University Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date:	Thursday, April 18, 2024, via Zoom
Voting Members Present:	Amy Sueyoshi, Robert Collins, Jennifer Daly, Deborah Elia, Iese Esera, Daniel Gabriner, Michael Goldman, Mari Hulick, Jeff Jackanicz, Crystal Kam, Gretchen LeBuhn, Mary Menees, Dylan Mooney, Jamillah Moore, Tiffany O'Shaughnessy, Irina Okhremtchouk, Shrey Patel, Eugene Sivadas, Genie Stowers, Venesia Thompson-Ramsay, Alaric Trousdale, Jeff Wilson
Non-voting members present:	Deborah Elia, Christine Hintermann, Chanda Jensen, John Kim, Katie Lynch, Cesar Mozo, Lynn Mahoney, Tammie Ridgell, David Schachman, Jamil Sheared, Elena Stoian, Venesia Thompson-Ramsay
Guest presenters:	n/a
Members Absent:	Emiliano Balistreri, Brad Erickson, Ashkan Forouhi, Tim Jenkins, David Miller Shevelev
Meeting coordination:	Nancy Ganner, Mariela Esquivel

Accompanying presentation can be found here: UBC Presentation April 18, 2024

~~~~~~

UBC co-chairs called the meeting to order at approximately 10:03 A.M.

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

- **Co-Chairs** welcomed committee members and guests.
- Agenda reviewed, guests reminded of the ways to contact UBC including Office Hours.

Agenda topic # 2 – Member roll call

- Quorum established.

Agenda topic # 3 – Approval of minutes from March 21, 2024 UBC meeting

- Minutes approved as submitted.

Agenda topic # 4 – President's Message

- President Mahoney acknowledged the 200+ attendees and noted it says a lot the campus to see so many attend these meetings regularly.
- Its still unknown until the May (budget) revise but it seems the "big 3" (Senate, Assembly and Governor) have agreed to the Governor's proposal, which would keep the CSU compact intact but with a risk: to defer it. As tax revenues were recently received, is hopeful this remains true and urged meeting attendees to support advocacy efforts: a document will be shared after the meeting by email for everyone to contact their legislators and speak the value of the CSU. Advocacy works, and the Chancellor is spending a lot of time in Sacramento doing that also.
- Universities across the country are also resizing and learning to do with less. Heard a term at ExCom recently about doing "less with less" – which is to be strategic about what should be done. Some things need to continue, and while others are very good they may not be affecting the primary mission of the university: to offer a high quality undergraduate and graduate education. Noted that 90% of SF State students are undergrads and that focus will bring hard questions about drawing any funds away from the core mission and having staff to support.
- In 2020 the discussion about RSO's was had, and UBC recommended, and she adopted, a policy **(link)** that moved research centers to be self-supporting. It isn't because the work isn't good, but the campus is not funded for it.

That's doing "less with less" to engage in the work needed over the next few years and to ask: while it may be very good and it's important to the campus, it may not be as important as offering students the number of sections needed to reach graduation and the staff needed to support those programs. SF State is leading the CSU in transparency and change, and is confident these goals can be met.

Agenda topic # 5 – AY 2024 – 2025 Budget Update

- **Jeff Wilson** restated President Mahoney's remarks about the Assembly, Senate, and Governor's offices agreeing on the Governor's proposal to defer the 2024-2025 CSU compact funding to 2025-2026. While there is risk associated with that, it's the best-case scenario right now in terms of funding for the CSU. The risk is that it will require the State to give twice the amount of funding next year, as the State confronts its deficit.
- The May revise will be out early May and info will be shared via email with members and meeting guests who regularly attend. A more robust discussion will be had at the May UBC meeting.
- No questions received.

Agenda topic # 6 – MBRAC Update

- **John Kim** presented an update following the February UBC presentation.
- Explained MBRAC (Academic Affairs Multi Year Budget Realignment Advisory Committee) focuses on doing a comprehensive survey of operating expenses (non-salary expenditures) and needs across Academic Affairs.
