



## University Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: Thursday, Sept. 21, 2023, via Zoom

Voting Members Present: Robert Collins, Jennifer Daly, Iese Esera, Daniel Gabriner, Michael Goldman, Mari Hulick, Jeff Jackanicz, Crystal Kam, Gretchen LeBuhn, David Miller-Shevelev, Dylan Mooney, Jamillah Moore, Irina Okhremtchouk, Tiffany O’Shaughnessy, Jason Porth, Irving Santana, Eugene Sivadas, Genie Stowers, Amy Sueyoshi, Alaric Trousdale, Jeff Wilson.

Non-voting members present: Chanda Jensen, John Kim, Katie Lynch, Lynn Mahoney, Cesar Mozo, Sandee Noda, Tammie Ridgell, David Schachman, Jamil Sheared, Elena Stoian.

Guest presenters: Sutee Sujitparapitaya, Lori Beth Way

Members Absent: Emiliano Balistreri, Deborah Elia, Brad Erickson, Ashkan Forouhi, Tim Jenkins, Shrey Patel, Venesia Thompson-Ramsay

Meeting coordination: Nancy Ganner, Mariela Esquivel

Accompanying presentation can be found here: [UBC Presentation Sept. 21, 2023](#)

~~~~~  
UBC co-chair Provost Sueyoshi called the meeting to order at approximately 10:01 A.M.

### **Agenda topic # 1 – Welcome from Co-Chairs and Agenda review**

- Amy Sueyoshi and Jeff Wilson welcomed committee members and guests.
- Agenda reviewed, guests reminded of the ways to contact UBC including Office Hours on Sept. 22<sup>nd</sup>

### **Agenda topic # 2 – Member roll call**

- Quorum established. New faculty committee member noted.

### **Agenda topic # 3 – Approval of minutes from Aug. 31, 2023 UBC meeting**

- Minutes approved as submitted.

### **Agenda topic # 4 – President’s Message**

- Lynn Mahoney shared remarks:
  - Board of Trustees passed a tuition increase last week across the CSU system, reluctantly. They’re volunteers and many of them have endowed scholarships because they do care about CSU students.
  - Explained this was necessary to save the CSU system - will send a campus email today to summarize how this demonstrates the large gap between what it costs to run the CSU with the State support and tuition.
  - Mercer study on staff showed the lack of funding comes at the expense of staff who are paid, at minimum, 12% below comparable institutions.
  - California held to it’s compact of CSU funding despite a State deficit, but it's not enough to catch up with years of underfunding the CSU.
  - Chancellor modeled numbers based on unknown figures for collective bargaining, and recognized the need for a rational tuition policy for multi-year budgeting, to be received in July.
  - Fall/Spring scheduling for the following year is done, so the 3-year budget is based on assumptions, holding the Governor to continue to fund as promised and based on assumptions of a 5% increase per year for employees as a placeholder – ultimately 15% increase over 3 years, a conservative estimate.

- Next year when the 6% tuition increase is collected, there remains a \$10M budget gap. Without the increase, the system cannot sustain itself nor pay its employees. The increase next year for undergrads is \$342 and \$402 for grad students.
- The challenge is not only the cost of tuition but also lack of affordable housing. This is known about SF but now also true in places like Fresno, LA, San Diego. This will remain a focus for the future.
- CSU advocacy will be needed for funds for Title IX; more needs to be done but comes without funding so it comes out of operating budgets, which are largely for instruction. NAGPRA is unfunded but it's a State mandate. Compensation is a big ask to cover rising healthcare premiums. CSU requested \$145M over the compact received but campuses need to absorb all kinds of additional expenses, including compensation.
- Reflecting on work, whatever collective bargaining resolves this year, asked all to keep in mind the gap of what's not getting additional funding, as there's no tuition increase for this year.
- There has never been a more important moment for faculty, staff, administrators and students to advocate together for additional State funding. It's not just about being inefficient or administrative salaries – it's about the effect of decades of cumulative CSU underfunding with structural deficits. The State owes the CSU for the work it does for all its students.
- **Mari Hulick** asked if there will be organized actions to help CSU approach the State for funding. Also asked about CFA messaging she receives about CSU having billions in assets.
- **Lynn Mahoney** replied there will be messaging coming re: launching an advocacy campaign.
- **Jeff Wilson** added the "assets" are mostly one-time funding or due to policies legally have to be set aside for things like new buildings and cannot be used for other purposes. The CSU number is about \$800M. SF State's portion is \$15M, but to put into perspective the monthly payroll is \$21M, so there are currently inadequate funds to meet even one month's payroll.
