



University Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

DATE: Thursday, May 28, 2020
LOCATION: via Zoom

MEMBERS PRESENT: Interim VP & CFO Jeff Wilson, Co-Chair, Provost & VP Jennifer Summit, Co-Chair, Interim VP Beth Hellwig, VP Jason Porth, VP Jeff Jackanicz, Dean Amy Sueyoshi, Senate Chair Nancy Gerber, Ian Dunham, Andrew Ichimura, Mary Menees, Kathleen Mortier, Gitanjali Shahani, Jerry Shapiro, Genie Stowers, Dwayne Banks, Maria Martinez, Elena Stoian, Sutee Sujitparapitaya

Advisory team present: Enrollment Mgmt/President’s Office: Tom Enders, University Controller: Sylvia Piao, SAEM: Mirel Tikkanen, ADV: Venesia Thompson-Ramsay, UE; Tammie Ridgell, A&F: Cesar Mozo)

Absent: (none)
Guests Present via Zoom: (see last page)
Committee Staff Present: Nancy Ganner, Edwin Critchlow

Accompanying PowerPoint presentation for this meeting can be found here:
<https://adminfin.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/documents/UBC%20Presentation%20May%2028.2020%20PDF.pdf>

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

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

- **Jeff Wilson** and **Jennifer Summit** welcomed all members and guests, and welcomed new Staff representative member Mary Menees to the UBC.

### Agenda topic # 2 – Review and approval of Minutes from May 28, 2020 meeting

- **Jeff Wilson** requested approval of the meeting minutes.
- They were approved, seconded and passed.

### Agenda topic #3 – CARES Act Update

- (see slides/page 5-9 on accompanying presentation)
- **Jeff Wilson:** Thanked committee members for their input and support around the second tranche of Cares Act funding. Summarized the three levels: The first for direct student aid as distributed directly to students; thanked all involved including Tom Ender’s team with enrollment management, Bursar’s Office, Information Technology Services and others who heled manage it efficiently.
- Acknowledged (see slides) the second part of the funding is in four categories: as communicated by the Chancellor and by the President, there will be limited face-to-face instruction on campus and activities necessary to support that instruction, and that’s how the last part of that second tranche will be used.

- Reported the third and final part of the CARES Act funding will be paused until a better understanding of the use of the second tranche is observed, along with the budget for the Fall when more focused decisions can be made for that funding.
- **Genie Stowers:** Questioned that at the last meeting, the recommendations and the process for determining the funding recommendations had not been decided. Comments were solicited but there was no communication since. Reminded all that the culture of this committee has been a working advisory board, but would have appreciated more transparency about the decision-making process. Does not want to exchange the perception of a “rubberstamping” committee replacing a rubberstamping committee. Indicated she was personally okay with the recommendations as per her submitted comments, but would have appreciated more interaction about the decision-making process, even if it had been another meeting.
- **Jerry Shapiro:** Agreed with Genie and expressed concern about funds not going in that last in that fourth category for students support, prioritizing their safety and lack of correspondence in terms of what type of backup we're providing students. There was a shortage of counselors throughout the CSU before this pandemic and referrals to community agencies doesn't address how students are going to come back into an extremely complicated environment. Stated that the striking absence of allocating funds specifically to improve and expand counseling is problematic and raises concerns about institutional insensitivity and a liability in terms of disregard for the mental health, trauma and cultural trauma components by providing additional SF State-tailored mental health inclusive responsiveness.
- Added that he contributed to the ongoing conversation online but it wasn't clear this meeting would be a final presentation of what was approved, as he was looking for additional conversation in an environment where things are changing quickly. Summarized that we owe it to students to keep up with those changes.
- **Nancy Gerber:** Agreed it was also not her understanding that a final distribution had been approved. When asked for feedback, heard consistent comments the allocation for health and safety was not enough. As discussions of having some instructional activities face-to-face and hearing about associated costs, allocating a mere \$500K may be insufficient to help mitigate risks and might allow more activities on campus. Adding to what her colleagues pointed out, this was not her understanding about the process and is disturbed by it.
- **Kathleen Mortier:** Shared same concerns for lack of allocation of funds for mental health and support for students and also faculty.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Appreciated the candid feedback. Stated that approval was needed before today to launch the Faculty Development Institute in time for there to be registration before faculty went off contract (for summer). There was a time-sensitive element to get this to the President as soon as we could. They gave the President both the recommendation and also the feedback, so it was taken into consideration, and she acted on our proposal. Added that the existence of the third tranche of CARES Act funding is the hope to be able to use that to address needs it wasn't to address directly with the first two.
- Reiterated the first tranche was for direct student aid. The second was reserved for institutional support, and there will be a different set of directions applied to that third tranche. It's not done yet, and can take directly into account the feedback as that's allocated.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Appreciated the comments made as a reminder the committee is just beginning this process of being a deliberative body, where all members can be involved around decision-making. Based on the feedback received, will work with co-chair and bring back to the committee a process for these types of decisions so everyone feels engaged.
- **Genie Stowers:** Asked about the third tranche of funding, as she understood there were only two. Asked where the extra \$2M came from?

