



University Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: Thursday, May 20, 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 Albiniak, SIC Chair Michael Goldman, ASCSU Vice Chair Darlene Yee-Melichar. Non-voting members present: Elena Stoian, Dwayne Banks, Katherine Lynch, Cesar Mozo, Mirel Tikkanen, Venesia Thompson-Ramsey, Tammie Ridgell, Deborah Elia, Jaime Haymond, Jamil Sheared, Sandee Noda, James Martel.

Members Absent: Lynn Mahoney, Carter Pauline Roa, Lark Winner, Amy Sueyoshi, 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 can be found here: [UBC Meeting Presentation May 20, 2021](#)

~~~~~  
UBC co-chairs called this meeting to order at approximately 10:00 A.M.

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

- **Jeff Wilson** and **Jennifer Summit** welcomed committee members and guests.
- **Jeff Wilson** reminded of UBC's May 21<sup>st</sup> Office Hour at 10:00am, the last of the semester, hosted by UBC staff, faculty and MPP UBC members (*see slide 3*)

### **Agenda topic # 1 – UBC member transitions**

(*see slide 5*)

- **Jennifer Summit** welcomed new members Dean Eugene Sivadas, Associated Students President and VP of Finance Joshua Ochoa and Nia Hall. New faculty members will be introduced next meeting after Steering Committee vote and President's appointment. Thanked all outgoing members.
- Reminded members they will receive a survey link re: HEERF funding proposals after meeting for their feedback.

### **Agenda topic # 2 – Approval of minutes from April 29, 2021 meeting**

- **Jeff Wilson** asked for changes to the meeting minutes. Hearing none, approved as submitted.

### **Agenda topic # 3 – Opening remarks**

- **Jeff Wilson** shared President Mahoney couldn't be present for today's meeting but would receive the recording.

### **Agenda topic # 4 – Transparency topic – topics raised at recent UBC Office Hours**

(*see slide 6*)

- **Jeff Wilson** shared two topics that came up at UBC Office Hours:

- Concerns about future layoffs: unable to say with certainty, but current budget situation of additional State funding, reinstatement of 2019 reduction and positive economic direction of the State takes layoffs for '21-'22 out of the picture. Not planned nor being considered.
- Chargebacks: a campuswide complex CSU budget-related topic and will bring it to Aug or Sept 2021 meeting.
- Thanked UBC members who hosted and campus community who attended.
- **Sandee Noda** clarified layoff terminology: layoffs refer to permanent staff only; temporary staff can be let go when contract ends or with two-week notice.
- **Gitanjali Shahani** requested clarification of Chargebacks
- **Jeff Wilson** explained Chargebacks are primarily services provided by campus units to other campus units. Ex: Facilities providing a service, and then the unit is "charged back" to cover the cost of that service.
- **Elena Stoian** further explained Chargebacks have two components: Direct and Indirect Costs (IDC). The Facilities example is a Direct cost. The cost allocation is recovery of an Indirect Cost. The Fall presentation will include the Executive Order for the CFO's Office that is responsible for this recovery as related to the General Fund unit spending or providing services to self-supports.
- **Genie Stowers** amplified the last Office Hours tomorrow as a way to ask these types of questions.
- **Dylan Mooney** added clarity to the Chargeback question as he helped host that session: the request was regarding the Chargeback system, its consistency, transparency and they're used, and overall, if necessary. But, it was also raised that some areas rely on them and if they go away, it might cut their services as well.
- **Mary Menees** added the larger issue is to/from General Fund accounts charging each other for services.
- **Jeff Wilson** thanked all for clarifications.
- (helpful list of references:)
  - EO 1000 <https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/9594654/latest/>;
  - the legal manual chapter 23 <https://csyou.calstate.edu/Divisions-Orgs/bus-fin/Financial-Services/sfsr/Pages/Legal-Accounting-Manual.aspx>,
  - ICSUAM policy number 3552.01 <https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/8543151/latest>

### **Agenda topic # 7 – FY 2021-2022 Budget Status**

*(see slides 7 - 19)*

- **Elena Stoian** introduced her presentation (slide 7-9) will focus on the impact from the May Governor's proposal, focused mostly on operating costs, not one-time costs, and the sequential '21-'22 budget planning status.