- **Lynn Mahoney** continued that this includes monies received directly for the new [science building](#) and funding for [#stopAAPihate](#), and it will not cover ongoing increases.
- **Alesha Sohler** remarked with the reality of the campus and the whole CSU situation, the "glidepath" may be more like "significant steps" rather than a smooth transition.
- **Lynn Mahoney** remarked this campus is not the only one resizing. SF State is 21% down in enrollment, Sonoma State is down 40% with others in between. Absorbing unfunded compensation increases makes the "glidepath" more of a cliff. Had conversations with the Interim Chancellor and Vice Chancellor that will be passed onto the new Chancellor, so the glidepath plan will be reviewed. If a reprieve is received it may be to absorb the compensation increase, but it doesn't mean additional funding.

#### Agenda topic # 5 – Enrollment update

- **Katie Lynch and Sutee Sujitparapitaya** presented (see accompanying slides).
- **Katie Lynch** prefaced the presentation reminding of demographic shifts in California affecting enrollment, that affect this region the most harshly. Also the UC's are admitting more FTF from in-State. All are doing everything they can to mitigate enrollment loss.
- **John Kim** commented on the slide showing course enrollment by college and pointed out the percentage declines between Fall 2023 and Fall 2022 where some declined, and looking at 2019 where all declined. The decline is 19% over the last 5 year period. When making considerations for funding reductions in the colleges, it didn't happen in that time period so basically it's a readjustment now.
- **Mari Hulick** noted a thread on the Chat about the section counts, including supervision and classes that combine labs/lectures. Asked for details not only by college but also by departments, as this is a very broad overview.
- **Sutee Sujitparapitaya** said classes with a lab and lecture are not counted twice, and referred to the Institutional Research website where the information can be found: <https://ir.sfsu.edu/>
- **John Kim** suggested once the detailed course level info is found for a given semester with the class schedule, have each of the departments indicate for the classes why the enrollment levels are set the way they are and what the

implications are of the schedules they built. There will be similar issues across campus, for ex: 5 sections of the same class with a cap of 25, but they all meet at the same time, same place. Total enrollment is 125 and each has a corresponding lab, and lab is capped at 25 because it's a computer lab. These are the kinds of things that have to be taken into account. It's hard to see that centrally due to many departments but each know their schedules.

- **Genie Stowers** asked re: section scheduling and if drilling down on the details as John suggested should be done in a formal way. Surprised to note some colleges increased sections in this low-enrollment environment.
- **John Kim** agreed: the question is how to reduce the number of sections in the class schedule based on the fact that enrollment is declining. Often when a class schedule is being built, the semester from the previous year is used and often unchanged. The colleges are now working closer with departments to make sure what they're offering is in line with resources available. The first time that impact will be seen will be this coming Spring.
- **Lori Beth Way** addressed the SJSU questions (in the Chat) adding there seems to be a focus on what divisions can do, such as Enrollment Management, but they're doing everything they can. While SJSU and other campuses are doing good things, it took time to change their cultures. SF State has the same opportunity to change culture, and asked all to focus on working together to do that.
- **Katie Lynch** added when comparisons to other institutions are made it's easy to forget the details. SF State is very different from SJSU and although the cost of living is similar, SJSU invested in marketing 10+ years ago, and they have a broader athletics program. Enrollment is working with SMC but it takes time to build campaigns. All CSU campuses differ and agrees the focus should not be on comparisons, but working together for a cohesive message to prospective students and families about choosing SF State.
- No further questions received.

#### Agenda topic # 6 – SF State Budget Update

- **Jeff Wilson** introduced the presentation noting there was no update on the budget. Collective bargaining continues and plays a large role. Until then will continue with Fall financial review, assuming the compact holds with the 6% tuition increase. The tuition increase is not part of the 2023-2024 budget but recent enrollment numbers have a negative impact on budget performance. Presented (see accompanying slides).
- **Danny Paz Gabriner** remarked that it seems the idea is to decrease staff positions where possible to save budget. Asked how the workload of departing staff might be handled, whether made more efficient or with current staff taking on responsibilities and, if there would be increases in costs for those position changes.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied that would address position by position, but if critical work has to be done and the number of staff is reduced that is performing that work, that has to be considered by the administrator.
- **Dylan Mooney** asked if the total number was calculated by the number of eligible employees and, and if the calculations were done per wave to see what impact this could be.
- **Jeff Wilson** said he used a recent snapshot of the employee database to arrive at the data presented – further analysis will be done if it's decided the program will be implemented.
- **Dylan Mooney** asked when calculating for the roughly 80 employees FTE, what the average salary was.
- **Jeff Wilson** estimated it was about \$125k salary plus benefits.
