

California State University, Chico
Academic Senate
(530) 898-6201, Zip 020
MEMORANDUM

UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 1, 2018, 2:30-5:00, K-207/209

University Budget Committee meetings are recorded. Traditionally the written minutes consist of a summary of topics discussed. For more detail, listen to the audio file [here](#). Time stamps for each agenda item are provided in parenthesis for convenience. CSU, Chico is committed to making its resources accessible for all audiences. If you have accessibility-related difficulties with any of these documents, please email oats@csuchico.edu.

Chair Wyrick called the third meeting of the academic year to order at 2:32. He noted that the 4th meeting would occur on April 27th. (3:03-3:43)

1. [Approve Minutes of November 9, 2017](#). (3:44-3:52)

Minutes were approved.

2. [Approve Agenda](#). (3:54-4:02)

Agenda was approved.

3. [2018-19 Budget Overview](#). (4:06-14:22)

Wyrick introduced President Hutchinson and Jeni Kitchell, Director, University Budget Office, to give the overview. Hutchinson welcomed everyone and said that the hope was that this body would begin to make recommendations that can be used in deliberations after we receive our budget allocation after the Governor's May Revise comes out. This is a review of process to help us.[Slide 1]

- **[2018-19 CSU Operating Budget \(Board of Trustees 11/8/17\)](#)**

For the Operating Budget of 2018-19 the Board of Trustees requested @ \$283M [page 6]
The breakdown is:

- \$76M Graduation Initiative;

- \$122M Compensation for salary and benefits of all the different ranks of staff and faculty;

- \$39,905,000 Enrollment Growth of about 1% for the entire system;

- \$15M Facilities and Infrastructure including all the deferred maintenance;

- \$30,888,000 Mandatory Cost increases

- **[Governor's Budget Summary 2018-19](#)** (see page 29)

The Governor's Budget which came in in January 2018 appropriated \$92.1M to the CSU with tuition growth of @\$20M that allots about \$112M to the budget. This leaves a total budget gap of \$171M.

Given this large gap Hutchinson said beyond our lobby days on March 7 and April 4 that we should communicate with our legislators about the importance of higher education and investing in the CSU.

- [Legislative Analyst's Office 2018-19 Budget: Higher Education Analysis](#) (see page 30) [Slide 3]

Hutchison encouraged members to look at the report of the Legislative Analyst. The information suggests that CSU needs to work within it means. The social compact we fulfill means we serve about 30% of the college ready population and now we have reached up to about 41%.

[2018-19 Budget Overview](#)

[Slide 4]

Given that we have a \$171M gap, she thought there are two approaches to take:

- 1) Seek additional state funding
- 2) Adopt CSU controlled strategies

The Board of Trustees is considering raising tuition. Hutchinson reminded everyone that this is different than raising campus fees that we will discuss below.

[Slide 5] Hutchinson pointed out that the CSU is currently operating more efficiently than comparison institutions. Our expenses per FTES were \$17,354 while comparable institutions average \$23,962. The CSU is already educating our students in a way that is high quality and efficient and effective.

Jeni Kitchell added that that is pretty much the point of this presentation –At the CSU we already do more with less. The expectation that we have more places to cut is shown to be inaccurate. It will be really difficult for us to continue to do that.

Stivers said that we have just this last year reached the funding level that was taken away some 5 years ago. Hutchinson added that we lost about \$1B during the Great Recession and the governor has helped us come back from that, but we have about 21% more students.

[Slide 6] Hutchison hoped we would think about our advocacy efforts right now. This is the legislative season when we remind our legislators about the importance of the CSU. The Governor will come back with the May Revise on May 10 or so, and the Board of Trustees will meet shortly after on the 15th and 16th. If the gap is still \$171M, the board will have to wrestle with the notion of raising student tuition.

The final budget comes out around June 30. This is difficult because as an institution we will already be making plans. We have already determined the Fall schedule. We will have to make adjustments over the summer with information given to faculty as quickly as possible. As we have in the last two years, the budget and allocation will be out with the same speed (two months earlier than in the past).

Hutchinson said we will use the WASC institutional self-study to think about what we are doing well and what direction we want to set our sights toward. This will require strategic planning and prioritization and this will continue into next year.

