



University Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

DATE: Thursday, June 25, 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, current Senate Chair Teddy Albinak, former Senate Chair Nancy Gerber, Ian Dunham, Andrew Ichimura, Mary Menees, Gitanjali Shahani, Jerry Shapiro, Genie Stowers, Dwayne Banks, Maria Martinez, Elena Stoian, Sutee Sujitparapitaya, Associate Students President Andrew Carrillo and VP of Finance Rashid Abdul Rahiman

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

Absent: Kathleen Mortier, Tammie Ridgell

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%20June%2025.2020%20pdf.pdf>

UBC Co-Chairs called this meeting to order at approximately 10:05 A.M.

Agenda topic # 1 – Welcome from Co-Chairs

- **Jeff Wilson** and **Jennifer Summit** welcomed new members Teddy Albinak, Academic Senate Chair and Rashid Abdul Rahiman, Associated Students VP of Finance, all members and guests.

Agenda topic # 2 – 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 – Enrollment Update

(see slides 6-14 on accompanying presentation)

- **Tom Enders:** Showed enrollment trends. Had this pandemic not happened, the university still had enrollment challenges.
- Reassured enrollment teams are working hard to help students find their way to at SF State.
- Reviewed enrollment projections: FTF nearly 30% lower than last year, which affects future enrollment, as freshmen drive enrollment for years to come. SF State’s enrollment is 80% undergrad, so anything that affects undergrad flow is a significant factor, from a budget standpoint. The pandemic has disproportionately affected freshman. Continuing students are down over 6% from last Fall 2019, and New undergrad Transfers down 27%.

- Reiterated these are *projected* enrollment number (as of June 4th), at a time when history is unreliable due to the pandemic. Post bac/grads holding somewhat steady in new students and retention, but its low volume and high cost to the university. However, it's a strength to acknowledge.
- Reviewed trends by college; COSE has highest volume but not highest decline, but all colleges differ in size.
- The large Undeclared decline is due to re-directs from other campuses, which are coded as Undeclared. The redirect volume is lower than prior years. Has observed a trend in FTF declaring a major early, especially first-gen and low income students in their interest to identify career paths early.
- Reviewed residency stats and listed CA residents by geographic area: highlighted 6-county Bay Area FTF who said they were going to come but had not enrolled by time of census (the "melt", as highlighted in blue). Noted lower rates in 2019, which may have been driven by the high cost of living or not knowing financial aid packages before they said 'yes'. Now, enrollment is giving estimated aid offers to new students so they understand the costs and their financial reality, before they submit their intent.
- Also noticed in AAO's (highlighted in blue) the Bay Area has a lower decline than other areas of California. In this pandemic, non-local students are least likely to stay. All Los Angeles basin CSU's are full or over-enrolled – those students are staying close to home in this environment. Our diverse enrollment is a strength in its spread across California, but it's also a vulnerability that we're so dependent on students from SoCal.
- Reviewed new undergrad transfers; these "melts" (in blue) are too high and we have to do better when we're able to focus on this, but similar to FTF, we have less of a decline in local than in SoCal areas.
- Compared projected decline pre- and post-pandemic. The decline in transfers is slightly less than FTF, and in grad students is somewhat flat. Continuing students are down 5%, with a total predicted enrollment decline of 11%.
- Applauded efforts underway supporting students with a positive spin on SF right now. Advisors, grad studies, etc. have been conducting focused re-enrollment campaigns and seeing some results. Continuing student enrollment came up about 2%, so some efforts are paying off. Direct contact from advisors, removing holds and other administrative barriers, continuing students receiving estimated financial aid documents, etc. The team is narrowing the gap as best possible, but the effects of the pandemic upon students is still to be determined. There is a focused, coordinated effort to reduce Summer "melt" using student outreach leaders to contact students who haven't signed up for orientation, then later, advisors will reach out to students who signed up but have not registered. Financial Aid is following up with students who haven't completed their applications, grad studies is reaching out as well – many teams are working hard on this. When census is confirmed, we'll know how it paid off.
- Many of the issues aren't pandemic or crisis-related, and focus will turn to long-term issues later, to insure SF State is communicating in the right markets, getting the word out about SF State and telling its story. Teams are working on a strategic enrollment plan, and forward to sharing key findings and recommendations, in order to position SF State to be successful in the future.
- **Jerry Shapiro:** Thanked for report. Re grad studies, added might be helpful to add a column about demand/number of applicants to grad programs. Asked UBC to re-conceptualize grad study costs. If SF State can put together a program where recruitment of freshman and transfers is connected with a grad study program, then the investment in grad studies will result in a benefit to enrollment from the program. Drawing students to grad studies helps with continuity and commitment to SF State because they're anchored in the pathway. Also with the geographical concern: if students invest as freshmen with a connection to grad studies, they begin connecting with community agencies as volunteers, then progressing towards work with their advanced professional degrees, and it may validate student concerns when relocation to SF is a long-term investment.
- Proposed for discussion an opportunity enterprise zone on campus; programs that come forward with application pool/demand, the benefit of community relationships that demonstrate a pathway towards continuity and professional development experiences, then maybe there's a way to plan that into the long-term academic

