University Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: Thursday, October 28, 2021
Location: via Zoom

Members Present: Voting members present: CFO & VP Jeff Wilson, Co-Chair, and Provost & VP Jennifer Summit, Co-Chair, VP Jeff Jackanicz, VP Jamillah Moore, VP Jason Porth, Dean Eugene Sivadas, Jennifer Daly, Mary Menees, Dylan Mooney, Evrim Ozer, Renee Stephens, A.S. President Joshua Ochoa, AS VP Finance Nia Hall, Ben Kumli, Kathleen Mortier, Akm Newaz, Gitanjali Shahani, Genie Stowers, Senate Chair Teddy Albinia, SIC Chair Michael Goldman, ASCSU FGA Liaison Darlene Yee-Melichar. Non-voting members present: President Lynn Mahoney, Dwayne Banks, Deborah Elia, Jaime Haymond, Katie Lynch, Cesar Mozo, Sandee Noda, Mirel Tikkanen, Venesia Thompson-Ramsey, Tammie Ridgell, Jamil Sheared, Elena Stoian.

Members Absent: Nia Hall, James Martel, Joshua Ochoa, Lark Winner, UAPD rep

Committee Staff Present: Nancy Ganner, Edwin Critchlow (Budget Administration & Operations)

Guests Present: Frank Fasano, Sutee Sujitparapitaya, Lori Beth Way (list of all guests furnished upon request)

Accompanying presentation to read concurrently can be found here: UBC Meeting Presentation October 28, 2021

UBC co-chairs called this meeting to order at approximately 10:04 A.M.

Agenda topic # 1 – Welcome from Co-Chairs
• Jeff Wilson and Jennifer Summit welcomed committee members and guests.
• Jeff Wilson reminded of the upcoming campus community budget presentations on Nov. 4 and Nov. 12.

Agenda topic # 2 – member roll call
• Noted absent members: Nia Hall, Joshua Ochoa, James Martel, Winner, and UAPD rep

Agenda topic # 3 – Approval of minutes from August 26, 2021 meeting
• Jeff Wilson requested approval of meeting minutes. Motion for approval made, seconded, passed.

Agenda topic # 4 – President’s Message
• Shared the BOT will meet next week in-person, where discussions will include an aggressive CSU budget request from the State, as extra funding received last year was only to restore the severe cut from year prior. In addition to repeated requests for GI2025 and basic needs funding, will ask for funds to bridge the technical divide. CSUs used HEERF funds for laptops and hotspots for students but permanent funds are needed for this and for infrastructure. They will also ask for enrollment growth funding, but, none of that will come to SF State:
• CSU Presidents, Chancellor and senior leadership are firmly committed to making requests for compensation increases for CSU employees, who worked very hard to keep the largest public university system in the US not just afloat, but graduated its largest class of graduates ever. Will share outcome of that meeting next UBC.
• Acknowledged email she sent re: launching the university’s new strategic plan, urging everyone to access the links in the email. The past strategic plan’s accomplishments included the Division of Community, Equity & Inclusion, a new tutoring center in the library and the growth of advising, a Dream Resource center, basic needs work and the Hope Crisis Fund which helped get money into the hands of students during the pandemic. Also
the first year student program and CEETL, which is at the forefront for pedagogical redesign. This has paid off as retention rates are up for freshman classes of Fall 2019 and Fall 2021.

