TT faculty; only percentages of Asian TT faculty have increased.
- ➔ More female than male TT faculty tend to resign.
- ➔ As lecturers have become more diverse overall, their position has also become more precarious, with a decrease in full-time positions.
- ➔ Overall, staff are primarily female and ethnically diverse, with variations among job type.
- ➔ The student body continues to be diversified, however we have small numbers of American Indian and Pacific Islander students, relatively small numbers of African American students, and decreasing percentages of Filipino students.

1) **FACULTY DATA:**¹ we chose Fall 2008 as a point of comparison with Fall 2015 because Fall 2008 was the last time we had similar full-time equivalent student (FTES) total enrollment to that of Fall 2015 and is therefore a good point of comparison.

- Tables 4 Total Faculty Headcount and 15 Tenure Track Faculty: Between Fall 2008 and Fall 2015, **we lost 105 TT faculty** (from 889 to 784), an 11.8% loss and *gained the same number of Graduate Teaching Assistants* between Fall 2009 and Fall 2015, a 19.96% increase.
- Table 8 The RTP process became leaner and meaner between 2011-12 and 2013-14; in these 3 years, 14 TT faculty members were denied tenure or reappointment whereas between 2007-08 and 2010-11, no faculty member was denied tenure or reappointment. In the past two years, only one faculty member has been denied tenure or reappointment.
- Tables 11 TT Faculty Gender/Ethnic Diversity and 16-17:
 - **Percentages of female faculty have remained fairly flat in the last 10 years**, fluctuating between 40 and 42% (compared to 44% CSU-wide).

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, faculty information is derived from data provided by the Office of Faculty Advancement

- Percentages of faculty of color have gone up from 25% to 30% (compared to 33.5% CSU-wide).
- We are *slightly below CSU percentages* on both counts.
- Table 13 TT Faculty disaggregated data by ethnicity:
 - Percentages of underrepresented faculty have remained fairly flat at about 14% in the last 10 years, hovering around 3% for African American faculty and around 9-10% for Latino faculty.
 - Only percentages of Asian faculty have gone up significantly from about 10.5% to about 16%.
- Table 12 Status of Overall Diversity by College:
 - When breaking down the category of people of color between Asian and underrepresented groups, we have 105 Asian faculty (15.96% of the total faculty) and 92 underrepresented faculty (13.9%). In the College of Business, faculty of color are mostly Asian (only 3 underrepresented faculty). The College of Sciences fares poorly on both counts.
 - The Colleges of Arts and Letters and of Education lead the way in terms of underrepresented faculty (in CAL, the strong numbers of African American and Latino/a faculty are due in part to the presence of departments of Africana Studies, Chicano/a Studies, and Spanish and Portuguese).
- Table 16 TT Faculty Diversity by *ethnicity* by college:
 - Sciences and PSFA are the least diverse colleges although there has been some improvement in the last 10 years.
 - SDSU-IV, Engineering, and Education are the most diverse units/colleges.
 - Percentages have gone up for all colleges except for CAL, which has remained stationary but is at average.
- Table 17 TT Faculty Diversity by *gender* by college:
 - Engineering and PSFA are the least diverse colleges although there has been some improvement in the last 10 years.
 - Education and HHS are the most diverse.
 - Percentages have gone up for all colleges except for CAL, which has remained stationary but is doing better than average.
- Tables 16 and 17: When looking at both *ethnicity and gender*, PSFA is the least diverse college and Education the most diverse.
- Table 18 Lecturers:
 - Between Fall 2008 and Fall 2015, **we lost 59 lecturers** (from 982 to 923), a 6% loss.
 - **43 of the 59 lost lecturers were full-time lecturers (FTL)**, a **24% loss** in full-time lecturers; in 2008 and again in 2010/2011, many full-time lecturer positions were converted to part-time positions; numbers have slowly gone back up, but this category is the one that has suffered the most).
 - In 2008 we had 81.77% part-time lecturers (PTL) and 18.23% full-time lecturers (FTL); in 2015 we had 85.27% PTL and 14.73% FTL, a drop of 2.5 percentage points in FTL.
 - Percentages of female lecturers have gone up from 54% in Fall 2008 to 59% in Fall 2015, much higher percentages than for TT faculty.
 - Percentages of lecturers of color have gone up from 21% in Fall 2008 to 27% in Fall 2015, slightly lower percentages than for TT faculty (similar for African American faculty at 3.58% for lecturers; much lower for Asian faculty at 6.72% for lecturers; and higher for Hispanic/Latino faculty at 14.84% for lecturers).