- **Jeff Wilson:** Responded was also surprised by it, but it was probably buried in the legislation document, which was hundreds of pages long. The University received notification after the second part was announced, and it is tied directly to our status as a minority serving institution. Some campuses received, others did not.
- **Jerry Shapiro:** Advised he'd like to see a statement or indication of commitment from the UBC, to tailor expenditure of those funds in that third category to the stated purposes. It could be characterized in terms of community building on campus and development of therapeutic services as a "soft landing" upon returning to campus, as important online training, understanding the contractual approvals needed. Difficulties, challenges will need to be resolved, because is concerned the University will be liable when making the representation it's okay for students to come back.
- Continued that there needs to be some delivery of how the University is giving a comparable standard of care that was provided up to that point. Prioritizing these other areas doesn't address the commitment the University owes students and faculty in coming back to campus.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Said she shares a strong commitment to doing the right thing and being mindful of the intention of that funding, which is to support the responsibility to students as a minority serving institution (noted that the term "minority" is not meaningful to our campus, but is a term that comes with that funding.
- **Amy Sueyoshi:** Commented that in terms of moving forward with a procedure, there's just one step missing, and that's acknowledgement of the comments received. Added that if it seems the UBC approved, then it would be presented to the president, or ask if the committee wishes to meet. Alternatively, does it will be presented and an update given back to the committee in terms of procedure.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Agreed, and it's a concrete direction that can be incorporated in future decision-making. Did not want to ask members for additional meetings, but would do so if necessary.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Agreed this was a perfect time to have these conversations because the UBC is focusing on the work the subcommittees did on defining the Charge and processes and how the committee moves forward itself. Folding in awareness of the concern raised to define processes or checking in and consulting between meetings. Perhaps a digital way to give feedback other than sending an email to everyone asking them to email back: a way to create a forum specific to this committee to carry on discussions between meetings. This is something the Charge committee can address, as there will always be issues in between meetings where we need to be able to consult. The co-chairs called an emergency meeting to talk through the existence of that CARES funding, so we do need a mechanism for that kind of consultation.
- **Amy Sueyoshi:** Suggested an iLearn Chat Forum such as they use for their Council.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Agreed.
- **Andrew Carrillo:** Echoed Professor Shapiro's comments about third tranche of funding as an opportunity to invest in building services such as mental health services. Mental health is a growing issue in this pandemic and especially in the Fall semester could also be utilized towards creating a virtual community where students feel connected to SF State, no matter where they are.
- **Mary Menees:** Commended the rich discussion around student and faculty and assistance they may need, and reminded the committee that staff are also part of that community that needs to be considered.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Thanked everyone for their comments and noted no further questions.

#### Agenda topic # 4 – 2020-2021 Budget Planning Update

- (see slides/page 9)
- **Jeff Wilson:** Gave brief update on the budget planning process: Governor released May revise, advised of a possible 10% reduction to higher education, which did not include any support for mandatory costs such as CalPERS contributions and health care costs for employees. Also, no assumptions for future years due to state's

tax revenues delayed and likely additional changes coming for several years. SF State has not received allocation from the CSU and as application deadline was extended, enrollment numbers not available yet. Hopefully UBC can have a more robust conversation when info is available. According to law, budget needs to be passed by June 15th and Governor has to sign it by June 30.

- **Jeff Wilson:** Noted no questions. Thanked everyone and moved onto next topic.

