

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

**UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE MINUTES**  
December 7, 2018, 8:00-10:00, 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](mailto:oats@csuchico.edu).*

Wyrick called the 2nd meeting of the academic year to order at 8:04.

**1. Approve Minutes May 14, 2018 and [October 5, 2018](#).** [0:13-1:04]

Minutes of October 5 were approved.

**2. [Approve Agenda](#).** [1:04-1:14]

Agenda was approved.

**3. [Budget Building Timeline and UBC Engagement \(Hutchinson\)](#).** [1:15-3:04]

Hutchinson reminded everyone that our Chico budget cycle aligns with the State budget cycle through the year.

[Slide2] State Budget Cycle

- We are now in November of the cycle. The Trustees have adopted the proposed CSU budget and are submitting that request to the Governor.
- In January, the Governor releases his budget and from January to March we really go over the budget and many parties lobby in Sacramento for allocations.
- In May, the Governor sends out his May Revise to his January plans.
- The hope is that this budget is approved by the state by June and the University gets its share.

[Slide 3] Chico Budget Cycle.

- Since it is December, this UBC meeting will consider the campus budget plan and begin collecting input as we think about our allocation for next year.

She asked Kitchell to lead the committee through discussion of Item 4.

**4. [2019-20 Support Budget Plan – Board of Trustees Request \(Hutchinson\)](#)** [3:04-30:23]

[Slide 1] Kitchell explained that the CSU creates a support budget plan annually.

[Slide 2] This was passed at the November 14-15, BOT meeting. Table 3, shows the source of the funds requested and an idea about how they will be used. These may seem familiar as they are typical of our recurrent annual expenses

[Slide3] Kitchell went over the expenditure plan at high level. These expenses are animated by 5 key priority commitments in the CSU. The first is Student Success which is really spearheaded through the GI 2025 funds. To continue the initiatives we have already started we need to secure:

- fair Employee Compensation for all CSU employees –this remains a high priority in the CSU
- Maintain Affordability for students
- Expand Access
- Renew/Repair Facilities & Infrastructure

She thought two things seemed different in his budget request: with the new leadership and the State's economy continuing on a positive trajectory, the CSU is asking for a significant increase in resident enrollment as well as facility and infrastructure dollars. She planned to describe the ongoing funding to continue our initiatives as well as some of the one-time fund requests.

### Expenditure Plan

#### Graduation Initiative 2025

The CSU will ask for \$75M to continue the third year of our efforts that are part of a five year commitment we have made. She noted that the CSU has been making good progress on these goals and we are in a good position to ask for continued support.

Sistrunk wondered how this impacted us as we are supposed to be promoting enrollment growth in times of stress. Hutchinson said she had made a formal request of the Chancellor that Chico be held "harmless" or exempt from system goals because of the possibility of enrollment fluctuations over the next three years or more.

She added that in times of disaster we should work hard to keep our students in school and enrolled while we help them with progress to degree. It is very important for us to keep reaching out to them. 20% of our students come from the North State and many from Butte College, so we might see some changing enrollments.

Larson asked if the increase in student minimum wages that is coming was factored into the Compensation Increases column. Kitchell answered that this was captured in the box on the right side of the slide under Minimum Wage Increase \$6,831,000.

Compensation Increases of \$147,785,000 includes faculty, staff and administrators' salaries and any current contracts that are in place as well as the many pending contracts not yet settled. Kitchell explained that the student minimum wage will continue to increase until 2022 and reach \$15 an hour. She noted that information about this has been distributed so that departments can begin to plan for the impacts.

The intention of the \$80M for Academic Facilities and Infrastructure is to finance the debt of \$1.2B in projects. The system has identified \$10B in priority projects, so this \$80M would take care of 12 projects per year. It would cover 12% of the ongoing costs a year.

The Mandatory Cost Increases is explained in the smaller box to the right totaling \$45,419,000. The Health Benefits are increasing and this \$7,304,000 is the expected amount next year. This is also true of the Retirement Benefits costs of the employers' contributions to CalPERS which continue to increase.

Maintenance of New Facilities is for when new spaces come on line. This \$4,748,000 represents about 400,000 square feet of new space that the CSU will bring on line next year.

Kitchell said that the 5% Residential Enrollment Increase calculates the marginal cost per student at \$11,000, which would equal 18,000 new students in the CSU. Wyrick clarified that this is money above the regular budget, and Kitchell answered that it was part of the \$554,344,000 in new money being asked for.