- However, SF State has the sixth lowest 6-year graduation rate: 18th in the CSU. This rate of progress is outpaced by peers, including San Jose State which has the same cost of living/high rental market as San Francisco and similarly, a sizable percentage of students from Southern California.
- Unfortunately SF State also has the 7th highest equity gap in graduation rates between white and black, latinx, American Indian and Pacific Islander students. This is unacceptable. Fulfilling that gap is fulfilling the spirit of meeting the demands of the (1968) student strike in the access and equity of a relevant education.
- The enrollment landscape has changed dramatically due to the pandemic. Experts have been predicting the decline in the numbers of college-going students for years, and that cliff is here. What’s happening in California’s community colleges will be a direct impact, and the impact of the decline in SFUSD students is unknown yet.
- The CSU will put in its budget request for approx. 10,000 additional students, distributed only to those campuses with high demand - nearly all in Southern California, such as San Jose State. This means even more competition for students because students will have more choices.
- Graduation rates reflect the whole SF State student experience, from recruitment to retention and career. The student experience is imperative, and asked everyone to focus specifically on improving the experiences of undergrads, so the university can be the size it needs to be to support the programming it wants to offer. It’s critical to be within 5% of the enrollment target, otherwise budget cuts will follow for the students not being served, and funding will be reallocated to other campuses such as CSUDH and CSULA which are serving those students.
- Remains optimistic SF State can come within those targets, and San Francisco has so much to offer. Other things critical to success such as faculty excellence, investment in their research, graduate programs, and attention to basic needs will still be important – all can be done, but for the next 2-3 years, a laser-focus will be on planning to improve the experience of undergrads.
- A large Strategic Planning Committee has been formed to include voices of faculty, staff and students. The committee will be the conduit to pulling together what will be heard from thousands of students, faculty and staff across campus, and the Strategic Plan will be drafted based on this. Many of these sessions will be held virtually this Fall, and also in-person options if (post-pandemic) numbers remain the same or improve. When she offered this at CSULA they had over 2,000 participate in the process, and is hoping for thousands to participate here also, using surveys, focus groups and workshops that will be offered.
- Summarized that so much has been accomplished recently, and the same can be accomplished with SF State’s equity gap with more intentionality, focus and priority.

**Agenda topic # 5 – Transparency Topic: Chargebacks, Part 2**

- *(see slides 7 - 21)*
- **Jeff Wilson** began the presentation, explaining that the topic of chargebacks came up during UBC Office Hours, and this is Part 2 of the follow up. Questions shown today came directly from these Office Hours, which focused mostly on Facilities chargebacks. Frank Fasano will join the presentation and answer any questions.
- *(see slides)*
- **Frank Fasano** offered to present the questions asked (beginning slide 13) at Office Hours, and added:
  - Facilities operates on a zero-based budget. No profit is made off services provided, whether in-house work or subcontracted.
  - Facilities canvased other CSU’s chargeback processes and also received guidance from the Chancellor’s Office (“CO”). They created the Facilities document Guide to Services for details and answers to most questions and referred to the Facilities Customer Service Center for any specific information.
  - When an order is placed for a cost estimate, the chartfield is requested as it helps pre-fill much of the client information, saving time when placing work orders and to ensure the chartfield reflects the correct
department. Stressed the chartfield is simply used for tracking and is not charged until the estimate is customer-approved.

- Facilities does over 25,000 work orders per year.
- Contractors hired pay prevailing wages, similar to union wages. When comparing work that might be done for less with a contractor, it may help to compare if that contractor pays their workers a prevailing wage. Campus is not allowed to source the work for less than that.
- Materials are sourced at the best cost that can be acquired, which is often less than a contractor may provide. Same for internal labor rates as well: often they are less than a contractor would charge.
- When addressing priority, referred to the Guide to Services, and added that Priority 1 would be for emergency services, Priority 2 would also be an emergency, but can wait a day or two.
- When addressing overblown estimates, added that something may seem simple but to subject matter experts, may be more complex. Shared an example of adding an outlet to a wall, where it may actually require a new circuit to handle the capacity so added work includes pulling wires, etc.
- Facilities staff are always here, even during the pandemic, and will request union approval to seek outside contractors if they cannot do the work.
- Facilities experienced nearly 40 layoffs during the pandemic, which is more than 10% of its workforce. As their website states, for safety, they operated on a skeletal crew last year, so other than emergencies, there may have been some delays due to staffing levels. They are working with the President and Vice President’s Office to hire staff back.
- There always opportunities for improvement and some of these questions prompted them to reevaluate and begin implementation of planned improvements.
- He is in support of a chargeback governance committee, which is not common at CSU’s but is at other universities. Facilities has a recharge calculation sheet that can be shared for transparency.
- Was unaware the descriptions for the chargeback work were not carried and described in the line item due to field limitations, and has instructed his staff to send an email to the customer reminding them of what the charge is for so when they see the journal entry, they'll have that information.
- Will also improve timeliness for the chargeback process and recording. Shared that sometimes they wait for financial close because parts were ordered and didn't get invoiced, as working with vendors can take months.