- Slide 10 shows the CSU request made from the original BOT of \$506M thru to the Governor's budget proposal
- First column shows the original allocation request \$506M
- Second column shows what the Governor proposal in January of \$145M
- Third column is the Governor's restoration of \$299M from the 2021 reductions
- Fourth column shows May's proposal and allocated funds in ongoing expenses with distributions for mandatory costs , specialized programs, restorations, equalizations (for campus that are over-enrolled, they'll receive an additional base) and GI 2025 and closing equity gaps
- Next slide shows the best-case scenario, one of the scenarios presented a few months back. This chart shows comparison of the '20-'21 base budget with the '21-'22 planning base budget. You'll see a 6% increase over '20-'21, since we did not balance the '20-'21 budget due to the remaining 12% deficit (after the layoffs), which means our expenses exceeded our resources. Also, you'll see a 2% increase in expenditures. However, in planning for the best-case scenario, we are \$2.4M in the positive (surplus), as our resources are better for '21-'22 compared to last year.

- Additional State funding of approx. \$14M is being discussed with the CSU.
- Next slides showed the SF State campus budget planning, including revenue from State allocation and Tuition/fees/other revenues, planning for 5.4% below target as per the “Best Case” scenario. Will monitor closely as enrollment numbers come in and will adjust as needed up until Aug. 15<sup>th</sup>, when the budget has to be submitted to the CO.
- Next slides showed additional allocations requested, to be received per the B-Memo. CO will advise.
- Next slides showed how the fund reduction restorations will be used, including the \$12M prior year deficit, the additional cost of bringing campus buildings back online for Fall repopulation and adjusting for property insurance increases.
- Next slide showed mandatory cost expenditure increases.
- Next slide showed an itemization of the \$2.4M surplus.
- Last slides show the budget update timeline and next steps (budget planning framework).
- **Darlene Yee-Melichar** requested details for two items listed on the Additional Allocations slide: in reference to Unit 8 Compensation, if other union negotiations have financial results, asked if that will also be allocated. Additionally, asked what the AB1460 cost was for.
- **Elena Stoian** replied the CO directed additional support funding for safety units on campus – a half-year in actuals and a full year in the planning budget. Funding for AB1460 will be allocated to the College of Ethnic Studies for the new program rollout, and is not certain what the allocation will cover yet.
- **Michael Goldman** asked about the first slide and if it represented SF State or the CSU.
- **Elena Stoian** clarified it was for the CSU, as each campus distribution was unknown until recently.
- **Mary Menees** asked about the BOT reduction for GI’25 and Closing Equity Gaps, which went from \$151M down to \$77.4M, and if there will be more funds coming for that.
- **Elena Stoian** responded the “closing equity gaps” includes other programming. Campus is receiving an additional \$14.9M and its possible some may go to GI’25 efforts.
- **Elena Stoian** emphasized this presentation focuses more on the CSU/CO, and establishing base budget assumptions on campus for ‘21-’22. In June, campus will receive the B-Memo with the CO’s allocation details.
- **Genie Stowers** asked what the strategic investments are.
- **Elena Stoian** shared they’re for the new Stockton campus and for the common learning management system.

#### **Agenda topic # 7 – HEERF Funds discussion**

*(see slides 20 - 32)*

- **Jay Orendorff** explained he was the Principal Investigator for HEERF I, before it was anticipated there would be additional tranches of funding. Has worked closed with Elena and Sylvia Piao (campus Controller) to draw down the funds accordingly. HEERF I is completed, with the quarterly reports on the websites:  
HEERF I (Cares Act): <https://dos.sfsu.edu/covid-19/csu-cares>  
HEERF II: <https://fiscaff.sfsu.edu/content/higher-education-emergency-relief-fund-ii-%E2%80%93-institutional-support-fund-o>
- Slide 21 shows CSU distribution, and slide 22 shows SF State distribution. Explained HEERF I and II have been distributed, but HEERF III institutional portions have not been received yet.