- **Dylan Mooney** asked about the "hiring freeze" and if that could happen after the separation program or, after analysis of critical health/safety positions that need to be filled.
- **Jeff Wilson** noted the hiring freeze would happen after an initial '24-'25 budget and if the campus is not achieving the goals of the glidepath based on all coming changes. President Mahoney would decide whether to proceed.
- **Dylan Mooney** asked about the 80 employees and if the limit is based on the number of employees or the dollar amount needed, and what happens if more eligible employees apply than anticipated.
- **Jeff Wilson** advised those details would need to be worked out. Some campuses use a timestamp for applications so the last one received would be the last eligible to participate.
- **John Kim** added re: workloads, all departments should be reviewing carefully what work is absolutely necessary.

- **Jeff Wilson** stressed these are university-level strategies, and all divisions are working toward the glidepath.

#### Agenda topic # 7 – Indirect Cost Recovery (“IDC”) Policy re-introduction

- **Eugene Sivasdas** presented (see accompanying slides).
- Workgroup formed in Fall 2021 and created a report in 2022 with recommendations ([link](#)). Today’s goal is to determine whether to form a work group to create the actual policy. The workgroup provided detailed explanation on what IDC is, and further work will identify details such as spending policy, carryforwards, workload issues, addressing [RSCA](#), etc. Next steps include reintroducing this work and launching this initiative.
- **John Kim** agreed next steps would be to constitute another work group to start developing the policy that would follow the report from the workgroup.
- **Gretchen LeBuhn** commented on the workgroup recommendations that some are not particular to budget, but speak to everything from workload to broader questions. Wondered if the committee will address those outside of UBC or if open to broader university input.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied the new workgroup will be based in UBC but will include those who are non-member stakeholders in the process overall.
- **Tiffany O'Shaughnessy** shared there may be mixed messages about spending restrictions and percentages of funds that go back to the colleges, who may do things differently. Offered to volunteer for the new workgroup.
- **John Kim** added workgroup would put forward recommendations in terms of policy most likely be specifically around funds, not workload or work-related issues.
- **Amy Sueyoshi** stated the workgroup would just draft a policy based on the recommendations.
- **Gretchen LeBuhn** noted while the workgroup did a good job, no one on the group generates IDC. Stressed that it's critical to involve stakeholders who both generate and use IDC.
- **Eugene Sivasdas** responded that within the recommendations there are budgetary ones; carryforwards, how IDC should be split and those between the college department and individual PI. The rest are for a policy discussion. Faculty who generate IDC were consulted and the goal was not to write a workbook on how to generate IDC, but to look at IDC policies on campus and how they compare with other universities in the system.
- **John Kim** clarified there are questions left open on the recommendations that may not be relevant to budget that the new workgroup may not do.

#### Agenda topic # 8 – Divisional Budget Strategies: Administration & Finance

- **Jeff Wilson** noted this is the second divisional update for '23-'24 of how each division is undertaking the glidepath and adjusting its operations. A&F provides the business technology and infrastructure support services to support the university mission.
- **Cesar Mozo** presented (see accompanying slides)
- **Danny Paz Gabriner** noticed Facilities seems to be about \$1M over budget from the '22-'23 budget; asked how that increased budget compares to the spending and if that also increased from last year. If the university is aiming to spend less across the board, asked what the rationale is for increasing the budget from last year.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied it goes back to the salary increases received last year that were not part of the '23-'24 budget. When salaries/benefits are added, it results in a net decrease in the '23-'24 budget.
- **Dylan Mooney** asked about the focus on workstudy students vs. student assistants. As units across campus do the same, it may hurt international students who can only work as student assistants, not workstudy. Would like to see at some point see the effects of reducing student work across campus. The delineation between the cost-recovery from other general fund units vs. non-general fund units, and how much is just moving from one pocket to another and how much is actually generated outside of general fund.
- **Jeff Wilson** appreciated the question and will come back to that at some point.

- **Evrin Ozer** adding to Dylan's point, workstudy doesn't offer enough hours/income for students year-round. It's a struggle to recruit for workstudy students and even though unrelated to budget, filling the positions through Handshake -- if there's any way to fast-track that, if the approach to emphasize workstudy is pursued as a way to deal with the budget situation.
- **Jeff Wilson** agreed UBC would probably need to talk about student assistants and workstudy overall. Seems there's limited efforts to recruit workstudy students and that's why it's been emphasized this year as part of the budget plan so the campus fulfills the amount of resources committed to workstudy for each division.
- **Cesar Mozo** added he did not remove the student assistants, just lowered it on the amount that will be covered by the workstudy amount.