Kitchell said that all the funds including GI funds are an addition to base dollars.

[Slide 4] Kitchell included some other information from the CSU Budget Plan that she thought was useful. She noted that the Public Policy Institute had projected a 1.1M degree gap over the next 15 years in California education. They are projecting that the CSU for its part will need to graduate 481,000 additional students to meet workforce demand in the state.

The CSU already has many things underway to meet this need. The GI 2025 completion outcomes are improving. There is also a new Redirection policy that will direct students to different CSU's as they apply to maximize access for students. 41% of graduates from California High Schools are CSU eligible.

Sistrunk noted that hiring more tenure-track faculty was a direct answer to these challenges.

Kitchell said the last bullet on the slide underlines that meeting these enrollment challenges will require us to increase enrollment 3-5% annually over the next decade.

[Slide 5] Kitchell said that in addition to the base fund increases, the CSU asked for some significant one time funds. Governor Brown's rainy day fund is now fully funded, and the CSU believes the state can now fund some pretty substantial projects. Basic Needs Partnerships are conceived as part of the GI 2025 project to address the needs of students \$15M.

The Deferred Maintenance Backlog of \$250M is to address critical deficiencies and avoid catastrophic failure. A recent study of deferred backlog for the system has reached \$3.7B and this amount will just continue to grow. At Chico we estimate the upgrade to our electrical system will be about \$20M and right now we have about \$5M of that.

Ford noted that the Faculty Trustee Sabalius has been advocating for \$1B for deferred maintenance. He said he has heard only about bond allocations and wondered if Kitchell knew anything else. Are we just going to borrow to address this deferred maintenance?

Kitchell said that the \$80M on slide 3 was to fund bonds. This one-time request will be allocated to campuses as what are called “pay as you go” projects –all of the funding will be taken for the identified projects. She noted that the CSU can also issue its own bonds and we can service that debt within our existing funds. There is conversation that the state should take this on for these needs. Ford wondered about the wisdom of using capital financing for deferred maintenance as opposed to new construction as Trustee Sabalius is advocating.

Hutchinson said that the Presidents are not privy to the conversations at the BOT about this topic. Kitchell believed that this \$250M was probably for a cash transaction to care for deferred maintenance. She noted that things change over the year as budget is negotiated and usually we end up with a much smaller amount. Hutchinson said that things can happen like a recession, but that the new governor has sat on the BOT and has proclaimed his support of the CSU.

Evanne O’Donnell, Interim Associate Vice Provost, asked what the term “Sustainable solutions for students” meant on slide 5. Kitchell said the intention was to address longer term needs, but that the BOT don’t get into details in this document. Hutchinson said she would have loved to see mental health needs separated from the other dimensions of Basic Needs Partnerships since they are so significant and a crisis in the country.

Sistrunk noted that the need for counsellors underlines that adequate compensation is required to hire more tenure-track faculty with their retirement needs met as well. Perhaps it is time to give retirement back to the state fully. Hutchinson said she had not heard that kind of conversation was ongoing.

Zartman asked what the entire operating budget was for the CSU. Kitchell said \$7.2B which includes tuition and fees. The amount we receive from the state is just under \$4B. Zartman pointed out that the backlog of deferred maintenance of \$3.7B is almost the entire annual budget.

[Slide 6] attempts to set the stage for the advocacy we will need to undertake in the next year that explains our pretty significant ask. At the top of the slide is a comparison of our tuition and fees for average undergraduates compared to comparable institutions. The CSU is actually a fairly affordable education.

The CSU’s grant program awarded over \$700M to 138,000 students. At Chico we have dispersed about \$25M. All this effort is to maintain access for students. 80% of CSU students received financial aid, 63% of all undergraduates paid \$0 tuition, and 49% of all undergraduates received a federal Pell grant.

## **5. Approval of Graduation Initiative Team Funding Recommendations – Action Item**

[30:23-1:05:12]

Wyrick said that this was an action item because we will actually approve of this distribution of GI funds. He introduced Kate McCarthy, Dean of Undergraduate Education, to discuss the proposal.