- Slide 23 shows the dates of distribution and institutional funds left to allocate, expiring within one year to use those funds – when notice is received of fund availability (“GAN” = Grant Adjustment Notice). Emphasized the great opportunities these funds give but stressed timeline for submitting requests is very strict, and also cautioned feds may pull funding back if things change.
- Slide 24 shows categories to simplify funding objectives.

- Slide 25-27 shows examples of projects received for funding, as things continue to change quickly.
- Slide 28 shows Budget Stability to address lost revenue and backfilling reserves to stretch funds further than a year.
- Slide 29 shows the categories given to the Cabinet VPs to request projects for funding, and shows the dollar amounts of the proposals received
- Slide 30 shows a conceptual view of how reserves can balance campus long-term needs and risk-avoidance (lowering risk exposure). With adequate reserves, risk can be mitigated for the short or long term, as issues for other emergencies or economy downturns can be better managed.
- Slide 31 shows the categories again and percentages for total submissions, using same percentages to distribute the actual funding of \$73.6M.
- Slide 32 shows considerations given its federal funding, highlighting funding management by project managers across campus who might already be overwhelmed, including audit risk for record-keeping as this process is very different from general fund management and other national concerns, such as supply shortages.
- Slide 33 shows links to the federal funding websites.
- **Teddy Albiniak** asked co-chairs if UBC will be reviewing HEERF distribution percentages, or actual proposals.
- **Jennifer Summit** responded the expectation is UBC will be reviewing the 60 proposals and identifying their priority recommendation. Asked Jay to clarify any changes since the proposals were offered, ex: PPE was a priority at the time but health guidelines have changed since.
- **Jay Orendorff** agreed the percentages could be used as a proportional guidepost.
- **Teddy Albiniak** recommended a discussion about percentages and how they align with campus mission and with actual need. Also recommended a discussion about transportation, as due to limited access of the M line and Bart, it has become a major issue. Asked which category this fit onto.
- **Jay Orendorff** confirmed it was included in Health & Safety.
- **Genie Stowers** asked since this is a Federal grant, if it includes IDC and at what level. Or, can it all be spent. Clarified is UBC members would be able to read the proposals.
- **Jay Orendorff** replied there is IDC that can applied to expenses, at a 25% rate. Looking into that - deferred to Jeff on how that could be utilized, and anticipated the proposals would be shared with UBC.
- **Kathleen Mortier** commented she had a few questions, including how the percentages came about as that would be useful. Asked if these funds can be used as reserves for financial security, and remarked ORSP has experience managing federal funds but recently lost staff, so wondered if staff can be hired to help manage this. Lastly, asked if there's a category for instruction and if release time was included, as support for students. They're expected to keep going and there's little time for more planning, as there was little time to plan when the pandemic happened suddenly.
- **Jay Orendorff** responded re: percentages, they were derived from the submissions received and consolidated into categories. Also confirmed the funds could be put into reserves once recaptured as lost revenue.
- **Jennifer Summit** responded ORSP did lose staff and those needs are being addressed, as HEERF funds are one-time, but ORSP manages ongoing funds. Confirmed that faculty support is a large category here and it includes faculty development support for moving teaching online and also a proposal to help faculty move back to teaching in-person particularly from a trauma-related perspective, as it will demand a different set of skills than was used to before the pandemic. Funds will also address interruption to Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (RSCA) for faculty who depend on access to collections, such as in labs or studio space as a component of instruction.

- **Dylan Mooney** reiterated evaluating the need for transportation and the shuttle service. Also, noting things changed quickly since the funding call, if it might be worth it to open up the call again for new ideas that may be more appropriate now, and if that call might be expanded more broadly campuswide, as communication does not always trickle down from management and those doing the work on the ground may have good ideas.