- (see slides)
- **Danny Paz Gabriner** asked if there will be additional budgeted expenditures for operating expenses, and if that would increase the deficit or need to be covered with one-time funding; how will results be incorporated into next year's budget.
- **John Kim** replied there is no additional money – the budget is relatively fixed, based on last year's allocation. Any additions (such as GSI) or reductions (such as permanent reductions) this year - those calculations don't include additional money for operating expenses. Operating expenses have to be funded out of the fixed pool of money. As an example for a source of (some) funding, he looked at the summer instruction budget from last year: actual expenditures vs. budgeted/allocated, and there was some money leftover so that will be used for operating expenses. This was its intended use and rather than labeling it as "summer instruction", it will now be labeled back into the budget as operating expenses. Is unsure how far that strategy can go, but the idea is to find ways to start building an operating expense budget within the operating budget for Academic Affairs.
- **Mari Hulick** asked about overlaps between operating expenses and instructional expenses.
- **John Kim** replied salaries are not instructional expenses. Instructional equipment needs can be expensive, such as in her program, and that's not uncommon across the university. Those would be categorized as operating expenses. That's exactly what they want to get their arms around: the details of the needs and the expenditures that have been made in recent history. Department may have a good idea of their expenses, but the rest of the college and a few levels up may not have that level of detail from all their departments. Travel expenses, equipment expenses, how those items are being used and why they're needed; some computers might be used for other things as well, so general categories don't answer those questions. That level of detail isn't understood that well so it's difficult to prioritize, and that's why the goal of MBRAC is to understand those details and if some things cannot get funded, what can happen. Anything that's not salary is considered an operating expense.
- No further questions received.

Agenda topic # 7 - Alternative Revenue Workgroup update

- **Jeff Wilson** remarked this workgroup is the result of a charge President Mahoney gave the UBC last year: to form a subcommittee with the task of creating framework for alternative revenue.

- (see slides)
- **Genie Stowers** referred to a tax measure one of the CSU's had last year that was unusual, which might serve as a resource: Fresno State University Tax Fails from the Fresno Bee, March 2024: ([link])
- **Tiffany O'Shaughnessy** asked the difference between sponsorship and philanthropy and how funding might go through this workgroup vs. through University Advancement.
- **Jeff Jackanicz** noted that a general distinction between philanthropy and sponsorship, among others, is the kind of sponsorship: the university might potentially talk with local companies or vendors to consider becoming an "official partner" of the university. As a result, after rigorous negotiations with him and relevant colleagues on campus, they would have the opportunity to market their services to the alumni database or by offering special deals to students, faculty and staff potentially with advertising or signage on campus public spaces. Those are highly transactional arrangements in which a company is getting something in return for affiliating.
- Philanthropy or grants to the university are for specific purposes, because they believe in the mission, and his team has done a wonderful job around philanthropy and there's more that can be done that they're working on. Sponsorships are not an area the university has historically tried for different reasons, but they're beginning to work on that. Also added, noting a question in the Chat re: a breakdown of how revenue would be distributed between college department levels, that it depends entirely on the nature of the sponsorship.
- **Katie Murphy** noted on the slides that Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) considerations are something the subcommittee would be assessing and asked if the university has guidelines or references for what are the sort of things it would or would not align with.
- **Jeff Wilson** explained that's something for the subcommittee to work on, to point to for reference, such as the investment policy of the University Foundation which they spent a long time developing which specifies the types of things that should be considered.
- No further questions received.

Agenda topic # 8 – Discussion: IDC policy workgroup update: 1st reading
- **Eugene Sivadas** introduced the members and presentation of the IDC (InDirect Cost recovery) workgroup, emphasizing this is the second iteration of its first reading and they are still happy to accept any comments/feedback. They'll offer the second and final reading at the May UBC meeting.
- Reminded he was part of the first workgroup which produced a [document explaining what IDC is] with comparisons with other universities and information. The goal is to propose a policy that will create more transparency.
- (see slides)
- **Genie Stowers** asked if the university budget situation played into the workgroup's policy considerations, and the level of different distributions such as requiring less distributions.