#### Agenda topic # 9 – Alternative Revenue Workgroup

- **Jeff Wilson** shared a brief update that committee (see accompanying slides) membership will likely be expanding to advisory members, based on feedback. The first meeting was held last week and discussed were different types of alternative revenue that might be considered, and a framework for how those revenues will be evaluated to ensure they align with university mission and values. Also that they generate ongoing significant contributions to the general operating fund (as opposed to being earmarked, like a philanthropic donation or grant). Work will continue through this year and hopefully will have a framework to bring to UBC early 2024.

#### Agenda topic # 10 – Public Forum

- **Katie Murphy** asked about the voluntary separation program: requested clarification on a slide that noted age is not a factor and another that noted "CalPERS eligibility".
- **Jeff Wilson** explained the two eligibility requirements are that the individual must have a certain number of years of service, and also they must be eligible for retirement per CalPERS.
- **Ingrid Williams** clarified it depends on the CalPERS membership type: "Classic" vs. "PEPRA", (anyone hired on or after January 1, 2013).
- **Katie Murphy** asked what percentage of the total staff/faculty is, as the estimated number of employees is 80.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied its less than 5% in terms of individuals.
- **Katie Murphy** added since MPPs aren't eligible, asked how the university will reduce their numbers and by what percentage.
- **Ingrid Williams** replied there are many questions about this process but it's being presented just to explore the idea. It has to go through the meet-and-confer process with the unions where many of these questions will be answered. Once the Cabinet makes a decision, if they choose to move forward, the Chancellor's Office will notice the unions and there will be further conversations. Similar to other campuses that went through this, this is just to explore -- any forms and timelines will be determined after going through the unions.
- **Amy Sueyoshi** added that there is an effort to reduce the number of MPPs. Work can be reorganized, and the colleges will soon be working on a staffing plan. This is all being considered.
- **Mari Hulick** asked if a hiring freeze would mean no new faculty lines.
- **Amy Sueyoshi** responded at the moment, there are no plans for a hiring freeze for faculty lines. Have to get through making adjustments at the college and department level due to the reduced enrollment.
- **Ingrid Williams** responded to Dan Rosenthal's question in the Chat ("*Can you clarify Tier 1 vs. Tier 2 meaning?*"): CalPERS membership type: "Classic" vs. "PEPRA", (anyone hired on or after January 1, 2013).
- **Rick Harvey** noted Lori Beth's comment about changing the campus culture and thanked everyone for the dedicated work being done, with more hard work to come.
- **Amy Sueyoshi** emphasized the work cannot be done without everyone on board, and all will need to pitch in to make it all work well. Shared gratitude.

- **Katie Murphy** asked about the voluntary separation program and a potential loss of institutional knowledge and wondered if there might be a way to retain it; suggested a different type of offboarding/exit interview.
- **Jeff Wilson** acknowledged this and confirmed this is another reason to give the process plenty of time to plan.
- **John Cleary** shared his anger due to pay disparities, including between staff and administrators. In the 2008 and 2012 budget crisis staff were told the State had a \$1.5B fund, but staff received a .3.5% increase over the last two years with high inflation. The students protested about the fee hikes and during the pandemic but the CSU Presidents received pay raises. The biggest problem is the system is broken and there should be a way to let the State know the CSU is not being funded to what is needed.
- **John Kim** emphasized John Cleary's point re: staff/lecturer pay with the budget problem. Everyone is doing what they can and there has to be a way to get more staff involved. Is going around the colleges where the focus of discussions are among Deans, Associate Deans and Chairs but staff need to be in the conversations. President noted the CSU needs to find a way to advocate to the Legislature and Governor. Individuals efforts are never as strong as coordinated efforts, as was done in the past.
- No further comments received.

### **Co-Chairs adjourned the meeting approximately 12:05 PM**

- Next meeting: Thursday, October 19, 2023 from 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM via Zoom

-end (nrg)

### **From the Chat:**

10:04:09 From Iese Esera (Member) To Everyone: Unable to join audio, as participant

10:06:00 From Edward Tan To Everyone: Me too.

10:06:43 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) To Everyone: Hi Irina! It's good to see you again!

10:08:20 From Irina Okhremtchouk To Everyone: Likewise! @MariHulick. Good to be here :-)

10:22:18 From Alesha Sohler (She/Her) To Everyone: May I ask that staff or a council be included in this rethinking if this is beyond the UBC group?

10:25:11 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: 1st time graduates means graduate students.

