



University Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

- DATE:** Wednesday, July 12, 2017
- LOCATION:** NEC Room – Administration Building, Room 560
- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ann Sherman, VP & CFO (Interim) Admin & Finance and UBC Co-chair, Sheldon Axler, Nancy Gerber, Pamela Howard, Darlene Yee-Melichar
- Members absent:** Les Wong, University President and UBC Co-chair, Jamal Cooks, Jackie Foley (ASI), Sheldon Gen, Luoluo Hong, Robert Nava, Linda Oubre, Janet Remolona, Christina Sabee, Jennifer Summit
- Guests Present:** Alan Jung, AVP, Academic Resources on behalf of Jennifer Summit
Dylan Mooney, Academic Senate, Strategic Initiatives Committee
Jay Orendorff, AVP, Business Operations, Risk & Analytics
- Committee Staff Present:** Nancy Ganner, Staff to committee, A&F VP & CFO Office,
Elena Stoian, Executive Director, A&F Budget Administration & Operations

Agenda Topic #1: Call To Order

UBC Co-chair Ann Sherman called the meeting to order.

Agenda Topic #2: Announcements and Approval of April 21, 2017 Minutes

Approved with changes:

- Page 3, Topic #4, in Sutee's comment: change "on target" to "off target"
- Page 3, Topic #4, in Sheldon's comment: change "funds" to "FTE's"
- Page 11, in Ann's comment: change "where" to "which"
- Agenda Topic #4 re: new City College free tuition eligibility requirements will be:

Update from CABO conference call:

- CABO is the "College Assoc of Business Officers" and all CSUs and CO were on the call.
- We discussed the final Governor's budget and CSU's received three special pieces of funding 1) \$2M for an additional 2,500 FTE enrollment increase: 2) \$2M for transportation research studies and 3) \$2M for increasing the diversity of faculty across CSU, primarily around recruitment. Disbursement plans and requirements still being discussed at the Chancellor's office. Beyond that, there hasn't been much change in our allocation since April.
- **SHELDON AXLER** → Have those funds been allocated to campuses?

- **ANN SHERMAN** → Not yet and it's unlikely we'll get any since our enrollment is down, but we may receive a small amount for campuses that are taking admittances from other campuses – we might take advantage of that since we do this. Also, campuses where they have not seen an FTE increase, but an increase in unit loads.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → I heard San Diego State's strategy was to intentionally drop their FTE to re-bench themselves to acquire more funds from system and State. Since our enrollment is fluctuating, has there been any attempt for us to try this strategy too?
- **GUEST: JAY ORENDORFF** → San Diego State had a lot of reserves, so they took a cut in funding and gave back State dollars to use their reserves to balance their budget. When their new enrollment growth came online, they were able to grow their FTE's. It was more complex than simply cutting their enrollment number and it was a sacrifice on their part to give the CSU back their funding, but it got them there.

Agenda Topic #3: Updating University Budget Committee charge:

- **ANN SHERMAN** → It seems the Committee charge is quite different than what we actually do at these meetings, since I've been attending. The charge reflects an oversight and decision body, rather than a review and informational body. What was the actual intent of the charge, for those that has served for a while?
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → Based on my experience, we've only been considered advisory, so that faculty, students, staff and MPP's can provide input on some of the thoughts that happen behind closed doors, and the President and his Cabinet takes that info into consideration when making decisions. The current charge does sound like it's decision-making rather than consulting and advisory. Am concerned about members, such as faculty, having the depth and knowledge for making those decisions. Also, the charter tone uses "must" and "should", instead of "will".
- **ANN SHERMAN** → In some instances there are Executive Orders from the CO that assign some of these tasks to the CFO, and not a committee. It's concerning, since we can't subvert Executive Orders.
- **SHELDON AXLER** → I think this is wildly inappropriate, such as the item that lists UBC has responsibility to monitor the flow of all university resources – this is impossible, since we only meet twice a semester.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → Let's look at membership and try to come to agreement: I propose we rewrite the beginning in the context of what this committee has been doing last several years. Membership, terms, appointments, any questions about it?
- **GUEST: DYLAN MOONEY** → In the annual appointments, with the ASI President, should they be allowed to offer a designee, in order to consider an additional member from ASI? Their position is also on the Senate, ASI Board, Academic Affairs Budget Advisory, this Committee, as well as attending classes. May be too much to expect from one person.
- **STAFF: NANCY GANNER** → At one of the prior meetings, the ASI former President mentioned this and she was going to suggest their VP of Finance be the alternate. They were in the process of rewriting their PD's to reflect this, but I have not heard if this happened. Invites to this meeting were sent to the ASI President and the VP of Finance.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → Speaking of student representation, there is a differential between graduate and undergraduate with tuition and fees themselves, so they have different concerns. If we are going to reexamine representation, I think we might want to consider the student level and augment with someone who is a different level of student (if President is an Undergrad then we should look for a Graduate representative as well).