Kate McCarthy reminded committee members that over the summer the GI Advisory Team went through a process of formalizing its structure and procedures. One aspect of this was to clarify the process by which it would allocate GI funds. This recommendation request is from the Academic Affairs side of the funds received (which are initially split with Student Affairs). Academic Affairs allocated

- \$1M to tenure-track hires
- \$274,022.29 went to Student Success Funding
- **Student Success Funding Recommendations**

32 proposals were received this year and 17 were partially funded in order to extend the money to more people. The recommendations are made by the GI Advisory Team Steering Committee which then makes a recommendation to the full GI Team that has now passed them to UBC for review.

Larson said that she and Lang had reviewed the recommendations and supported them with some small comments. She wondered about the role of UBC in providing yet another layer of review given the adequate shared governance practice already signified by the large size of the GI team.

Hassenzahl suggested that next year the applicants should be consulted about which parts of their proposals they would like funded. He wanted to point out that calling this a Student Success measure is misleading because everything we do at the University is for student success. People outside the university should not be misled by this language.

- **Proposal Review Rubric**
- GI Advisory Team Steering Committee Members: Kate McCarthy, Chela Paterson, Jed Wyrick, Barbara Fortin, Kaitlyn Baumgartner Lee, Ellie Ertle, and Ben Juliano

Ford congratulated Kate McCarthy for putting together a much better system to evaluate proposals than was done in the last years. He said that proposals should include any mandated costs associated with this one-time discretionary money. One example he noted was that EO 1100 requires that all freshman be seated for Math and English courses and though our expenses are not great, other campuses have substantial costs associated with this. EO 1071 is also a mandated change to multiple degree programs throughout the system that has been given no additional funding to support. He thought we should be applying our discretionary funds to these kinds of mandated expenses.

Kate McCarthy noted that part of the challenge with dispersing funds this year was that the timing, sequence and explanations about what could be done with the funding were unpredictable. This required backfilling some things with funds designated for other things. She said she hoped mandated costs would be at the top of the allocation pile in the future when

we have more knowledge and control of the moneys and can then use discretionary funds for creative projects.

Larson said \$220,000 of the GI funds were allocated to support EO 1110. \$150,000 of these were one time funds, and it turned out the Chancellor's Office had different ideas about how that money should be spent. This required our adjustments and she has continued to discuss this.

Ford appreciated how the Provost has tried to allow our campus colleges to determine their own way without pigeon-holing moneys too restrictively. He hoped this would be repeated elsewhere in the system. Hutchinson said all the Vice-Presidents and Presidents continue to bring these points to state-wide conversations and advocate for flexibility and especially for not changing ideas after money has already been allocated in a certain way.

Barbara Fortin noted that nothing from the one-time funding was earmarked for implementation of first-time freshman entry into Math and English classes, but that one new position will be created in Academic Advising Programs to help coordinate these specific efforts and other unfunded aspects of EO1100.

Ferrari wondered how members of the team had recused themselves since so many were applying for funds. Best practice would be complete recusal from the process. Kate McCarthy said that individuals did not rank their own proposals, but so many are involved in Graduation Initiative efforts, it was not possible to recuse themselves completely.

Sharma wondered if the steering committee alone made the rankings and Kate McCarthy said they made them and then the whole team weighed in.

McCarthy added that she did not see any sign that GI dollars would be awarded more flexibly in the future. She noted that a recent report of our spending in the last two years had required an extraordinary amount of detailed accounting of spending and outcomes metrics. She thought our assessment will just be more important in the future.

Ford asked why the report only noted Academic Affairs spending when there was money given to Student Affairs and members of the GI Advisory Board and Team were from both units. Kate McCarthy said that the process was opened up to both divisions but we mostly received Academic Affairs proposals (only one from Student Affairs personnel).

Boyd recognized that the transparency of this process this year was wonderful and a product of the new processes adopted.

Wyrick noted that there was \$840,000 worth of projects funded and that there are more than were solid proposals that could move the needle on goals articulated.

Larson noted that GI funds are helping redesign 7 courses with over 35% WFD rates.

Sistrunk had thought that UBC was supposed to be informed of proposals and the way GI money was spent, he didn't know that our approval per se was necessary at this level. Kate McCarthy said the policy used the word "approval".

Boyd thought that the UBC perspective was different than the GI team and that because the proposals were across divisions, that it was a good that UBC endorse the work of that group in a very formal way.

Wyrick hoped that UBC would not slow the process of awards overly.

Hutchinson thought that there is a difference between endorsement and approval and that the former would not really hold up the process, but it would provide an accounting and demonstrate trust in the representatives on the GI team.