4. Guiding Principles for Budget Prioritization: Initial Discussion (14:22-48:39)

Wyrick handed out a copy of a document listing University strategic priorities and the University values. He explained we would engage in an exercise in prioritization. Since the May Revise does not come out until after the last meeting of UBC on April 27, the committee has no chance to provide feedback on what the budget will actually be this year. We are trying a strategy to think about our priorities that will have to be decided in the summer.

Lang described how this exercise will prompt us to look at our core values and how we prioritize them if we are pushed to a point when we have to look at our budget and think about potentially making cuts. We should do this in a way that keeps us close to our core values and not let these cuts get us away from what we are truly about.

Wyrick explained that we might ask if there are aspects of our values that also might be prioritized and are there key values of our institution that don't appear in our mission that also need to be ranked. The committee divided into pairs to think about the questions.

Hassenzahl hoped the exercise would not be framed as if we are thinking about what we are not going to do if push comes to shove. Hutchinson said the challenge was to think about how to get information from this body in a way that will be meaningful, because Cabinet will take the input received into their deliberations. This is a friendly exercise, but if something emerges that is even more focused, let's figure out how to work with it.

Pairs met and talked (20:22-35:26).

Wyrick invited comments.

Larson said that her group noticed that the 3 of the priorities in our mission ("Assist students", "Prepare students") are outcomes. The 3 priorities that we hope to "provide excellence" are strategies to get to the outcomes. If the outcomes are done well, the 3 categories about the hope to "Serve" Northern California, the state, and the nation are the result of achieving the outcomes. Her group thus prioritized the outcomes.

Larson also noted that the work that everyone does at the university including all that the staff at every level accomplishes does not really fit in the older faculty buckets of teaching, research, and service. We will become a more effective university if we can figure out mechanisms to appreciate and deliver a merged set of activities for our students and community.

Hassenzahl said that if we were not in triage mode and throwing things out, that he thought we should focus on things that are accomplishing multiple objectives at one time. A focus on excellence in instruction should feed all of these things. If there is something that is not involved with this that is not our highest priority.

He added that since it looks like our budget will not be good when our economy has never been doing better, it is safe to assume we will not have good budgets into the future. How do we plan for that, how do we find other ways we can accomplish our goals? Which of these things are fundable elsewhere? There are ways to fund public service, research, and creative activity. We

must figure out how to provide our students with a well-rounded education possibilities and fund the parts that can't be paid for by the general fund.

Lang said that he and Barbara Fortin thought that instruction, research and creativity were a major part of our core values and then to the priority of preparing our students with attitudes, skills and habits of lifelong learning to be useful members of a global society, they added and be competitive in the job market. He also asked were safety and security fit in our core values.

Evanne O'Donnell said that her group changed the number one priority to: "Provides excellence in instruction to assist students in the search for knowledge and understanding in a global society." This seems to encompass all of the outcomes. The emphasis that we are serving California is important to add as well. They thought service and creative activity was about faculty and was a third priority.

Stivers reported that he and Sistrunk combined priorities under a rubric of a commitment to sustainable practice as excellence in instruction, research and public service. We should start there with an input in order to have the outcomes we want. The first three bullets could be combined with the last three 3, so that the University assists students in search for knowledge and understanding to assume responsibility in Northern California and in a global society. Sistrunk added that the emphasis on Northern California would distinguish us from other Universities.

Boyd said she and Selvester thought the priorities were so interconnected, they could not really be separated. They decided to consider the values to start to find priorities. They started with the commitment to academic excellence and high expectations for our students and thought the ideas connected to that were tenure density, faculty development, the teacher/scholar model, the staff that facilitate the work to make this happen.

They thought that this second bullet (on the left hand side) connects to the last two bullet (on the same side) that call for active learning, etc. and co-curricular experience, service engagements, etc. really encompass a multi-disciplinary, or integrated approach that are a way to take the academic silos and recognize how they actually overlap to create a student with a well-rounded education.

Boura said they had combined the three final priorities that are student focused. Since we teach, they recognized the primacy of providing excellence in instruction to provide research and creative activity and public service (these are all complimentary). The students should be civically engaged in their community (whether it is the North State, California or anywhere in the country). Wherever they are, students should demonstrate the values of Chico State.

