



University Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

DATE: Thursday, August 27, 2020

LOCATION: via Zoom

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, Dean Amy Sueyoshi, Senate Chair Teddy Albiniak, Ian Dunham, Andrew Ichimura, Mary Menees, Kathleen Mortier, Gitanjali Shahani, Jerry Shapiro, Genie Stowers, Dwayne Banks, Maria Martinez, Elena Stoian, Sutee Sujitparapitaya, Associate Students President Andrew Carrillo, President Mahoney

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

Absent: AS VP of Finance Rashid Abdul Rahiman

Guests Present via Zoom: Ingrid Williams, Associate Vice President of Human Resources
Carter Pauline Roa, AS rep and designee for AS VP of Finance

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

Accompanying presentation for this meeting can be found here: [UBC Presentation 8.27.20](#)

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 members and guests.

Agenda topic # 2 – Approval of Minutes from August 6, 2020 meeting

- **Jeff Wilson** requested approval of the meeting minutes.
- Other than a request from Genie Stowers to correct wording, members motioned to approve; passed.

Agenda topic #3 – Opening Remarks by President Mahoney

- **President Mahoney** noted the large (127+) campus attendance at this meeting, and expressed gratitude for their commitment to this topic. Thanked all for opening this Fall semester under extraordinary, unimaginable circumstances.
- Remarkd she had to leave last meeting early, but listened to recording of discussions and public forum and thanked those who also emailed her personally to ask specific questions or give suggestions. Acknowledged a reduction in workforce is extremely difficult, but the circumstances leave no recourse, as the University is not allowed as a single campus to enact furloughs, nor reduce compensation of any classification, such as MPPs. Stated those decisions are made systemwide at the CSU, and the layoff process is driven by

bargaining agreements which establish rules we follow. Layoffs include MPPs, so a reduction in workforce will be felt across the board.

- Confirmed we need to be deliberate and careful in attempts to minimize the number of staff to reduce, and today wants to hear everyone's thoughts on how much risk the University assumes, understanding the consequences of making the kinds of structural changes needed to compensate for reduced budgets.
- Ensured a commitment to more conversations with PowerPoints, to help all have the same level of knowledge, but keeping conversations as the most important tool. As the UBC is not a policy-making committee but is advisory to the President, the conversations and public forum questions help inform and enable her to think through decisions that must be made over the next few years.
- Thanked Genie Stowers for the correction to the minutes regarding that program, because there is uniform support for all three programs Student Affairs proposed at the last meeting for Cares funding; mentorship for men of color, technology needs for the digital divide, and mental health – those are heard repeatedly as needing support from all university constituents, so those will move forward. Student Affairs has identified funding to pick up those counselors in the 2021-2022 budget, and VP Hellwig urges anyone with questions to reach out to her directly. The remaining Cares Act \$1.8M will be retained, as much is unknown as we move to Spring, and whether we will still be remote – the CSU committed to making a decision by early October.
- Thanked everyone again for attending, and summarized that the better the university navigates the next few months, with compassion and collaboration, the stronger the institution will be.

Agenda topic # 4 – 2020-2021 Budget status (funding gap, strategies: enrollment, workforce reductions)

(see slides 8-16)

