



## **University Budget Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Date:** Thursday, February 25, 2021

**Location:** via Zoom

**Members Present:** Voting members present: Interim VP & CFO Jeff Wilson, Co-Chair, and Provost & VP Jennifer Summit, Co-Chair, Interim VP Beth Hellwig, VP Jeff Jackanicz, VP Jason Porth, Jennifer Daly, Mary Menees, Dylan Mooney, Evrim Ozer, Renee Stephens, A.S. President Andrew Carrillo, Ian Dunham, Andrew Ichimura, Kathleen Mortier, Gitanjali Shahani, Jerry Shapiro, Genie Stowers, Senate Chair Teddy Albinak, Michael Goldman, Darlene Yee-Melichar. Non-voting members present: President Lynn Mahoney, Elena Stoian, Dwayne Banks, Katherine Lynch, Cesar Mozo, Mirel Tikkanen, Venesia Thompson-Ramsey, Tammie Ridgell, Deborah Elia, Jaime Haymond, James Martel, Jamil Sheared, Sandee Noda.

**Members Absent:** Amy Sueyoshi, Carter Pauline Roa, Lark Winner, UAPD representative

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

**Guests Present:** (list of all attendees furnished upon request)

Accompanying presentation to read concurrently and can be found here: [UBC Meeting Presentation Feb. 25, 2021](#)

-----  
UBC Co-chairs called this meeting to order at approximately 9:02 A.M.

### **Welcome from Co-Chairs**

- **Jeff Wilson** and **Jennifer Summit** welcomed committee members and meeting guests, and thanked them for their time at this 3-hour UBC meeting.

### **Agenda topic # 1 – Approval of minutes from Jan. 28, 2021 meeting**

- **Jeff Wilson** requested approval of the meeting minutes. (past meeting minutes are found here: [UBC webpage](#))
- No corrections requested. Voting members motioned to approve as amended; seconded and passed.

### **Agenda topic # 2 – Opening Remarks from President Mahoney**

- **President Mahoney** welcomed over 140 meeting attendees. Reported that the Governor's office, with support from the Legislature, agreed to restore some of CSU's 2020-2021 funding cuts (less mandatory costs), but whether the balance of those cuts will be restored to the CSU is still undecided. CSU continues to advocate for the full restoration, which includes some enrollment funding and may take into account the enrollment growth in SoCal. Although this is good news, SF State still has much internal work to do and enrollment remains volatile. Federal support could afford extra time needed to plan more slowly and carefully.
- Acknowledged this very difficult time still, and even with the hope of vaccine rollout campus morale is low, with pandemic-fatigue and many still skeptical of the future. Thanked everyone for continuing to partake in campus opportunities such as these meetings, which demonstrates a strong commitment to the university.

### **Agenda topic # 3 – Budget scenarios for 2021-2022**

(see slides 7-59)