- Genie Stowers asked when the chargeback system was developed and how long it’s been in place.
- Frank Fasano replied it’s been at least 20 years. When the CO issued a general statement a policy that charges must be recouped above and beyond baseline services. Same for an auxiliary services.
- Genie Stowers requested clarification that it applies to the general fund side as well as auxiliary services.
- Frank Fasano clarified the statement does say they must recharge for anything above baseline service – suggested imagining Facilities as an operational expense budget line item that covers salaries and materials for baseline services, as outlined in the Guide to Services. When they begin the year’s budget, they use a historical average of what the recharges were, as many are recurring (i.e. labor costs for special event set-ups like Gatorfest) and may require more staff. It may seem like a double-charge, as they are already paid salaries for working by the State. However, they use a 3-5 year average to figure out recharge recovery rates, and use that to put in the budget as a line item to be taken off what’s given by the State so they aren’t double-charging.
- Genie Stowers expressed concern this system was developed when the campus had more funding and operates similar to a private-sector model, but many departments are experiencing cuts, some several times, but they still have to pay for what seems in some cases like basic support services. To support the campus mission of ensuring classrooms have proper equipment such as white boards, charging for this seems inequitable. Suggested taking a look at some recharges when using system developed 20 years ago and consider ways to readjust to today, so some basic services aren’t considered extra and subject to chargebacks.
Frank Fasano thanked for the comments and reiterated he would welcome a governance committee to help make these determinations.

Teddy Albinia echoed Genie Stowers idea of a governance committee as an optimal way to respond to questions received about transparency and negotiation. Asked if implementing this committee should be with UBC to provide the framework for that governance system.

Jeff Wilson suggested based on feedback received, UBC could discuss and if not housed within UBC, can make a recommendation to the President and charge that committee to undertake its responsibility.

Dylan Mooney shared appreciation for the presentation and the Guide to Services, and understanding the Guide cannot cover everything Facilities does, but stressed there has to be a mechanism of flexibility where charges that aren't specifically outlined can be better understood. He hosted the Office Hours where chargebacks were raised and is able to provide some context to the questions:

Some departments use multiple chartfields, so the fund given may not be the one that should be charged as it depends on project costs. Suggested there may be a better way to identify (the customer), perhaps with department codes.

Agrees with the governance structure Genie suggested. Since this system goes back so long, and if only reflecting on the year prior, there may be things that don’t have to be done every year - costs which may have inflated over time. Suggested the baseline may have to be readjusted to consider what baseline services are today, and what is considered over and above, as this creates tension.

Referred to Frank’s example of adding an outlet in a wall; suggested some of that cost should be considered a long-term infrastructure improvement the university benefits from, and a department shouldn't bear the cost for it wholly. Reaffirmed a cross-campus governance system could help.

Frank Fasano thanked Dylan and added the billing chartfield can be changed at any time, as its just a placeholder.

Michael Goldman noted some departments are in very old buildings and due to their location, asbestos treatment is added but those expenses should be held centrally as building maintenance. Agrees with Dylan that some costs should be considered infrastructure.

Evrim Ozer shared she lives on campus with her family and expressed gratitude for the workers she saw coming to work every day for maintenance and housekeeping services. Commented she’s unclear if there is any leeway in terms of expanding what is considered baseline services as they are now defined specifically.