planning for campus. Makes sense that where there's demand, and where there's proven continuity of enrollment, there may be a plan for balancing that into long-term planning.

- **Amy Sueyoshi:** Other CSU Deans report despite full classes on SoCal, and they're being asked to cut some of those classes to reduce their budget. Is there anything coming from the CO that says even if we fill classes, deeper cuts should be anticipated?
- **Tom Enders:** CSULA was overenrolled, which means they were not receiving State funds for the students they were serving. Structurally, we're under our enrollment target, which means we're receiving funds for more students than we're serving. In the past, CSU has done across-the-board cuts rather than enrollment targets. Equal distribution benefits us, but some in SoCal are hoping there won't be cuts where the students are.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Not sure why SoCal is cutting classes. All CSU's are subject to same projected reduction in our allocation from the Governor, and we don't know how it will be distributed yet. Noted that SoCal may have less resources for more students, but, they still receive tuition from those additional students, and SF State is lacking those same resources with less students.
- **Teddy Albiniak:** Thanked Tom. Inquired about redirect process where SoCal might send students to SF State.
- **Tom Enders:** Replied that redirects received are from SoCal and NorCal campuses, but many from there are also deciding to attend a community college instead. In SoCal, it may have been best for them to redirect rather than send out so many offers, and perhaps they did not expect a surge in admission.
- **Jeff Jackanicz:** Inquired about local CSU's such as East Bay, SJSU? What are their numbers like?
- **Tom Enders:** Replied that Sonoma reports they're in the same place SF State is. SJSU freshman were slightly down, and Easy Bay is not down as much – same for Sacramento. There's a marked difference in the two regions; NorCal and SoCal.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Thanked everyone for their comments and noted no further questions.

Agenda topic # 4 – 2020-2021 Budget Update

(see slides 16-18)

- **Jeff Wilson:** Shared recent updates from State level: Governor indicated it may not change the budget during the year, but as tax revenue is not due until July 15th, that may change. The "triggers" noted are due to the pandemic – the cuts the CSUs are facing may be reversed, depending on the amount received, if any. Current language reports a 7.5% decrease. Campus allocations will come from the CO over the next few weeks.
- Shared that he was asked why we're moving so slow on our campus budget, but that's because of the dramatic levels of difference between the Governor and Legislature. It's hard to plan with such a large difference. We've been planning for a 10% reduction based on current enrollment, and noted measures taken so far. It will be several weeks before another update is received.
- **Mary Menees:** Shared she received an email from CSUEU saying the Legislature for the first time is directing the CSU to use their unrestricted surplus of \$1.5B to alleviate budget cuts. Requested an update and if that has been discussed and how will it impact our campus.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Replied it's included in our budget as it stands, and the CSU is analyzing the funding gap to unsure what we have can cover that gap to deliver our mission, but it would not necessarily fill the budget gap.
- **Genie Stowers:** Noticed on the CSU financial portal, it seems SF State has one of the highest levels of reserves in the system, so how might those reserves help this coming year? How does an 11% enrollment decline in tuition revenue and a 7.5% decline in State support, result in a 10% reduction in revenue for Fall? Tuition reduction plus State reduction should be more than 10%?
- **Jeff Wilson:** Responded the reserves on the portal are at the all-campus level, attributed to various units across campus, with some restrictions. Once the funding gap is determined and which reserves are unrestricted after June

30th, then determination of which portion may be used to address the university's funding gap. Also, the revenue sources are both at about 10%. The UBC should have actual numbers ready by the next meeting.