Wyrick thought the conversation was a good segue into preparing to talk about the strategic plan. He said that Senate staff will summarize what was discussed. This is also preliminary for what we hope to do in our April meeting to create a more targeted prioritization list to assist cabinet in budget decisions in May and thereafter.

5. Graduation Initiative Spending – 2013-to Present - Loker. (48:40-1:12:22)

Wyrick introduced Bill Loker, Ex-Interim Vice Provost for Academic Programs. Loker said he will summarize how Chico State has spent the money entrusted by the state over the last five years or so.

[slide 2] He said there are challenges to providing this summary. There has not been a coherent approach to allocating the funds by the Chancellor's Office to campuses. There have been a variety of packages: sometimes one-time money vs. base; sometimes a competitive proposal process (ex. REACH, Summer Bridge, EOP) vs. earmarks vs. open-ended. There has not been a uniform allocation process.

The important principle that did not vary was that the money given to Academic Affairs was always determined by the Provost. In Student Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs always had the final decision. Sometimes money was specified for Student Affairs or Academic Affairs and sometimes we had to come up with ways to collaborate. The Graduation Initiative and Student Success majors over the last years have been an excellent example of collaboration between units.

[Slide 3] starts with the Academic Year, 2014/15, which is the first year money was associated with the Graduation Initiative. Most of this money was allocated competitively between campuses which were invited to apply. In Academic Affairs, this funded REACH, Summer Bridge courses, U-courses. This was the beginning of the course redesign with technology program (that remains under the direction of Kathy Fernandez in the Chancellor's Office). The Chancellor's Office also began to emphasize gathering accurate and reliable data to direct decision making and supporting computer program purchasing to do it.

Zartman asked if the Chancellor's Office distributed roughly \$15M and we have been getting @5% of that of the total each year? Loker answered that he did not remember what the total was, but that distributing 5% to us has sometimes been used and sometimes not. Loker said that he did not believe the competitive programs were strictly assigned as 5%. Zartman wanted to observe that we seem to have been ahead of the curve. Loker could not say, but there has been great work going on across the system.

[Slide 4] In AY 15/16, the total amount of money allocated to the campus was increased and this was the first time that the money allocated was base funding. This was \$750,000.

- \$500,000 went to tenure-track hiring.
- \$127,000 base money was allocated to Academic Advising.
- \$152,000 was allocated for a center for High Impact Practices (this was never put into place).

Hutchinson asked where this money went and Loker said it was base funding that went into the Academic Affairs budget.

- \$357,177 paid for 30 grants awarded by the Chancellor's Office to faculty for

course redesign.

- \$70,000 was spent for more data infrastructure.

[Slide 5] AY 16/17 funds were increased but it was all one-time money. This means we could not invest in tenure track or advising hires. We spent money'

- \$319,558 to hire temporary advisors and others
- \$166,425 Chancellor's Office course redesign
- \$474,640 supplemental instruction (tutoring, peer mentoring, etc.). The money was also supposed to impact graduation rates that year (this was put into summer and winter intercession courses and fee waivers)
- \$418,414 – money was spent to relieve course bottlenecks (and add sections)
- \$220,000 further improvements to data warehouse
- \$119,500 Ucourses and retention of minority male students (attempts to close the graduation gap –leadership center –this is being repeated this Spring)

[Slide 6] AY 17/18. This year is marked by the \$75M tuition increase. We were allocated about 5% (or \$2.9M). This has been split between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

- \$2,200,000 Academic Affairs share allowed 22 TT searches.
- \$568,800 There has been longer term investment in the centralized advising services as well as in ARC and EOP. Some of this is base money and some is one time money.
- \$205,000 We continue to work on course redesign some of this money comes from the Chancellor's Office
- \$259,000 Supplemental Instruction (winter grants, peer mentors, etc.)
- \$50,000 FLC for inclusive pedagogy
- \$137,400 Minority male support, Dream Center (mix of one time and base)
- \$98,800 Student Basic Needs (increased awareness in the system that our students are food and housing insecure)
- \$217,888 Unallocated -all left over one time money

[Slide 7] Final Summary to Date 2014/15-17/18

- \$2,700,000 (27 TT hires)
- \$1,076,217 Course Redesign
- \$668,414 Increased capacity for classes (one time basis)
- \$393,205 First Year Student Support (EOP, REACH)
- \$832,440 Other Student support (supplemental instruction)
- \$396,250 Data Infrastructure
- \$1,015,358 Advising
- \$567,650 Other
- \$217,888 Unallocated one-time

Zartman said it looks like Tenure track hires where 34%, but the bulk of that was in one year. All of that is base money which Loker pointed out will be paid every year.

