



## University Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

- DATE:** Tuesday, September 12, 2017
- LOCATION:** NEC Room – Administration Building, Room 560
- MEMBERS PRESENT:** President Les Wong and VP Ann Sherman (Interim), Co-Chairs  
Provost Jennifer Summit (Interim), VP Robert Nava, VP Jason Porth,  
Andrew Harris, Nancy Gerber, Sheldon Axler, Singing Chen, Nathan Jones,  
Sheldon Gen, Andrew Ichimura, Jerry Shapiro, Genie Stowers, Maria Martinez,  
Elena Stoian, Sutee Sujitparapitaya
- Excused Absences:** VP Luoluo Hong, Darlene Yee-Melichar
- Guests Present:** Advisory members (see sign-in sheet for non-members)
- Committee Staff Present:** Nancy Ganner

### **Agenda Topic #1: Welcome and Announcements (President Wong and VP Sherman)**

UBC Co-chair President Wong called the meeting to order at 10:04am.

- ❖ **PRESIDENT WONG** → The University is off to a great start for 2017/'18. I have three items to share with you today and I'll pass it over to VP Sherman:
- One of the things that saved this year was our effort over the past year and a half to make budgets more transparent, and to make the processes more transparent, so the actual budgeting and funding are occurring earlier in the year. Hopefully we'll soon be done with the augment system, and we'll expect to live within those budgets, with the assumption that our government doesn't take unpredictable turns. Thanks to the UBC, you were all instrumental at helping us get to this point and we'll continue to get better as we help people understand the responsibility of a budget that's much more transparent.
  - Secondly, we are now within inches of declaring our structural deficit gone. It's about two decades in the making, and I want to thank those in the room and across the Cabinet in helping us get to this point. In a way, getting rid of structural deficit does enable us to make the one-time budget allocation, and support people in real-time on a budget based on actuals throughout the year, so it really is a cultural shift in the way we monitor budgets.
  - The third piece probably everyone is aware of; last Spring and Summer, early enrollment projections were painted at being down almost 9%, which would have been a very significant impact on the budget. As of a couple weeks ago, estimates show that we're going to be down only 1.6%. That's a very dramatic change. The issue still continues to be our efforts in meeting our Student Success Graduation Initiative goals, and making courses available to students. I can tell you with confidence that the issue is retention, and that we do everything we can to move our first-time, full-time freshman and new students

through the curriculum in a way to get them to graduate. I think we're making some headway, and that's good news for the campus.

- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → Welcome everyone. This is the fullest house we've seen in a long time. Rather than supplement President Wong's remarks, we'll jump right into the agenda.
  - Topics 5 and 6 were swapped to accommodate more time for Provost Summit's presentation.

### **Agenda Topic #2: Approval of April 21, 2017 Minutes (VP Sherman)**

Approved with no changes.

### **Agenda Topic #3: Updated Committee charge and Membership (VP Sherman)**

#### **Committee Charge**

One of the items we've discussed in the last few UBC meetings is the UBC charge, and for those of you on the official Committee, the charge is in front of you. We've applied all the recommendations Committee members had in those meetings, and reviewed the Executive Orders and Directives from the Chancellor's Office ("CO"). There were a number of suggestions in the prior charge which were never been officially approved, I believe, that were contrary to the Executive Orders from the CO. The current charge in front of you includes the specific Directives from the CO with regards to this type of work, and we tried to clarify both the scope of the Committee work and the composition of the Committee, including the number required for quorum. Are there any comments or questions?

- ❖ **SHELDON AXLER** → We've spent way too much time discussing this over the past few meetings, but this is not okay with me, and I'll explain why. Regarding the Operation...

*(Referred to this part of the charter):*

#### **Operation:**

*Specific matters to be addressed by UBC include, but are not limited to:*

- i. Verification of compliance with applicable statutes, regulations and policies*
- ii. Fiscally sound and sustainable budget plans and expenditure commitments*
- iii. Controls for the safeguarding of assets and reliable financial reporting*
- iv. Propriety of auxiliary organization expenditures*

Many things in this list are not appropriate and potentially subject faculty on this Committee to legal liability. MPP's have legal protections and responsibility to verify things, and this Committee doesn't. With regards to "Controls for the safeguarding of assets" and "Propriety" – we don't have time to investigate all these things, as we only meet only twice a semester. I don't want to be responsible if some auxiliary in the organization has had an inappropriate expenditure. I'm very uncomfortable with this and I've said this repeatedly through these discussions.

- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → That has been a matter of contention because people have insisted that remain.
- ❖ **SHELDON AXLER** → That doesn't make sense, and I didn't hear anyone insist.
- ❖ **SHELDON GEN** → On Page 4, where it mentions nominating new members every two years, should it be every year, as there are six faculty members and they are three year terms, so it should be staggered every year. My term is three years.
- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → So the Senate nominates two new members every two years?

- ❖ **SHELDON GEN** → Every year, three year terms. And I would echo Sheldon’s legal concern. I like the bottom of the first page where it talks broadly and particularly that faculty input is useful, but I would agree we’re not doing those specific things on that bulleted list.
- ❖ **NANCY GERBER** → I also agree that like Sheldon said, at the July 12<sup>th</sup> meeting I didn’t hear anyone advocate for these items. I would also ask that the people we’re including are aware of each other.
- ❖ **JERRY SHAPIRO** → I’m new to the Committee this year but served in previous decades, so I have an interesting prospective. I agree with my Academic Senate colleague Sheldon - this really sets the environment for collaborative discourse, and this is the one really important place where discussion not only about how all the pieces fit together, but how the trade-off works, and that’s in terms of detriment as well as value, where there is some mechanism for prioritizing the richness of the voices in the room right now, and less on the compliance measures.
- ❖ **GENIE STOWERS** → – What were the arguments of those that insisted that those items be included?
- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → – I can’t really speak to that – I know the submission was that they remain. I did not have a conversation to the understanding of that justification.
- ❖ **GENIE STOWERS** → – It makes it difficult to vote on, if we don’t know the pros and cons. Also, I remain concerned and disappointed that there is not a meaningful role for at least the Senate Chair, in a body that is beyond advisory – I think the Senate Chair needs to be part of the decision-making body about the University budget, as exists on many other campuses. It’s nice that faculty are on this advisory Committee, but it’s just advisory, and I think faculty need to have a meaningful place at the table.
- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → – Thank you. Is there a motion to do anything, other than modify it?
- ❖ **ROBERT NAVA** → – This is good feedback from the faculty, and as I look at this more carefully, I see there is not an alignment with the charge and the operation. I think we can agree to a working group that can review the charge and come back with recommendations, would be a good way to proceed.
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → I agree with Robert – let’s make sure there’s adequate faculty representation on the Committee.
- ❖ **GENIE STOWERS** → – I move that this is be tabled until a working group can get together and further review with (this motion was seconded by Sheldon Axler).
- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → Approved.

**Membership:** (see Committee Membership 2017/’18 roster document for details)

- ❖ Introduced Jeff Wilson (absent), AVP Fiscal Affairs
- ❖ Introduced Maria Martinez, AVP Enrollment Management
- ❖ Introduced new Committee members
  - Dean: Andrew Harris, LCA
  - Faculty: Andrew Ichimura, COSE
  - Faculty: Jerry Shapiro, HSS
  - Faculty: Genie Stowers, PACE
  - Staffmember: Singing Chen, HSS
  - Nathan Jones, Associated Students
- ❖ Introduced (Non-Quorum) members
  - Elena Stoian, Budget Administration
  - Sutee Sujitparapitaya, Academic Affairs
- ❖ Introduced Advisory Committee members

#### **Agenda Topic #4: Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) in Academic Affairs (Provost Summit)**

I'm glad to have the opportunity to present to this group the Budget Advisory Council ("BAC") and this is a new council started last year. I'm here both for info and for feedback, mostly for feedback.