- → the percentages of faculty members not earning a good salary (part-timers) have increased, as have the percentages of female lecturers and lecturers of color.
 - Table 20 TT faculty Resignations by Gender, Race, and College:
 - Numbers of resignations are within what is considered a normal range for a campus of our size, however:
 - The biggest difference is in terms of gender (a 12 percentage point difference between women at SDSU and female resignations).
 - Additional information for 2015-16 shows an increase in the problem, with 2/3 of the resigning faculty being women.
 - ➔ This is cause for concern and is being investigated by the Strategic Plan Working Group on Recruitment and Retention of Underrepresented Faculty.
 - The **loss of 164 faculty members** (from 1,871 down to 1,707, an 8.8 % loss) between Fall 2008 and Fall 2015, years that have similar FTES total enrollment, explains the increase in student-faculty ratio, which has been 28:1 since Fall 2013 and was 22:1 in Fall 2009 (and 17:1 in Fall 2001).² The recommended SFR is 18.1 for the CSU.³
 - ➔ The decrease in faculty numbers is cause for concern, as is the fact that percentages of female and underrepresented faculty members have not increased in spite of retirements and regular hiring since 2014-15; new strategies in recruitment and retention are needed to move the needle on both issues.
- 2) **ADMINISTRATOR DATA** (State employees only, not including employees of auxiliaries):⁴
- Between 2008-09 and Fall 2015, **we gained 46 administrators** (from 270 to 316), a 17% increase.
 - Numbers of administrators had been relatively stable between 2006-07 and Fall 2013. Numbers began increasing to 285 in Fall 2014 and ballooned to 316 in Fall 2015.
 - **The ratio of administrator to TT faculty was 1:2.5 in Fall 2015.**
 - Since Fall 2011, most of the gains in administrators were at the lower levels (20 additional Admin I or 21.3%; 31 additional Admin II or 24.6%); some Admin III positions were reclassified as Admin IV (e.g., coaches and AVPs), leading to a loss of 4 such positions or a 6.7% loss; Admin IV (the highest level positions) increased by 7 or 19.4%.
 - Since Fall 2011, none of the net increase in MPPs (54 additional administrators) was within the University Operating Fund. Since 2011, the numbers of MPPs supported by the University Operating Fund has decreased by 9 FTE (full time equivalents). All net growth in MPPs is supported by other sources.
 - Overall, administrators are 66.46% white, 12.66% Hispanic, 9.18% African American, 7.28% Asian; and 52% women. For white administrators, there is male-female parity; among administrators of color, women are 56%.
 - Lower level administrators (Administrator I and II) are primarily female (60% and 55%, respectively); 40% and 31% of lower level administrators (I and II) are members of ethnic minority groups and the majority are women; there is almost gender parity among whites.
 - Upper level administrators (Administrator III and IV) remain overwhelmingly white (75%) and primarily male (56.7 and 67%, respectively).

² From the Common Data Set on the ASIR website, available at: <https://asir.sdsu.edu/common-data-set/>

³ https://www.calstate.edu/budget/fybudget/2008-2009/supportbook1/challenges_faculty.shtml

⁴ Administrator information is derived from data provided by Human Resources

- Administrator IV level (the highest level) includes 8 ethnic minority administrators and 12 women out of 36 Admin IV.
- About 12% of administrators have a disability.
- Overall, administrator ethnic diversity has increased by 6 percentage points, from about 1/4 to about 1/3, and female diversity has remained stationary at 52% since 2011.
- ➔ Overall, the large spike in administrator numbers in recent years, coupled with the loss of faculty and staff, is cause for concern.