- **ANN SHERMAN** → Let's look at meeting attendance and how often they occur. We do have one member that is an appointed member but has never been present, and is there something we can include as to attendance or lack of, and ask the Senate for an alternative member.
- **GUEST: DYLAN MOONEY** → Academic Senate does have attendance rules – they can miss two meetings, then you're off.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → Academic Senate basically uses the “3 strikes and you're out” rule. Usually right before the 3rd absence, the Chair has a private conversation with that member and asks if they're planning to be active or find out why they're not coming. Since we only have two meetings per semester, we might want to implement a rule, because missing 3 out of 6 meetings is 50%.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → It seems missing two would be reasonable. Any thoughts with regards to consensus?
- **GUEST: DYLAN MOONEY** → With regards to Section 4 that says the UBC charter should be reviewed from time to time – consider stating a timeframe to review the charge. It's history so far shows the 1993 draft was revised in 2013 (20 years) and from 2013 it was revised in 2017 (4 years). I recommend every 3-4 years would be good. Also, posting the minutes with a direct link to the committee page on the website would be best.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → With regards to the topic of open forum that we're supposed to have at every meeting, the meeting dates should be posted on the website and also in Campus Memo a few weeks in advance, so that faculty, staff and students know when the meetings are if they wish to attend.
- **PAMELA HOWARD** → They should also register if they wish to attend.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → Under current membership and how we determine our role, under “Allocation of resources”, I'm concerned about time management in terms of the role that we play and when and how we do this in a timely fashion. At other budget meetings I've attended, such as the one at the CO, there's a question of confidentiality vs. consultation. How do we address this on this Committee - - are there parts of our meeting that are confidential and we're not supposed to talk about those issues, and other parts where we seek input from our constituents? Clarification on this might be helpful. Also, the reports give a lot of information and we might receive them for the first time that day. If we're asked to vote or make a decision, on the Senate we use the process of a first reading and second reading, where we discuss the item at one meeting and have time to talk to our constituents to get their input, in order to make an informed decision at the next meeting.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → How many meetings should we have? That might be the only caveat to that idea. Perhaps we provide a conditional approval or affirmation so we have time to talk to people about it?
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → If a decision or input is needed at that meeting, then we might receive the reports in advance so we have time to share with our constituents and collect feedback for the next meeting.
- **GUEST: DYLAN MOONEY** → With regards to the current two charters (1993 and 2013), there was a vast difference on the role of this committee being a real influencer on the budget and who should be part of that. SIC had the same quandary about their role. We all agree this committee's 2013 charge was much weaker and gave little info on its role, so the SIC reverted back to the old one because it had more detail. However, if those issues will not be handled by this committee then we should iron that out first. Also, I didn't see enough about transparency or communication in particular – this committee provides the President with advice and recommendations related to budget policy planning and review, but what about with regards to communication. I see members are charged with informing their constituents, but how and what is that process? Lastly, in subsection 4: “monitoring of allocation expenditure patterns” it says “regular and ad hoc reports must be available to UBC members in formats that allow analysis across all units”. As I

understand it, every unit does things differently, so is this body prepared to provide a format that will meet all those needs for everyone? You're asking for information, but you have to provide a good way to receive it back.