- BAC was formed to increase transparency with the Academic Affairs budget, but most importantly, as President Wong mentioned, to move us beyond and in front of a process of augments. We affirm our augmenting system and we'd like to move to a place where we can use the Academic Affairs budget more strategically and also more in a planning directive way. We have big goals for this group and lot of ground to cover.
- A little history about the augments: after the events of 2008-2009 the University cut all budgets quite drastically. This resulted in the loss of 350 classes as the departments and colleges pulled back their own funding and redirected it to the majors, but this left out a number of the GE and service courses, which are courses taught in one department for another major. Example: Chemistry has a number of Intro Chem courses that are required of other majors (see presentation). These are actual photos that were taken from the press that featured our travails, as you may remember. The augment system was created as a way to make sure there were GE, service courses, bottleneck courses in the curriculum. What Academic Affairs did was to pull back funding and reallocate it on a course-by-course basis to the colleges, so they could supply those necessary courses. It made sense at the time because we wanted to avoid situations like this, but it also had some unintended negative consequences: one was that it created a huge burden of effort for the Deans and Chairs, as they're scheduling their courses in real time. So, watching as courses would fill up, they would add another one or more to absorb that demand. What it meant for faculty and the lecturers that were affected is that it became impossible to plan a course if you have *that* little notice. From a student's perspective, it also became impossible to plan their own schedules, and so it created a lot of randomness and a lot of extra work, and also meant the departments were unwittingly incentivized to move GE course and service teaching onto lecturers, because they were funded extra for those courses, and asked to pull back their tenure-line faculty to teach only in the majors in graduate courses (showed old Doonesbury cartoon depicting adjunct hiring). We can do better.
- This is where we are now: the college budgets are essentially static. Once, the budgets were linked to enrollment/FTE's, but as a result of the events of 2009, they were frozen at one level. The only way we responded to enrollment was through the augment system. There's no relation to enrollment in the college budgets, except for the augment system. It also means that all faculty hiring, staff hiring and upper ratio budgets are carved out of essentially the same amount. The only way for a Dean or Chair to hire staff is to take the money away from somewhere else. The lack of strategic planning leads to a great deal of unevenness in staffing across the division.
- If you think about it, given that budget allocations were not linked to enrollment, impaction is the only logical response, because if you're a department and you're facing a surge of enrollments and you're not going to have resources tied to enrollments, of course you're going to restrict incoming students. What we found out is that as impaction crept across the University, it had a negative effect on enrollment overall, because students would get scared off, or they wouldn't apply, or they'd go to another campus, and this is what got us to the situation we've been dealing with, in addressing our enrollment overall. It's clear that we need a new budget model in Academic Affairs. We need something that's going to align allocations with enrollment growth and student need, but rather than doing that through enrollment, we'd like to be able to give that funding to the colleges so they can better control their planning in a more strategic way. We also need to create stability in the college-based budgets so they're not pulling away from the curriculum in order to fund staffing or operational needs. When I came into this position

as Interim Provost, the President asked me to look hard at student success, and I brought back the evidence that our budget is the biggest barrier to student success in Academic Affairs. He challenged me to take a look at it to produce some good alternatives, so the BAC was formed.