- **Gitanjali Shahani:** Asked if we had a sense if the 7.5% decrease to CSU was one-time? Also asked the Provost if there had been any form of protest or pressure to the Legislature against these cuts.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Replied they were advised this is a three-year decline in budget cycle. In year four, either it will flatten, or possibly increase. The 7.5% decrease is for year 2020-2021 as currently written. Does not know of any particular advocacy efforts.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Responded she is not aware of any particular advocacy in Sacramento right now either, and right now we're in a wait-and-see mode, but has heard the lower the cuts we anticipate this year, the higher they may be next year. It's a question of how the State allocates its reserves; whether front-loaded to smooth out the reductions or spread out over the next three years.
- **Teddy Albinak:** Asked if once we determine the funding gap and the reserves, might that readjust the 10% across-the-board reduction the Cabinet level is considering?
- **Jeff Wilson:** The 10% reduction is a budget guideline: there's an expectation that not every department/division would be able to achieve a 10% cut and still deliver its mission. As we move forward, those adjustments can take place.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Stated that Academic Affairs maintains the largest of the carryforwards proportionately. The Cabinet is planning for reports from each area, so it'll be clear how carryforwards are being distributed among them. 80% of the budget is tied in salaries, and it would be impossible to meet the 10% reduction target without utilizing those carryforwards and applying them to the gap. There's an active plan to redistribute these funds to support instruction, as that's our primary mission and commitment.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Noted these funds only buy time, and it doesn't resolve budget issues for the next three years. As we plan, it's important to plan for the next three to four years, not only this year.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Noted no questions. Thanked everyone and moved onto next topic.

Agenda topic # 5 – Review of UBC Workgroups:

(see slides 19-28)

Revise of UBC Charge workgroup:

- **Jennifer Summit:** Reviewed the Charge Revise group's work and changes they made to the Charge with the feedback received and acknowledged the importance of deliberation, participation in fiscal decision-making and transparent two-way communications.
- Changes to the UBC Charge membership includes changes to the co-chairs to the CFO and Provost, five faculty members and the addition of the Chair of the SIC. The group did not come to consensus about how faculty members are selected, so they bring the discussion back to the full UBC to give feedback so they can reconvene and visit this key point.
- **Jerry Shapiro** (speaking to his position shown on slide 25): Spoke in favor of seven total faculty members; an elected representative from each college and the library. The selection of these nominees would be conducted during campus elections that identifies faculty to represent their colleges in Academic Senate. As point of continuity, it could open up discussions of the UBC to the entire campus and provide an opportunity to encourage budget literacy, demonstrating community outreach. If a college does not elect someone, then it reverts to the Senate for nomination. It assures each college has a voice and fulfills our commitment that UBC is dedicated to reaching out and obtaining best information possible to present to the president for selection.
- **Nancy Gerber** (speaking to positions of the other group members shown on slide 26): Agrees with the spirit of Jerry Shapiro's points, but things to consider:

- When UBC positions are open, notice goes out to the entire campus so faculty already have the opportunity to nominate themselves.
- Since the Deans and Staff members are also from colleges, some colleges may have over-representation, relative to their size.
- In her experience as Senate Chair for three years, it's been a struggle for the smaller colleges with limited faculty, such as the Library, to be available to serve on committees.
- The UBC does require some experience with shared governance and knowledge of how the university functions, and it may be ineffective for someone without that experience yet to represent their college. She noted this over the years where some who may not understand the topics discussed, remain quiet, don't contribute to discussions, and may not, due to college structure, have power to the degree they'd be able to consult with members of their college on certain issues in an effective way, to garner consultation and feedback for the UBC. To have a selection process that allows for broad representation, and allows for people in positions that can speak truth to power is the best way to represent a stronger and clear faculty voice.
- Lastly, this is also a very large committee and this would raise the number of faculty from six to nine and less of other representation.
- Reiterated her agreement with the spirit of the proposal of broad faculty representation but disagreed on the mechanism for doing so.
- **Jennifer Summit:** Thanked Jerry and Nancy and noted further changes recommended in the addition of non-voting members of the president and adding representatives from labor councils. Requested feedback from UBC members. Will reconvene the Charge subcommittee to factor in any feedback.
- **Genie Stowers:** Referring to slide 21 re: communication: "Inform" is not the same as two-way communication. Referring to slide 23, disagreed with per-college nominations for same reasons Nancy stated. Also noted concern re: who would do the choosing of the final nominees which are sent to the president: should note if chosen by ExCom or Senate-wide.
- **Andrew Ichimura:** Appreciated the two points of view. Agrees with the spirit of the intent but also supports nominations through Senate.
- **Andrew Carrillo:** Commented regarding student representation, and strongly advocated for having two student representatives, especially since increasing of staff to two members. If this committee wants broad representation, more than one student is needed.
- **Gitanjali Shahani:** Asked Jerry to clarify his concern of nominating per college instead of from Senate; asked if this would fix any particular problem.
- **Jerry Shapiro:** Historically here's been some confusion what happens with the nomination pool, who gets selected, and what happens if there isn't a college rep – this would be a way to guarantee for each college to bring a voice to this committee. If they choose not to do so, they can revert to the Senate process. The Senate pool fails to address how the pool of nominees is crafted, so how the selections are then made is less transparent and less participatory than bringing it to the entire college/faculty community. It balances the voices of individuals who do not participate in Senate, whether due to time concerns or primary focus on their college activities. The more opportunity we have for self-governance, then a great participation of voices and perspectives will be included.
- **Teddy Albiniaik:** Appreciates the conversation and understands that previous decisions were made solely by ExCom. As it's now open to anyone from the faculty community, whether they are Senator or not, nominees already represent the greater body of the community.
- **Mary Menees:** Agreed it's also her understanding that any faculty member can be nominated from the Senate, and they do not have to be on the Senate to participate.