- Last slides show the budget update timeline and next steps (budget planning framework).
- **Darlene Yee-Melichar** emphasized mental health services are crucial to campus, as counseling and psych services need more funds for student advising. Faculty and staff burnout is a real issue also, and hopes this is included. Following up on the Provost's comments addressing faculty professional development, hoping it includes opportunity for them to continue their RSCA, especially probational and tenure track faculty for RTP. Lastly, as the ASCSU rep, shared they passed resolution 3466, AB14 AB34 and AB1175 to close the digital divide by expanding campus bandwidth, and read recently broadband was to get a major boost from CA budget revise of about \$7M, including educational institutions. Asked if anyone knew where the CSU was in that \$7M.
- **Jay Orendorff** replied he isn't aware of that \$7M grant process and deferred to subject matter experts as to how that's being coordinated.
- **James Martel** echoed Dylan Mooney's comment about broader input from the community and speaking specifically to instruction, added a link to the Chat sharing results from a faculty survey with opinions on how to spend these funds. Results included a pilot for a participatory budgeting process for greater input from faculty to address faculty working conditions. They also held a general meeting where they prioritized some of the proposals. He strongly advocated for community involvement and using some of their ideas, and once plans are solidified, they would appreciate having some influence over everything.
- **Jennifer Summit** acknowledged their conversation about this and noted some are subject to collective bargaining agreements but there was a lot of consistency in some of the categories mentioned and submitted through the colleges.
- **Evrin Ozer** asked about the process of calling for proposals through the Vice Presidents, and if there was still time for employees to submit ideas for proposals, as they may not have heard about it from their Vice President.
- **Jay Orendorff** cautioned against soliciting for new projects due to the short timeline. Nearly three months have passed already - deferred to Vice Presidents.
- **Sandee Noda** commented on ongoing communication issues to staff and had not heard a call for project proposals, but now there's a deadline, limiting opportunity for staff ideas.
- **Jeff Wilson** thanked everyone for questions, comments and feedback.
- **Jeff Wilson** explained the process: UBC to provide via the Steering Committee an advisory recommendation to President Mahoney based on the information presented today, via survey. Survey will include a more descriptive understanding of the categories. Stressed the urgency of response needed, as some health and safety proposals are time-sensitive prior to start of semester, such as HVAC cleaning.
- **Jennifer Summit** added one of the challenges was to balance the specific proposals to the categories of the criteria. Steering Committee meets tomorrow to approve and finalize the survey instrument, with the expectation that sufficient information will be shared to allow voting members to identify their priorities and give direct feedback. The total value of the proposals exceeds available funding so prioritization is important. \$74M seems a large amount, but once real needs were factored in addressing the needs of aging campus facilities, and addressing the needs of teaching hybrid and remote, the amount is considerably reduced. Advised to prepare for a lot of proposals, and feedback critically important to helping the President make final decisions.
- **Jeff Wilson** noted no further questions or comments, moved onto the public forum.

## Public Forum

- **Jeff Wilson** opened the public forum.
- **Daniel Paz Gabriner** noted the budget presented differs from the various scenarios originally offered. Understanding change will happen, asked where they are in the process of adjusting revenue expectations in the budget cycle.
- **Elena Stoian** replied changes are made as information is received from Institutional Analytics and Enrollment Management. The “best case scenario” has not been realized yet, and change will continue to be applied until the final budget is submitted.
- **Katie Murphy** commented at last month’s UBC meeting, she asked about the ability of the university to post in a public space the results/accomplishments produced from the federal relief funds. The compliance-based websites suggested use technical language that doesn’t speak to the average person. Hoped there would be a more community-based webpage, using plain language, where this could be listed so members of the broader campus community could see quickly what has been accomplished.
- **Jeff Wilson** thanked her for the suggestion and will reach out to Strategic Marketing & Communications to see if something can be created and shared.
- **Asta Sveinsdottir** asked what the largest 52% chunk of the projects involved.