Hassenzahl thought it was strange that these moneys are designated as Student Success funds since all the other funds we spend are also dedicated to student success. Hassenzahl hoped Loker in retirement could reflect on what practices have really been efficient, high impact in promoting student success and what has not been so good. Hassenzahl wanted to note the unfunded administrative load that has come with all these discrete specialized programs. The budget must be managed separately, the process must be managed separately and it seems like a lot more money to accomplish the things we were likely to do anyway. It's nice to have the money, but frustrating to be given it in the way it has been.

Loker admitted that that has been challenging. He said we can look at individual programs and see that they have been successful (retention, EOP, etc.). A piecemeal look will miss the complexity of the outcomes that lead to students' success. He does not feel confident to identify what specifically led to what outcome.

Lang wanted to note that the Graduation Initiative was part of the first system meeting he had attended a few weeks ago. The question of the collaboration between Student Affairs and the Provosts' Offices came up. He said he was able to talk about it in depth and address how funds were delegated and many of the other institutions could not do that. He said he was able to shine a light on our campus and how Student Affairs and Academic Affairs can work together for our students.

Loker wanted to recognize Barbara Fortin for all her work and she really has been co-Chair of the Graduation Initiative Team.

[Slide 9] Loker said that these 2025 Graduation Initiative Goals are important for performance indicators and he hoped as we consider funding problems and our work, we will keep student success front and center.

6. Student Fee Proposal – Lang/Larson (1:12:22-1:50:53)

Lang explained he and Larson would give an overview of the presentation they have been giving. As an institution, he wanted to recognize that things have happened in the past that we have no control over. Presently, we are faced with challenges to make sure we can continue to provide a comprehensive educational experience for our students. We no longer have the luxury to spend our reserves. By necessity, we must put this on the table. Some of our programs are running deficits and if we don't do something these will continue.

He and the Provost are trying to show where we have come from, where we're at and where we would like to go in terms of these fees and to get feedback about them so we can make an educated decision as an institution.

- [Proposed Campus Fee Adjustment Website](#)

Challenges now include:

- 1) long walk-in wait times for students at the Health Center, not enough appointment

- times, not enough medical providers, or counselors in counseling services
- 2) outdated equipment, limited support services such as tutoring
 - 3) not enough base funding to sustain a competitive Athletic program

The Fee increases will allow us to hire and retain more medical and counseling staff, make sure we maintain top notch intercollegiate athletics sports and intermural sports and sports club programs, provide needed resources to support student learning and extend financial aid. The changes proposed:

- \$99 Student Health Services (financial aid set aside 6%)
 - \$51 Athletics (financial aid set aside 4%)
 - \$40 Student Learning Fee (financial aid set aside 33%)
- \$190 Total fees 1017/18

Year by year these fees will continue to rise.

Alternative consultation is underway in student open forums and with many student groups including the Campus Fee Advisory Committee, AS and a host of other groups. Lang said as a first generation low income student to come to this campus and be put into this conversation is very uncomfortable for him. Our educational experience for our students is at risk and we have to have this conversation.

- **Frequently Asked Questions**

It was asked why financial aid is so high for the Student Services fee and so much lower for the others. Larson said the original fee EOs determine this percent and the escalator of expenses. This financial aid is flexible. Can we change these rates? Larson said no decision has been made and this comment will be taken into account when the final determinations are made.

Larson said that when they do the full presentation they bring the people who direct the services that are impacted to talk about the fees. The experts are in the audience to address hard questions. She said that we are familiar with the services these fees provide.

The **Student Health Service fee** is covering three different areas: 1) Student Health Center 2) Counseling Center and 3) drug and alcohol education center. The fees for these program come from a program established in 1998 with just the Student Health Center, in the meantime we have brought in two other units. We are working with a 1998 economic model. We collected \$4.4M in revenue from the fees, but the estimated program costs are \$6.78M without the additional costs required. How are we making up the additional debt difference? We are spending down reserves.