- **John Kim** replied the workgroup considered both increasing and decreasing the distribution to the colleges: increasing was not really possible as it would impinge upon fixed costs that are covered by IDC revenue, and might endanger the ability to fund those things if IDC was to decline. Discussions were had about reducing distribution to the colleges from about 25% to 20%, but that included the notion among some that research is not something really valued on the campus, and certainly not research that generates revenue from IDC grants. There was an overwhelming sense that reducing the rate of return to the colleges would reinforce that notion, so they decided not to change it. The workgroup can look at what can be better coordinated but the campus may not be ready for that right now without hurting morale. The policy will be reviewed in about three years.
- **Tiffany O'Shaughnessy** added about the morale: discussions included faculty bringing in these IDC funds and not knowing where it was all going, but the percentage coming back to the college is shared with their department and is needed for them to be able to do the grant work. Some things like grant assistants, paper... things that are expected to be covered and those that aren't university general expenses – they happen at the department and

the college level. The money does need to flow back that way so that folks can do the work - IDC is supposed to be reimbursing the university for so those expenses incurred across different levels, not just centrally.

- **Genie Stowers** thanked the workgroup for making sure that those points were covered, especially in this context, in this environment, as they needed to be addressed.
- **Ron Marzke** remarked its good to see some IDC policy developed and appreciated the changes since last meeting. Asked the workgroup about whether they might recommend departments/colleges have a policy about the amount returned to the PI (Principal Investigator) as incentive. It's not common in CoSE (only eight departments do that) and it seems to go against what's been discussed. Their view has been that directing money back to the PI is not the best use of those funds.
- **Eugene Sivadas** advised the workgroup can discuss this and suggested departments should have discussions about it, as they know their areas best and some may be resistant to change processes that have worked in the past. They did hear frustration during the faculty focus groups in their prior workgroup. SF State is an R2 university and there's no merit pay, and it does take a lot of work to do grants so at some level, incentivizing those who spend a lot of time generating grants may not be a bad idea in principle. Departments should discuss this, and should be open to looking at their existing policies to see what makes sense for them. Sometimes the amount of IDC generated may be so small that it may not make sense to carve out a small percentage of it. In other cases it may make a lot of sense, so it will be left to the department.
- **Cynthia Grutzik** agreed its good to see this work evolving as input is received. Asked if the proposed policy would affect carryforward IDC funds held at the college-level or what's been accrued in the departments.
- **Michael Scott** explained in the policy was at 10% and the workgroup elected to push it to 20%. ORSP gets IDC information from the fiscal year, and needs to wait for the fiscal year books to close and then corrections to be made, so they don't have a budget until end of September, and because of that the workgroup elected to move to a 20% carryforward.
- **Cynthia Grutzik** replied she understands that to mean all the college IDC funds -- whatever is at the college level and department level. Also asked for clarification on what the plans are for IDC funds returned to ORSP and if there's a clear plan for how those are to be used.
- **Michael Scott** clarified that funds go back to Academic Resources. IDC return is managed by them, not ORSP. He assumes that if money is returned it would go towards the reserve, and if there's excess it would follow the excess policy.
- **Cynthia Grutzik** remarked it would be helpful to have that spelled out, for the overall picture.
- **Tiffany O'Shaughnessy** added one of the workgroups conversations with CoSE was the worry about giant expenses coming up where they would need to save/carryforward IDC over multiple years that would exceed the 20%. The workgroup was clear that it's something that could happen, but it just needs to be explained.
- **Michael Scott** added a classic example of this is Earth & Climate Sciences needing a new van, and a van is $70,000. As they don't generate a lot of IDC, it may take 5 years to generate enough to buy their van, and every 10 years they need a new van.
- **Tiffany O'Shaughnessy** emphasized that would be fine – this is about transparency and knowing why a department might be growing IDC funds and not spending it.