- **Jeff Wilson** prefaced his presentation by offering to share links to Budget Transparency Resources locally, and at the CSU (to be shared on the UBC webpage):
  - SF State's Budget Administration and Operations Office: <https://budget.sfsu.edu/>
  - University Budget Committee: <https://adminfin.sfsu.edu/ubc>
  - CSU's Transparency and Accountability portal <https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/transparencyaccountability/Pages/default.aspx>
- Referring to a question asked by Sandee Noda at the last meeting about a comment from Chancellor Castro stating "... no layoffs of permanent employees" and what that may have meant, responded that although he could not speak to what may have been implied it would all have to be negotiated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement process (with the unions).
- **Jeff Wilson** began his presentation as follows:
- Showed a summary of budget scenarios (on slide 9) as "Best Case, Medium Case" and Worst Case", estimated because the pandemic has affected ability to rely on historical information.
  - Budget planning review
    - Brings the process of budget planning to UBC. In the past: submitted as completed. Now: the UBC will review the budgeting process as it happens.
  - Scenario planning
    - Showed the planning framework; currently in the Scenario planning stage. Today's Action item will be to recommend scenarios to the President to give direction to divisions to begin budget planning.
    - VPs will present their tentative budget plans to the UBC beginning March.
    - Shared definitions of terms he uses (on slide 15 and 16) for greater understanding: "Real Work", "Build Budgets" and "Tentative Budget Plans"
    - Future meetings will lead discussion re: the Governor's revised budget to the enacted budget, due on June 30<sup>th</sup>
    - Phases 1 – 3 of scenario planning reviewed, including resources (revenue) and expenditures (costs) and who manages which process.
- **Jerry Shapiro** inquired about enrollment, and where plans to increase enrollment work into these Best, Medium and Worst Case scenarios – for both undergrad and grad students.
- **President Mahoney** confirmed there is a dedicated commitment to addressing enrollment and growing programs that serve the community and the region. However, with the pandemic, it will not be fast and may take years to return to 100% to where it was before or better. For Fall, there are also issues bringing everyone back to campus, including students. These scenarios build budgets based on what there is now, and will help identify opportunities for growth in both graduate and undergraduate programs. Both short term and long range plans are being developed.
- **Jerry Shapiro** expressed he was surprised by the hopeful Spring enrollment data, which may help reduce some costs. CEL/Open University have been offering new programs and there may be opportunities for grad programs to utilize them. Asked where growth might be factored in, for example, for providing SF State program incentives to Bay Area unions, demonstrating a benefit to the community.
- **Katie Lynch** responded having been at SF State only a month, has seen incredible resilience in considering how enrollment can grow. Agreed with President Mahoney that pandemic-related declines will likely last a few years, while efforts to build innovative programs to attract students from non-traditional pipelines are being made, rather than using historically relied-upon methods. Focusing even more effort on retention of current students is important so as not to lose them also, as costs spent recruiting will also have been wasted.

- **Darlene Yee-Melichar** inquired as to how new funding opportunities from AB85, based on the 2020 budget act, may benefit the CSU and perhaps this campus. Examples are funds for Project Rebound, rapid-rehousing efforts assisting students experiencing housing insecurity, and summer financial aid to eligible California students. Asked what will the CSU distribution to each campus be like.
- **Elena Stoian** replied that this funding has been part of past funding (noted its decrease in recent years) and each campus's Project Rebound and Financial Aid offices have to submit requests for it. These are one-time funds, supplemental to the base funding the campus receives.
- **Jeff Wilson** continued reviewing:
  - Resource scenarios:
    - Showed the various resources the campus derives revenue from, and the possible scenarios that impact those factors by the pandemic, which will affect campus revenue.
  - Expenditure scenarios:
    - Showed anticipated revenue based on the Governor's January proposal, which does not include mandatory costs funding, and he has not received indication yet if any might be attached to the funding. Information may be provided in April, so planning is based only on what's known so far, with mandatory costs, based on the February revision. Created \$0, 5% and 10% scenarios to add flexibility, as even if received funds are received they may be earmarked/restricted for specific purposes.
    - Showed slides considering contingency planning and use of HEERF II and other funds
  - Scenario recommendations:
    - Phase 1: Bringing revenue and cost considerations together, showed three scenarios based on Best, Medium and Worst Cases, and noted they are based on no changes at unit or Cabinet division levels. As the budget process gets underway at these different levels, there may be changes. Any surplus will be allocated in support of the university's mission, and similarly, planning strategy around any deficit.
- **Teddy Albiniak** asked for clarification of the contingencies that assumptions are made based on the proposed budgets standing and the CO makes no changes to distribution at the CSU level, based on enrollment. Also asked if cost-savings from the hiring chill and lay-offs were factored in.
- **Jeff Wilson** confirmed both assumptions, and cost-savings from layoffs and non-retentions are factored in.
- **Gitanjali Shahani** asked to further clarify that a scenario for reduced CO funding based on missing our enrollment target (due to the pandemic) and its reduction of funds, is not one of the proposed scenarios.
- **Jeff Wilson** confirmed it's not one of the scenarios; they used Best, Good and Medium Case scenarios, and the worst case of a 12% reduction = approx. \$60M reduction in tuition revenue, was not used. (see slides 35).
- Continued:
  - Phase 2: Contingency-planning (slide 47), funds received to date, with restrictions and adopting framework for allocation of HEERF II funds, and whether any additional funding may be received with President Biden's administration.
  - Reminded everyone that one huge contingency is that Federal funds are one-time funds.
  - Phase 3: based on scenarios presented, unit level planning may result in a surplus or deficit, and deficit-planning includes use of reserves. Both the original plan, and forecasted after the adjustment due to layoffs and non-retentions, required use of reserve funds.
  - Showed a summary of the three choices for the resource and cost scenarios.
- Discussion:

- **Jerry Shapiro** gave gratitude for the use of reserves in covering the deficit, and asked what tuition revenue the campus gains for every additional student enrolled, particularly with CEL/Open University. Also asked about the cost of replacing employees who left campus in addition to those laid off and cost of rehiring. Lastly, asked about the cost of restructuring the operational infrastructure, not only to cover emergencies but to restore organization integrity and morale.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied to his student revenue question, gave an example of a 1% change in enrollment is worth approx. \$1.5M in revenue. If it's an increase in enrollment, revenue is additional, but similarly, it's lost if it's a decrease in enrollment.
- **Elena Stoian** clarified that it's difficult to find a cost per-student because there are so many variables to the data, such as waivers and university grants. For CEL/Open University, it shows in the line items for the colleges as cost-recovery. Dean Hwu shared with her that Open University generates approx. \$122 per unit.
- **Jeff Wilson** responded to his questions about the pain of the workforce reductions, which was felt across all divisions, and that's why numbers shared were noted as *before* any changes are made in the divisions in the budget process, realizing that in a surplus situation, some critical staffing needs may be addressed.
- **Evrin Ozer** added it's important not to underestimate the employee morale and engagement from the workforce reductions. Also asked about the \$8M (noted in slide 52) and since it's to be used, why plan for a worst-case scenario when those funds may be available.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied the scenario planning does not use the \$8M, unless it becomes necessary in the Worst Case scenario where we face a deficit. Then, that decision may be need to be made.
- **Genie Stowers** noted grad programs generate more revenue, but have higher costs to teach. It may be useful for the Provost's Budget Advisory Council, who worked on the marginal cost of instruction, to share data for grad and undergrad, in the future.
- **Jerry Shapiro** added there may advantages to growing grad program capacity for short-term enrollment increases, noting applicant wait lists such as in his program, and in counseling where they're about to send out 500 denial letters. Biology also has growing over-enrollment. It may be beneficial to keep those students who are applying while long-term, balanced enrollment solutions are planned. Is glad the Provost is establishing a council where discussions about putting these pieces together are happening, and hopes there can be direct involvement from the Senate, UBC, or UBC Steering Committee in reviewing potential short-term solutions to budget shortfalls.
- **Jeff Wilson** closed the presentation requesting an action item: to recommend scenarios to the President for the initial budget planning process.
- **Teddy Albiniak** asked for clarification of the request.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied they are to recommend one, two or all three scenarios.
- **Andrew Ichimura** inquired as to the potential change the Legislature might offer in the May revise, and if that was a strong possibility that would affect the recommendation being requested.
- **Jeff Wilson** explained they cannot wait until May to begin planning and it's important to choose a tentative scenario now to plan with, which can be adjusted later as info is received. Also because members of the UBC may have limited availability over summer, and the difficult work of decision-making has to be done now.
- **Jeff Wilson** recommended, as a voting member of the committee, to move the scenarios to the President.
- **Dylan Mooney** commented that recommending less than all three scenarios, the whole picture may not be seen, noting the Worst case scenario notes the possibility of a deficit.
  - **Teddy Albiniak** observed that if the base budget assumption does not include any cost-savings from the layoffs, there should be a caveat added that this is an operating assumption that may affect the budget

planning in different ways than presented. Agreed with Dylan and recommended all three scenarios be sent to the President.