- The BAC includes reps from across Academic Affairs, the colleges, Deans, Associate Deans, Chairs, a Staff rep, a Student rep, and Jay Orendorff from Admin & Finance as well as from the different ranks, because each of them will have a different relationship with the budget. The curriculum is the biggest single item in our budget. Their charge is to examine and assess the current Academic Affairs budget to investigate alternatives and to establish some guiding principles that can form the basis of a new Academic Affairs budget.
- Last year, we analyzed the historical budget and performed an analysis of the current budget which established that the Academic Affairs budget is not responsive to the fluctuations in enrollment. We also brought in visitors to share with us alternative budget models. Jane Wellman talked us through the relationship between academic budgeting to student success, and the Provost at CSU East Bay brought us a model which brings performance funding onto the colleges on a campus by campus level, and Andy Feinstein from SJSU and shared with us a model that many of us found compelling, which links budgeting to FTEs enrollment in a way that is much more nimble than the previous system.
- This is where we are now. What we would like to do this year is to move ahead to a place where we can give the colleges their allocations for curriculum planning in advance, ideally sometime around February, while they're planning the entire curriculum for the year ahead. That would allow them to plan the curriculum including, the GE and services courses, to know that it is funded and to notify the lecturers and other faculty that they will be called on to do this. This will also allow us to offer our students the whole curriculum a year in advance, both semesters, so from a student perspective they can plan what they'll take the whole year, rather than in the panic mode, which the augment system induces.
- In order for us to do this, we're going to make curriculum allocations tied to enrollment targets, we're also going to be monitoring enrollment over the next academic year to see how well those plans have met enrollment needs, then we'll adjust allocations once we find out about our short and long term trends.
- These are the steps we're taking starting now. In order to set budget by enrollment targets, we need to understand what is the true cost of instruction. To do this, we brought in consultant Debbie Rothwell, who visited the Academic Affairs Council and BAC and shared with us what she'll do: she'll dive into the budgets of each college and to look at our enrollments, to come up with an actual cost of instruction that we can then spread out and take a look at across the Academic Affairs division. Then, make our allocations to the colleges based on what it cost to teach students in those colleges. For example: to teach a student in Chemistry involves different costs due to labs, rather than a student in Classics. We can't treat all the enrollments as having the same cost. In order to establish what the enrollments targets are, we'll be using two tools: one is the induced course load matrix developed by Sutee at SJSU, which allows us to measure enrollment by major, but also by the courses that are required across the major. For example: a Nursing student who also requires Chemistry, will allow us to give allocations to both HSS and COSE in order to meet their needs. Or, that HSS student that needs to take GE courses in LCA or ES. It will allow us to give accurate allocations across the college. We'll also use Ad Astra, which allows us to dig even deeper into the which particular areas we need courses, whether in GE or the majors.
- Our hope is to work on this next two months, and we expect we'll be able to take her work, determine our enrollment targets, then begin this experiment starting this February. Then return to each of the

Deans, give them the enrollment targets, give them the allocations, then step back and assess carefully how the enrollment follows those. What are your responses to this, as this is very important to us?

- ❖ **SHELDON GEN** → I get the impression that work Debbie is doing is the unit of analysis in the colleges, and it seems that in my college, with Nursing and PA, there are huge variations.
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → She is actually looking at both the departments as well as the colleges. We need both. We will give the allocations to the Deans, not the departments., but it will be based on a more granular analysis of the cost of instruction in each program. The analysis is program-by-program, but the allocation is college-by-college.
- ❖ **GENIE STOWERS** → I'm thrilled. This is the most rational explanation of our budget I've ever heard, and it makes sense and I'm thrilled that someone is taking a planning approach to how to rationalize the Academic Affairs budget. I take it following up on Sheldon's question that means the Deans will be expected to follow this model, this assumption and this allocation model.
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → They will, but they will have tools they have not had in the past, so as an example: Ad Astra and degree progress reports, it can both assess and forecast actual student course demand. We're going to be watching that very closely from Sutee's office, the Deans will be watching very closely, but maintaining constant communication in order to make sure funding is going where it's needed, in order to do that in a more planning way so it's in real-time, as opposed to when courses fill up.
- ❖ **JERRY SHAPIRO** → 2009 was an important time because the number of colleges were reduced, and I raised this in the past, but what was the evaluation of the impact of the college re-org? What can we learn for internal ordering of priorities and allocation of resources - I think that's a really important part of figuring our next steps. I'm also going to raise the matter of - is there some equivalent of Debbie Rothwell that can look at administrative costs, to bring the packages together? How are we factoring in potential of some administrative redundancies? How can we generate some internal economy of quality that looks at how the pieces fit together comprehensively? I agree this is a good first step, but I think looking at the symmetry of all of this, we need to look at the administrative as well as the instructional.
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → You're right. This is looking specifically at the instruction and curriculum, side, but you're right – one critical component that Debbie is *not* looking at is staffing. This is something we're working on in another college to take a more deep-dive approach, a forensic analysis into how their budget is lining up around their staffing costs, where can we create efficiencies but also where are the places we can create greater equity across the board. Those of you in the colleges who have spoken to colleagues in other colleges will know that our staffing levels have been very uneven across the institution, which has led to uneven performance, frankly. That's a result of the freezing of these budgets, so you're absolutely right: this is a first step, it's a necessary step, but by no means is it the whole thing.
- ❖ **JERRY SHAPIRO** → Do we have any information about the restructure, in terms of what was the impact?
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → The question about the combination of the colleges is a good one – that's something we should look at. The question about the benchmarking of staff levels actually is something we do have available, so that's something we need to work very closely with A&F to do.
- ❖ **PRESIDENT WONG** → One of the things to do was to do an analysis of staff deployment across campus, because what happened in 2009 was an uneven shrinking, and we're still living with that, so I've asked Ann to start taking a look. In parallel with academics, we're looking at staff positions, and

you'll notice one of the results of that was the reinstatement of the MPP1, so we're getting at it gradually across the institution.