10:30:06 From Member John Kim To Everyone: This will be beyond UBC. I expect all VP divisions will involve their constituents in the best way possible. In any case, I can only speak for Academic Affairs and what we have done so far. I know that I only met with your College's (Extended) Leadership Council yesterday, but I've been having regular meetings with similar Chairs Councils across Colleges; these have often included some staff from the College and sometimes Department offices. I will continue this practice and act as one conduit for coordination and involvement of Chairs Councils. I'm happy to expand the work I'm doing to include other faculty and staff constituencies as well. For Academic Affairs, perhaps the best way to proceed is to have the Provost discuss this with her direct reports as a group and decide on the best way for Academic Affairs to proceed from here.

10:31:50 From Member - Jennifer Daly To Everyone: Does the "total sections" number include Supervision courses, or is that just Lecture/Seminar/Activity/Lab?

10:33:38 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: Non-resident enrollment does not count towards our FTE CSU target.

10:33:45 From Anjali Billa To Everyone: do we have data on whether the non residents are coming from a particular state/region of a state?

10:34:11 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: Seeing increases from WA, Oregon, and Arizona

10:34:43 From Member Gretchen LeBuhn (she / her) To Everyone: How does this compare to SJSU?

10:35:07 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: They are consistently over target. Not sure we know for this year yet.

10:35:22 From Anjali Billa To Everyone: @Lori Beth Way thank you. Is there also a correlation between colleges and non resident students?

10:35:30 From Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) To Everyone: @Member Gretchen LeBuhn (she / her) - San Jose is not in the same situation as us. I don't have their numbers yet for this year but our realities are very different

10:35:33 From Member Genie Stowers (she/her) on Bay Miwok lands To Everyone: What about East Bay, Lori Beth?

10:35:47 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: They are having even worse issues than us.

10:35:57 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: They are further from target than us.

10:36:28 From Member Genie Stowers (she/her) on Bay Miwok lands To Everyone: thanks... it looks to me as if USF is having problems, too, and Golden Gate. True?

10:36:42 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: I know Golden Gate is. I don't know about USF.

10:36:44 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) To Everyone: @Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) It would be great to get details of SJSU numbers.

10:37:17 From Member Gretchen LeBuhn (she / her) To Everyone: And how they are re-positioning themselves from an advertising standpoint.

10:38:17 From Michael Scott To Everyone: SJSU. See <https://www.sjsu.edu/irsa/dashboards/daily.php>  
Click the link [Fall 2023 Daily Student Enrollment by Headcount and FTES](#)

10:38:31 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) To Everyone: @Member Gretchen LeBuhn (she / her) "San Jose State University is Silicon Valley's Public University"

10:38:33 From Herman Lee To Everyone: How does the 1st year retention rate of Northern California students compare to Southern California students?

10:39:20 From Alyscia Richards To Everyone: Is there data on the conversion of RFI's to actually enrollment?

10:39:27 From Member Jeff Jackanicz To Everyone: Huge props to SMC/Enrollment partnership!

10:39:52 From Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) To Everyone: Replying to @Mari- as soon as we know, we will share

10:40:06 From Sutee Sujitparapitaya To Everyone: Number of sections in my presentation includes all class types (lectures, labs, activities, supervisions, etc)

10:40:44 From Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) To Everyone: @Alyscia, we are in our first year of the campaign so we will be working on that now that census has passed

10:41:35 From Jane DeWitt To Everyone: How are average unit loads for students doing at this point?

10:42:03 From Member - Jennifer Daly To Everyone: Including Supervision seems to me to be very misleading, as a significant percentage of those sections have just one or two students in them but have no additional cost to the University in salary (being taught by T/TT faculty). Is there a way to get section counts without Supervision?

10:42:38 From Member Crystal Kam To Everyone: Replying to "Including Supervisio..." I agree, Jennifer.

10:42:51 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) To Everyone: Replying to "Including Supervisio..." Agreed!

10:42:59 From Cathy Tong To Everyone: Replying to "Including Supervisio..." I agree with Jennifer as well.

10:43:10 From Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) To Everyone: @Jane- our AUL is increased about .25. Many other CSUs are seeing a decrease so many props to our teams leading our Think 30 campaigns

10:43:47 From Jane DeWitt To Everyone: Replying to "@Jane- our AUL is in..." That is really good news!

10:44:10 From Member - Jennifer Daly To Everyone: Also, are the section counts counting courses with mixed classification (e.g. part Lecture and part Activity) as two sections?

10:44:45 From Alesha Sohler (She/Her) To Everyone: I appreciate the frankness!!!

10:45:02 From Cynthia Grutzik (Guest) To Everyone: This is great, Lori Beth and Katie. Thank you.

10:45:23 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: @Herman Lee - people can compare retention rates on the CSU Student Success dashboards. That will allow you to look per campus.