- **Vance Vrendenburg** thanked for the transparency efforts and as a biology chair agrees things can be expensive, and hopes it won't be difficult to ask for exceptions as CoSE might need them every year. Asked about the recommendation for quarterly reporting and if that's realistic without extra staff support. Addressed PI incentives/getting money back: the PI's in his department are motivated by their scholarship and agrees leaving that to departments to determine makes sense. Lastly, stated that grant start-up packages in biology are very important to allow for lab repair for undergrad and graduate students to engage in successful research scholarship.

- **Eugene Sivadas** clarified the department and college-level reporting would be annual, as ORSP does quarterly review and reports. As to incentives, there's also another angle; when the PI brings in the grant they may need other support or more funding, so they can go to the Chair or the Dean and facilitate that from their own account, to keep the process moving. The policy leaves it to departments to discuss what works best for them.
- **Megumi Fuse** agreed that providing IDC funds to faculty is not an incentive and the amount of reporting may be disincentive to getting more IDC. Likes the idea of knowing where the money is going but doesn't understand the need for getting into the finer details of reporting each year. At one point she was at a place where she didn't want to write two grants at the same time due to the amount of paperwork, and this feels like the same sort of disincentive. Is happy for IDC to go to the departments so they take care of the faculty.
- **Eugene Sivadas** agreed the department can do what they decide is best for them as there are differences on opinion. With regard to the transparency and reporting, it's the responsibility of the department and the fiscal people who process it.
- **Michael Scott** added Crystal Kam (CBO for CoSE) has been involved in these discussions and is working on simplification for how best to report with minimal effort. Ideally, this should be something that could be pulled out quickly in 5 min. from the Data Warehouse.
- **Amy Sueyoshi** asked if this (reporting) is really the work of the College Business Officer. Some PI's maybe be nervous they'll have to do all the reporting.
- **Michael Scott** replied they're trying to figure out the easiest way to be transparent with minimal amount of work.
- **Tiffany O'Shaughnessy** remarked there is awareness this puts a burden on staff but as the President said about "doing less with less", it may take little time. Alot of researchers bringing in the grants do want a sense of where the money is going. The workgroup is trying to find the least intensive way to increase transparency, so everyone involved knows where it's going and it doesn't just disappear with no sense of where it all went.
- **Kwok Siong Teh** added to his colleagues point that a lot of what the PI gets out of a grant could be written into the direct cost portion of it, and the IDC comes back to the institution. The principle of transparency is great but, in this era, as President Mahoney was saying it's not about "doing more with less". Staff morale is pretty low and it's a lot of work that needs to be thought about. As a Chair, keeping track of all the expenses and reporting without having a lot of support to begin with could be challenging.
- **Eugene Sivadas** commented this is a double-edged sword; if the numbers aren't reported, there's no transparency and when there's no transparency, there are conspiracy theories. Its best to create a structure where reporting is done in broad categories, so everyone knows what it's spent on. The workgroup wants to minimize the burden on staff, but there will be some with any reporting. A lot of it can be pulled out of Data Warehouse so encouraged all to consider these efforts, and thanked for the added input.
- **Michael Scott** added that 80% of the IDC resides in CoSE and that's why the CBO was consulted, to figure out how easy this will be to do for the other colleges. Crystal will work out a way to minimize the workload for everyone involved. The idea is to have broad categories where the money went – its not to list every single detail. Believes this can be done at the college level with minimal effort.
- **Arno Puder** asked if there are the same kind of transparency for endowments. Also asked about a slide on IDC generation for all the colleges (then acknowledged Michael Scott posted one to the Chat (link).
- **Eugene Sivadas** replied their task was specific to IDC transparency and could not comment to that.
- **Megumi Fuse** asked about the 20% of IDC going to ORSP and why that would go over.
- **Michael Scott** responded ORSP needs to create a reserve. Every year ORSP begins the year $4.5M in the negative, which is then filled by IDC as it comes in. Costs vary from year-to-year and there can be times when a charge comes in that needs to be paid, such as a $20K CalPERS charge from 20 years ago and the grant no longer exists. Thats one reason they need a reserve available to cover those kinds of unexpected costs.
- **Megumi Fuse** asked why not just cap it at 20% and what happens if it goes over 20%.
