

FASP Minutes October 20, 2022
Condensed meeting: (4:22-5:12 pm)

Quorum assured (roll not called)

1. Meeting called to order at 4:22.
2. The agenda was modified.
Sistrunk explained FASP will take up the three introduction items at the last two meetings of FASP in November, and we will skip approval of the minutes today since we are late starting.
3. Discussion Item
Proposed revision of EM 05-017 University Budget Committee.

Sistrunk introduced the Guest speaker (Ann Sherman, Vice-President of Business and Finance) and thanked her for attending the meeting that began so late. He noted that a FASP subcommittee has been working on revising the EM defining the University Budget Committee to promote its interactive possibilities more markedly so that it serves to promote shared campus conversation and decision-making.

Ann Sherman noted that there has been some frustration in the UBC on the part of presenters and audience members. She hoped she could reduce this by thinking about ways we all might work together and make these meetings more productive for everyone. She noted that she discussed some issues with Sistrunk and Boyd and had five basic questions that we could all think about working together to improve how the UBC functions.

1. The first question is fundamental: What is the fundamental purpose of the UBC meetings?
If the purpose is to review the budget, or discuss the budget, or we have some sort of existential questions about it, the EM as it is written, is focused especially on Academic Affairs. This is about 64% of the budget (so there is some 35% we do not discuss).
2. It has been fun to see so many people show up for UBC meetings since they have been held on ZOOM. We have had up to 170 to 200 people, so this feels like a lot of engagement (and more than the meetings in Kendall 202-209). Those seem useful in that it is easier to break people into smaller groups to report out. Maybe we can maintain meeting schedules that allow us to do both types of meeting?
3. What is the difference between the people who are actively engaged on the committee itself compared to the audience that shows up to watch? Sherman said at San Francisco it was very clear who was part of the Budget Committee. It was always a small group of perhaps 8 or more, who sat at a main table and discussed their duties as parts of the committee explicitly.

4. The fourth question is about optics or the committee's scope. She would really like to find a way to be more interactive. It is difficult because we are often sharing basic information about how things work on a regular basis. We depict how the state budget cycle works and the CSU cycle beside it and the ways we allocate money within the campus. This happens on an annual rotating basis because we are always having new-comers joining. We really don't get into substantive conversations - how are we allocating our money, and why? We need to be more interactive than just reporting out.
5. The fifth question is an acknowledgement of the state budget cycle as it starts in January and then May and then June. While the CSU cycle starts in July and our campus cycle starts in August which is all during a time when faculty are off contract.

Sherman noted that she is trying to create 3 year budgets that can allow some planning and preparation to take place despite the cycles. She would be interested in the committee's ideas about how to best schedule meetings to greatest effect. How do we create a committee that has a good understanding so it feels like they can participate in some of its decisions even if they are over the summer months?

Sherman explained that the committee that met in San Francisco had representatives for each of the colleges (though not as many as we have). The President was Chair of the committee and ran the meetings. There was a staff person in my role and a budget director. It feels we report out a lot more where the committee was a lot more interactive and had substantive conversation more of ten between themselves. There was a representative from the staff council.

Boyd asked if Sherman knew of any written policy that described this more. She wondered if the FASP sub-committee could ask more questions to bounce more ideas off of Sherman.

Boyd wondered if we could explore being more flexible to address our enrollment challenges and other issues. Should the budget committee meet more regularly than quarterly and perhaps a subcommittee might meet more regularly.

Sherman said she experimented with three-year provisional budgets, but not everyone had supported this. She will try again this year.

Sistrunk hoped the FASP subcommittee had many ideas to start their work. He said this is the time when we are facing many challenges and concerns for this kind of thinking about how to make the UBC work.

Sherman addressed a strange rumor that we want to dispel. She said the University is not thinking of cutting our budget by 100 million dollars.

Dennis O'Connor asked if there were budget cuts on the horizon since our enrollment numbers are dropping. Sherman said we may be facing some sharp budget cuts and need to be ready for some difficult conversations. Our enrollment is projected to be flat for 3 to 4 and maybe 5 years, and the CSU has informed us they intend to reallocate allotments to campuses based on whether campuses are meeting their enrollment targets.

Patrick Newell thought the UBC should promote a campus-wide Financial summit to discuss different ways we can meet our campus challenges. He wondered if divisional cooperation will have to grow and change.

4. Action Items

a. Proposed revision of EM 06-034: Student Privacy Rights and Records.

Michael Dills-Allen explained the reasons the registrar must comply with federal changes in HERPA laws immediately and this EM would guarantee this. He also answered a question from last week about prices students are paying for their records. He said the price for a copy of our transcripts was set in 1978 and has not changed since.

b. Proposed Revision of EM 15-001: Exceptional Service Assigned Time.

Sistrunk explained that all the personnel were returned as members committee and that successful recipients would now have to complete a brief report after they received this honor which will be given to the Provost's Office for archiving.

Betsy Boyd noted she would include some language at Senate to capture that this policy will remain ongoing even if due dates might change and contracts might be readjusted in future negotiations.