10:46:01 From Member - Jennifer Daly To Everyone: Replying to "Also, are the sectio..." PLSI 304 as an example of what I'm talking about... the class schedule shows 4 section numbers, but there are really only two sections of the course because sections 1 and 2 are one course, section 3 and 4 is another.

10:46:03 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: @Cynthia Grutzik (Guest) Thank you!

10:47:20 From Herman Lee To Everyone: Replying to "@Herman Lee - people..." thanks. I was more asking how the retention of SFSU's nor cal vs so cal 1st years. I'm curious if the either population helps our numbers better because of their retention rates.

10:47:40 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: Replying to "@Herman Lee - people..." Ah! Sorry. We do retain our local students the best.

10:48:16 From Alesha Sohler (She/Her) To Everyone: Thank you for sharing this 5-year data

10:48:27 From Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) To Everyone: Replying to "@Herman Lee - people..." @Herman, we need to all be aware of how we can help our So Cal students succeed and stay. Unfortunately, there aren't enough Bay Area students to sustain

10:50:42 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: I would strongly recommend that everyone with these questions explore the IR dashboards.

10:50:59 From Member - Jennifer Daly To Everyone: Replying to "I would strongly rec..." How can we access those?

10:51:17 From Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) To Everyone: Replying to "I would strongly rec..." <https://ir.sfsu.edu/>

10:51:23 From Member Michael Goldman To Everyone: Are we still asking students WHY they decline admission?

10:51:50 From Member Gretchen LeBuhn (she / her) To Everyone: And, can we articulate why they should come here instead of

10:51:55 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) To Everyone: @Lori Beth - I do.

10:51:56 From Member Gretchen LeBuhn (she / her) To Everyone: SJSU?

10:51:56 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: <https://ir.sfsu.edu/> and then click on Course Enrollments. There's tons of ways to slice the data there.

10:52:10 From Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) To Everyone: @Mike, yes we survey students at different points in time. We also look at where they go instead. We can't access that data for a bit but will continue to do that this year

10:52:27 From Member Gretchen LeBuhn (she / her) To Everyone: Or why they choose SJSU over SFSU?

10:52:36 From Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) To Everyone: @Member Gretchen LeBuhn (she / her), yes, that is a focus of our work- telling the Why SF State

10:52:57 From Jane DeWitt To Everyone: Using the DIY course enrollment report on IR site:

10:53:33 From Herman Lee To Everyone: Replying to "@Herman Lee - people..." Yes, anything we can do can help. Many want to be closer to home/family and many just can't afford the Bay Area... both of which are things we don't have much control over

10:54:24 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) To Everyone: Replying to "Or why they choose S..." Gretchen, you are getting to really important things here. San Jose is as expensive, or almost as expensive as SF. Yet, this doesn't seem to deter students from their campus as much as it does from ours.

10:54:34 From Nancy Ganner v2 To Everyone: Guests - you'll have a chance to voice questions on any presentation during the public forum. Thanks-

10:55:01 From Member Gretchen LeBuhn (she / her) To Everyone: Replying to "Or why they choose S..." I think looking at what is succeeding is a helpful way to approach the issue.

10:57:09 From Jane DeWitt To Everyone: Yay Katie!!!!

10:57:10 From Alesha Sohler (She/Her) To Everyone: Yes! Thank you Lori Beth

10:57:32 From Member Genie Stowers (she/her) on Bay Miwok lands To Everyone: Lori Beth, thanks for that! So glad to have Katie here, with her expertise and knowledge.

10:59:39 From Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) To Everyone: @all, thanks for the love. I have the absolute best team and campus partners doing everything we can. appreciate the support.

11:02:45 From Linda Schaffer To Everyone: Replying to "Or why they choose S..." In terms of students coming from Southern California, could weather be a factor?

11:03:19 From Claude Bartholomew To Everyone: Replying to "Or why they choose S..." Is that something we can change?

11:03:40 From Matt Itelson To Everyone: Replying to "Or why they choose S..." Change the weather? LOL.

11:03:43 From Linda Schaffer To Everyone: Replying to "Or why they choose S..." Not that I'm aware of. Just wondering.

11:03:43 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) To Everyone: Replying to "Or why they choose S..." I like the weather here.

11:04:13 From Claude Bartholomew To Everyone: Replying to "Or why they choose S..." Just hoping we can focus on the things we can impact.

11:04:55 From Katie Murphy To Everyone: Replying to "Or why they choose S..." Collectively, as a species, we are changing the weather. It's not going well.

11:05:09 From Linda Schaffer To Everyone: Replying to "Or why they choose S..." Understood. Just noting that it may be a reason for more enrollments at SJSU.

11:05:25 From Claude Bartholomew To Everyone: Replying to "Or why they choose S..." @Katie Murphy Very true and worries me daily.