- **SHELDON AXLER** → If we were meeting once a week we could take a lot of responsibility and achieve a lot, but we're not, so to me this is an advisory group, so that the people that are actually going to make those decisions have some information to consider. Similar to VPs only bouncing things off each other, for example, you need to hear from a wider group like this. Members are to bring concerns to -- it's not a decision-making group. We may not need a first and second reading because there's nothing to vote on. Let's just use the 2013 version and take the membership part from the older version and go with that.
- **GUEST: DYLAN MOONEY** → SIC saw that -- if it's simply a reporting body and if it's the same report that's given to the Senate plenary, then we're just repeating meetings, and we're just treading water.
- **SHELDON AXLER** → Then it's more of a chance for two-way advice.
- **PAMELA HOWARD** → – Executive Orders probably came out after the 1993 version, so we need to see something with the EO functions taken out, and I agree with Sheldon we're only an advisory board. We have no effect on the CA budget, nor the CSU's decision on the division of that budget and we have no effect on the regulation that says how we should spend it, so our job here is to say “I don't understand this” and “how did that happen”, and take that info back to our constituents. That is the role I have experienced in two years, so I believe our role is closer to 2013 version. I agree in some fashion about what you're saying this is double-reporting, but in class we repeat things 3x anyway, so I'd like to see the 2013 revisited to have a little more back and forth as Dylan and Sheldon suggested, but I can't see (as the 1993 version suggested) taking personal responsibility without being insured, and that insurance is about education in these matters.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → – Agreed but if we are to be focused on the advisory role, we need to go back and look at the language and where it says we're “responsible to resolving issues”, and that's not going to happen, especially on Page 3 as it refers to the reserves.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → What is a recharge policy?
- **ANN SHERMAN** → The recharge policy is, for example, if we receive services from other units, then internally they have to charge us back for these services (see EO 1000: <http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1000.html>)
- **ANN SHERMAN** → We will put together these recommendations and any written comments sent to be incorporated, and hopefully we'll have a last draft to review at our Fall meeting.

Agenda Topic #4: Enrollment Update:

- **ANN SHERMAN** → Alan Jung will present an Enrollment Update for Sutee:
- **GUEST: ALAN JUNG** → We have good news all around. Summer and Fall enrollments are up from last year: 180 FTEs up from summer of last year, however, this is as of census R1 and R2 (don't have R3 and R4 yet) so that may change.
 - The average unit load shows undergrads are taking at least two classes (last year almost two), and grads are hovering about 1 – 2 classes, so no change there.
 - We have more detail with per college info but not in this presentation – some have seen increases and decreases. COB accounts for 30% of all FTEs generated – the largest amount this summer.
 - For Fall, FTF yield is up but transfers are down.
 - AAO's (Accept Admission Offer) are much higher from last year – 21% yield rate (vs 19% last year).

- Although applications are down, AAO's are up. Conclusion; either incoming students are much better students, or we somehow weakened our admissions process a little.
- The most important thing is how many actually showed up in our classrooms: We had 4,631 attended orientations, and of those 4247 actually enrolled, so our intake is 91% from orientation.
- To get a sense of the yield of how many applicants ended up in our classrooms. We're better off than Fall '16. It could be that the \$100 requirement for the AAO's helped our yield a little – too early to tell yet. Students Affairs and Advising probably did a good job of enrolling them into classes.
- Now for the bad news: undergrad transfers are down, despite the applications for '17 are higher than '16 - 8K more than last year. You can see that from 23,000 applicants. we ended up with roughly 3,000 students, so our take rate is 13.6%. Lower than last year, and I'm not sure why.
- **GUEST: JAY ORENDORFF** → – Regarding AAO's and the \$100 deposit, why would it be positive for FTF but not transfers?
- **GUEST: ALAN JUNG** → It may be a question the \$100 deposit – did it discourage them, or encourage the ones who wanted to come? With transfers, it may be more of a hindrance, and for FTF it may have been motivational. Just a guess.
- **PAMELA HOWARD** → At the last committee meeting, Gene Chelberg commented the financial aid and housing acceptance were coordinated together. Is it the same for transfer students as undergrads?
- **GUEST: ALAN JUNG** → I know they did a considerable amount of coordination, but not sure for whom.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → That's a good point, because we did prioritize freshmen and sophomores.
- **GUEST: ALAN JUNG** → It's discouraging because the transfer applications were so high, and yet our take was so much lower than last year.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → Last meeting Gene Chelberg also commented about rolling admissions and that letters went out faster now.
- **GUEST: ALAN JUNG** → It might be helping FTF.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → I teach grad students - is that enrollment information available?
- **GUEST: ALAN JUNG** → Yes on the next slide. It's also important to note that transfer students are still enrolling, whereas FTF enrollment ended. There's still time, so this may improve. Sutee's initial estimate of the Fall 17-18 full year FTE's was down 8%, then it was 3%, now it's only down 1.8% so things are a little better there, and it has a large impact on our budget with more fees and tuition. The only sour note is that our non-resident students are down 18.3% than last year. This may be our international or out of state students, both undergrad and graduate students. Our figures went from 1,660 down to 1,357.
- **SHELDON AXLER** → So about 300 students down -- if they pay \$10,000/year in tuition, we're losing \$3M per year. That's huge.
- **GUEST: ALAN JUNG** → I understand OIP will be taking their outreach on the road, but am not sure if this figure is all international students.
- **SHELDON AXLER** → Also we should note than many of our international students are grad students.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → Also, we have had some students comment that they're not coming due to the political environment, and have been withdrawing their names from consideration on some of our programs.
- (See PowerPoint presentation for data on this topic).