Jeff Wilson responded the governance structure around chargebacks should be the first step.

Jeff Wilson announced that since the meeting is running short on time, moved the public comment for chargebacks to the open forum.

**Agenda topic # 6 – Updates/Information Item: Enrollment Update**  
(see slides 22-32)

Sutee Parapitaya presented an enrollment update.

Katie Lynch presented new student recruitment efforts.

Lori Beth Way presented the reenrollment project overview (noting this presentation is different than the one presented at Senate recently)

Darlene Yee-Melichar commented in the past, CSU hosted Super Sunday events to recruit students from underrepresented communities, and asked if Enrollment might engage alumni to help, and have current students do peer-to-peer advising, as students motivate one another to continue. A cross-collaboration effort with alumni and AS may help with enrollment efforts.

Katie Lynch replied the CSU has not decided what in-person events that may all do yet, so SF State is formulating a community-based approach to recruitment. Dr. Eurania Lopez is leading an effort in the Office of Undergrad Admissions & Recruitment to partner with different community-based organizations, many of which
Metro and EOP programs have had long-standing relationships with SF State to ensure SF State is visible and not relying on those communities to seek it out, as the first step in the relationship. They've received a lot of feedback by going to neighborhood farmers markets and festivals and places they can be present with the capacity of the team, to figure out where it makes most sense to be. Noted the recommendation to engage alumni and will have conversations with the college teams about how to involve more people in recruitment efforts. It will take everyone partnering together to progress.

- **Lori Beth Way** added she’s working with a faculty member who is hosting alum panels with psychology students and finding them extremely effective. They will have a large team convening when the project ends next year, where those involved in the grant will present. Encouraged all to attend to hear about the ways they’re engaging alumni to retain psychology students.

- **Akm Newaz** asked if they have data based on the colleges to help track retention.

- **Lori Beth Way** confirmed they do have specific data from the colleges, including at the program level.

- **Jennifer Summit** confirmed that college Deans have access to that data, and it’s on the Institutional Research data page maintained by Sutee [https://ir.sfsu.edu/](https://ir.sfsu.edu/). Hopes colleges and departments are making use of it to understand how these numbers impact their areas.

**Agenda topic # 6 – Updates/Information Item: IDC Workgroup**

(see slides 33-35)

- **Jennifer Summit** re-introduced the IDC workgroup and thanked the 5 members for their upcoming work, with Dean Sivadas serving as chair.

- **Eugene Sivadas** stated the workgroup plans to have a 360 degree process to better understand IDC, starting with SF State’s current policy, a range of options available by studying peer institutions, meeting with focus groups of faculty and officers who keep track of the funds. Summarized this work will be completed with their recommendations by late April, and invited anyone to reach out with their ideas or suggestions.

- **Jennifer Summit** reported the group will share updates at upcoming UBC meetings.

- **Kathleen Mortier** asked how this work is related to the Reserve and Carryforward policy, and if that workgroup will continue.

- **Jeff Wilson** responded that Reserve and Carryforward policy workgroup will not continue.

**Agenda topic # 7 – Presentation: 2021-2022 University Budget Update**

(see slides 36-47)

- **Jeff Wilson** prefaced the presentation with a reminder that the 2022 funding was historic, in that it restored funding cut the year prior.
  
  o The reduction for SF State was about $21M and that was restored, but the CSU kept $9M of that.
  
  o Declining enrollment continues to affect the budget; tuition and revenue was $11M less this year than in 2019-2020 which compounds the reduction in State funding.
  
  o Last year started with a $38M deficit which took severe actions to address, with the hiring chill and ultimately layoffs. SF State targeted $9M worth of layoffs to help address the budget deficit, but the actual layoff number was closer to $6M, which left an additional $4M to be covered from reserves. In total, $12M from reserves was used to cover last year’s deficit, and this year’s budget presentation will show an $8M deficit, which will also be covered with reserves, leaving with $1M in central reserve.
  
  o HEERF funds have strengthened reserves, but that will be used to adjust for the lower tuition & fee revenue, based on lower enrollments that was originally budgeted.
  
  o Overall, the budget situation remains difficult. HEERF funds can only be relied upon as a one-time source of funds over the next few years.
• When other CSU campuses are noting record state funding and their enrollment success, SF State is not enjoying the same budgetary position.