- **Michael Scott** explained they keep the 20% and if there's extra, they figure out what to do with it.

- **John Kim** added this draft policy has been in 1st reading for two UBC meetings and the workgroup is following the process where policies are reviewed and approved at Senate. If there are major suggestions that could be incorporated into the proposed policy, asked them to be sent to Dean Sivadas before it comes back to UBC for final reading, so UBC can vote on it.
- No further questions received.

Agenda topic # 9 - Academic Affairs Budgeting Process
- **John Kim** remarked this topic request came to UBC via Office Hours, similar to the IDC policy requests. This presentation is about how allocations of budgets are made to the colleges and other academic affairs units. Commented if the question was what happens in each college once the budgets are allocated, things within the colleges and units are very different so it's best to ask them directly.
- (see slides).
- Concluded his office is working with the colleges on the salary rosters for the budget planning process in order to see where we they are. By the end of next week after meetings with the colleges he should be able to finish the first snapshot of the budget plan for Academic Affairs.
- **Mary Menees** asked about the mention of finding the shortfall.
- **John Kim** replied rosters have been worked on and reviewed by the colleges and his office. Discussions will be had with all Academic Affairs units for developing a plan to reduce the cost of staff staffing by reorganizing, with an eye towards making a reduction of a certain size as part of the third-year reduction goal. In the original "glide path", the third-year reduction goal was $3M.

- **Agenda topic # 10 – Public Forum**
- **Danny Paz Gabriner** noted FTES goals are made in January and they follow the previous year's performance, and asked when that information might be updated and evaluated to possibly change section counts.
- **John Kim** responded if they were optimistic that more students were coming in Fall than anticipated, then presumably revenue would not be down as much as it is and more classes for first-time-freshmen may be needed. The campus would be obliged to offer classes to meet the demand. If there are fewer students than is being projected, the lesson learned this Spring is by being careful, so the campus doesn't run the risk of having huge numbers of sections that are under-enrolled.
- **Sutee Sujitparapitaya** added the targets are updated regularly. Targets can't be exactly predicted, but using past numbers means it likely wouldn't change much. Targets are to provide a guideline and are monitored on a daily basis to see if enrollment moves upwards beyond a certain target. If so, they will work with the college department to offer additional classes. Targets are not set in stone and are subject to change.
- **Mary Menees** commented she understands the re: the instructional budget, but if the goal is to reduce staff, asked what will happen to their workload. The President remarked on the need to "do less with less" because there are fewer resources. Asked what principles will guide the changes and redistribution of staff and workload, and what things will stop being done.
- **John Kim** replied he doesn't have the answer, but believes parts will be reflected in the reorganizational plans for staffing that the colleges are working on. It's a work-in-progress.
- **Amy Sueyoshi** added they are trying to reduce duplication of services - that's one thing that we're explicitly trying to address. They need input from the campus overall, to hear and think about what things absolutely need to continue to do and what can stop being done.
- **Katie Murphy** asked, given the realignment of staff work, if there plans to develop committee where staff can advise. When the campus faced layoffs in 2020, her college created a workload committee because they were so impacted by the layoffs. It was something really generative which improved processes ongoing within the college, and suggested it would be good to do that again. She believes it also raised morale, in a sense, for at least the

- people on the committee, which was comprised largely of staff like AOC's and department chairs. It would be good to have a body like that preparing for the third year.
- **John Kim** agreed it's a great idea. He has a few more meetings coming up with non-college units, college offices and deans and will raise the question there, as it could be useful.
- **Deborah Curtis** asked about the second 5% GSI for faculty being contingent on the State having the same allocation in the budget for this year as it did for last year, and wondered how the decision will be made and how that would affect this planning.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied they are planning now to include the 5% GSI in the 2024-2025 budget which will add to the deficit, since it's not fully funded by the State. However, it was negotiated if the campus funding remains the same or increases for 2024-2025, so they would honor the 5% increase.