What happens if we don't get the fee adjustment? The lines will increase. The Center's ability to provide doctor notes has been suspended because of demand. The practitioners are overworked and they are getting sick. We will have to invoke session limits on our counselors. We need two more doctors, two more nurses and one more lab tech. Students will have to go elsewhere to get services.

The **Student Service Fee** will serve all students. We estimated that our unmet need for

AY17/18 is about \$2.4M. To arrive at the figure we are charging, we took the current set aside of 1.33 and divided it by an estimate of the students paying fees and we end up with \$187 a year. We are only asking for \$156. We recognize the impact of these fees and we don't exactly know what our need is for 17/18 since this is just an estimate, and we won't be sure until all the fee proposals come in. Academic Affairs cannot continue to draw down reserves and so we will continue to have deteriorating lab equipment and less co-curricular activities that are so important as a residential campus and draw people to Chico.

The last consideration is the **Athletic fee**. This includes intercollegiate sports, intramural and club sports. This fee structure suffers as outmoded just like the Health Center. Everyone must have a full picture of how the students are being served by Athletics. We currently have a great 13 Division II teams that we are all proud of. There are 350 students who currently participate in these teams. There are other activities partially funded or fully funded by the athletics fee.

4000 unique students participate in WREC sports that equals 22,900 participant events. There are 20 sports within 40 divisions. Club sports continue to grow (like Rugby and La Crosse) and 1,100 participate in these. Athletics also employs 125 students.

This fee was established in 1992 when athletics was pulled out of the general fund and students were asked to pay for it through fees alone (with some exceptions). Athletics generates \$3.17M in revenue, and their expenses are \$3.26M. They too have been using their own reserves to backfill their need. To be a part of NCAA programs there are things that must be done, which includes some \$600,000 for our teams to travel.

If we cannot make this fee adjustment, we will not have Division II sports. We have 13 teams and are required to have 10. Anita Barker, Athletic Director, has said that she cannot eliminate 3 teams and get us to a place where we are financially solvent.

Lang wanted to add that we should imagine what will happen if we eliminate the 20,000 visits some students make to the WREC in a residential campus. What will students do for entertainment, they will go downtown and do things we don't want them to do. Our goal is to keep students active and engaged.

Boura said he knew the impact of student athletes. He said in a small community like Chico, the whole community can get engaged. Chico state also gain credibility from our athletes. He has been most impressed by Anita Barker's effort that have resulted in so much success.

Zartman wanted to review the multiplier of the student fees. Larson said it was 17,000 since that is slightly less than our student body number. So the total number is the fee listed times 17,000 times two (for each semester) and that will mitigate the shortfall.

Sistrunk commended these efforts since no one questions the value of athletics, counseling and medical care for our students, they are fundamental services that our students need. But he said the money is student money, and the older process of having a student vote is the most democratic and most clear word you can get about what the students are thinking. The ad hoc consultations seem inadequate. He noticed the Academic Senate was listed as consulted but we

did not vote about what we heard. We are not the students who are paying the fee.

He thought we should slow down the process that has been generated as we heard over ten or 15 years of mismanagement. If the students feel like they want to do this now, they are the ones to decide.

Larson said she thought that alternative consultation will gain richer feedback from the students. We have gotten better at addressing concerns and answering questions as they have come up. This will give us an opportunity to hear from a diversity of students as well as other stakeholders from the city.

Lang objected to the statement that funds were mismanaged, which lead to the impression that someone did something wrong. Historically our administrators probably made the decision not to increase fees because of how painful it is. We are running these programs on a shoestring budget. The problem is that we have not had a fee adjustment in 15 or 20 years and it has caught up with us.

Larson said that the way we have been supporting this level of experience for our students is that we have been drawing on our reserves since fiscal year 2014. We were building infrastructure and equipment and tutoring.

Wyrick asked if the Government Affairs council of the Associated Students will be voting on the measure. That is a recommendation sent to CFAC, which can then give its recommendation

Hutchinson noted that alternative consultation or a referendum is recognized by EO 1102 as advisory to the President. At the end of the day, she will have to make this difficult decision. She wanted to say that there was no mismanagement here and she believes that past administrators wanted to avoid the painful decision, but at the end of the day, one can't keep drawing down the reserves.