• **Elena Stoian** began her presentation with the CSU’s request to the State.

• (see slides)

• **Teddy Albiak** inquired about the “economic uncertainty reserves” phrase and if that was a subset of the total reserves, and that would need to be replenished in various ways.

• **Elena Stoian** confirmed there are designated reserves (used at Cabinet level) and undesignated reserves (mostly used for economic uncertainties), and clarified $1M is what’s left of available/undesignated reserves.

• **Dylan Money** commented that given enrollment trends, the problem of not meeting enrollment targets might mean those targets may be set lower, which would be very detrimental to this campus. Understands sources of funding comes from the CO and student tuition/fees. Funding from enrollment targets is being received but it’s not being met -- despite this extra funding over the years, has heard a structural deficit remains. Suggested discussions need to be had about where exactly the deficit is, as the explanation that’s its in salaries and benefits does not give sufficient detail nor tell what the problem is.

• Suggested that at some point, a charge for the UBC should be to pull this problem apart and have an open discussion about where this gap lives in order to begin addressing it. The deficit cannot be solved by just increasing enrollment. Hopes this is something that can be tackled by the UBC.

• **Jennifer Summit** thanked Dylan for identifying this challenge and a UBC charge, moving forward.

**Agenda topic # 7 – Presentation: 2021-2022 Academic Affairs Budget Update**

(see slides 48-55)

• **Jennifer Summit** shared that Academic Affairs is the largest division at the university (68% of the university budget), and she will provide a framework for the budget Dwayne Banks will present. Will preview some of the challenges that need to be addressed, as that will shape the planning next year.

• Two changes over the last two years that are important to keep in mind with budget constrictions: The first is that last year, all university divisions reduced their budgets the same proportions relative to their size, and those reductions remain in place. Academic Affairs was not cut more than other divisions – it still accounts for 68% of the budget just as before the pandemic, but just like the budget overall has shrunk, it’s 68% of a smaller pie.

• The second point is that the general fund allocation for Academic Affairs has not covered all its costs. Historically, Academic Affairs has maintained significant carryforwards year after year, which were used to pay for mandatory costs, the most important of which were lecturer faculty salaries. This practice of not budgeting for lecturer salaries created downstream problems, as it made it impossible for the colleges and departments to plan their course schedules accurately. This played out for students as problems around course availability. Over the last few years, one of the biggest efforts has been to move the full instructional budget onto general fund, for the sake of better schedule building and also student success, as well as sound budget practices. Last year and this year, Academic Affairs spent its carryforwards in order to cover the cut taken in order to meet its share of the university target. This means moving forward, carryforwards will not be available and the budget has to be balanced without them. The general fund allocation is larger than last year, but still not enough to cover the full cost of instruction, which exceeds the general fund allocation by $5M. The challenge in looking at next year is to absorb these costs into general fund by reducing spending in other areas, prioritizing student enrollment and educational equity. 90% of the budget is in salaries, so perhaps finding ways to save is by not replacing people who leave, including staff, faculty and MPPs. They will also be looking to scale the instructional budget to match declines in enrollment as fewer students mean fewer demands on instruction.
• Shared that Academic Affairs does have a solid budget for this year, but needs to look ahead to 2022-2023 to reduce spending proportionate to the university’s drop in enrollments. In areas where it’s possible to reduce hiring in salary categories though departures and not through layoffs, with a strategic allocation of hiring. Then, reducing instruction and services relative to reduced enrollment. Through strategic planning, prioritizing student success and supporting enrollment, can help the campus rebuild.