- **Jeff Wilson** reviewed the current planning scenario is based on 8.4% decline from Chancellor's Office enrollment target. Will present two scenarios based on enrollment numbers improving: 1) Scenario 1 = 6.7% decline from Chancellor's Office target and 2) Scenario 2 = 4.5% decline from Chancellor's Office target.
- Noted that any improvements to enrollment trends as presented are marginal, and will not resolve the funding gap caused by reduced State-funding and an overall enrollment decline.
- Advised two conditions create (revenue) risks associated with these proposed increased enrollment projections (from the CO's target): 1) non-resident and resident student enrollment has significantly declined from historical trends, which revenue forecasts rely upon, and 2) the campus has not yet cancelled students' registrations due to non-payment. This creates risk since we expect a high portion of currently registered students will not show up (= not pay tuition).
- Presented two scenarios: Scenario 1: reflects a 6.7% below enrollment target projection, so the deficit is \$40.3M. Note the difference in necessary savings from workforce reductions is reduced from \$11.9M to \$11.1M. Scenario 2 is the most optimistic scenario: a 4.5% the decline from CO's enrollment target results in a \$37.9M deficit, and the savings needed from workforce reductions is reduced to \$8.7M. Both include one-time actions taken to address the deficit: savings from vacant positions due to hiring chill, reducing student assistant wages, lower operating expenses/utility-savings due to closure of buildings due to pandemic, and savings from postponing deferred maintenance on campus buildings. The liability/risk pool costs, which are insurance costs, have not decreased.
- Invited Provost Summit to provide context around this for Academic Affairs, and how these one-time changes affect that division.

- **Jennifer Summit** observed that Academic Affairs has run its curriculum in ways that exceed budget capacity, and has covered the difference with salary savings or with carryforwards, which were a considerable amount in the past, that augmented support for the curriculum. Those funds has been diminishing year by year, and will soon run out. Without the opportunity to create salary savings by not hiring, the curriculum exceeds our ability to pay for it with available funds. There is a group working collaboratively with the Academic Senate Executive Committee and Academic Affairs Council to look at opportunities for creating permanent savings within Academic Affairs, to better align curriculum delivery with available funds. This is one example of an unsustainable situation, just within this one division.
- **Jeff Wilson** reiterated what President Mahoney stated: if the University relies on one of these optimistic enrollment scenarios, it will require implementation of discipline across the campus to prepare for next year. The CO already communicated there will be another budget reduction from the State for next year, and planning has to begin now, as will planning for enrollment in the hopes the next year brings improvement around the pandemic crisis. However, even with additional enrollments, plans are still needed to account for reduction of State funding.
- **President Mahoney** asked the UBC members for conversation about balancing the budget this year; if done by relying on temporary measures, every scenario uses nearly \$8M of the limited university un-allocated reserves. Current measures are being taken one-time, so hopes are that enrollment is more optimistic and offers slightly less reduction in the university workforce, but that requires, as VP Wilson stated, more discipline, which will also be difficult to figure out how to cover the cuts which are not taken this year.
- Governor Newsom let the CSUs, UCs and Community Colleges know they will receive another budget cut next year – that doesn't mean the needed funds won't be requested, but likely not received. Advocacy efforts have already begun.
- Requested the committee members' thoughts about the amount of risk to absorb this year, in order to make more permanent reductions.
- **Genie Stowers** asked about central reductions: slides state each VP was asked to reduce their budget by 10%, and in Academic Affairs, so assumed this was passed down to the Deans that some of those reductions might have been in lecture section reductions, etc., how will the others reflect this reduction?
- Also requested further clarification of the enrollment numbers, to determine which scenario to consider.
- **Jeff Wilson** responded the other divisions took the reductions in the hiring chill. The reductions that were taken across the campus divisions are reflected in the first three lines. The hiring chill (with positions left vacant) reduced student wages and operating expenses. Requested Tom Enders respond to enrollment questions.
- **Tom Enders** observed that the more optimistic scenario (#2) is based on ending the full academic year, as it started in Summer. Weeks away from Fall census, there is still activity, so it's just a projection. Enrollment Management is struggling to understand student behavior in this environment, and how it will affect the numbers. They are not cancelling students for non-payment, and trying to encourage students who are not ultimately going to come to drop their classes, so others who want to come can enroll. It's not known yet whether they did, but will be encouraging faculty before the drop deadline to advise which students have not participated at all, to give them the courtesy by dropping the class for them. Normally

there is lots of activity before census, partly because of students adding themselves back in that were dropped.