She emphasized that no decision has yet been made. She said that student voter turnout by students in general elections was pretty impressive, but that turn-out in referendums was not. She thought an election would turn out about 1000 or 1500 students. This alternative consultation and the use of social media, beside the online forum and other open forums and the networking students are doing to get students to participate will be comprehensive. There have been 1300 unique clicks on the website and she will read the feedback and pull it together.

Wyrick asked Barbara Richardson, RCE, how many students are distance learners. She said about 350 and then another 80 some more are off campus on weekends. Should we consider taking these students out of the 17,000 we are thinking of requiring pay fees because they are not using the services? Hutchinson said that will be taken into consideration.

Ford pointed out that each of the fees has a very different character. Ford thought the input from the students means something different for each of the fees. The obligation of this institution to provide health care services is more mandatory. If only 20% of the students use those services and you get the message that it is not that important, he thought we still have to

recognize the responsibility. That input must be weighed in a different way than we might weigh the input from the athletics fee. Will there be a possibility for three different answers for each different fee? Hutchinson said there will be three different answers, it is not a package.

Stivers said that the President had asked him to look into the fees and he thought it was remarkable that the fees have not been raised before now. He thought he probably would have had a fee increase before now since it has reached the point that reserves are being spent at a faster rate than what they should be. He has also looked at some benchmark data and he thought the fees were reasonable. Holistically, from a perspective of safety, it's important that we keep students engaged.

He had talked to the departments requesting the increase and they understand efficiencies. He will continue to help them. He is checking out the departments as the state comptroller requires and this necessary increase is just a result of inflation over time. Costs don't remain static forever. Many eyes have looked at this.

Dean Trethewey wanted to particularly address Sistunk's statement about mismanagement to emphasize that the students of CFAC have made particularly thoughtful decisions over the three years she has sat on that committee. The students do this at every level. The benefits of the fees are going up more quickly than we can support them. She said the students sit there and make these really hard choices and she wanted to go on the record as saying that it is a democratic process in that room and not mismanagement.

Boyd wanted to add some perspective about the student learning fee. She said a faculty in a lab course in Agriculture was given the ultimatum that he had to cut out the bus rides that made the field trips possible. The alternative was that they could drive their own cars. We surveyed students in Agriculture and Natural Sciences and they wanted to preserve the bus rides. This became an example of how consulting seriously with the students might discover other alternatives to preserve high impact practice because they now all pay an additional \$4 and that has solved the issue for now.

Zartman asked if the increase had a self-life of three or four years, or what? Is that built in? Larson said in the website we are suggesting five years. For health and athletics they will escalate for 5 years and then switch to a CPI.

7. Revenue Generating Exercise – Larson (1:50:53-2:13:33)

Wyrick said he had been speaking about ways to let us begin to consider our spending and whether we have ideas about generating more fees. Hence, this exercise.

[Slide 1] Larson introduced a pie chart that can help us begin to think about ways to generate that is revenue. If the larger part of the pie is our state appropriations and the other is our tuition, what's left is this yellow slice. As a campus we should begin to think about what we can do creatively and innovatively to fill it?

[Slide 2] She explained that this slide lists the things we are already doing, or hope to do. These are examples of what the Research Foundation already supports (HSI/Center for

Bilingual/Multicultural Studies, SNAP/Calfresh)

Other ideas include Public Private Partnerships (like On campus residential housing with revenue sharing or hotel/restaurant with internships)

Selvester asked if the Center for Economic Development had any of these value-added projects. Larson said this Center mostly got funds through small business development grants. So, yes, there were funds and student being employed and activities. But that was more of a pass-through to develop programs in the community.

[Slide 3] includes Non-Resident students. These students (both international and out of state) bring wonderful diversity to our campus as well as bringing additional revenue. There are also Regional and Continuing Education programs. Selvester wanted to note that the Liberal Studies online program (one of the top 25 in the nation) should be listed as well.

[Slide 4] lists examples like Philanthropy or campus Auxiliary Partnerships. Larson pointed out the Concrete Industry Management Program as an example of the way that a private/public partnership can work well as it has allowed us to renovate laboratories and build relationships with the industry.