- **Jeff Wilson** explained the scenarios *did* take the layoff and non-retention cost-savings into consideration.
- **Kathleen Mortier** agreed that if all three scenarios are recommended with all the given variables, then she also recommends sending all three.
- **Jeff Wilson** commented after reading some items in the Chat (included at end of this document) about the implications of sending all three scenarios to the President, then they can begin planning using these scenarios, nothing they may change as information becomes available.
- **Michael Goldman** noted the difference between the best case and worst case scenarios is small, and asked about similar scenarios from prior years.
- **Elena Stoian** responded the largest variable of past scenarios is enrollment, when last year they did not have updated data until July so they planned for a worst case scenario. The other unknown is the CSU allocation, and how much will arrive earmarked for specific use. These are large variables, despite differences in the three scenarios being small. There's never been a crisis like this, so there's no historical data to refer to.
- **Andrew Ichimura** asked Jeff is he knew the source of the recent announcement for the restoration of funds from the Governor; if based on economic data or state projections.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied he did not know of the politics behind it, but it seems the effects of the pandemic on the economy did not materialize the way it was predicted it might. Tax revenues positioned the state to be in a better-than-expected position, to be able to fund things like the CSU and help it recover from the pandemic.
- **Genie Stowers** supported Jeff's motion to send all three scenarios to the President. Commented there's not much difference in the bottom line of all three, but noted two place the university in a surplus position and one in a deficit, which is entirely possible, and offers balance.
- **Mary Menees** asked if proposing all three scenarios, what the VPs planning scenarios might look like.
- **Jeff Wilson** responded that by supporting all three scenarios for the VPs and their units, their budget officials would build their budgets using all three scenarios, as some will have a known upcoming expenses while others may not. The small differences in the scenarios will help them plan for that.
- **Jeff Wilson** asked voting members to vote to recommend all three scenarios to the President.
- (Voting members used Zoom "reactions" to vote. As it was difficult to track votes this way, votes were unclear).
- **Genie Stowers** raised a point of order to clarify the votes, for transparency purposes.
- **Jeff Wilson** asked voting members to Raise Hands for Yes, No and Abstentions.
- With 20 voting members present, quorum is 50% plus one = 11. There were 18 votes in favor of recommending all three policies to the President, 1 No: Ozer, and 1 Abstention: Dunham.

#### **Agenda topic # 4 – Reserves, Carryforwards, and Fund Balances policy (First Reading)**

(see slides 60-86)

- **Jeff Wilson** introduced his presentation of this first-reading of the proposed policy as follows:
  - 1. Introduction
    - Thanked the UBC Policy workgroup for starting this work over a year ago, then pausing and continuing over 2020 in reviewing and comparing policies from other CSUs.
  - 2. Policy Objective
    - Noted two major objectives of the new draft policy; to comply with CSU policy, and to provide a framework/guidance for campus units to manage/record/report balances, reserves and carryforwards.
  - 3. Background

- Definitions and context: Designated balances and reserves, Carryforwards, Fund balances
- 4. Policy Statement
  - Campus approach – (showed percentages 1%- 3%)
- **Andrew Ichimura** acknowledged (as a member of the Policy workgroup) he supported a 2% unit-level carryforward for unanticipated costs such as repair/maintenance, sharing an example of COSE that may be more equipment or facility-intensive, such as the industrial design arts, etc. Advocated for at least 2%, then 3%.
- **Jennifer Summit** commented those should be anticipated expenses, and reflected in their budget.
- **Andrew Ichimura** added that older equipment also tends to break and that can be unanticipated; in times of budget shortfall when those funds may need to be relied upon.
- **Michael Goldman** agreed the percentages seem small; if the university should have a 10 % reserve, proposed the carryforwards might also be limited to 10%. If units cannot hold monies they do not spend in that year, then they might perceive a “spend it or lose it” approach and may treat the funds less responsibly, than holding and spending less for the current year (to use when they need them). Asked if there was an intermediate percentage that rewarded units for spending wisely, which may be more beneficial.
- **Jeff Wilson** responded that leaving 10% of a budget unspent is inefficient, as there may be other units unable to fulfill their mission to students due to lack of resources. Conveyed the money would not be going anywhere and will still be at the university, but taking care of the university’s overall needs by adding that flexibility of funding.
- **Genie Stowers** noting in the draft policy that anything over these proposed levels would go to the VP area, and commented that for nearly a year, discussions centered around *not* having carryforwards. Was surprised by these provisions for carryforwards, citing them as one of the reasons for the Academic Affairs structural deficit. Strongly supports the needs for reserves, but carryforwards are not reserves.
- **Jeff Wilson** thanked her for the statement that carryforwards are not reserves, and explained that leaving up to 4% at the division level provides transparency and accountability. Carryforwards indicate budget inefficiency, pointing to possible over-budgeting in a unit, but by implementing a policy that requires transparency and accountability, they will be better able to manage them in a way that does not result in future problems.
- **Genie Stowers** maintained that transparency seems limited at the college-level, referring to a slide she saw last summer that has not been shown again. Emphasized that for transparency, the policy needs to include what information needs to appear and for how long.
- **Andrew Ichimura** agreed with Genie’s concern and requested clarification about reserves being held at the university level and units, and the potential needs of colleges needing a “cushion”, to serve their mission.
- **Jeff Wilson** reiterated reserves are built at the university-level, not at the college level. Carryforwards attempt to allow colleges and units to save up to 4% for specific, targeted programs/objectives, not for a general “cushion”.
- **Darlene Yee-Melichar** supported concerns re: budget transparency and requested evidence-based data re: college carryforwards, in order to understand the 1%-3% model. Seeing carryforwards trending history from the different colleges. Also, for those colleges that don’t spend their carryforwards and have funds swept into reserves, asked to see how those reserves are spent (redistributed among the colleges, other Cabinets, etc.)
- **Jennifer Summit** explained this is the first year at a distribution attempt for carryforwards. In the past, carryforwards were just reloaded back to the colleges, and when one college had greater need, they had to draw on their own resources. By pulling the funds back to the VP level means funds could be redistributed where needed. This year, most of the needs were operational or instructional costs, and they helped weather a difficult year better than in years without the redistribution.
- **Evrin Ozer** remarked she has also heard the “use it or lose it” approach to budgets at the end of the year, and asked what incentives departments have to spend funds more wisely, in terms consequences for the following year if they may have remaining funds at end of the current year.