11:06:57 From co-chair Amy Sueyoshi To Everyone: Just a reminder folks that surveys from DUEAP revealed that the number one thing that kept students in school despite difficulty is a meaningful relationship with faculty or staff.



11:07:05 From co-chair Amy Sueyoshi To Everyone: I have to go, BRB!

11:07:39 From Lori Beth Way To Everyone: One other difference that may be relevant with SJSU, they went back in-person earlier and is still much more in person (for classes).

11:07:44 From Member John Kim To Everyone: To address Genie's other question, I believe that the reason that some items are not part of the usual process of systematic communication among departments, colleges, and Academic Affairs centrally is that there are some assumptions about how the usual systematic communications can be interpreted without further consultation. So the problem is that when "new" questions arise, the assumptions about, say, the class schedule that those "new" questions make may not be true. What I suggested in my direct answer to Genie's other question is a case in which one of these assumptions about the class schedule is not true, and my answer to Mari's question is one suggestion for how we can get everyone on the same page regarding these assumptions. This is not the only way to do this, but doing this should result in more common agreement when summary information comes from, say, the office of Institutional Analytics.

11:09:21 From Member Genie Stowers (she/her) on Bay Miwok lands To Everyone: Thanks, John. In this case, the qualitative "data" is going to be really important to provide critical context to the quantitative data we are presented.

11:11:11 From Member John Kim To Everyone: Thanks, Genie. Agreed!

11:14:22 From Andreana Clay To Everyone: Replying to "One other difference..." I think these last two comments are critical, in that being back in person—either (one day a week) hybrid or fully in person has contributed to deepening relationships between students, faculty and staff. I noticed this as Chair in SOC/SXS last year, specifically at graduation but, also, in the "hanging out" in the department—still slim compared to before the pandemic—and, certainly, this Fall as Interim Dean in CHSS. The halls are filled, people are hanging out more and the shift is palpable. Not that faculty don't reach across the screen in online courses but, it feels different. I lean into this work as we are buoyed by the significant recruitment and retention work by DUEAP and Enrollment teams. Thanks!

11:17:52 From Member Gretchen LeBuhn (she / her) To Everyone: Replying to "One other difference..." SJSU is also really emphasizing experiential learning - internships, community-service, research opportunities...

11:24:44 From Nancy Ganner v2 To Everyone: full IDC summary can be found here:

<https://adminfin.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/documents/Indirect%20Cost%20Workgroup%20Summary%2009.15.22%20oby%20Dean%20Sivadas.pdf>

11:25:02 From Michael Scott To Everyone: IDC is general fund and has the exact spending restrictions as our normal budget

11:26:37 From Member Elena Stoian To Everyone: Replying to "IDC is general fund ..." Operating budget ( general fund)

11:28:15 From Member, Tiffany O'Shaughnessy, PhD (she/her) To Everyone: Gretchen go ahead, I have to fix my blue tooth

11:31:20 From co-chair Amy Sueyoshi To Everyone: Im back!

11:33:56 From Member, Tiffany O'Shaughnessy, PhD (she/her) To Everyone: Great point Gretchen! I'm not sure what our usual process is, but I generate and use IDC and would love to be a part of this workgroup

11:34:16 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) To Everyone: @Member Gretchen LeBuhn (she / her) , excellent point. The IDC generators should be part of the workgroup.

11:37:34 From Member, Tiffany O'Shaughnessy, PhD (she/her) To Everyone:

It also seems like it would be important to have a representative from Office of Research and Sponsored projects on the policy workgroup, someone like @Michael Scott or Josh Calder who work with implementation and compliance for grants with IDC, to be sure that the policy is consistent with regulatory requirements

11:37:50 From co-chair Amy Sueyoshi To Everyone: Sorry all! I had to greet protestors who came to admin but they were super peaceful, left a petition for President Mahoney, and marched back to Malcolm X Plaza. Noriko Lim Tepper and Chris Trudell really saved the day. If you see them, please give them a smile.

11:43:35 From Nancy Ganner v2 To Everyone: Reminder: this meeting will likely run past 12pm today so we have sufficient time for the public forum

11:43:39 From Member Sandee Noda To Everyone: As a reminder the University should not be using Student Assistants/Work Study Student Assistants to do staff work. You should be hiring staff to do staff work1

11:46:59 From Marilyn Jackson To Everyone: Thanks Dylan.

11:47:48 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) To Everyone: @Member, Dylan Mooney That was a great point about International students. And, I too would like to see a breakdown on student assistants and Work Study students

11:47:52 From Member Michael Goldman To Everyone: Also, faster billing is only one time.