- ❖ **GUEST: YVONNE BUI, CHAIR (BAC)** → I wanted to respond to Sheldon's question that Debbie will be looking at types of course within the college; a lab vs. a seminar vs. a revision. In that way, you can look at the department costs, but she won't be proving it by department, necessarily.
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → One possible goal is how many student fees we might be able to eliminate by bundling them into the cost of instruction.
- ❖ **SHELDON AXLER** → I think this is an excellent plan – I really like it. I wanted to share some history; when I was Dean of COSE in 2002 – 2015, before 2009, we had a system that was somewhat like this actually – colleges got FTE targets and if we did not make that the following year, there would be a little bit of a budget cut, if we exceeded it, there would be a little bit of an increase. My college added a department and it was the same thing – it was a weighted average from the previous two years. The Chairs all knew this was their target, this is what they had to make, all throughout the enrollment process starting with early enrollment, the first week, I would send Chairs a spreadsheet every week of their target percentage and what they currently needed – it was a totally different atmosphere. Then 2008/2009 came, and somewhat to my surprise, as it wasn't under a different administration, we got the target as “do the best you can”. It was an emergency, so I persisted for about a year sending targets to Chairs, then I just stopped because no one else in the University was doing it, and consequently it had all those bad effects you spoke about. I think going back to this is a really good idea. Just one word of caution: the augment system had all those problems – last minute hiring, etc. On the other hand, it got dollars into the courses that needed that extra enrollment, so as you go to this new system that I very much support, it's important that you look not only at the colleges' own budgets, but at the budgets including the augmentations, because sometimes, enrollments patterns have changed so the augment essentially became the new budget, but, you need to look at where they are, rather than the 2009 situation.
- ❖ **NANCY GERBER** → Thank you very much for the presentation. I would agree it sounds like a marvelous new direction (or a slightly old direction) as a way to go, but I was wondering about your timeline – it sounds like you're evaluating 2017-2018, so is 2019 your goal, or is that too optimistic?
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → We're going to be even more optimistic, and pilot this in February 2018. We've got the leadership team at Academic Affairs meeting once a week to get together enrollment targets, and Debbie is working very hard, and I would like to be able to work with the Deans soon, with a lot of safety nets in place to see if we can bring this on in February.
- ❖ **SHELDON GEN** → How does Academic Resources fit in there, in terms of the lifecycle costs of different equipment that the different majors require. I really like the full-year budgeting, but equipment is on a different cycle than the semester is, so how does that fit in? Is that part of this budget allocation or is it separate?
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → That's a good question and it depends on what you mean by equipment - if it's a marginal cost and it's going to increase the amount of students you bring in, or, if it's a question about equipment that you're going to have anyway, whether you have 12 or 30 students, then that's a different analysis. We're looking at marginal costs specifically here - marginal costs of the student. I think that in terms of more equipment and facilities, that's where I would go back to the answer I gave Jerry - I would say that's a necessary analysis, but not necessarily what we're doing. I'm giving the same presentation the Senate next week and to the Chairs Council on Thursday.
- ❖ (See PowerPoint presentation for data on this topic).