- **Jennifer Summit:** Grateful for the feedback and how the Charge language can be sharpened to meet its goal. Will discuss these concerns at the Charge group's next meeting, then will bring back something that can be finalized.

Fiscal Policy workgroup

(see slides 29-40)

- **Jeff Wilson:** Summarized the Fiscal Policy workgroup efforts on fund balances, reserves and carryforward policies, and they are still working on it. Have received feedback and as it keeps unfolding, insure those are addressed.

Budget Literacy workgroup:

- **Jeff Wilson:** Shared the group created a literacy guide (shared among the UBC members) and it's a foundational document that could lead to more literacy initiatives. Asked Elena Stoian to give document highlights.
- **Elena Stoian:** Thanked the group, reviewed the slides with the budget process, fund/revenue sources, expenses, terms glossary, and requested feedback.
- **Genie Stowers:** Commended Elena on this document and looks forward to building on it to help community members understand the university budget.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Noted no questions. Thanked everyone and moved on.

Agenda topic # 6 - Open Forum

- **Jeff Wilson:** Asked if there are any speakers present.
- **Sandee Noda:** Thanked VP Hellwig and UBC members for their support in adding a 2nd staff representative. It's important to hear from different voices and have broader participation. Thanked the UBC for adding the union presence because it's equally important for them to know the status of the university finances.
- **Jeff Wilson:** Seeing no further questions, closed open forum.

Agenda item # 7 – UBC Meeting Dates

- **Jeff Wilson:** Showed dates proposed for future meetings proposed. Seeing No comments, dates were approved. (all dates 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM via Zoom)
 - July 23rd
 - August 27th
 - September 24th
 - October 22nd
 - November 19th
 - December (none, for now)
- **Jennifer Summit:** Thanked all for attending this meeting, and mentioned to UBC members to expect a guidance request for the 3rd tranche of Cares funding that is due to the Minority Serving Institution ("MSI") status, and noted the term is not our campus term but a CSU term. Members can expect several disbursement proposals for their consideration and feedback, which will happen before the July 23rd meeting.

Meeting adjourned approximately 12:00pm.

- Next meeting: Thursday, July 23, 2020

/nr-g

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

1. Alex Hwu
2. Amy Lin
3. Angie Lipschuetz
4. Catherine Kim
5. Cathy Tong
6. Christopher Clark
7. Connie D'Aura (off-campus guest)
8. Derek Trang
9. Diep Nguyen
10. Ewa Zachoszcz
11. Gilberto Ramirez
12. Ingrid Williams
13. Jack Mao
14. Jaime Haymond (SUPA)
15. James Martel (CFA)
16. Janet Remolona
17. Jay O
18. Jennifer Khuu
19. Kay Gamo (UAPD)
20. Ly Chau
21. Marina Shevyakova
22. Mei Chin
23. Michael Goldman
24. Michael Scott
25. Mike Beatty
26. Nathan Norasmith
27. Nikkie Guevarra
28. Sandee Noda (CSUEU)
29. Shae Hancock
30. Shanice Robinson
31. Shumei Xie
32. Susan Pelton
33. Teresa Dziadur
34. Tiffany Cheung
35. Veronica Castillo
36. Vicky Lee