Agenda Topic #5: Governor's Final Budget: 48.22

- **ELENA STOIAN** → The Governor revised his budget from April and it's a little better; he increased the spending plan for the overall CSU, and increased Prop 2 which supports the Rainy-Day Fund reserve. He continues his investment in education, thanks to Prop 98. Providing affordable health care will impact the California budget in 2020, when federal support might be cut off.

http://www.sco.ca.gov/eo_pressrel_18616.html The budget assumes the extension of a strong economy, and we're in the 7th year (typically lasts 6-7 years).

See also: Also: <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/FullBudgetSummary.pdf>

- **ANN SHERMAN** → Another CA recession has been projected in the last few years. It will have implications on us, and per the CABO call, we should expect slight reductions in our allocations next year. They're warning us to be careful about spending and to watch the actuals.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → I heard a lot of community colleges in the state are considering the free tuition model. Has that been counted with regards to the community college near us?
- **ELENA STOIAN** → All the CSUs and UCs are discussing this with their local community colleges but they're still in negotiations.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → When we start our new semester with all the publicity about free tuition, and I wonder if students who were accepted here will leave.
- **ELENA STOIAN** → We might see freshman leaving to get their general education at the community colleges and see our transfers going up instead.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → I think there's a lot of uncertainty at this point. This year will be the benchmark.
- (See PowerPoint presentation for data on this topic).

Agenda Topic #6: Budget to Actuals and our Budgeting Assumptions for 2017/2018:

- **ELENA STOIAN** → (See presentation)
- **ANN SHERMAN** → Today on our CABO conference call, the tuition increase, along with the Governor's final budget, helped us get to ¾ of our full funding request which is better than we've had in recent years. It's not everything, but more than we've had recently.
- **ELENA STOIAN** → We haven't heard anything about our one-time request from cap and trade for energy and water conservation projects, and deferred maintenance requests. We typically hear back around August or September. Budget Assumptions: This is what we use to build our budget. We still show a 4% enrollment gap and plan conservatively until we have enrollment results.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → Although Alan Jung's presentation pointed out we closed that gap, I guided Elena to be very conservative – we'd rather be safe than sorry.
We will keep using the SSGInitiatives as performance indicators, as it will run for 3 years and results are sent to the CO.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → The BECA project is approx. \$81.1M. We will get funding from the CO, but 10% has to come from the campus, and we have \$6M set aside for it. The rest will come in the form of gifts to campus.
- **ELENA STOIAN** → The budget process is that the allocations are sent to the campus, then consolidation and analysis is presented to the President and VPs for final approval. The approved budget presented to the UBC. At this time, we are in the allocation phase (see slide). If we don't have the right assumptions, then we don't have the reserves, so we have to plan carefully.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → I appreciate the allocation breakdown by Cabinet with the dollars and percentages. Do you have that information by year, so we can compare to year's past? Would be good to look back five years.
- **ELENA STOIAN** → Yes I can provide it. Remember this is just the *planning* phase so once the budget is adopted, we can go back and look at trends. The next two slides will clarify our sources and uses on campus. We have two sources of funding; allocation state appropriation, and net tuition/fees. Here we show a trend from 2011/2012 up to 2017/2018, and how they fluctuate annually. Up to 2014/15, it did not include summer so we should correct that. In 2015/16 and 2016/17, we've been steady.