- Asserted that the highly optimistic scenario is still, highly optimistic, and did not include a reduction in new Spring students, which is typically parallel to the Fall by the same percentage. Spring may be more reasonable due to changing times, so the 6.7% scenario is a midpoint between where projections started and an optimistic view, but it won't be known until Spring census.
- **Teddy Albinia** appreciated the explanation but echoed Genie Stowers' concern about rendering conversations around scenarios without more active data. Asked about general trends in the stability of enrollment between Fall and Spring – if there tend to be drops, under normal conditions, or if there are any predictions of how the pandemic might affect Spring enrollment.
- **Tom Enders** responded that campus worked hard to reassure students, and undergrad and grad advisors have been reaching out all Summer. Current projections for Spring assume last Fall's retention. They are definitely seeing the effects of the pandemic in new students, especially new freshmen. They are a small part of Spring, but there is a 16% decline in new transfer students for this Fall.
- **Teddy Albinia** asked for a rough estimate of how many students missed their payment deadline; if a substantial percentage or a minimal percentage.
- **Tom Enders** responded in a normal Fall, they would have canceled about 700 students for non-payment. However, the next day they could re-enroll, if they wanted to, still without paying. Compared it to kicking a can down the road; the university has always saved students from cancellation for non-payment, even though they hadn't settled their account. This campus has had a liberal approach on this.
- **Jerry Shapiro** recognized the value of additional information when considering strategic formulations. In using reserves and in light of workforce reductions, asked what the financial impact will be on future planning, and will there be savings that allow campus to reformulate how to strategically use reserves. Asked if there is additional information that can be considered, to allow for the benefit on morale and community relations, and presenting to the community the desirability of coming to SF State as an investment of future financial benefit.
- Asked if there a movement towards generating a centralization of funding.
- Asked if there was opportunity for generating additional revenue through the Bold campaign or other specific programs, which could reduce workforce reduction.
- **President Mahoney** responded that in order to enable the campus to get through the next four years of reduced allocations, it was wise to consider using no more than 25% per year of the reserves, as there are diminishing carryforwards, as the Provost explained, to fill the instructional budget.
- Explained the UBC recommended use of 35%, which is the \$7.8M, and any more than that would put the university on very shaky financial ground, and the CO may be very concerned. The university has to be prepared for the unknown in terms of future budget cuts, and for any other disaster or emergency, such as earthquakes. There was already a flood in a campus building this year during the shutdown. Reserves are already being squeezed.
- Summarized that once through this immediate budget problem, there is still the hard work of planning long-term strategies with the effects of these decisions.

- **Jennifer Summit** repeated that Academic Affairs is using its own diminishing carryforwards in order to cover the curriculum. This year, it will use \$6.7M of carryforwards, pulled back from multiple sources, leaving very little for next year. The university needs to rethink and revise the way it delivers curriculum, because the source of that funding will be depleted by end of this year.
- **Jerry Shapiro** thanked for the additional information, as it allows for more strategic conversations rather than vague percentages. Layoffs characterize an emergency, and it's a difficult conversation to have about how risking more this year is a way that defines our commitment to not only to people on campus, but to the community.
- Asked what opportunities the university may have to reach out to alumni to participate in this type of commitment.
- Also asked about trust funds donated to colleges and departments for specific purposes and intent, as those may influence, at the department level, how to strategically stretch in a cost-effective way. The more information given, the more the UBC can collaboratively plan.
- **Jeff Jackanicz** responded to the question about fundraising; every day in Advancement is an "all-hands-on-deck" for raising as much funding broadly for campus, but with a particular focus on student scholarships. They look at every possible chance to proactively raise that with alums. Advancement just concluded a comprehensive campaign which, despite the pandemic, the most generous donors stepped forward to their greatest capacity in recent history. Additionally, Advancement is working hard to leverage the pandemic message as effectively as possible, as it's a very fine line. It's been effective in regards to the Hope Crisis Fund, but if invoked too much, or in an unforeseen way, it ultimately may end up discouraging philanthropy. Folks are generally more interested in helping an institution move forward, rather than, for lack of a better term, preserving a status quo. Advancement is looking at finding inspirational ways to leverage that message.
- **Mary Menees** asked with regards to Spring enrollment for grad students, for example: they've deferred several to Spring enrollment instead of Fall, based on what they wanted, and was wondering if the same was being applied to undergrads, or if that would have an impact on Spring enrollment.
- **Tom Enders** responded that the Spring numbers, especially for grad students, are very similar to last year. A small percentage of overall enrollment is new grad students, and as Spring may be virtual, it's uncertain if they will actually enroll.
- **Amy Sueyoshi** acknowledged the three scenarios, asserting it's suggested the last two may lead to reduced layoffs. How does the UBC determine which to plan for, or, are the scenarios not for planning, but to give a landscape of things that could happen?
- **Jeff Wilson** answered 'yes' to the first question; generally if the amount of savings necessary to achieve workforce reductions is lower, then the number of layoffs would be lower.
- The second question is for UBC discussion: what advice can it provide to the President around the level of risk the university can assume, while understanding the hard work necessary over the next year facing additional budget pressures.