• **Dwayne Banks** stated this presentation is a truncated, summarized version of a budget presented in June to the President and CFO. Will not be covering the FTE labor categories which were art of the original budget proposal.

• (see slides)

**Agenda topic # 8 – Public Forum**

• **Jennifer Summit** opened the public forum.

• **Gitanjali Shahani** inquired about the slide showing lecturer faculty expenses from the carryforwards and asked if HEERF funds were going to be used for increased lecturer faculty funding.

• **Dwayne Banks** responded the footnote in the chart shows it excludes HEERF funding. There is about $5M in HEERF funding being used for lecturer expenses directly related to Covid.

• **Mari Hulick** referred to the Facilities chargebacks discussion and that the system was created a long time ago in a different budget circumstance. Suggested a new system is definitely needed in how to approach Facilities, which is critical to retention and recruitment. Emphasized that when students walk into campus spaces, they need to feel cared for, and do not need to see things falling apart and departments are stretched in terms of their budgets right now. The system needs to see the university as a whole, as opposed to individual departments that may be well funded or not.

• Commented on recruitment and retention efforts and supports Darlene Yee-Melichar’s idea re: involving alumni and peer counselors. Faculty and chairs are exhausted and even if a few calls, doesn’t support asking them to do this right now.

• Lastly, thanked Dylan Mooney for pointing out the need to understand the deficit, to see that outlined and to understand everything. Remarked it’s all interrelated to recruitment, retention and to academic excellence, and stressed the campus also has to think about the retention of faculty.

• **Jennifer Summit** thanked for her remarks and asked Katie Lynch to respond.

• **Katie Lynch** acknowledged the idea of using alumni and also recognizes it takes organization capacity to organize and streamline efforts to send consistent messaging that’s powerful. The work for peer outreach is already underway. Students oftentimes want to hear from faculty and staff, and understands that people feel stretched, but they also need to make the most powerful and impactful contact they can make. Noted that the capacity to train and fund other positions is a reality as well.

• **Dylan Mooney** explained he understands the strategy of not filling positions as they exit, but how the remaining people lift the burden remains to be seen. Suggested thinking more about succession planning. In the recent past and discussions regarding faculty workload, wants to understand the cost of a 3:3 average course load vs. a 4:4 and how it relates to the $5M deficit. Wants to better understand how workloads affect the budget.

• **Jennifer Summit** noted this is one of two campuses that maintains the 3:3 normative faculty teaching load, which costs the campus $8M-$9M/year. It’s a commitment she and the President stand behind, so it also means a greater need to exercise discipline around what is being spent. The campus needs to ask itself if it wants to do what it did before the budget challenge, but do it less well, or, are there areas that can be reduced or resources that can be combined so as not to spread the same resources thinner and thinner. It’s an important conversation that needs to be had and should continue at Senate and at the several campus roadshows.
• Gretchen LeBuhn asked about the composition of the IDC group. Understands how it was settled and sees representation and expertise on spending, but it doesn't include key stakeholders with recent experience with IDC generation. Without particular representation of the understanding of the expectation of funders, the probability of success of different types of proposals, and the role IDC can play in the future success of the campus, it may constrain the insight and understanding of the group. Encouraged that the workgroup representation be revisited.

• Jennifer Summit explained the UBC selected these members, and asked to the IDC workgroup chair Dean Sivadas to contact to the faculty groups.

• Kathleen Mortier emphasized the work on the tenured faculty, if some faculty that will not be replaced. They can bring in lecturers, but there’s a lot of work not done by lecturers to be considered as well.

• Jennifer Summit acknowledged her concern, and reiterated the challenges ahead of how to rescale the university to meet its current resources.