Larson said the description of the team organization and conduct was not really approved by Senate, but received a tacit approval from EC to proceed. It was a response to the confusing practice of the past. Kate McCarthy added that this had not been written as an EM since it responded to a temporary initiative, but should the initiative become permanent, the policy could form the basis of an EM in the future.

Consensus concluded that the policy guidelines could be revisited and language changed or added to make consultation with UBC part of an endorsement process that would not slow the GI team giving awards if necessary before coming to UBC with a reporting. This policy should be brought to EC in the future to verify the changes and then noticed in Senate as was done before.

The current recommendations were endorsed by UBC with a unanimous vote.

## **6. Post Camp Fire Review (Cabinet)** [1:05:12-1:41:30]

Hutchinson noted that yesterday in Senate she had given an account of the University's actions during the Camp Fire. She will expand on the Post Camp Fire Recovery phase that is underway. The Emergency Operations Team is having a meeting today for a post fire review and this group will then serve as a steering committee to identify areas for focus as we move forward.

Recovery Efforts are two-fold:

- Impacts to the University
- Broader Impacts to the Community and how the University can step up in leadership and partnership roles

She said she is incredibly proud of our community at large as well as the campus community for all the individuals who have stepped up and stepped out to volunteer personally with many organizations, or by bringing people to our homes, and bringing service to the university itself to help our students, staff and faculty.

A preliminary view of some topics as we go forward:

Student Support: (support, recruitment and retention)

- Support around basic needs for those displaced by the fire
- those housing and food insecure
- those living far away and trying to keep up with courses (and transportation issues)
- mental health (upsurge in need for counselors)
- reassurance/recruitment: We are still here! (support to prevent dropping out)

Staff Support: (many of the same issues)

- recruitment and retention

Faculty Support

- recruitment and retention

A common theme for everyone is the concern around housing.

- There are about 2300 beds on this campus for students
- The majority of students live within a mile radius
- For faculty and staff- the housing market has gone from ample to empty  
-prices are skyrocketing
- How to house people closer to campus is a real challenge

We are also working with the Chancellor's Office and with the Unions to allow faculty and staff to donate catastrophic leave across a campus as well as across the system to each other.

We will continue to monitor the Campus Climate since there are so many people impacted by the Camp Fire.

With the changing demographics of Chico, we will remain mindful of student, faculty and staff safety questions.

There are the broader community concerns of transportation, commuting and telecommuting.

We will also need to think of the importance of our communication plans to tell our stories. We want to collect the stories of our fire survivors, our wonderful volunteers and communication about the recovery work that students, faculty and staff are engaged in as we move forward.

Among the final topic areas we should be mindful of, the formal taskforces that are ongoing outside the University as in the city or county housing considerations or other issues like the Paradise citizens alliance. We are making sure we are at the table to reimagine going forward, talking to FEMA, Calfire, the World Central Kitchen and other taskforces including, for example, the Butte County Office of Education, or labor conversations with Assemblyman James Gallagher.

Finally, we need to think about our academic mission and what our true values are: civic engagement, community service, sustainability, and innovation so that faculty can work with students to actually plug into our community to work together while we reimagine it future.

Lang wanted to add a priority to the list: student basic needs are being tracked to make sure students have money for food and books.

Larson commended the faculty for showing flexibility and care to students after the fire in scheduling and assignment accommodations to continue to move forward with our primary mission of education.

Hutchinson said that Dan Herbert had been working with the rental property owners who are committed to maintain housing for students into the future. They understand the economic impact of our students and the university has on the Down Town. They are working with Dan Herbert to find solutions. We are also trying to educate students about renewing their leases immediately to lock themselves in to housing for a longer period of time. It is true, there are some stories of secondary displacement when students lose their lease so that the property owner can move new people in. We are trying to mitigate these impacts.

Hutchinson wanted to thank the HR group that has made some 200 calls to faculty and staff to check in to make sure they were okay and helping with questions about benefits and payroll as well.

Kitchell described the how the HR group and the Office of Academic Personnel is now conducting a secondary survey of all the people they contacted initially about the impacts of the fire in order to follow up and confirm the status of people who were unsure in the initial call, and secondly to really understand where they are now, how housing problems are being met and the impacts this might have on returning to the university for work. We want to retain who we can and recruit those we need already in the works.

Applications to the Wildcats Rise funds are also being dispersed.