- **Jeff Wilson** replied that the budget official responsible for that department has to review their practice and determine whether those funds would be better allocated to another area in the future. If there's a legitimate reason funds weren't spent, and funds should remain at their unit the following year, they need to understand why those funds were needed that year. Budgets are built in their departments by their budget officials, and this is part of the "heavy lift" that's required by those budget officials in each unit to look closely at their needs and those types of issues.
- **Kathleen Mortier** requested clarification that the percentages relate to the carryforwards from the General Fund, and IDC funds are not part of this.
- **Jeff Wilson** confirmed this, and it's referenced in the policy. Responding to Genie's question about reporting and transparency, asserted he will go back to the policy and ensure reports are available to the UBC. As this is in first reading, he will take the feedback given and welcomed any other feedback to the [ubc@sfsu.edu](mailto:ubc@sfsu.edu) email. Responding to Darlene's request for data, he will put something together for that, and reminded of the CSU transparency portal: <https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/transparency-accountability/financial-transparency-portal> where the reserves and designated balances are reported in charts and graphs.
- **Dylan Mooney** asked about the carryforward percentages with the issue of structural deficits; how are allocations made to the colleges, and do colleges intend to cover their expenses 100%? Additionally, if they carry an (up to) 4% carryforward, will their allocations be reduced by 4%?
- **Dwayne Banks** responded that budgets are built starting with the college's plan for the fiscal year. Currently they use carryforwards to supplement instruction, and moving forwards, they will seek a way to build a reserve, built into the budget planning process.
- **Jennifer Summit** reiterated the need to understand where reserves happen, and where carryforwards happen. Reserves are at the university-level, and when carryforwards happen at the Cabinet division level, they can address needs that come up in their units, and this gives them the flexibility to redistribute the funds where needed. They do not want to build significant amounts at either the college level or the division level.
- **Dwayne Banks** noted he used the words reserves and carryforwards interchangeably and clarified reserves are held centrally at the university level, and not the colleges. In the past, carryforwards were used to supplement equipment, maintenance and software needs, such as at COSE, that were unplanned, and now this will be built into their budget to plan for times of uncertainty. The most important part of the process is putting the planning prospective first, and then building the budget around that. That will provide more clarity as we move forward.
- **Jeff Wilson** (continued with the presentation):
  - Policy Statement
    - Campus Approach (showed examples of percentage situations)
    - Recording and reporting
  - 5. Policy Review
    - Every five years beginning on June 30, 2026 or as recommended.
  - 6. Discussion:
- **Jeff Wilson** noting discussions already had, continued to the Action request:
  - 7. Action item: as this policy is in first reading, and the March agenda nearly full, recommended a second reading at a future meeting date to adopt this policy.