## Agenda Topic #5: State of the Budget and the Student Success Graduation Initiative - Cost Estimate

- ❖ **ELENA STOIAN** → I created a timeline to show the University's budget process, but today we'll focus only on where we are today. Today, the President and Ann will be meeting with the VP's on their budgets. Prior to these meetings, my team did an analysis on their original budgets in the reporting system, and we conducted financial reviews for these meetings. Next steps for each unit are to receive their initial allocations based on carry forwards, SSGI and any other organizational changes. The timeline for the last revised budget is available as soon as September accounting month is closed, and the revised will be viewable in the financial system.
- ❖ The next slide shows the original allocations by Cabinet.
- ❖ The next slide shows we received from CO one-time allocations based on B-Memo 17-06. (<http://www.calstate.edu/budget/fybudget/coded-memos/>) and those are going to be subject to revision in the revised budget. We have to find out what the Cabinet allocations will be after the designations. Ann will talk about the Student Success Graduation Initiative Cost estimate.
- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → As part of the allocations from the State this year, related to the tuition increase, we receive a specific amount of money – the \$4.1M was based on our tuition revenue, which is not quite that high because as we heard earlier, we have a gap in our enrollment target. This amount is likely to be about \$3.9M rather than \$4.1M. The various Cabinet areas got together late this summer to look at what the main priorities would be based on the info we had available with regard to the activities and the initiatives, which we can, with great confidence say, are going to enable us to help our students be successful and to persist to graduation and in fact, graduate. The VP's got together and asked: of these key priorities, what do we fundamentally know we need to do immediately, and those are these items (see chart): Retention specialists; we are hiring 5 SSP employees...
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → These are advisors, and the retention and graduation specialists are in Academic Affairs but are shared between the advising center and each college - one for each of the 5 colleges.
- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → – The graduation specialists were funded by one-time funds and we are asking those be part of the SSGI money. The Director of Student Activities & Events in the Dean of Students office and the associated expenses of operations. We're trying to do something beyond what ResLife does – to create more of a welcoming environment for all students across the campus regardless of their living circumstances. The Metro Academy institutionalization and their expansion – we know this has been very successful program for many years now and the grant funding is about to come to an end so we need to find a way for that successful program to continue. There's Supplemental instruction, and an example here is COSE and what that would cost (it's only an example). We're looking at high failure-rate courses, where we see students are either dropping out or having a difficult time passing that course. How can we provide supplemental instruction through the use of various elements, including peer tutors. Equity & Community Inclusion is a program within SAEM - one of the key things that came out of a small study group was a Black Unity Center, and funding for that particular program which is aligned with the 6 directives from the CO in regards to how we can insure *all* students feel they can be a part of feeling included and supported in campus life. Now, we have about \$2M left to allocate, and the VPs have been asked to submit those requests and we are meeting in the next two weeks. At that time, we'll determine how much progress we've made on these items and what the remaining funds look like, and how best to allocate that, based on enrollments that came in this year. One of the things we know is necessary to support for Robert's Communications and Marketing team through Elizabeth Smith, to insure we have sufficient digital outreach. We made some funding for that, as we know that will be on the list. The rest remains to be seen.



- ❖ **GENIE STOWERS** → Can you clarify – the graduation specialist are also advisors?
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → Yes but the retention specialists focus on students in lower division, and graduation specialists focus on students in the upper divisions, to help them graduate.
- ❖ **SHELDON GEN** → Does the Graduate College of Education not have any retention issues?
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → These were allocated proportionate to undergrad student enrollment (although GCOE does have one Undergrad program; Special Education).
- ❖ **ANDREW HARRIS** → The \$689K for SSGI: what is it for?
- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → We don't know yet – we're still planning. (Asked Jennifer Summit)
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → (Asked Advisory guest Alan Jung): Is the \$689K is for remediation? It's one-time funding, so there is no funding in these one-time buckets for curriculum.
- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → We need to meet our enrollment targets, and we're not there yet.
- ❖ **ANDREW HARRIS** → At LCA we have more FTEs than last year, so we either have to schedule or add more classes in the augment system?
- ❖ **PRESIDENT WONG** → That's where you would plug into the BAC new program, as we experiment with this new system, that's where the cost of instruction with the enrollment becomes critical, in order to make an adjustment, if you see an up or a downtick in enrollment. I guess there's no answer to your question. There's not a fixed amount. Under the old model, I could have said there's a fixed amount and it's going here, but under this new model, we're trying to tie cost of instruction to enrollment.
- ❖ **SHELDON GEN** → Can you give me more detail on what the job of a retention specialist and a graduation specialist is?
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → The retention and graduation specialist are advisors who have a joint appointment in the Undergraduate Advising Center (“UAC”) and also the colleges; one focuses largely on undergrads in lower division, and the other on upper division. The benefit of the joint appointment is that they can help advise on GE and also major requirements, and also in the UAC they can help students choose or change their majors. In the past, the UAC focused mostly on GE and in the colleges mostly on major advising, but we know that students who go to too many places are not going to go to advising at all, and 50% of our students never see an advisor, so this is to try to spread limited resources as best we can.
- ❖ **SHELDON GEN** → So they are direct service providers – they are not an analyst, who's thinking systemically about curriculum?
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → These are direct face-to-face student advisors.
- ❖ **PRESIDENT WONG** → I would recommend people acquaint themselves with our student success goals – they're pretty ambitious. We've been trying to put people directly in line to service to students to help them. These are good questions.
- ❖ **LINKS**: to SSGI details: <http://studentsuccess.sfsu.edu/> and <http://air.sfsu.edu/graduation-initiative>