#### Agenda topic # 5 – Review of UBC Workgroup meetings:

- (see slides/page 11-18)
- **Jeff Wilson:** Thanked all volunteering for workgroups.
- **UBC Charge workgroup:**
- **Jennifer Summit:** Summarized Revise of UBC Charge workgroup efforts: they examined the previous charge and had discussion about what UBC will be doing in the year ahead, and crafting the charge to reflect those priorities. Invited workgroup members Nancy Gerber and Jason Porth to share the texture of the discussion and how their revisions reflected that discussion.
- **Jason Porth:** Explained they tried to find a way to make the work of the UBC more deliberative and engaging, rather than just receiving reports, and the role the UBC has in providing both voice to concerns that come up on campus, and also to educate the campus community, to ensure that role of the UBC is also captured
- **Jennifer Summit:** Thanked Jason and opened the floor to comments about this part of the Charge revision.
- **Genie Stowers:** Commented the changes were a significant improvement and thanked the group.
- **Amy Sueyoshi:** Underscored that the statement defines the UBC as a deliberative body, and not decision-making, so it's clear to all members of their roles.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Confirmed their work is to make recommendations to the president, but the president is the decision-maker.
- **Kathleen Mortier:** Commented she appreciates the addition of the link to the University's priorities.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Thanked all for comments and invited Nancy Gerber to report on the discussion of UBC membership.
- **Nancy Gerber:** Reported a large part of the discussion centered on the University president's role recently removed as co-chair, so now added as one of the ex officio members.
- Added that as the Academic Senate's Strategic Issues Committee was engaged over issues around the budget and budget transparency, the group felt it was appropriate for the SIC Chair to be an ex officio member as well.
- Consideration given to the size of the UBC being already large, removed one of the six faculty seats to accommodate this ex officio member. To replace this appointed seat, recommended adding an ASCSU member, who is on Academic Senate and also faculty. Rationale is that they're involved in discussions of budget and related topics at a higher statewide level, so they bring that perspective as well. Clarified that the faculty members as a whole, remain at six.
- Proposed for the non-voting members, one area the group did not reach consensus was whether the president should be a voting or non-voting member.
- Also, whether labor unions should be represented as non-voting members, and the thought of listing them individually, as some or all may wish to be involved. The recommendation was to leave it more general.
- **Genie Stowers:** Asked how people are chosen for the committee, such as the staff member, Dean – what is the process? Suggested this vagueness needs to be clarified.
- **Nancy Gerber:** Agreed that was a good point. For Deans, the Charge language indicates that every attempt shall be made to include representatives from across the six colleges and the library. It doesn't mean those five faculty have to represent as same, but between a Senate Chair, SIC Chair, Dean and Staff members, there is

representation flexibility. When the process is agreed upon and those appointments are made, broad representation should be considered. Acknowledged there is some vagueness in how faculty members are appointed, as they get nominated by the Academic Senate, and then those recommendations are sent to the president for final selection.

- **Beth Hellwig:** Voiced concern there is only one member representing Staff for the entire university; one vote. It is difficult for that one member to represent the entirety, so hopes the Charge might include at least two.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Appreciated the question, particularly since a member of this Charge Revision workgroup is that Staff member representative, and it showed how valuable that input was. Inquired how they might choose another Staff member?
- **Beth Hellwig:** Responded there could be a nomination process. When the request came to the UBC members, she solicited staff names from her SAEM leaders, so this could be how Staff could be nominated from each area.
- **Jerry Shapiro:** Spoke in support of two Staff members, as it diversifies the representation of staff in the in the deliberative conversations.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Remarked that two arguments were made in favor of adding another Staff member, and asked for any opposing views, otherwise will accept the shared recommendation. Noting no opposition, agreed to take it back to the Charge workgroup to add another Staff member, as it only strengthens the group.
- **Mary Menees:** Asked if the process would be the same as it was for her appointment?
- **Jennifer Summit:** Stated she believed it was ultimately up to the president but understands that if there's a request for a certain number of faculty members, it would be the same for a certain number of staff members.
- **Amy Sueyoshi:** Asked for further clarification why only one Staff representative was to be chosen; was there a reason or disadvantage to it, or was it simply arbitrary?
- **Nancy Gerber:** Clarified that with both the Staff representative and presumably the Dean, although it's not quite as clear, they're not being elected or appointed; they're simply nominated, and then the president makes the decision. The line on the Charge would just read "two staff members, serving staggered two-year terms" and then indicating these are nominations, not appointments or elections.
- **Genie Stowers:** Inquired about the faculty nomination process from the Senate.
- **Nancy Gerber:** Replied that the Senate election process was just deciding who to nominate, but the president makes the appointments, so that's not a change to the process.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Concluded and thanked the workgroup for their effective work and discussion.
  