- **Chanda Jensen** suggested thinking about how to create more efficiencies in processes across campus. It's in the works now with event planning and procurement, but there are others that can be streamlined such as Human Resources processes, student hiring, etc. Everyone across campus is doing things differently in so many different ways, and streamlining to a more uniform process reduces emails, time and the number of people handling these same processes.
- **Ingrid Williams** added that Human Resources will be involved in the processes and plans on meeting with the different divisions down to the Dean level, because she knows there are inefficiencies. They'll work through some of those issues with the different departments.
- **Ingrid Williams** also responded to Burcu Ellis's Chat question asking if there will be a second round of VSIP by stating she has a significant number of applications that will be reviewed by April 30th to determine if they might need to extend it. However, cannot guarantee it at this point as more applications are being received that might meet the goal of $3.5M
- No further questions received.

Co-Chair adjourned the meeting approximately 12:13 PM
- Next meeting: Thursday, May 16, 2024 from 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM via Zoom

-end (nrg)

From the Chat:
09:54:43 From Member Iese Esera, ASI Chair to Everyone: Good morning!
10:13:36 From co-chair Amy Sueyoshi to Everyone: Just a heads up- President Mahoney is not feeling well today but powering through!
10:40:50 From Member Elena Stoian to Everyone: Bond is one-time not ongoing source of revenues.
10:41:17 From Burcu Ellis to Everyone: Thank you for providing a useful framework!
10:43:04 From Burcu Ellis to Everyone: Is there a break-down of how how revenue would be distributed between University/College/Department levels?
10:43:30 From Guest Ifeoma Kiddoe Nwankwo to Everyone: One of my alma maters, Duke U, does this kind of thing very successfully
10:44:33 From Burcu Ellis to Everyone: Thank you, Jeff!
10:48:05 From Nancy Ganner to Everyone: we'll restart at 10:51am
10:49:08 From Maricel G. Santos to Everyone: I would like to request the sharing of successful sponsorships, as well as examples of inappropriate/unsuccessful ones. This would help depts think creatively and critically about potentially opportunities.

10:53:32 From Member, Tiffany O'Shaughnessy, PhD (she/her) to Everyone: Not a question, just a thought I had during the break. I really appreciate the work of the MBRAC committee, and I'm sad to think that we need corporate sponsorships to fund the fundamental work of a public school -- really highlights the underfunding of public education in the nation.

10:53:55 From Nancy Ganner to Everyone: the document can be found on the UBC website, next to the March meeting

10:57:25 From Member Danny Paz Gabriner to Everyone: Replying to "Not a question, just..." Corporate sponsorship or alternatively, increasing enrollment. State Allocation has increased from $180M to $233M in the last 4 years, while tuition declined from $176M to $157M

10:57:38 From Member Jeff Jackanicz to Everyone: @Maricel - successful sponsorships include naming an athletics facility after a company (like SJSU's basketball arena named after a credit union in exchange for $ from the company, though they are Division I and have a state of the art facility with significant seating capacity) or providing Coke or Pepsi "pouring rights" (e.g., exclusivity) across all outlets on campus (this was attempted at SFSU years ago and proved too controversial to move forward with). We're trying to look for some other options to explore. I think the other alternative revenue sources are as - if not more - important than sponsorships though in terms of amount of $. Happy to discuss sponsorships further offline.

10:59:41 From Member - Jennifer Daly to Everyone: Jeff Wilson mentioned "commercialization of assets" as part of his presentation. Would that be things such as corporate naming of buildings? e.g. SJSU's arena?

11:02:02 From Member Genie Stowers (she/her) on Bay Miwok lands to Everyone: Sorry, it was not a bond measure but another tax measure-- in Fresno for the use of Fresno State and it failed. "Fresno State University Tax Fails. Fresno County voters rejected Measure E, a 0.25 percent transactions and use tax to fund academic initiatives at the California State University's Fresno campus. The tax, estimated to cost residents $63 million annually, received support from 43.8 percent of the electorate. If Measure E had been approved, Fresno would have been the first county to create a dedicated local funding source for a California State University campus. State universities currently are funded by state dollars, student tuition, and donations from benefactors.