11:49:06 From Alyscia Richards To Everyone: Yes, work study awards seem to cap out at \$2,000 max per semester which averages to only 7/hours per week. It's hard to get students when that is all that can be offered

11:49:37 From Lori Schafer To Everyone: Thank you Alyscia. Yes, very good point!

11:50:13 From Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) To Everyone: @Alyscia, we hope now that more in person classes/activities are happening that students will find value in utilizing their work study. Unfortunately, the budget for FWS has not increased by the Federal Gov't as minimum wage has increased

11:53:05 From Dan Rosenthal To Everyone: Can you clarify Tier 1 vs. Tier 2 meaning?

11:53:54 From Alyscia Richards To Everyone: @Katie, thanks for that. It's just hard as students need positions that contribute to their cost of living expenses. When we were able to offer 12-15 hours per week, that amounted to enough income to make the position meaningful. All the classes and activities can't help make work study attractive if a student can't get enough hours to contribute to their cost of living. (And thanks for all you do to support and retain students—this is not a criticism of you, your team, or all the excellent work you are doing)

11:55:02 From Member Katie Lynch (she/her/hers) To Everyone: @Alyscia, totally understand. We've explored higher awards to fewer students but that can reduce eligibility for other aid. We will continue to work to strike the right balance.

11:55:49 From Dan Rosenthal To Everyone: Thank you

11:56:10 From Alesha Sohler (She/Her) To Everyone: Thank you everyone!

11:57:19 From Nancy Ganner v2 To Everyone: UBC peer-hosted Office Hours tomorrow 11am - 12pm via Zoom for Staff, Faculty and MPPs. Email [ubc@sfsu.edu](mailto:ubc@sfsu.edu)

11:57:27 From Member, Dylan Mooney To Everyone: Bring your questions to the UBC Office Hours. Email [ubc@sfsu.edu](mailto:ubc@sfsu.edu)

11:57:37 From Alyscia Richards To Everyone: Replying to "@Alyscia, totally un..." Understood and thank you all for your work on this. FWIW, even if we could offer 10 hours a week, that would be really helpful.

12:01:11 From S. Evrim Ozer (they/them/theirs) To Everyone: Thank you, John.

12:01:41 From Claudia Murcia To Everyone: Thanks, John!

12:02:00 From Mou Becky To Everyone: Thank you, John!

12:02:04 From Anarose Schelstrate To Everyone: THANK YOU, John!

12:02:10 From Member, Dylan Mooney To Everyone: Even more crushing? Uh oh.....what don't we know?

12:02:16 From Elsie Bondoc To Everyone: Thanks John!

12:02:19 From Kendra Mangmoradeth To Everyone: Thank you, John!

12:02:22 From Victoria Narkewicz To Everyone: Thank you John.

12:02:31 From Myla Adeva To Everyone: Well said John Cleary! THANK YOU!

12:02:53 From Kendra Harris, BECA AOC To Everyone: Thanks for speaking up friend!

12:02:58 From Herman Lee To Everyone: Appreciate you speaking up for the staff John.

12:03:21 From Linda Schaffer To Everyone: Thank you, John!

12:03:46 From Mirna Vasquez To Everyone: Thanks John C.

12:03:57 From John Cleary To Everyone: sorry, I was a bit late and didn't hear that. and thanks for speaking to this John Kim.

12:04:09 From Alesha Sohler (She/Her) To Everyone: Yes, John K!

12:04:11 From S. Evrim Ozer (they/them/theirs) To Everyone: Yes, CSU coordinated.

12:04:57 From John Cleary To Everyone: thanks John, really appreciate your thoughts.

12:05:09 From Alesha Sohler (She/Her) To Everyone: We need to come together!

12:05:14 From S. Evrim Ozer (they/them/theirs) To Everyone: As recently as 2010 we included parents, family members, and alumni in advocating for CSU funding as well.

12:05:21 From Member Robert Collins To Everyone: Thank you!

12:05:25 From Alesha Sohler (She/Her) To Everyone: Thanks everyone!

12:05:29 From David Hellman To Everyone: Thanks!!

12:05:30 From Member Jamillah Moore To Everyone: Thank you

12:05:30 From Lori Schafer To Everyone: Thank you everyone

12:05:31 From Victoria Narkewicz To Everyone: Thanks both John Kim and John Cleary!

12:05:32 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) To Everyone: See you soon

12:05:34 From Ocean LaLuce d'Luna To Everyone: Thank you

*12:05:34 From Jisel Iglesias To Everyone: Thank you*

*12:05:38 From Grace Key To Everyone: Thank you all!*