#### **Agenda topic #5 – CARES funding**

(see slides 88)

- **Jeff Wilson** referenced the third and final amount from the original 2020 CARES Act, a section denoted for MSI (Minority Serving Institution) of \$2.2M, which has the least restrictions of funds received. CO advised to draw

down the funds, to request reimbursement from the Federal Government. Has to be done by the end of March or April, when they expire. As we missed the \$9.1M deficit target in the layoff process, which reduced it to \$4.9M, these \$2.2M funds will be used against that remaining deficit to offset general operating costs, rather than draw further from university reserves.

### Agenda topic # 6 – HEERF II funding framework

(see slides 89-93)

- **Jeff Wilson** presented the HEERF II framework: HEERF I was the CARES Act, and HEERF II is called the CRRSAA. Reviewed the details of requirements, limitations and restrictions of fund use. Asked Jay to speak to the framework, who is the contact for direction of this grant from the Dept. of Education.
- **Jay Orendorff** explained he is the PI (Principal Investigator) for this grant and is working with campus partners in meeting the requirements associated with this grant, one which is posting links to university quarterly reports (link: <https://dos.sfsu.edu/covid-19/csu-cares>). Next one will be uploaded next month.
- Like CARES, funds have to be spent on health & safety, faculty development, technology, housing (such as reimbursements to Housing for student refunds given last year), etc. Reports have to be publicly posted for one year from January 1<sup>st</sup>. Is asking Academic Affairs to provide info on where they see cost increases related to Covid-19, such as additional course sections for Fall, faculty replacement due to Covid leave, transitioning return to campus planning, etc. Other plans include Covid testing and PPE costs for the Fall, unknown yet for but costs estimates are underway.
- **Jeff Wilson** reminded this is a collective university-wide effort in planning for the Fall.
- **Jerry Shapiro** asked for clarification that the provisions of this act and fund distribution allows for funding to hire lecturers for additional sections.
- **Jay Orendorff** agreed but specified it has to be Covid-related, with documentation to support it. Is working with Dwayne's office and COSE to do some of that work. Asked him to work with Dwayne Banks to coordinate efforts.
- **Michael Goldman** suggested campus ventilation issues may be helped with these funds, towards making employees feel safer in returning to work.
- **Jay Orendorff** replied those discussions are already happening.
- **Teddy Albinia** asked if there was any information about proportional support; what percentages might go to student health vs. student housing, parking, etc., or if it will be released on a case-by-case basis.
- **Jay Orendorff** responded there are no percentages assigned and that's better, because formulaic budgeting takes the strategy out of it, when there's a need to be more flexible.

### Agenda topic # 7 – Steering Committee Report

(see slide 94-95)

- **Mary Menees** shared the UBC Steering Committee is working on efforts to create more budget transparency and budget literacy. Invited UBC members to attend the March 5<sup>th</sup> orientation, offered for the first time (via Zoom).
- **Genie Stowers** added the UBC created "office hours" (on Zoom) to help the campus community better understand the budget situation. Once a month during Spring on Fridays at 10:00am (March 19, April 16, May 21), it will be staffed by members of the Steering Committee for each constituency group, such as the one she'll be offering for faculty.
  - Also shared the new email address for UBC and the new Feedback button on the UBC webpage for any comments and feedback to the UBC <https://adminfin.sfsu.edu/ubc>.

### Public Forum



- **Jeff Wilson** opened the public forum.
- **Danny Paz Gabriner** referring to the Best, Medium and Worst Case scenarios for revenue, asked if the current Governor’s proposal was a Best Case scenario, so far. Also noting the revenue from tuition and fees in all three scenarios seems to be the Medium Case scenario, and they miss the university’s enrollment target by about 7%. Asked that with current efforts on increasing enrollment and retention, if that is considered the best outcome.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied that based on the information in hand, there’s a chance the full funding request from the Governor will not come through, so that’s why revenue is noted as is. As to the enrollment question, remains hopeful for enrollment to improve. However, for budget-planning, there has to be a base to rely on. If this changes, budget-planning will be updated.