- **President Mahoney** confirmed the she needs to hear from the UBC about the level of risk for next year, if based on optimistic enrollment numbers. It save more staff positions, but pushes the problem down the road. The decision needs to be made this week.
- **Amy Sueyoshi** suggested Scenario 1 as it seems not overly optimistic, and may be a more moderate way to take cuts rather than “taking an axe to the tree”.
- **Jennifer Summit** offered what this means to Academic Affairs. As with the President, they desperately want to reduce the number of layoffs as much as possible. Given the size of the division, fewer layoffs also mean fewer resources available for critical areas like operating expenses, or, most of all, funding the curriculum. The urgent need for discipline is to identify where to create permanent savings.
- **Andrew Ichimura** repeated Jerry’s comments about a campaign to increase enrollment and strengthen programs that are doing well. Enrollment has not declined uniformly across all departments and colleges, so advocating for those is a proactive measure to delivering curriculum well, and an important message for enrollment in the future.
- Inquired about projections for retirements this coming academic year, as another piece of information that might lessen the impact of layoffs.
- **President Mahoney** responded that the university will be doing a lot of strategic work on enrollment, but that can take years to build. A small freshman class means reduced retention for the next three to four years. The university has to identify strategic ways to grow enrollment and stabilize it.
- The early-exit retirement program is an example of conversations needed for the budget; minimizing layoffs only buys some time, but the university needs a variety of other strategies to help meet the budget.
- **Jeff Wilson** reminded that the University faces another budget reduction next year; attrition encountered in '20-'21 may help support some of the reduced funding for next year.
- **Genie Stowers** remarked that although optimistic about the level of risk, there are too many unknowns, considering the coming Presidential election and any repercussions and disruptions to our systems in ways we cannot foresee, and have to be considered in some way. Agreed with Dean Sueyoshi on choosing the middle ground, at this point.
- **Jeff Wilson** invited Ingrid Williams to answer any member questions around the impact of layoffs from a Human Resources perspective.
- **Mary Menees** asked when layoffs will occur on this campus, as other campuses have had layoffs due to lack of work, instead of lack of funds.
- **Ingrid Williams** responded that different scenarios are being reviewed. Primarily, layoffs would happen for lack of funding, and the President needs to finalize the information soon. Layoffs would occur within the next couple of weeks. The process begins with identifying those classifications and forwarding the information to the CO, which notifies the unions. After, staff would receive their notifications. Layoffs are based on classifications per the collective bargaining agreements.