Sistrunk noted that the work of the University is ongoing in so many dimensions, and he complimented the amazing efforts of everyone in responding to this catastrophe. He wondered about the statement that the Incident Response Team would act as a steering committee as we move forward to rebuilding. He pointed out that there are no faculty on this team. Hutchinson said this would be rectified. Livingston thought students and staff should be added as well.

Boyd asked about the role of FEMA in helping our campus financially in responding to the Camp Fire.

Kitchell pointed out that this situation is something the university and the state have never experienced before. The university will be filing a claim with FEMA, but we may have numerous other claims that we need to file. We will file with our insurance company, and we are currently collecting information about all our costs both during the response and as we offered mutual aid as a state agency in providing emergency resources to many different responders. This will be one category of financial recovery we will pursue. The loss to ourselves from the emergency is probably a different claim to our insurance.

This will be a lengthy process which may take a year before we really understand the scope of our claims. We are starting to file with FEMA now so that they are aware we will be filing a claim. Chico will be joining other universities in the system that suffered damage (such as having to close because of smoke) and so we will not have to pay the insurance deductible of \$100,000 by ourselves.

Hutchinson reported that FEMA had said on November 27, they were bringing housing for about 1900 households. They tried to identify a location their trailers would be set up. Many places volunteered, but FEMA needs electrical and sewer infrastructure in place. At that time 1,158 households were asking for housing which is pretty high. At that time FEMA only had 90 units on the way and they would not put more than 100 to 150 people together in a trailer shelter community.

Boyd said among the information that should be reported in cataloging our costs are student supplies lost in the fires. If this is to be captured, how will we do this? She also thought the Chairs group would be a useful source to ask for reports of lost property from faculty, staff and students. She wondered what the timeline would be to get that information back and what is the scope of the type of information needed?

Kitchell thought the university would have to replace the items and then ask for reimbursement.

Barbara Fortin said that the new student orientation for this Fall had been moved. She said before the change we had expected about 400 students. For this event over 300 registered which she thought was a positive sign.

Mike Schilling noted that in January we wipe out hundreds of hours of unused vacation time. He wondered if this might be put in the catastrophic leave pool instead. Kitchell said that she is unsure whether we will be able to do this. The idea is that the leave will be gathered into a pool which is not typically allowed. The problem with this is that catastrophic leave does not come off of the employee's balance until it is actually given. This may work out anyway after more procedural consideration.

Evanne O'Donnell asked how long one can stay in a FEMA trailer? Kitchell answered 18-24 months. One must apply and qualify. They are typically for people without insurance who are most needy.

Boyd hoped Dan Herbert could come for an information session at one of the Senate meetings (like the one next week) and because this is long term, maybe he should visit again later. Hutchinson thought it was easier if there were specific questions beforehand and expectations could be managed. Boyd said the Senate can do a call for questions beforehand.

Ferrari noted that the many questions asked at Senate yesterday might make a good list to start with.

Reynolds asked if there was any way to facilitate the people who were relocated outside of Butte County to find carpooling or some way to cut down on travel expenses to come to class or to work. Can HR help discover who has been displaced outside of town? Hutchinson thought it was a great idea to try to get intentional about helping people in this way. Kitchell thought the data collected by HR about the help people might need could also help with this. Sistrunk recommended contacting the unions as well.

Boura said that Advancement had created a cooperative space that allowed people to find help and support from the campus. Seema Sehrawat agreed with Boura that people need to reach out to share how they can help. Perhaps the Senate questions can be turned into an FAQ that is sent out to departments and colleges.

Sharma suggested that Dan Herbert work with CLIC to reach out to students as well. This is a place where students already go. Maybe they could do more intentional information sharing around housing.

## **7. University Advancement Updates – Boura [1:41:31-2:03:57]**

Boura said he would cover three things:

- 1) Communications Efforts
- 2) Fund raising and processing
- 3) Where we are in the Capital Campaign

The Advancement Communication Team has been using every possibility to communicate in order to:

- 1) Create Awareness -Depict the support system the university has created for the university community and the community at large
- 2) Share our Impact –recognizing that after three or four weeks the impact of the Camp Fire will die nationally. We need to preserve and share our tragedy and our stories of compassion that have given us such strength to move forward
- 3) Responding to the regional, national and global media questions we receive  
Boura noted that our story has been national news in many venues. He shared a clip from “60 Minutes” that interviewed Chico Forensic Scientist, Colleen Milligan, Anthropology Department, as she explained the work she did in looking for human remains in Paradise.