### **Agenda Topic #6: Open Forum – Ten minutes, 3-minute limit per speaker**

- ❖ **SPEAKER Kirill Chernomaz** → My name is Kirill Chernomaz, and I am faculty in the Economics Department. I represent a group of tenants at University Park, and we'd like to read a letter addressing this Committee. (See attached letter). This letter was signed by a number of faculty and there are people present here who support this, and potentially you can tell us who we can follow up with on this issue, and if you have any comments we would appreciate it.
- ❖ **SPEAKER Michael Bar** → Kirill and I are colleagues in Economics and we are chairs of a hiring Committee. When I was hired 20 years ago John Gemello was the Provost, and it was his initiative to

increase retention of faculty by the decision to purchase this property. It was to have housing available for faculty, to keep it affordable. Over the years since the University took it over, what I see is that new faculty and staff come in and out and leave after a couple years, some after one year only. The 5% that Kirill mentioned is only for this year. The University said it would not honor not the rent control laws in SF, and some other administrators told me that in the next 5 years, there will be a 5% increase every year, but we really don't know - it could be a 10% or 17% increase next year. My challenge is to hire new faculty and we'll be interviewing faculty. In the past years I've been on search committees, many times, I always told faculty that we have University-subsidized housing, as candidates are very concerned coming to SF knowing that public schools don't pay professors that much and SF is a very expensive place to live. I always use this as a bargaining chip with candidates, always telling them that University housing is affordable, and it never occurred to me until recently that the University housing doesn't honor rent control, so now they go and hike the rents without any precedent and that's my challenge, and I wanted you to be aware. Thank you.

- ❖ **ANDREW ICHIMURA** → So as chair of the faculty committee of my department, I echo their comments because it is a concern for the search. In my years in the same position or similar, it is a very big concern in the city, trying to find candidates, and we have to try something to get new faculty and staff.
- ❖ **SHELDON GEN** → Can we add this to the next UBC agenda? This is a new issue for me, maybe to get some background on what this issue is and where the decisions came in, and where there's flexibility?
- ❖ **PRESIDENT WONG** → Housing is a really complicated issue so maybe we need to prepare something. I want to keep it on the agenda but maybe it won't make it to the next meeting, but we will take it on because there are a number of streams of information that influence housing. One thing in particular we're trying to convey to hiring committees is to be careful about offering subsidized housing, because that's not a guarantee. In working with the VP's and their staff, you have to remember scope of authority and scope of responsibility. You can't offer something you're not authorized to offer, so that's something we can't do, to be consistent and fair as we go into this. Housing has pretty limited options, and we do our best.
- ❖ **SHELDON AXLER** → For our information, is the University still offering the \$500/month, \$6,000/year subsidy for new faculty for one year?
- ❖ **JENNIFER SUMMIT** → The University continues to supplement the salary of new faculty who choose to live in University housing. You'll notice the difference between the way I framed what I said, and the question that you've asked, because there are certain things we are not allowed to do when we are negotiating with faculty -- we cannot say this is a housing subsidy: it's a salary supplement in exchange for work they're doing in the summer when they move in, if they choose to live in University housing.
- ❖ **SHELDON AXLER** → I understand - so it's still going on, and that's great, because I found that very useful in attracting faculty. I echo what everyone said but this is a very difficult issue for faculty. This is a really expensive place to live and this is housing cost – it's different from food, electronics or books - its housing cost.
- ❖ **PRESIDENT WONG** → I would like to add it's an extremely difficult issue for ALL employees, not just faculty.
- ❖ **JERRY SHAPIRO** → I wonder about the rationale, is there some sort of compelling set of circumstances to step back from honoring citywide rent control, and how that fits together with the mission of the University we all identify with?
- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → Let's talk about that next time because that's actually not quite a true statement.
- ❖ **JERRY SHAPIRO** → Ok. I think it's really important, speaking for Academic Senate, that we get some sort of information because I think as soon as couple hours we'll be visiting this, and any information we can have would be helpful.
- ❖ **PRESIDENT WONG** → We'll get the University attorney to help you understand that issue.
- ❖ **JERRY SHAPIRO** → I'd be interested in seeing the contract.