- **Mary Menees** asked further if that meant those layoffs happen at the end of the year.
- **Ingrid Williams** acknowledged the difficulty of providing specifics, as much of the timing is fluid based on many factors, and based on the budget scenario decided upon. Likely, they'd happen over the next few weeks.
- **President Mahoney** responded that most collective bargaining agreements include 60 days of notice, so staff would likely work through the most of the Fall semester.
- **Gitanjali Shahani** requested clarification about layoffs based on classifications and seniority within those, and, what would happen to the work itself - how do units reassign it, and if work might be pushed to faculty.
- **Ingrid Williams** emphasized that bargaining unit work cannot be mixed. Once decisions are made, VPs will meet with their unit leadership to decide how the work in their unit will be done. Its possible positions may be moved around to help other areas to fill in the gaps.
- **Jerry Shapiro** asked what the specific impact was in the two scenarios offered, and a rough estimate of the number of individuals involved.
- **Ingrid Williams** estimated the President mentioned around 140 or so positons, to perhaps about 100.

Agenda topic # 5 – UBC priority: planning for 2021-2022

- **President Mahoney** expressed that much has already been said about the very hard work the university has to do for this year, one way or another. This next budget begins with a deficit, because some of the permanent cuts have been met with one-time funding, and determinations have to be made as to the gap that will need to be covered permanently for 2021-2022. As the university begins to hear more from the State in January, the need for budget planning in multiple scenarios begins, adding future funding cuts on top of that as well.
- Noted that planning for budget cuts takes place at the department levels and college levels -- the UBC does not make these decisions. The ability to learn what the colleges and the department units are doing has to be built into the conversations, to be able to look at it all from a distance.
- Reminded the UBC has two jobs: to discuss with the university community the kinds of permanent changes needed to meet the cuts faced this year, as well address those changes coming.
- Summarized that fundraising is not the solution, because salaries are permanent costs if they're retained. Using the recent BOLD thinking campaign as an example; most of these gifts are one-time, and for a specific purpose, so they don't just get added to the university's endowment. Fundraising and alumni support will be critical to move forward, but is not the solution to meet the funding gaps.

Agenda topic # 6 – UBC governance: process, membership, campus community engagement and input

- **Jennifer Summit** began that at the last meeting, issues were raised concerning the UBC Charge, committee structure and its function.
- Presented the plan to reconvene the UBC Charge revision workgroup to meet, discuss and revise the current Charge and bring it back to the full UBC for further consideration.
- Opened the issues to be discussed before that meeting:

- 1) adding more staff representative members; how many, and how
 - 2) the creation of and the topics for UBC agendas, and instituting a small steering committee elected by UBC members to meet more frequently to set the agenda and maintain regular communications with the co-chairs and President, at a pace synchronized with the most urgent issues the university is experiencing.
 - 3) how the UBC best captures the discussions in order to represent an accurate reflection of them to the President, as this group serves as advisory to the President and she won't always attend these meetings.
- Reiterated the goal to surface as many perspectives, so the Charge workgroup can take them into consideration. The Charge workgroup members are Jerry Shapiro, Jason Porth, Mary Menees and Teddy Albinak.
 - **Nancy Ganner** asked for clarification about who can comment on this topic, whether UBC members only or also advisory members.
 - **Jennifer Summit** confirmed just the core UBC members, as this is the last item on the agenda and the public forum can be used to address comments on this issue as well.
 - **Mary Menees** asked when the 2nd staff member would be added.
 - **Jennifer Summit** responded they have not joined yet, and as that was just added in the recent Charge revision. Requested feedback on the issue about adding additional staff representatives to the UBC membership.
 - **Genie Stowers** agreed that more staff representation is needed. Also voiced concern over UBC process, as it occurred with the presentation by Student Affairs at the prior meeting about Cares Act funding that was decided via survey, which seemed non-transparent.
 - Reiterated the UBC's attempt to change its culture, with the need to think ahead and discuss how to make recommendations like that, rather than a sudden survey between meetings. More planning is needed, with a process for discussion and motions, etc.
 - **Gitanjali Shahani** agreed on adding more staff, to help UBC hear from staff. Regarding how many; suggested taking into considered the various levels of faculty on the UBC; Deans, Chairs and Senate members, so representation among staff ranks from different parts of campus is also important, and asked to keep that principle in mind.
 - **Kathleen Mortier** supported an increase in the number of staff representatives on the committee, and offered perhaps equal representation to faculty. If meetings remain on Zoom, a larger committee should not be a problem.
 - **Andrew Ichimura** inquired if there was any issue with staff ability to participate in the meetings per the collective bargaining agreements. Faculty has a duty to contribute service to the institution. Also wondered if financial experience or skills may be needed, such as some of the targeted positions of several of the committee members.
 - **Andrew Carrillo** requested consideration when adding staff, to include an auxiliary staff member, as they would offer different input and diverse opinion which most university staff members may not might not have.