**Meeting adjourned approximately 12:00pm**

- Next meeting: Thursday, March 18, 2021 from 1:00PM – 3:00PM

/nr-g

**NOTED COMMENTS AND LINKS FROM THE CHAT:**

09:13:22 From Edwin Critchlow to Everyone: [budget.sfsu.edu](http://budget.sfsu.edu)

09:13:35 From Edwin Critchlow to Everyone: [adminfin.sfsu.edu/ubc](http://adminfin.sfsu.edu/ubc)

09:14:34 From Edwin Critchlow to Everyone: Financial Transparency Portal

<https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/transparency-accountability/financial-transparency-portal>

09:14:38 From Member, Voting, Evrim Ozer to Everyone: I found these two that I think are full of good amount of specific information and learning materials about the budget #s and process: <https://budget.sfsu.edu/transparency-accountability-our-committments>

<https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/transparency-accountability>

09:14:43 From Member, Voting, Ian M Dunham (he/his), MBA, PHD to Everyone: Regarding vaccine appointments, educators are eligible to sign up, and there are appointments currently available at the Oakland Coliseum for this next week. Sign up here. <https://myturn.ca.gov/>

09:29:34 From Guest, Wei Ming Dariotis (she/her/hers) to Everyone: Our graduate program in AAS has seen a significant increase in enrollment.

09:30:09 From Guest Marie Drennan to Everyone: So has BECA’s M.A. program.

09:34:14 From Member, Voting, Ian M Dunham (he/his), MBA, PHD to Everyone : There is also an, albeit theoretical, assumption that enrollments may INCREASE when unemployment is high. The two are inversely correlated.

09:35:46 From Member, Voting, Ian M Dunham (he/his), MBA, PHD to Everyone: For example, MBA applications MAY increase. We must be careful not to be shortsighted and cut resources, for example by eliminating the downtown campus where MBA classes are taught.

09:35:52 From Guest, Alex Hwu to Everyone: CEL is actively working with academic colleges to support adult learners and professional in offering two online degree completions in Ethnic Studies and Criminal Justice starting Spring 2022.

09:37:28 From Member, Voting, Darlene Yee-Melichar to Everyone: CA AB 85 – Budget Act of 2020

<https://legiscan.com/CA/text/AB85/2021>

SEC. 15.

Item 6610-001-0001 of Section 2.00 of the Budget Act of 2020 is amended to read:

6610-001-0001—For support of California State University ..... 3,723,360,000

Of the funds appropriated in this item, \$3,300,000 is provided to support Project Rebound.☺

Of the funds appropriated in this item, \$6,500,000 shall be available to support rapid rehousing efforts assisting homeless and housing insecure students. 😊

Of the funds appropriated in this item, \$6,000,000 shall be used by the California State University to provide summer-term financial aid to any student who is eligible for state financial aid and who is a California resident 😊

10:02:10 From Guest, Alex Hwu to Everyone: Each Open-U enrollment generates a \$122.45 (per unit) hearing back to academic college

10:03:14 From Guest, Alex Hwu to Everyone: That is equivalent to a 31% of revenue sharing

10:09:30 From Guest, Alex Hwu to Everyone: The total Open-U and Special Session revenue sharing from CEL is around 1M annually

10:10:26 From Member, Voting, Jennifer Summit to Everyone: @Genie and @Jerry, let's bring these questions about enrollment and instructional costs back to the steering committee as future agenda items for UBC

10:10:53 From Member, Voting, Genie Stowers (she/her) to Everyone: Yes I would like to see that data on our agenda in the future.

10:10:55 From Member, Voting, Jennifer Summit to Everyone: There is a Strategic Enrollment Management plan in preparation for broader consultation, @Jerry

10:11:51 From Guest, Carmen Domingo to Everyone: Indeed we have high demand in programs such as Biology, Computer Science, Psychology, and Engineering. Strategic investment to capture student demand is important.

10:13:23 From Guest, Cynthia Grutzik to Everyone: Strong enrollment in Graduate College of Education, too.

10:13:51 From Guest, Kasturi Ray to Everyone: Same in WGS MA program this year

10:15:06 From Member, Voting, Jennifer Summit to Everyone: Dean of the Grad Division Sophie Clavier is (or will be) working with departments in each of the colleges to develop plans for expanding their capacity for grad enrollments, where the demand is looking strong

10:47:23 From Guest, Wei Ming Dariotis (she/her/hers) to Everyone: To what extent are anti-racism, justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion being emphasized in our campus budget policy?