- **PAMELA HOWARD** → It's gone back up because the governor took a lot of money from us and said he'd return it in 5 years, and he kept his commitment.
- **ELENA STOIAN** → We computed marginal costs based on program codes, which are instruction, research, public and academic. Our marginal cost (average cost per student) is about \$12,700 for 2015/16. Our campus was allocated funding lower than our average marginal cost – approx \$9,900 per FTEs. Moreover, we received \$7,400 from the State. It's hard to figure why our campus is so high compared to other campuses for FTEs. We'll continue to look at these trends and where we can improve. I noticed we focus our costs towards instruction which is good, but we'll look at other lines of expenses where we can do better to accommodate, such as duplication of services, or we can look at shared services. ITS consolidation, for example, will reduce our costs for FTEs.
- **SHELDON AXLER** → So our marginal costs are greater than our revenues, per student.
- **ELENA STOIAN** → This is just to open the conversation to figure out how we can be more effective or better plan moving forward and how we reduce and/or allocate these costs.
- **PAMELA HOWARD** → Marginal costs is a great thing when counting dollars, but it has little to do with people. The only way to bring down instructional costs is to use more lecturers and less tenure and tenure-track professors. It's the only way, but perhaps not the best.
- **ELENA STOIAN** → We don't have to reduce instruction, but we need to consider other areas where we can review expenditures, and where we have duplication and redundant services.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → As faculty member, we talk about instructional costs, but a lot of us work with students long after they graduate and it's not included in the workday. How do you support alumni who may need many letters of reference over time? How do we manage that time? We need to consider other types of costs as well, when it leads to marginal costs.
- **ELENA STOIAN** → These are items we can benchmark, but we also need to compare apples to apples. We don't use the new NACUBO codes so it's hard to compare where we are with these costs, as compared to other CSUs. We have different names on our financial statements so it's difficult to compare similar items. Perhaps we can offer campus standardization? It's a conversation we should have more often so we can align our reporting. We also need a strategic plan, a long-term strategic financial plan. We have so many smaller line items. We have the tools, but not the strategic picture on where we want to go with it. If this committee has recommendations, I would welcome them.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → This is a great start.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → At each meeting, we're trying to introduce a bigger picture topic, rather than simply reporting and giving the same information. The next topic will be more like this.
(See PowerPoint presentation for data on this topic).

Agenda Topic #7: Strategic Salary Spreadsheet; Proactive Management-Initiated IRPs:

- **ANN SHERMAN** → When I arrived on campus in my role at Human Resources, everyone was complaining about the IRP process. We had lots of complaints and grievances due to this. We're trying to drive consistency and fairness for staff positions across the campus. The Strategic Salary Spreadsheet is intended to provide leaders with information. This was one of the problems we found; an employee would put in an IRP to their leaders, but the leaders had no frame of reference and would sign it, then HR would deny it, and we would have problems. No one was happy. This will help them understand what they're signing and prepare them better via their budget. We also wanted to assess equity – we've got internal SF State comparisons and also across from CSU from the State Controllers data, so we can compare within the contract as well as across the campus. It assumes a minimum target of our SF State midpoint.