- **Jeff Wilson** responded 52% is an effort to provide financial stability for the university. After the devastating effects of past year, state allocation reductions and decreases in tuition revenue from declining student enrollment, this portion helps revenue recovery of about \$25M to restore reserves depleted by funding the budget deficit. This helps anticipate future economic downturns unseen yet over the next few years, rather than going through what was experienced this year. Another large portion is revenues to self-support units, such as housing, which has been at 10%-15% capacity and parking, with lack of employees and students coming to campus. Other self-supports which rely on people being present also suffered losses.
- **Jay Orendorff** added self-supports have employee payroll to maintain, and housing has a debt-service to bond obligations campus is required to pay down. Campus would have to pay that from its reserve also.
- **Christian Rodriguez** asked for examples of HEERF-supported projects from the first HEERF funds that were already funded, such as HVAC.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied HEERF II and III institutional portions have not really been used yet – they’ve gone through the process of identifying proposals. HEERF I consisted of several projects, such as faculty development in preparing for remote instruction last Fall and for Spring, and also, purchasing of supplies for PPE such as Plexiglas, etc., and a portion to support housing to replace revenue from when resident students were asked to move out in March 2020. Technology support also provided faculty and students with technology and connectivity resources as campus pivoted to a primarily remote instructional modality.
- **Mi-Sook Kim** asked for clarification for an item under instruction where it lists an increase in campus hours of operation. Also, another lists faculty professional development for remote instruction, but this has been nearly completed and wondered why it is listed again.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied he believed the first was in response to conversations happening across the country that campuses may be open late and weekends to accommodate remote instruction, and that’s why it was labeled that way and listed under instruction; infrastructure for support services would have to have been provided, such as custodial services for expanded hours.
- **Jennifer Summit** replied with regards to faculty professional development, its for continuation of online support CEETL is offering, as it’s been very successful. CEETL is also developing trauma-informed pedagogy. A number of classes will continue online with a focus on hybrid teaching, which is a different skillset from teaching online and in-person and will likely ramp up as comfort levels increase. This extends beyond the pandemic in ways that

will be beneficial to students and will help expand academic classrooms, as campus classrooms are limited, and also helps students and faculty with long commutes. Hybrid is an important investment.

- **Genie Stowers** remarked on process, as most of the questions heard were about what kinds of project the different categories include. At the Steering Committee meeting, they removed other items from the agenda as was thought there would be much discussion about this – she was under the impression the information presented today was to be the actual list of projects. Just offering categories is not enough information to provide feedback on, as it was a lost opportunity to hear meaningful feedback about some of those projects.
- **Jeff Wilson** responded the survey will have project details with descriptive narratives for each project. It will go out tomorrow or Monday, as the next step in the process. The President will also be provided with a recording of this meeting to hear the feedback that was given.
- **Darlene Yee-Melichar** asked if UBC would be meeting over summer, as it did last summer, to review the survey results and move forward with it.
- **Jeff Wilson** replied there will not be meeting in June or July – meetings will resume in August. A UBC newsletter update for each of those months will be sent for any developments that transpire over summer. If new budget issues surface, there is the ability to reconvene an emergency UBC in June/July.
- **Jamil Sheared** inquired as to why this process will not be shared in an open forum (when there will not be a meeting over summer for the community to attend).
- **Dylan Mooney** agreed with Jamil he would prefer to listen to and process community feedback to formulate his own thoughts on the projects, but will not have an opportunity if the survey is done online and not discussed together, as a group.
- **Jerry Shapiro** added the question of summer meetings has been raised, and this is a defining moment in the way UBC is evolving. Voting members have the opportunity to convey to the President what is established in the Charge. Recommended a motion for the UBC to have at least one summer meeting. It can be of an advisory nature, but then UBC proceeds with its commitment to the community to move forward by establishing the intent and desire to meet over summer.
- **Genie Stowers** seconded the motion.