- **Fiscal Policy workgroup**
- **Jeff Wilson:** Summarized the Fiscal Policy workgroup efforts: workgroup is focused on developing budget and fiscal policies. The first meeting discussed the reserves and carryforward balances. They gained input from the perspectives of each of the constituencies represented on that workgroup. There's a lot of work around defining terminology and reviewing policies outside SF State and the CSU, to create some basic principles. A working Draft will be forwarded to the UBC when ready. It will have multiple parts: some will be highly technical due CSU regulations, and some more complex around considerations for the disposition and management of reserves and carryforwards.
  
- **Fiscal Policy workgroup**
- **Jeff Wilson:** Summarized the Budget Literacy workgroup efforts: this group was charged to lead the UBC in guiding the University on budget literacy. Various forms of literacy include creating definitions and terminology, and also communicating those in an effective way. The group will release a Draft to the

committee; a glossary explaining reserves and carryforwards (not the decision-making process), then working more on literacy initiatives. As the 2020-2021 budget process unfolds, hopefully the underlying concepts are explained. Asked the group members if they wanted to share further.

- **Jerry Shapiro:** Raised the concept of due diligence and where that fits into budget literacy, especially in terms of contractual dynamics that operate in grant-related funding and similar scenarios. Gave an example of a problem that emerged at the time the previous bookstore was sold, in terms of how the \$2M reserve fund was going to be expended. There are not only transparency concerns, but incorporated responsibilities with regards to such obligations, understandings in bequests, etc. Summarized that due diligence is going to be a critical component in giving the university maximum flexibility.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Noted no questions. Thanked everyone and moved onto last workgroup report.
- **UBC Communications and Outreach:**
  - Jennifer Summit:** Summarized the Communications and Outreach workgroup efforts:
  - Remarked this would be a perfect time to pilot a new iLearn site for UBC membership. Asked if all can agree it's going to be a venue where people can expect to get updates on some of these topics? (no noted response).
  - Stated the group would determine priorities for the communications and outreach for this group, and for UBC. Noted there's overlap between this group, the Fiscal Literacy workgroup and the Charge Revise group; an example is that Mary Menees follows the Legislative Analyst Office website (<https://lao.ca.gov/Budget>) because the website is a helpful instrument of budget literacy, and she expressed the same hope for the UBC.
  - Identified the group's strong commitment to transparency, particularly for the goal of "myth-busting", because in the absence of transparent communication, which is a two-way street, theories will arise in order to fill the vacuum so it's the responsibility of the UBC to make sure its communications are transparent and accessible. The group had a rich discussion about what communications and outreach look like, and it was clear that simply putting the information out there is insufficient; the UBC needs to do it in a way that can be received, and understood readily by the entire community.
  - Reiterated the goal is having visual information that can be quickly comprehended and lends itself to sharing and openness. The idea of an accessible website with reports, flow charts and infographics. They liked the idea of an infographic that can say "this is where your money is going" and simply stating that the landing page of the UBC website, as well as the glossary. That goes to VP Wilson's suggestion about a glossary of terms around literacy and a FAQ section that can be interactive, so that it can receive questions as well as provide answers.
  - Stressed that just putting things on a website is not enough, so need to insure the website is also regularly referred to and called out through social media, CampusMemo and other prominent links. iLearn was suggested as one particularly prominent link, and there was also the suggestion of budget "road shows". That can be the co-chairs and also include other members of the UBC to ensure representation that all (participant) voices are heard, to inform their work, including faculty and staff perspectives as well. Ideas for those opportunities can be the Academic Senate, Chairs Council, Campus Leadership Forum, and keeping an open list of opportunities to promote understanding and two-way communication. It will push information out and also receive information, in order to incorporate it into the workings of the UBC. Invited workgroup members to add or refine these ideas.
  - **Gitanjali Shahani:** Thanked for the summary and commended the perspectives of the participating students (Andrew Carrillo, AS President and Rashid Abdul Rahiman, AS VP of Finance) especially because it covered everything discussed and were extremely valuable in reminding the group this is information we have to take to many constituents on campus, and have to find the best ways to communicate it, such as the social media component.