- **Jennifer Summit** thanked everyone for their contributions and asked about the creation of a UBC steering committee, a small group elected and comprised UBC members, charged with consulting with the co-chairs and President for a range of tasks, such as creating agenda items.
- **Kathleen Mortier** spoke in supported of this idea, especially with the added members making this a very large committee, and the steering committee having input into the agenda.
- **Gitanjali Shahani** supported this idea, especially if that group meets more regularly, as it's difficult to pack everything into the monthly meetings to get things done. It works for the Senate and has been productive. It may not have been needed in the past, but now with the budget issues, this seems like a good format to use moving forward.
- **Mary Menees** supports a steering committee, and wants to ensure the composition is more representative than of the few groups that comprise the larger committee.
- **Jennifer Summit** thanked everyone for asked the last question about how to capture the discussions from meetings to convey outcomes to the President, so that they reflect the richness of the discussions and diversity of perspectives. As the UBC is counsel to the President, simply voting on items risks the silencing the minority voices.
- **Andrew Ichimura** confirmed it can be a conundrum to capture nuance without being present.
- **Kathleen Mortier** commented we may need a combination of solutions, but the main thing is the process is clear; found it useful to have meeting discussions, that all agree on something, and like last week, lead to a Qualtrics Survey. As a large group, it's hard to have input from all members on every point, every time, so a combination of ways is needed.
- **Jason Porth** recalled President Mahoney shared she had the benefit of listening to the last meeting because it had been recorded. Asked how members feel about that becoming an ongoing practice, even later, to give the President the ability to listen to the discussion and have the benefit of that nuance.
- **Teddy Albiniaik** appreciated the feedback as a member of the Charge workgroup, and called on all UBC members to help refine how to choose staff positions and how to put that in language, for broad representation across both colleges and members of the university. Invited anyone to contact him directly with recommendations.
- **Jennifer Summit** thanked everyone for the discussion and range of perspectives. Will take to the Charge workgroup and bring it back to this committee.

Agenda topic #7 - Open Forum

- **Jeff Wilson** opened the public forum inviting everyone the opportunity to speak, noting the session is recorded if a more extensive answer is required than the 3-minute limit per speaker allows for time.
- **John Cleary** asked three questions, as he has been working in a union subcommittee:
 1. Stated they're told all CSU's are one university re: furloughs, but when it comes to layoffs, each campus is on their own to solve its problems. They believe there's a large 'rainy day fund' (at the CSU) and it feels

like it's 'raining' now. The CO wants it both ways, and as the CO is not present at this meeting, they'd like to convey they are unhappy with layoffs, in one of the most expensive areas to live in the United States.