11:02:36 From Member Jeff Jackanicz to Everyone: I think of that as making a building available for rentals or parallel uses on a revenue generating basis, not so much corporate namings. And to clarify, I personally would never consider corp names for any academic buildings (unless suddenly Genentech offered us $50M for the new science building - then I'd want to have a conversation).

11:03:06 From Maricel G. Santos to Everyone: Replying to "@Maricel - successfu..." Thanks. Hope you dog is ok

11:03:07 From Member: Irina Okhremtchouk to Everyone: Replying to "Sorry, it was not a ..." Parcel tax?

11:03:45 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone: I "think" commercialization of assets would be something like making money on a patent and/or IP or renting out a service.

11:03:46 From Member Genie Stowers (she/her) on Bay Miwok lands to Everyone: Replying to "Sorry, it was not a ..." No, transactions and use tax

11:04:24 From Member Genie Stowers (she/her) on Bay Miwok lands to Everyone: Source of my comment above: https://caltax.org/voters-approved-38-of-79-local-tax-and-bond-measures-with-another-21-still-too-close-to-call/

11:04:36 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone: Replying to "I "think" commercial..." oops, comments coming in fast. Didn't see the response before I hit submit.

11:05:17 From Arno Puder to Everyone: I tell faculty that IDC is like a tax, no one wants to pay, but it helps the greater good. If faculty need something for their project, they should include it as a line item in their budget proposal to the funding agency.

11:05:17 From Michael Scott, Guest to Everyone: Last 4 years of IDC distribution data is available here https://research.sfsu.edu/annual-facilities-administrative-report

11:05:31 From Member non voting, Christine Hintermann to Everyone: Replying to "I think of that as m..." Everything has a price. Money for sure talks.

11:05:52 From Member: Irina Okhremtchouk to Everyone: Replying to "Last 4 years of IDC ..." Thank you!

11:07:25 From Megumi Fuse (she/her) to Everyone: Is the 10% carry forward on top of the 20% allowable carryforward?

11:08:25 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone: I sent my feedback to the group already.

11:10:05 From Member - Jennifer Daly to Everyone: Replying to "I think of that as m..." Thanks for the clarification!

11:13:46 From Kwok Siong Teh to Everyone: Just wondering, is the IDC Committee also recommending additional staffing to support all the transactions related to the necessary record keeping, transactions, and reporting? This is especially challenging for colleges that generate a lot of IDCs. Also, it would be good to show a slide on how much IDC each college generates so that we have a comparison of the additional amount of work that each college has to shoulder from just dealing with record keeping, processing IDC expenditures, and reporting, for the purpose of transparency. I will take the answer offline. Thanks.

11:16:35 From Michael Scott, Guest to Everyone: IDC by college for several years

11:16:58 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone: I read that section to be a recommendation/suggestion, but not a policy mandate (so it would still be up to the department to decide).

11:20:09 From Cynthia Grutzik, Guest (she/her/hers) to Everyone: Yes, and also grants have different time frames - some extend for 5+ years.

11:23:26 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) Member to Everyone: @ Vance, this is a really important point.Thank you for making it.

11:24:00 From Michael Scott, Guest to Everyone: Please note; start-up packages are a basic recruiting cost. Without it, we can't hire faculty

11:24:26 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone: Do we know what startup packages at comparable institutions look like?

11:24:43 From Member, Tiffany O'Shaughnessy, PhD (she/her) to Everyone: Yes, we need solid faculty start up packages across the university.

11:28:00 From Nancy Ganner to Everyone: Today's slideshow will be posted to the UBC website after the meeting

11:31:11 From Arno Puder to Everyone: Are there plans to create the same kind of transparency for endowments?

11:31:16 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone: Transparency also creates the ability to increase efficiency & savings.

11:31:18 From Vance Vredenburg Chair Dept Biology to Everyone: Transparency is very good!