- **Jennifer Summit:** Seconded that their contributions were fundamental to the perspective.
- **Andrew Carrillo:** Added that the idea raised frequently was that we have to communicate these priorities to different constituencies: students, faculty, staff, and these demographics receive their information differently, such as CampusMemo and social media. Shared his excitement for the plans to do this for the Fall semester.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Thanked the workgroup members and asked the full UBC for feedback.
- **Jerry Shapiro:** Recommended a 'suggestion box' to gather general ideas and suggestions from the community. Also that it may be possible to offer some sort of incentive as a symbolic gesture their comments are welcome.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Appreciated the point of interactive feedback to the UBC; a virtual suggestion box.
- **Ian Dunham:** Agreed and shared insight from the school of Management literature, that when you include all constituents, especially those affected by important decision-making processes, you have better outcomes in the long term when all are included. The process should be open and garnish as much involvement as possible.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Thanked and remarked that also speaks to the diversity of this workgroup. Asked for any other comments.
- **Edwin Critchlow:** Amplified and echoed the idea of bringing on an additional Staff member representative and wondered about the nomination process, whether through the Labor Union or other outreach to campus as well.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Recommended bringing that back to the Charge discussion, then thanked the Outreach and Communication workgroup and revisited the topic again and asked Nancy Gerber to review the process of soliciting nominations of faculty from the Academic Senate.
- **Nancy Gerber:** Responded the Academic Senate holds elections in the Spring and the committee nomination process goes out to every faculty, this year adding the UBC nomination to that process as well. The nominations are supposed to come from the Academic Senate itself, but they were open to every faculty member so they had opportunity to nominate themselves for UBC. Only Senators vote to nominate.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Thanked Nancy Gerber and noted she spotted a comment in the Chat mentioning a staff pool for committees, like the faculty pool for committees like this.
- **Nancy Gerber:** Advised it's not a pool like the service pool for faculty -- the only pool they have is for administrative searches, not committee appointments, so that's why the nomination process is used.
- **Mary Menees:** Informed the Staff nomination are open to anyone who wishes to nominate themselves or to have their supervisor nominate them, so restricting a nomination from a pool available for service may not be as inclusive as we wish.
- **Nancy Ganner:** Informed the committee a notice of nomination of a colleague or self-nomination was posted to CampusMemo, and an email was sent to all the Labor Union leads as well, yielding several self and Labor Union nominations.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Requested feedback from the UBC.
- **Andrew Carrillo:** Commented on the student perspective and asked if the four workgroups within UBC were going to remain standing committees? Suggested it would be beneficial to have a student on each, similar to the way Academic Senate operates. They aren't necessarily members of the greater UBC, but there's student perspectives included the work. As A.S. President now, between him and the new VP of Finance, there's no time to attend all of the workgroup and whole committee meetings. Asked if the UBC was open to incorporating students-at-large. He could recommend students from their Board of Directors for those four workgroups
- **Jennifer Summit:** Responded that her understanding is these workgroups were "disappearing task forces" formed for these specific tasks. When members volunteered, it was understood that way.

- **Jeff Wilson:** Agreed that once the task is complete, such as the Charge being revised, the group is done. The student representative member on the UBC can sign up for a workgroup or delegate that responsibility to another.
- **Genie Stowers:** Observed there were two prior workgroups formed before these; were they standing committees? They had the same conversations about reserves policy and budget literacy, and perhaps can be combined in some way, or place 'standing committees' on a future agenda to discuss if needed.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Thanked everyone and reiterated she looked forward to working together on these important priorities.