- **Jeff Wilson** clarified Jerry's motion for the UBC to meet over summer, but reminded of the urgency needed to make decisions so earlier would be needed – as early as the next two weeks.
- **Jerry Shapiro** shared his intent is to get a sense of votes from members about a summer meeting, and at tomorrow's Steering Committee meeting they can possibly discuss further and coordinate the meeting with a focus on how this process is moving forward.
- **Jeff Wilson** requested of UBC staff Nancy Ganner to launch a live Zoom poll for voting members to vote. Results showed 17 of the 21 voting members present voted in favor of meeting over summer, one in opposition and three abstaining.
- **Jeff Wilson** confirmed the poll indicated the UBC will meet over summer. The Steering Committee meets tomorrow as Jerry mentioned, and will develop a path forward for the summer meeting.
- **Jeff Wilson** continued that up to today, the next meeting as to be in August, and since this has changed, a date and time for the next meeting(s) will be shared tomorrow. Also, will share the process of selection for new UBC faculty members beginning Fall 2021.
- **Jennifer Summit** shared she anticipates a good discussion at the Steering Committee meeting and suggested keeping the next meeting to the one topic so there's time for discussion, barring any unforeseen circumstances. Looks forward to sharing results of new UBC faculty members as well.
- **Jeff Wilson** noted no further comments or questions, and adjourned the meeting.

## **Meeting adjourned approximately 12:00 PM**

- Next meeting May 28, 2021 from 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

/nr-g

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

10:22:00 From Danny Paz Gabriner, Guest to Everyone:

Was GI2025 and Closing Equity Gaps funding cut in half? Or was that planned as original?

10:30:37 From Jennifer Summit (she/her/hers), co-chair to Everyone:

to clarify: those funds are meant to help us implement AB 1460, and we haven't yet determined how we can best direct them to meet that goal.

10:33:16 From Michael Scott, Guest to Everyone:

CSU 2021/22 budget here

10:33:48 From Member, Darlene Yee-Melichar to Everyone:

@Provost Summit- thanks for the clarification, will be good to know how allocation will be directed to meet AB 1460 legislative mandate.

10:37:01 From Alex Hwu, Guest to Everyone:

Canvas

10:42:19 From Susan Pelton, Guest to Everyone:

And thank you to Raman Paul in ORSP for his help with the HEERF submissions!!

10:43:01 From Member, Beth Hellwig (she/her/hers) to Everyone:

Thanks to Gene Chelberg for his efforts to coordinate HEERF requests from SAEM

10:55:52 From Member, James Martel to Everyone:

The union did a faculty survey on what priorities they would like to see for the HEERF monies allocated for instructional purposes. The results of that survey were shared with the president, provost and every faculty member. The results are here: <https://www.calfac.org/item/cfa-sfsu-higher-education-emergency-relief-fund-heerf-faculty-survey-results> In addition,

10:56:24 From Nancy Ganner to Everyone:

Everyone will be able to ask questions very shortly

10:57:47 From Member, James Martel to Everyone:

Hmmm. I'll try to reload it. I actually hit send prematurely anyway.

10:59:35 From Nancy Ganner to Everyone:

you're good, James - you're a member. go ahead and raise your hand and you can ask out loud. Our guests will be able to ask during the public forum which will open shortly.