2. It seems staff hiring has remained static while MPP hiring has gone up. Lots of work has been pushed to staff, so they feel like they're doing more with less. All the while, they've noticed additional MPP hires and wondered if this will be taken into account, when MPPs earn more than staff, so savings would be more significant.
 3. In discussions about adding more staff to the committee, they will feel powerless and don't get to vote on decisions made. They know someone has to make those decisions, but they're being asked to take reductions in their workforce without an equal say in the decisions.
- **Darlene Yee-Melichar** reflected on the discussions about UBC governance, as a professor, coordinator of the Gerontology program, as the ASCSU Vice Chair and as a member of the CSU budget advisory committee, asked about the process of campus engagement and input from campus constituents, whether they be faculty, staff or students, and any plans for opportunities to share the information from today and solicit input from the broader campus community.
 - **Danny Paz Gabriner** asked for process clarity in the deficit savings, with reduction in student assistant wages and lower operating expenses, as part of each Cabinet's reduction plan – has this already occurred or if this will happen in Fall/Spring.
 - **Christian Rodriguez** stated that as presented, Academic Affairs has been working outside its budget for years, and asked how that was allowed to occur, as it seems fiscally irresponsible knowing funds were running out. It's a hazardous situation given the pandemic and economic depression, and it seems Student Affairs was doing the same. Stated that as a community, universities should be supported and invested in, but it's not the reality. Operating at a loss using carryforwards that reduced over years left less of a safety net for the university going into this pandemic.
 - **Jennifer Summit** clarified the public forum process of comments and direct questions: in order to allow for as many who wish to speak, they will gather the questions and respond at the beginning of the next meeting. Some questions may inform agenda items, in case it seemed they were not being heard and not responding, but they are taking in the feedback given.
 - **Carmen Domingo** stated in reflection of the scenarios presented, advocated for Scenario 2, as it might provide additional time to be strategic. It's at the risk of maybe miscalibrating enrollment, but the gain would be a reduction in the number of layoffs.
 - **Sandee Noda** made three comments:
 1. as a non-voting member of the committee, it's confusing as to why they have to wait until the public forum to ask questions.
 2. inquired about the transparency of a survey sent to voting members, and not seeing the survey or results.
 3. requested fairness in the process of selecting new staff representatives to the UBC, as during a similar selection process for the Presidential Search Committee, there was issue with the ability of staff to Single Sign-On (SSO) access to voting (different than it is for faculty). Otherwise, one person can vote multiple times, and SSO for staff would make the voting process fair.

- **Darleen Franklin** asked about COVID-19-related expenses the university is incurring, and if the recovery of funding/reimbursement coming will be shown in one of the scenarios.
- **Genie Stowers** objected to not answering questions during the public forum, as its not transparent, and is distressed to see the continuing evolution of the culture of this committee not moving more towards transparency
- **Jeff Wilson** thanked everyone for their comments and responded to Genie Stowers' comment that they (co-chairs) want to make sure they're able to answer questions and comments thoughtfully, and recorded the questions so they could answer them, and also to allow for every speaker to be heard. The public forum is 10-minutes and if they answer questions/have dialogue, it may prevent others from being able to speak.
- **Genie Stowers** thanked him for the response and suggested a change in process should be decided by the committee.
- **Jeff Wilson** asked Provost Summit to include this in the work of the Charge workgroup.
- **Sandee Noda** suggested making responses available on the UBC webpage. At the CSUEU they send an email to all members when responding to questions, but if not known who attended this meeting, the webpage could be a solution.
- **Jerald Shapiro** agreed with Sandee Noda and Genie Stowers and hopefully the workgroup will be able to address these matters. Also commented he didn't think they've had a clear representation of either scenario, which reminded him of past presentations where there was discussion, but no clear indication where it led in terms of formalizing a decision. Asked if the UBC will have a process to communicate their preferred option or somewhere in the middle.
- **Lynn Mahoney** summarized this is a very unusual year in terms of budget planning – ideally in Fall, planning is for the following year. This time, we're changing the budget for the current year. Typically there would be a longer deliberative process for planning, but budget cuts came when we should have already finished our budget. 2020 is an anomaly in all ways, and we cannot delay decisions any longer. The year has begun without a single permanent reduction, and the university is on the verge of a budgetary "cliff". Requested everyone's patience and forbearance for this very unusual time.
- **Jeff Wilson** thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting.

Meeting adjourned approximately 12:00pm.

- Next meeting: Thursday, September 24, 2020, 10:00am – 12:00pm

/nr-g