#### Agenda topic # 6 - Open Forum

- **Jeff Wilson:** Asked if there are any speakers present.
- **Beth Hellwig:** Asked about the next meeting and if an enrollment update would be given.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Responded that since the application deadline was extended, they would present at the next.
- Further advised that as they work on developing the website for UBC and enacting some of the recommendations from the Communication and Outreach workgroup and the others, it could be a place where regular updates are posted, even when UBC is not meeting because it serves the goal of this committee.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Noted another question on the Chat about Summer meetings, and advised the next meetings are scheduled for Thursday, June 25 and Thursday, July 23. If information becomes available between now and those dates, he would ask UBC staff Nancy Ganner to forward to the full UBC or point to a website that communicates that information.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Acknowledged faculty is off-contract over Summer. Noted that absence of their participation could hurt the quality of the discussion and asked if they were willing to participate. All responded they would.
- **Darleen Franklin (guest):** Inquired about funds allocated for health and safety costs for face-to-face activities: if it includes activities to ramp up faculty research and student research.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Replied that there is planning for how the University is preparing to allow for access to facilities for research, scholarship and creative activities.
- The CARES funding is earmarked for remote instruction and that's very clear it will be used to support the campuses activities around remote instruction in particular. The campus is also preparing a plan for a systematic and purposeful access to facilities for research and scholarship and creative activities. The University Research Council, which is part of the Academic Senate, recently surveyed faculty for a broad understanding of what their hopes were for access. Sophie Clavier and Michael Scott, are developing a more directed survey for faculty through their departments or Deans to specifically identify areas where faculty access to facilities for those purposes might be aligned with our campus plan around face-to-face instruction. It will follow the same guidelines and health restrictions as applied to face-to-face instruction. As we are part of San Francisco and are still under shelter-in-place orders, we are currently still at Phase 2 of the Governor's multi-phase process of reopening and advised of a 35% capacity, which is unclear but we need to be very deliberate at how to create those plans. We're hoping this can happen in conjunction with remote instruction. For example, if opening up part of a building in order to enable a lab class to meet, coordination is needed for access to labs for faculty and student research as well. There are cascading complications around doing this in a safe and coordinated way. There is a university-wide Fall 2020 Planning Group which meets tomorrow and this is on the agenda.
- **Gil Ramirez (guest):** Inquired about undocumented students who are not eligible able to receive any disbursements from the CARES funding and as the UBC considers recommendations to utilize the additional

\$2M, can they determine the feasibility in using these funds to facilitate automatic financial disbursements to every undocumented student?

- **Jennifer Summit:** Thanked him for raising this issue as it's of considerable concern to all. The CARES Act does not apply to undocumented students so an alternative fund, the HOPE Crisis Fund will be used (<https://dos.sfsu.edu/content/sf-state-hope-fund-crisis-loan-application>). Thanked VP Hellwig for her extraordinary outpouring of support for it. It's a campus-based fund open to all our students, but particularly directed at undocumented students because it isn't subject to the same restrictions.
- **Andrew Ichimura:** Asked about Summer some grad students who need access to complete their culminating experience and those who may be moving onto PhD programs or jobs and cannot put off graduation.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Noted this was a non-UBC question but reiterated the faculty survey about access to facilities for research activities. We hope this will include Summer as well.
- **Bridget McCracken (guest), as read by Nancy Ganner from the Chat:** Inquired about an administrative pool for staff service like the faculty have, so they could add themselves to be considered for these types of committees.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Replied that was already addressed and repeated Mary Menees' comment that a pool may limit broad participation. However, there's discussions around establishing a Staff Council, and that may be a way for more formal nominations of staff members.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Noting no hands raised and nothing further requested in the Chat, thanked everyone for their participation.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Echoed VP Wilson's thanks and acknowledged the important discussions ahead for UBC.

**Meeting adjourned approximately 11:55am.**

- Next meeting: Thursday, June 25, 2020

/nr-g

**UBC meeting guests (non-members and non-quorum):**

1. Jay Orendorff
2. Jesus Alberto Garcia
3. George Haris
4. Marina Shevyakova
5. Bridget Bamber McCracken
6. Elizabeth Bradley Hunter
7. Joel H Streicker
8. Samantha Ward
9. Vicky Lee
10. Cathy Tong
11. Crystal Kam
12. Teresa Dziadur
13. Anna Lim
14. Ly Chau
15. Janet Lil Remolona
16. Cheryl Leung
17. Frank Fasano

18. Teddy Albinak
19. Deborah Masters
20. Michael J. Scott
21. Susan Pelton
22. Dylan Mooney
23. Jay Ward
24. Sharon Bliss
25. Darleen Franklin
26. Barbara Stein
27. Julie Moed
28. Nathan Norasmith
29. Itza Cristiana Gonzalez Soza
30. Bonnie Li Victorino
31. Sandee Noda
32. Yim-Yu Wong
33. Andrew Harris
34. Carmen Domingo
35. Veronica Castillo
36. Tonee Sherrill
37. Rashid Abdul Rahiman (new VP of Finance)
38. Maureen Loughran, CFA