11:00:20 From Michael Scott, Guest to Everyone:

26% rate

11:00:39 From Member, James Martel to Everyone:

Here is the survey link again: <https://www.calfac.org/item/cfa-sfsu-higher-education-emergency-relief-fund-heerf-faculty-survey-results> and here is our participatory budgeting proposal: <https://www.calfac.org/item/participatory-budgeting-proposal-cfa> and finally, here are what we prioritized at our general assembly meeting based on the survey results: Priorities decided at 4/30 meeting:



Compensation for converting to online courses — per 3 units converted, progressively distributed acc to pay range

Assigned time for lecturer faculty research & service — research/professional 'catch-up' funds

Maintain course caps for online courses too (equity with in-person caps)

student retention, learning community, learning outcomes

Flat rate payment for internet and work-from-home expenses

needs to be parallel for students too

Improve iLearn + improve and/or replace Zoom

For the survey: <https://www.calfac.org/item/cfa-sfsu-higher-education-emergency-relief-fund-heerf-faculty-survey-results>

For the participatory budget proposal: <https://www.calfac.org/item/participatory-budgeting-proposal-cfa>

11:09:17 From Member, Darlene Yee-Melichar to Everyone:

In light of ASCSU advocacy for the three Broadband related bills (AB 14; AB 34; AB 1175) I find this summary of the section from the Governor's May revise rather interesting....\$7 billion!!!

See: Broadband gets a major boost in California budget revision at <https://edsource.org/2021/broadband-gets-a-major-boost-in-california-budget-revision/654684>

11:11:52 From Member, Elena Stoian to Everyone:

The Broadband for All Act, or AB 24, would ask voters in the November 2022 election to authorize a \$10 billion general obligation bond to fund internet access in hard-to-reach areas of the state.

11:13:08 From Member, Darlene Yee-Melichar to Everyone:

@Elena Good to know-- thank you.

11:14:42 From Member, Ian M Dunham (he/his), MBA, PHD to Everyone:

Thank you for your presentation, Jay. This is very timely and insightful information. Your work on federal funding on behalf of our campus is very much appreciated.

11:15:58 From Member, James Martel to Everyone:

I agree very much, Sandee!

11:19:37 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone:

Can that data include urgency and timelines?

11:21:57 From Noriko Lim-Tepner (she, her, hers), Guest to Everyone:

Regarding AB 34, Broadband for All Act of 2022, public universities were included in the language of the bill.

11:22:41 From Member, Sandee Noda to Everyone:

I hope that there is a contingency for the Hazard Pay/Emergency Pay for the staff. Since the mediation failed, we are headed to PERB in June.

11:24:04 From Member, Darlene Yee-Melichar to Everyone:

@Noriko Good to know-- thank you. Here is a copy of the ASCSU resolution FYI.

11:24:27 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone:

Please sign up for tomorrow's UBC Open Office hours - bring your comments, questions, and concerns about today's presentations.

11:25:26 From ng's screenshare to Everyone:

Thanks Dylan - anyone can email [ubc@sfsu.edu](mailto:ubc@sfsu.edu) to attend, if you think of any questions you'd like to ask or clarifications needed. No prior budget experience needed!

11:25:28 From Katie Murphy, Guest to Everyone:

Thanks!

11:34:28 From Member, Kathleen Mortier to Everyone:

I hope the focus will not just be on professional development but also on the time it takes to restructure our courses once more

11:35:28 From Member, Sandee Noda to Everyone:

FYI - Staff also have a long commute - not just faculty and students!

11:36:12 From Member, James Martel to Everyone:

I 100% agree, Genie!

11:36:12 From Member, Kathleen Mortier to Everyone:

I agree, that would have been helpful

11:36:14 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone:

Thank you Genie!

11:37:14 From Nancy Ganner to Everyone:

These slides will be posted to the UBC webpage after today's meeting: <https://adminfin.sfsu.edu/ubc>

11:38:40 From Member, jamil sheared to Everyone:

Why not in open forum though? The whole point of these meetings is to get useful information. And now we won't meet for two months?

11:39:13 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone:

Agreed Jamil

11:40:32 From Ásta (Sveinsdóttir), Guest to Everyone:

Agreed

11:40:56 From Member, James Martel to Everyone:

I also agree with Jamil. Open forums are critical to make sure that everyone gets a chance to speak and have input.

11:41:53 From Member, Dylan Mooney to Everyone:

Second

11:46:23 From Member, Michael Goldman to Everyone:

Thank you all! And enjoy v-Commencement, etc.