• Jeff Wilson reminded all of the upcoming campus budget presentations on Nov. 4 and 12, and encouraged any feedback to ubc@sfsu.edu

Co-Chairs adjourned the meeting approximately 12:05 PM

• Next meeting: November 18, 2021, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

FROM THE CHAT:
00:19:32 Jennifer Summit: Hi, everyone!
10:02:45 From Member, Ben Kumli (he/him) to Everyone: Good morning everyone!
10:03:37 From Jeff Wilson to Everyone: Good morning, everyone. We'll begin shortly.
10:04:17 From Member, Kathleen Mortier (she,her,hers) to Everyone: Great news about Commencement at Chase Center
10:04:44 From Jihad Alexander Totah to Everyone: Hello everyone!
10:13:46 From Member, Darlene Yee-Melichar to Everyone: I so much appreciate President Mahoney’s optimism and reminder of our campus success stories- thank you!
10:32:03 From Liesl Violante to Everyone: Priorities on Pgs 62-64
10:34:12 From Liesl Violante to Everyone: Recharge list plus rates pgs 67-70
11:07:43 From Jennifer Summit to Everyone: As you’ve pointed out, Lori Beth, the majority of our students who leave without degrees are in good academic standing.
11:12:52 From Member, Kathleen Mortier (she/her/hers) to Everyone: Thanks for this great presentation and excellent strategic recruitment strategies to bring these students back
11:13:10 From Lori Beth Way to Everyone: Thanks Kathleen!
11:16:44 From Lori Beth Way to Everyone:
   We’ll find the link and put it here in a minute.
11:16:52 From Nancy Ganner (2) to Everyone:
   innovative and energetic ideas from the three of you - what a collaborative team - thank you!
11:17:06 From Sutee Sujitparapitaya to Everyone:
   Institutional Research Website: https://ir.sfsu.edu/
11:17:09 From Lori Beth Way to Everyone:
   Thank you Nancy!
11:17:36 From Member, Evrim Özer (they/them/their) to Everyone:
   Alumni Association has heard from 13 alumni ready to bring prospective students to SF State. I’ll share the list with you separately, Katie. That’s on opportunity listed on our alumni volunteer form.
11:17:59 From Lori Beth Way to Everyone:
   Here’s the direct link to retention and graduation https://ir.sfsu.edu/retention-and-graduation
11:18:03 From Doris Flowers to Everyone:
   I agree with you Darlene. Our students are one of our best recruiters. I think if we go into the spaces/places that were are often not present we would find communities that are often underrepresented. Great idea and Thank you for your effort and work to bring students back to campus.
11:21:43 From Member, Katie Lynch (she/her/their) to Everyone:
   @Evrim, thank you!
11:23:44 From Member, Darlene Yee-Melichar to Everyone:
   Many thanks to Katie, Lori Beth and Sutee for their enrollment update. The enrollment strategies and re-enrollment project will help us to meet our campus target and move us forward! :-) 
11:24:24 From Sutee Sujitparapitaya to Everyone:
   Thank you Darlene
11:31:50 From Jeff Wilson to Everyone:
   we will take more questions during the public forum.
11:41:51 From Member, Mary Menees to Everyone:
   and Career Services just this year
11:50:07 From Member, Mary Menees to Everyone:
   Thank you, Dwayne, for a great presentation.
11:51:05 From Member, Dwayne Banks to Everyone:
   Thanks Mary
11:55:01 From Chanda Jensen to Everyone:
   Yes - Dylan raised an excellent point regarding getting more transparency around our budgetary gaps and where they really are.
11:55:52 From Member, Jennifer Daly to Everyone:
   Many Lecturer faculty are our alumni - perhaps they could be asked to help (with compensation) rather than T/TT faculty
11:58:53 From Member Sandee Noda to Everyone:
   I also want to remind folks that STAFF are also stretched thin and if not for the staff we wouldn't have a university...
11:59:08 From Member, Ben Kumli (he/him) to Everyone:
   Good point Jennifer
12:02:28 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone:
   Don’t forget tomorrow’s UBC Office Hours!