11:33:19 From Michael Scott, Guest to Everyone: The PDF I shared has detailed IDC by college and a breakdown of percentages

11:36:08 From Nancy Ganner to Everyone: if anyone has questions/comments on this draft policy please email ubc@sfsu.edu and I'll forward to the workgroup for consideration

11:37:33 From Member Eugene Sivadas to Everyone: Thank you everyone

11:38:34 From Member, Tiffany O'Shaughnessy, PhD (she/her) to Everyone: Thank you, @Member Eugene Sivadas for chairing and presenting the work! Much appreciated!

11:52:51 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) Member to Everyone: Has each college been given one these charts?

11:53:43 From Nancy Ganner to Everyone: Everyone, this meeting may go past 12pm so we'll open the public forum right after this presentation - any questions/comments for this, or any other topics, can be offered during public forum. If you have to leave send me your item to read aloud or email them to ubc@sfsu.edu. Thank you for being here.

11:55:06 From Lori Beth Way to Everyone: @Member Mari Hulick (she/her) Member Yes, every college gets the targets for each area of GE, undergrad non-GE, and grad

11:57:47 From Sutee Sujitparapitaya to Everyone: This year FTES Targets were available for both Fall 2024 and Spring 2025.

11:58:15 From Member, Mary Menees to Everyone: Where will be find the shortfall?

11:58:33 From Member Genie Stowers (she/her) on Bay Miwok lands to Everyone: Will these slides also be made available to us?

11:59:18 From Burcu Ellis to Everyone: Sutee, is it possible to post the AY FTES targets somewhere? This is very helpful, thank you, John.

11:59:27 From co-chair Amy Sueyoshi to Everyone: Yes Genie! On the UBC website?

11:59:34 From Member Genie Stowers (she/her) on Bay Miwok lands to Everyone: Thanks…

12:00:57 From Sutee Sujitparapitaya to Everyone: @Burcu Ellis … Targets are available in the Daily Course Enrollment as soon as the enrollment begins.

12:01:07 From Member, Tiffany O'Shaughnessy, PhD (she/her) to Everyone: Apologies, I have another meeting starting now, so I have to run - see you all next month!

12:01:10 From Sutee Sujitparapitaya to Everyone: https://ir.sfsu.edu/course-data

12:02:30 From Lori Beth Way to Everyone: Applications are significantly down compared to last year.

12:04:06 From Member, Mary Menees to Everyone: If the goal is to reduce staff through attrition, what happens to there workload? We need to less with less overall. What will guide these changes and redistribution of staff?

12:04:37 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) Member to Everyone: Replying to "If the goal is to re…" Another excellent question.

12:04:42 From Chanda Jensen to Everyone: Great question Mary!

12:05:07 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone: Great question!

12:05:13 From Chanda Jensen to Everyone: Sorry to hear the news that student applications are down.

12:05:34 From Deborah Curtis, ELSIT to Everyone: What is the status of the 2024-25 5% GSI salary increase for faculty? I believe it is dependent on the State allocation. How does that fit in here?

12:05:39 From Lori Beth Way to Everyone: Yes, sorry to give that news. As the Provost says, though, people just didn't have babies . . .

12:05:53 From Sandee Noda to Everyone: And when will the staff become part of the discussion?

12:06:39 From Nancy Ganner to Everyone: Please attend staff or faculty office hours tomorrow - email ubc@sfsu.edu for the link

12:07:01 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone: We need a process/plan.

12:08:48 From Kendra Van Cleave (she,her) to Everyone: Replying to "We need a process/pl…"   Agreed, one thousand percent.

12:09:34 From Alesha Sohler (She/Her) to Everyone: Replying to "We need a process/pl…"   Yes, and one that includes staff in the planning process.

12:10:50 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone: This needs to be an organized process.

12:11:03 From Burcu Ellis to Everyone: Will there be a second round of VSIP next year?

12:12:21 From Katie Murphy to Everyone: Replying to "We need a process/pl…"   It's not enough to talk to deans.

12:12:29 From Member Mari Hulick (she/her) Member to Everyone: Bye everyone!