10:47:50 From Member, Voting, Ian M Dunham (he/his), MBA, PHD to Everyone: Good questions. Can you please clarify a question that I have. Initially, I support our University to maintain a prudent reserve policy. It seems like good policy. However, hypothetically, what does our voting on this policy entail in terms of the following hypothetical situation: The University finds itself in financial dire straights again in the future, but we are not able to dip into the reserves based on the policy as it is currently being proposed. Or, the policy is actually detrimental to some unforeseen stakeholders. Are there any such caveats that we should be aware of?

10:52:16 From Guest, Wei Ming Dariotis (she/her/hers) to Everyone: Re: unit-level needs and priorities, an example of a one-time or rare opportunity is a department hosting a conference that rotates among various regions. We know it is coming, but it is not part of our regular budget and we would like to be able to set aside \$\$ to support it.

10:54:28 From Guest, Carmen Domingo to Everyone: Funds in each account are reviewed with chairs on a regular basis. Carry forwards are important for dealing with problems such as equipment repair, which is constant given the aging resources.

10:55:34 From Member, Voting, Genie Stowers (she/her) to Everyone: is this true in every college? college practices vary widely on fiscal issues, as in other issues. We need requirements for transparency built into the policy.

10:55:37 From Guest, Jane Dewitt to Everyone: Would this result in a situation where a department would underspend 4% to create a carry forward cushion for the next year?

10:55:47 From Member, Voting, Ian M Dunham (he/his), MBA, PHD to Everyone: I'm still not completely clear. Does this vote entail transferring more fiscal decision making power to the central University leaders --or-- distribute power, allow flexibility, and provide contingencies for individual colleges?

10:56:12 From Member, Voting, Genie Stowers (she/her) to Everyone: this is first reading right now, so there should not be a vote today.

10:57:04 From Guest, Andrew Harris to Everyone: Also relevant for meeting multi-year expenses, where a facility or equipment expenditure covers multiple years, or planning for future one-time expenditures that cannot be managed in the base budget. It leads to the possibility of planning.

10:57:54 From Member, Voting, Jennifer Summit to Everyone: Andy, Jeff is coming to deans council on wednesday and we'll discuss this with him then. this isn't the place for advocacy

11:05:21 From Member, Voting, Ian M Dunham (he/his), MBA, PHD to Everyone: Thank you for your detailed presentation and proposal, Jeff.

11:07:26 From Member, Voting, Dylan Mooney to Everyone: Off topic - Just sharing: <https://hr.sfsu.edu/staff-symposium>

11:14:18 From Member, Voting, Genie Stowers (she/her) to Everyone: Also, to be clear, I think budget flexibility for managers is a good thing. The question that remains is, how to achieve it.

11:24:36 From Guest, Melissa Hagan (she/her) to Everyone: Guest question: The audit reports do not offer detailed information on spending. Were the \$9 million from HERFF to housing distributed directly to students as reimbursements or given to housing corp? If latter, isn't the housing corp eligible separately as an org for forgivable loans to deal with their loss of revenue? Shouldn't these funds go to instruction instead?

11:24:44 From Speaker, Jay Orendorff to Everyone: <https://dos.sfsu.edu/covid-19/csu-cares>

11:27:40 From Member, Voting, Jennifer Summit to Everyone: @Jerry, there's a planning process in Academic Affairs: you'll be hearing more about this shortly. We need to start by determining the fall 2021 schedule, which will be happening this April

11:31:46 From Member, Voting, Ian M Dunham (he/his), MBA, PHD to Everyone: I want to thank all of the presenters today. It has been an amazing experience to witness the campus shared governance process. These debates and decisions have very direct material impacts on our constituents, the students. Democracy is not easy, nor is transparency. However, I am sincerely inspired by all of your enthusiasm, diplomacy, and attention to detail during these unprecedented times. Thank you all.

11:35:48 From Member, Voting, Beth Hellwig (she/her/hers) to Everyone: We have a Strategic Enrollment Advisory Committee that has been working very hard to create a Strategic Enrollment Plan to address this important area.