- ❖ **PRESIDENT WONG** → In closing, there are two pieces out there that we will keep the UBC up-to-date and informed on:
  - One, is that as the University evolves, we're getting over the hurdle on a number of difficult issues that have been in front of the University for decades; structural deficits, etc. One of the new challenges that I think we need to tackle soon as were trying to get our arms around the scope of it, is updating our IT infrastructure. It currently, in my estimate, is at best, 1980's, across the campus. I've asked Nish Malik to put together a group - I think he's that process now. He's also done some initial assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of what's on campus. We've not monetized that, but the infrastructure and the staffing of that infrastructure is antiquated, and I don't believe students and faculty in our programs deserve what they're getting, right now. It is a huge and expensive proposition to tackle, and what we're doing is trying to do an assessment of the current state and we'll share that with you, because it does become a significant cost structure over time as we move forward. Part of it is, as the Provost has done with the Deans and the BAC, means developing a different model in the way IT is funded and structured. I don't blame it on anything than the way things evolved, but we're now sitting on an IT model that is 'islands' -- those that have money, buy, those that don't, suffer. The scope across the campus is really clear that this is not a way for a University of the 21<sup>st</sup> century to exist, that it can provide students the kinds of IT and support they deserve. I can tell you now, I don't know what the number is, but I know it's not a small number. I wanted to make sure that's on everyone's radar, and there's no better time to begin tacking that than now.
  - Also, I think UBC also needs to be aware that in Sacramento there's a lot of feeling across the CSU, UC and Community Colleges that the budget situation for California will be flat, if not in slight decline over the next couple years. Then we have election years and who knows whether the Governor will take education in general, so there are two to long-term issues of significant proportion and impact that we'll try to keep you informed on.
  - As you all know, the budget appropriation for 2017/'18 that the Trustees requested and the Governor funded, there is still a gap of about \$60M, so were still not getting a budget to educate our students to this date. When you hear that we're balancing the budget and looking at new metrics, etc., we still think it's safe to say, from the President's perspective that we're still underfunded in many ways. We're trying to wrestle with that. I just wanted you hear that state-wide glimpse, as well as the IT initiative, and keep in mind that we still have roughly \$500M in deferred maintenance issues, and you know we're trying to build new buildings at the same time. We're pretty excited that the Holloway project will begin this summer, and the BECA project will begin soon too, and we're looking very hard at obviously housing for employees and students. The people working on it are a small army and they're doing incredible work in trying to meet a budget that's below what we need at least minimally, and yet, set opportunity for new construction and repairing buildings, both at the RTC as well as on this campus. It's quite a complex puzzle as we move forward. That's why we have this Committee, so we can talk through those things.
- ❖ **ANN SHERMAN** → Our next meeting is currently scheduled for Friday, December 1<sup>st</sup> (see schedule below). We try to align these with the budget process of the State and the CSU.

**Agenda Topic #7: Upcoming UBC Meetings for 2017/2018:**

- Friday, December 1, 2017, 10:00AM – 11:30AM
- Thursday, February 1, 2018, 2:00PM – 3:30PM
- April 2018 – TBD
- Summer 2018 - TBD

**The meeting adjourned at 11:32am.**

Useful links:

[http://www.sco.ca.gov/eo\\_pressrel\\_18616.html](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>