URP Minutes 2022, Oct. 25th

Attendance: Katie Robinson for Crystal Little, Bann Attiq, Gustaaf Jacobs, Mary Anne Kremicki, Tony Chung, Gregorio Ponce, Brian Hentschel, Eunha Hoh, Satish Sharma, Glen McClish, Rashimi Praba, Janie Chang, Amanda Wilson, David Fuhriman, Godfried Asante, Wil Weston

1) Approve Meeting Minutes of September 27, 2022 (passed)

2) Present 1x budget requests (Division reps will speak to their proposals). + Time for discussion and feedback.

Discussion about getting the proposals to URP in time. Need more clarity about URPs role in process and concern over URP just providing the appearance of shared governance on part of Senate.

Proposal Note:

1) 1x Staff Compensation. General agreement that this needs to be approved. There was some disappointment with the CSU/State for not providing funding for this CSU agreed upon cost.

2) Division of Research and Innovation. There was discussion around using one time money to fund. When asked about what if the base funding isn’t found what happens – described as being an unfortunate situation. Concerns around whether all these positions are needed in addition to the AVP. They appear to be duplicative of other positions in the University. Of particular concern is the Resource Manager – (neither Engineering nor Education (correction: Ed. has resource manager MPP) have a resource manager) perhaps, Colleges without the additional staff support would benefit more from this position (like College of Science or CAL) since faculty actively engaged in research are having administrative tasks pushed down to them. SEE additional emailed comments below:

EMAIL 1) Several of my colleagues (i.e., my constituents as a Senator) have repeatedly expressed concerns about the creation of many new AVP positions on campus during the past decade. They also have expressed concerns about whether funding for Mission Valley detracts from funds available for effectively staffing the main campus. The DRI requested $300K to fill the recently vacated AVP for Innovation -- with the sole justification that "It is critical to fill this position for the future Mission Valley Innovation District." -- strikes me as a bit inconsistent with the University's repeated messaging that the Mission Valley Innovation District "is self-sustaining and does not rely on the university's annual state appropriation, student tuition or fees." (quoting from Crystal Little's answers to questions submitted to UR&P by an SDSU Senator; Anges Wong-Nickerson made similar statements during the recent Budget Town Hall). Is there a plan to eventually have the "self-sustaining" Mission Valley Innovation District revenue reimburse this one-time PBAC request and past funding from AA for the AVP for Innovation? The plan to seek future base funding for the emergency DRI requests suggests not.

EMAIL 2) To move towards R1, it would seem from experiences on the ground (myself and conversations I have with faculty members across campus) that funds allocated to help researchers with their administrative burden are more likely to increase output then to have
more administrators in DRI, which has already grown considerably over the last 3-4 years (not in the least by the splitting of that Department into two (or is three) other departments (Graduate Studies/DRI).

3) “my.SDSU”. There was concern about the planning process for the implementation of the PeopleSoft Campus Solutions. While there is understanding surrounding the challenges around the data migration portion – there is concern about steps taken prior with the first company hired. There is concern surrounding the total cost of this project and will this be, “the last PBAC we will have regarding my.SDSU?”

4) 2023 Learning Environments. Overall excitement and support for this proposal. There were some questions regarding what was the prioritization of the rooms to be addressed; there was a request that be shared with the committee. Additionally, it was recommended that this positive project be shared with the Senate as an information item.

5) Enrollment Growth – 1x Funding. There was broad support for providing funds to cover instructional costs due to FTES enrollment growth costs higher than what was originally projected.

3) Discussion Item: First Question submitted to URP. (NOTE: I am very grateful that Crystal Little took a first pass at answering this question. Question for URP: Is there more that could be elaborated upon here or missing detail?)

Question submitted: I would like the senate to receive an overview of the Mission Valley budget. This would include, but not limited to, the following:

1.) The amount of bonds issued and their terms (duration, yearly payments, etc)
   For the site development, CSU issued $250 million in revenue bonds in 2020, 40-year term, interest rate 3.06%, with interest only payments through 2038. For the stadium, $200 million in revenue bonds were issued in 2020, 2.78% interest rate, 30 year term.

Can we get more detail on the yearly payments (amounts)?

2.) Total spent to date on for what 3.) Amount of funds received from the state/CSU
   SDSU invested $40M in auxiliary funds that will be paid back with ground lease revenue. CSU also invested $60M. These funds are inclusive of what the costs spent to date on the construction of the stadium, and ongoing construction of the site development and River Park.

3.) Estimated revenue from the stadium for both 2022 and 2023
   Stadium revenue is used for the bond debt payments, operation and maintenance of the stadium. We do not have a stand alone stadium financial statement. Total revenue for the Athletic program for FY22/23 (including the new stadium) is $80M as compared to $52M in FY21/22 (before the new stadium).

Why do we not have a standalone financial statement, i.e. will take a few years to develop?
4.) Estimated costs of the next phase of construction, where that funding will come from, and what will be built during that phase

Construction costs for the vertical construction will be covered by our development partners and future on and off-site improvements will be covered by fees charged to our development partners and ground lease revenue from our development partners. SDSU Mission Valley is self-sustaining and does not rely on the university's annual state appropriation, student tuition or fees.

**Projections for ground lease revenues? When does it start?**

4) Discussion: Annual Agenda. What are some of the agenda items you would like to see URP tackle for the year?

There was a discussion around having URP become more a part of the PBAC process (inserted further upstream). In general there is a concern about shared governance in the budgetary planning process and a desire for URP to be more involved in the that planning and priority setting.

5) Adjournment