3) **STAFF DATA** (State employees only, not including employees of auxiliaries):⁵

- Between 2011 and 2015, numbers of staff members remained stable at 1,429.
- Numbers of staff have not recovered from losses during the great recession: we had 1,670 staff persons in 2008-09, **a loss of 241 staff** or 14.43%.
- Since Fall 2011, percentages of female staff members remained the same at 60% and percentages of staff members of color increased from 41% to 46%.
- Since Fall 2011, percentages of Asian staff members remained similar at 11.68%; percentages of African American staff members went up slightly from 6.8% to 7.9%; and percentages of Hispanic/Latino staff members went up from 20.37% to 23.72%.
- There is gender and ethnic stratification by type of position:
 - Confidential classifications (staff to executive offices), are primarily made up of white women.
 - Physicians are primarily white.
 - Healthcare support professionals, student services professionals, and clerical staff are primarily women.
 - Operations support services (grounds, custodians...) are primarily underrepresented men.
 - Skilled trades (mechanics, engineers...) are primarily white men and include only 3% women.
 - Police officers are primarily men and are less diverse than they were in 2011 (43% officers of color in Fall 2015 vs. 47% officers of color in Fall 2011); there are only one African American officer and 4 women out of 21 officers → hiring more African American and female officers should be a priority of that unit.
- Student Services Professionals is a very ethnically diverse category (51% staff of color); this is important because this group interacts with our diverse students the most.
- About 12% of staff have a disability (the national average is 10%).
- Overall, staff are primarily female and ethnically diverse, with variations among job type.
- ➔ The loss of 241 staff members between 2008 and 2015, years with similar full-time equivalent students (FTES), creates a workload increase and is cause for concern.

4) **STUDENT DATA:**

- In Fall 2015, full-time equivalent students were back to comparable numbers to those in Fall 2008:⁶
 - Fall 2008: 30,821 FTES and 451,295 units attempted
 - Fall 2015: 30,765 FTES and 451,537 units attempted
 - Between Fall 2011 (the last time the DEO ran the numbers) and Fall 2015, the student body changed as follows:
- The largest ethnic group remained whites but went down from 38.7% to 34.1%.

⁵ Staff information is derived from data provided by Human Resources

⁶ Information from SDSU's ASIR website

- The second largest ethnic group remained Hispanic/Latinos and went up from 27.4% to 29.5%.
- African American and Asian students maintained somewhat similar percentages (3.7% and 7.1, respectively).
- Percentages of Filipino students dropped from 6.4% to 5.9%. Filipinos are underrepresented in higher education.
- Percentages remain very small for American Indians and Pacific Islanders.
- Percentages of students identifying as having multiple ethnicities went up from 3.9% to 6.2%.
- International students went up from 4.8 to 8.1%.

New student information (Fall 2015):⁷

- Local area students made up 37.6% of California first-time freshmen (FTF) and 30.7% of all FTF. In contrast, almost all transfer students (93.8%) were from California; local area transfer students made up 72.7% of California transfer students. Transfer students are a very ethnically diverse group.
- Most American Indian, African American, and Pacific Islander FTF were California non-local students.
- Most Hispanic/Latino and Asian FTF and almost all Filipino FTF were California students; the largest percentages of Hispanic/Latino and of Filipino FTF were local.
- The least diverse group of FTF continues to be out of state students and the most diverse continues to be local area FTF.
- Numbers of Pell-eligible (low-income) FTF have increased but numbers of other students have increased much more since 2013, perhaps due to an increase in admissions of international and out of state students. For transfer students, we admitted similar numbers of Pell- and non Pell-eligible students.
- Six-year graduation rates have improved tremendously for all groups.
- Graduation rates are improving less for FTF of color than for other FTF.
- In contrast, 4-year graduation rates have improved more for full-time transfer students of color and Pell-eligible full-time transfer students than for other transfer students, to the point that the gap has almost closed.
- ➔ The student body continues to be diversified. However:
- ➔ Small numbers of American Indian and Pacific Islander students remain cause for concern, relatively small numbers of African American students remain cause for concern, and decreasing percentages of Filipino students are cause for concern. Recruitment efforts are ongoing. Numbers and percentages of California American Indian, Pacific Islander, and African American high school graduates who have completed A-G requirements for CSU-eligibility are small and competition from other universities is high. For these groups, the difference between the eligible pool and the students who enroll at SDSU is minimal.

Data compiled and analyzed by Professor Anne Donadey
October 2016

⁷ Student information is derived from data provided by Enrollment Services