There can be extended opportunities to reach into the high schools or day camps or things like that. She invited people to speak to their neighbor and generate some ideas for five or seven minutes. What would you need to participate and what are you thinking about. (2:01:23-2:06:59)

Larson asked people to report. Some of these ideas are recorded here:

<https://csuchico.app.box.com/s/90mw7zxhr1e0f9zfdngc6fu4lohix8w1>

Evanne also added ideas about using the Warrens Center for events, weddings, parties, the Chinese New Year, using AWTU for faculty to spend time fundraising or creating opportunities that would pay for themselves, no credit study abroad trips with faculty that bring in student fees.

8. Advancement Report – Boura (2:13:34-2:31:09)

Boura said that he wanted to rename his division the yellow slice division.

The University Advancement division is not only about fund raising, they also raise the spotlight on our student's work, our faculty, our staff and our alumni. The more we highlight the successes, the better our reputation will be not just in the North State, but globally. We continue to create a lot of opportunity for alumni across the globe. We give them, our friends and donors, an opportunity to invest in a worthy cause. We help students to be civically engaged and give back to their communities.

January 1 is the midyear report. From July 1 to December 31, the Foundation was at \$5.5M which includes cash, multi-year pledges and deferred gifts. The donors who give the money get to decide where the allocation will go: academic programs, scholarships, restricted, faculty endowment and so on.

Boura showed a chart that demonstrates that we have 12,000 donors as of December 31. Last

year in 12 months we had 15,000 donors, this year in six, we have 12,000. The word is getting out. People are getting educated that we are a worthy investment. Money comes from people because it's emotional and personal. Over 550 faculty and staff gave this first six months over \$250,000. Last year in 2 semesters they gave less than \$100,000. People are proud of the work that we do and they are supportive.

The Capital campaign aims to raise \$100M we are at \$56M. This year was the first time we started giving day –a 24 hour effort to get the community to give to all the programs on campus. This was done with 100 different programs on campus. We raise \$297,000 the first day and more than 2000 gifts and over 1000 donors who it was their first time to give to Chico State. The contributions came from 34 different states. We got gifts from Tokyo and we are working on a gift from Dubai. We gave them a foundation here and they are going and making a difference in their communities. As of today, the campaign has received \$57.4M. We just secured \$900,000 for the school of Agriculture.

The Tower Society has 499 members, last year they gave \$2.7M and this year they gave us \$3.2M. We have shared with them that their gift has made an impact. The 158 members of the Tower Gold society who are alumni who are 15 year out gave \$50,000. The same people gave \$20,000 last year. Our students of the Chico Philanthropy Council raised \$19,000 for food insecurity just by speaking with their peers.

University Foundation

Boura said that the Foundation adopted guiding principle at the last board meeting. The Foundation will support the Strategic Plan by raising, investing and distributing funds to fuel the growth and excellence of the University.

He described how he can appeal to donors by describing our new efforts to create relationships with business and our community. They will jump on board to be part of growth. We must think and act differently collectively. He showed the new members of the Board.

Our endowment has grown to over \$80M and the return over the last five years has been. Last year we had 11.2% and as of December 31st we had 12.3 this year. Most of this is restricted money but there is enough that is not that we can create initiatives. We will help to create three new FRAS awards. This will help retention and our academic enterprise.

Hassenzahl asked were gifts fit in? Boura said that gifts in kind can be accepted if the Dean and faculty favor it. He said they will have their in kind gift appraised.

9. Other. (2:31:09-2:33:44)

Selvester wanted to acknowledge Jason Halley for his photography work. Jason thanked Michael Schilling and Ahmed Boura for investing in him. He wanted to point out that most of his important work is unrequested and he hoped we would exercise our possibilities in the same way.

10. Announcements (2:33:45-2:34:13)

Wyrick hoped people would send their comments on both exercises to the Senate Office.

He hoped people in the gallery would send their own as well.

11. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary

General Resources for Background:

State of California, Department of Finance:

http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/BUD_DOCS/Bud_link.htm

State of California. Legislative Analyst's Office: **<http://www.lao.ca.gov/>**

CSU System: **<http://www.calstate.edu/budget/>**

CSU, Chico: **<http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/planning/resourceallocation/index.shtml>**

CSU, Chico: **<http://www.csuchico.edu/bud/budgetplans/index.shtml>**

OpenGov: **<https://csuchicoa.opengov.com>**