- The “Compa-Ratio” takes a person’s salary and does the ratio against the midpoint average amongst the people within those particular classifications and ranges within those, and also includes certain years of service (at 5 year increments), so we have very specific data. It does *not* incorporate performance outcomes. You may have someone that is at less than our 90% target, but if they’re not performing, they should not be paid more to perform poorly. It *does* provide leaders with a target and a priority focus. As of May, when budget rollouts happened, we had 141 employees that were identified across campus for a management-initiated-IRP. If their salary was less than .9 in that Compa Ratio, we asked their leaders to pay attention to that person.
- As a point of reference, there were 230 employees higher than 1.1, so we need to get that ratio tighter. There are twice as many that are higher vs lower. If they are less than .9 and more than 1.1, we ask leaders to take that info into consideration within their budget planning process. If they’re a good employee and we want to retain them, we ask them to put money in their budget submission. In the bargaining contract it has to be a minimum of 5%. To insure when the IRP goes forward it’s not denied for lack of funds, you have to plan for it. Even though you may not give the increase immediately, you’ve planned for it within that year, so you’re being proactive.
- For those that are over 1.1 or significantly higher than the average for their range, it’s possible they’ve been in the same position a long time. It’s also possible they should be considered for a reclassification; a promotion. They might be making more money because they’re able to do more and they should be recognized for that contribution in the form of a promotion. You’ll see some examples in this slide.
- For many of our jobs, we are higher than the CSU average, but not always. Probably due to our cost of living. We ask leaders to look at the SF State ratio: is that person full-time, and how many years do they have in that role? We’re trying to be proactive about this to help drive a message across campus that we are being fair. We have fair pay comparisons and are looking at comparable rates across SF State, and it doesn’t matter the division.
- The IRP should provide sound rationale for objective decisions regarding salary and promotion, and that it’s not biased, and we look at the degree of inversion (when new staff are hired at more than those who are already here). We want to be mindful of that so that we don’t end up with bitterness amongst staff doing similar work. We want provide leaders with information so they can be more proactive. It’s one thing when employee asks for an IRP, but it’s another when their leader puts in for it on their behalf.
- **PAMELA HOWARD** → It changes morale.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → That’s what we’re trying to do. How do we apply a model for SF State values, particularly around equity. As an example, an employee came to me a few months ago who was very shy, but noted she was doing the same work as others but felt she was not paid the same. I looked it up she was here 19 years, but was still at grade 1 in her classification and was at 79% of her pay grade. Her boss wasn’t paying attention. This is the kind of situation we’re talking about.
- **GUEST: DYLAN MOONEY** → – This also puts a lot of the responsibility on management. Coming from a staff perspective, hearing from people I speak with, there are two paths to an IRP: your own submission, or your manager’s. The perception is that your own submission is disregarded, because it may seem your manager does not support it. The impetus is to work with your manager to have them submit for you. However, as staff, I don’t have access to the spreadsheet to see averages, so I wouldn’t know how far behind I might be in pay scale. If everyone requested this information from HR, they would likely be inundated, so where can I find out that information so I know I’m being taken care of, and also, where are the 5-year markings so I can see what those averages are for particular classifications?
- **ANN SHERMAN** → That’s a good idea. We have provided this to the CSUEU leaders, and we found out their leadership had their own spreadsheets – more than our own leaders did. It’s interesting to hear you say

that individual IRPs are not as weighted, because I would say they are *more* weighted, as there is a specific timeframe it has to be fulfilled, and management submissions have no timeframes. I've heard the reverse.

- **GUEST: DYLAN MOONEY** → Staff see it as opposite, but it does seem more acceptable they might be seemingly rubber-stamped if they had to be completed within a deadline.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → Actually the approval rate for both of them is very high – maybe we should get that information out there too.
- **DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR** → There are some state databases people find to research salary (Transparent California, Sacramento Bee) – who gives them information?
- **ANN SHERMAN** → They pull it from the State Controller's office. It's not always accurate, but people still use it. The difference here is that this compares to other people in those classifications, as opposed to a person-by-person basis.
- **GUEST: ALAN JUNG** → You can download a spreadsheet on Transparent California.
- **SHELDON AXLER** → I've seen a lot of inaccuracy for faculty salaries in the Sacramento Bee, such as summer research being included or not, so there's a great deal of inconsistency.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → This is only for represented staff, and it doesn't not include MPPs or Confidentials.
- **SHELDON AXLER** → I think it's ok for staff to go to their managers to say they 'deserve an IRP' and 'would you be willing to submit it for me'.
- **GUEST: DYLAN MOONEY** → – Except for the time limit issue.
- **SHELDON AXLER** → – But as Ann said it might seem stronger if supported by their manager, so why is there no deadline for the manager-submitted IRP?
- **ANN SHERMAN** → – It doesn't address that in the bargaining contract, and at the time, there was such a back-up of IRPs at Human Resources and it was all they could do to respond to the timeframe as per the CSUEU contract for the employee-submitted ones. Now they're down to about 61 days on average for all IRPs.
- **SHELDON AXLER** → – You could simply make that policy too – treat the manager-submitted IRPs with the same deadline, so it's equitable.
- **ANN SHERMAN** → – Right now we're getting them done in less than the given timeframe, so we're happy.
- **SHELDON AXLER** → – Staff should know that – we should publish that information.
- (See PowerPoint presentation for data on this topic).

Agenda Topic #8: Open Forum – Ten minutes, 3-minute limit per speaker

No speakers present.

Meeting Adjourned. Next meeting date: September 2017 (date TBA)

Useful links:

http://www.sco.ca.gov/eo_pressrel_18616.html

<https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/about-the-csu/budget>

<https://www.calfac.org/headline/gov-releases-his-2017-18-state-budget-plan-short-csu-trustees-budget-request>

<http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/budget/2017-18EN/#/Home>