Boura observed that our University has many experts who have helped the community respond to the Camp Fire, and he hoped people would continue to reach out and report on what they have done or will do so that our university continues to be a resource for our neighbors. We are still gathering information and he hoped people would communicate with our communication team. Chico can be a case study in responding to catastrophe.

Sistrunk reminded Boura that Chico had begun to develop a data base of faculty and staff expertise on campus of people who could be available to speak with the public when needed about their fields.

Boura said he hoped people would take advantage of the possibilities to apply for grants and attract donors to work on issues related to our responses and recovery. We will work to improve our university data about the people we have available on campus as well. We will contact the Chairs to improve our meaningful outreach.

Ferrari reported that she had created an instructional resource group the “Camp Fire Syllabus” of people coming together and sharing ideas and materials for teaching about the Camp Fire. It will meet on December 20 from 1-3 in the ARTS collaborative space. It is modeled on the social media resources and teaching opportunities created by a faculty member from Georgetown about the Ferguson MO racial violence and protests. Ferrari said there is also a Google docs resource already generated that people can visit and to which they can contribute.

Larson hoped we could tag our efforts to build an expert database onto this kind of conversation. Perhaps Richard Tafalla of RESP could support these efforts in some way.

Boura said we continue to evaluate and develop the Wildcats Rise website and FAQs to serve as a resource for information and connections about the Camp Fire.

- A face book group has been created where people can go and seek help.
- Wildcat Connect is a site the people can sign on and post if they are looking for housing or if they have space available
  - this can also be a space were people connect about carpooling and transportation and perhaps we can think about providing some funding to help
- Boura reported that as of yesterday the Wildcats Rise fund had raised about \$535,900. Advancement thought there might be 100 to 150,000 that still might be raised. He thanked everyone for sharing the word as we had about 4300 donors give.
- He wanted to acknowledge the committee that has been distributing these funds (Ford and T. Peterson are on UBC) and he praised Jessica Bourne who has done so much behind the scenes to facilitate this work. They have created a very simple application procedure and moved funds to people in need with alacrity.

Ford reported on the distribution of the Wildcats Rise funds. He said that the committee had calculated how many might be impacted by the Fire and concluded the about 220 students and 140 faculty and staff had addresses in the burn area.

As of today there have been 299 applicants having been displaced, lost their homes and another 175 that have had major impacts such as losing their job, having to leave the area because of smoke and other issues.

A second round of distributions is planned and the committee will meet again on Monday to make more distributions. It has been \$750 per applicant that has lost their home, but it appears

we will be able to add \$500 to this amount now. This is based on the number of applications we receive which are starting to slow down now. Eavanne O'Donnell clarified that the committee is looking at the same applicants in the second round and Ford answered affirmatively.

Peterson said it looks like we will close this process December 15. This will be opened back up if need becomes more apparent again and we get more donors. The hope is to expend all the money. Boura reiterated that people should communicate that people can still apply.

Hutchinson noted that the food pantry has been open every day and we are feeding about 150 students per day. 17 students were placed into university housing as well.

Boyd thanked Boura and his team for making these funds available so quickly so that it could become an effort we could all collectively contribute to.

Boura concluded by reporting on how the Capital Campaign is doing.

- We are at \$71.5M. It is unclear what the impact of the Camp Fire will be and analysis is ongoing. Effects of such catastrophes have varied historically.
- As of yesterday the campaign has raised another \$3.9M since the last reporting
- The number of donors has nearly doubled from last year to over 11,000.

## **8. Other** [2:03:57-2:05:32]

Larson noted that there is a faculty experts link on [Inside Chico State](#) that appears to be broken, and we will work on it and send out another call for faculty to participate. Department Chairs will also be asked to report again.

Boyd noted that we are in the stage of the budget cycle where we imagine what might be useful to discuss in UBC next year, she wanted to talk about professional development for Chairs and professional development in general for expert research and ways this might be increased.

## **9. Announcements** [2:05:33-2:06:44]

The Incident Response Team steering committee will be meeting right away in Kendall 103 and the staff, student and faculty representatives should be selected and join the meeting. T. Peterson and Sharma will join the meeting. Faculty Officers and other interested faculty should stay behind to choose someone quickly.

## **10. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.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](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: <https://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/bar/resource-allocation/index.shtml>**

**CSU, Chico: <https://www.csuchico.edu/bud/transparency-reporting.shtml>**

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