

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

UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 13, 2018, 3:00-5:00, 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.

Wyrick called the last meeting of the academic year to order at 3:01. [3:10-3:38]

1. Approve Minutes [February 28, 2019](#). [3:38-5:05]

Jeni Kitchell, Associate Vice President, University Budget Office offered corrections to the figures quoted in Item 7, slide 4, page 4.

Amended Minutes of February 28 were approved.

2. [Approve Agenda](#). [5:08-5:29]

Wyrick moved item 4 before item 3.

Amended Agenda was approved.

4. [Enrollment Update \(15 Minutes\)](#) [5:30-59:44]

[Slide 2] Kitchell said that she and Barbara Fortin, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management wanted to give an overview to rectify confusion about enrollment targets and provide context for the numbers to follow.

Each year our university receives a Resident Funded Target specified by the Chancellor's Office. The timing of this notification varies and is sometimes not released until August, though this year we got a preliminary number in early Spring. This determines the allocation of state funding Chico will receive, and it does not change over the year.

The Enrollment Planning Target Barbara Fortin explained that we begin conversation about the next AY in early spring with the actual funded target, or an estimated funded target. Many variables go into this overall annualized plan. Consultation occurs with Cabinet, EMAC and UBC. As the plan is enacted, we are specific about when we need to make adjustments. This deals with all groups of students enrolled. Over the Last 7 years, we have typically planned 1-3% above the funded target.

The Budget Planning Target is established in July/Aug as we finalize our Campus Budget Plan and we determine tuition and non-resident fee revenue for all types of students. This is the plan

for the actual revenue the university will spend for the year. Each of these planned targets has its own cycle and we have been trying to align our processes so we can coordinate better.

The Annualized Actual is determined after census for both semesters is done, and we know how many students we served and our actual revenue. Planning happens through the year and then the actual number comes in at the end.

Sistrunk asked who does the actual campus budget planning in July/Aug, PAC? Kitchell answered that up until 2017-18, the Campus Budget Plan estimated budget planning at the funded target. So, Cabinet and the division budget leads did not change FTES in our base budget. Sistrunk reminded everyone that faculty will be on campus at that time this next summer.

[Slide 3] Fortin said this slide is to inform the committee where we ended up in the 2018-19 year. These are the actuals for the past five years by headcount and FTES. Especially important is the way that California Resident FTES has grown. The dips in head count were intentional relative to our annualized enrollment plan.

[Slide 4] This is to show how complex the spreadsheet is to determine our resident FTES funded target. This process starts with the Spring 2019 census and a determination of which Spring students will persist into the Fall semester. This was put together in January-March. The plan was to be 2.5% above the California resident funded target to help support the university wide budget need. This 2.5% is also to offset the historical decline we have seen in non-resident FTES. (2.5%=@\$2.5M).

[Slide 5] shows the ambitious new student goals to achieve +2.5% above our funded target.

[Slide 6] charts all the new students admitted since 2006. Our new student enrollment numbers are around 5000 and they join us in the Fall semester.

[Slide 7] shows the bulk of our new students who are first-time freshman. This shows that we have had a 10,000 student increase in those who tried to enroll since 2006. The number of students who are admitted to reach our targets has also changed dramatically. The Admissions office works tirelessly with Enrollment Management to maintain this steady enrollment.

[Slide 8] shows the highlights of the Fall 2019 undergraduate admissions efforts. The goal was 2,960. Housing availability was emphasized and guidance to get financial aid was as well. Communication intensified since we did not know what the impacts of the Camp Fire would be especially from a public relations standpoint about Chico in general and safety on campus. We admitted more than we ever had.

All our indicators before the May 1 deposit deadline were tracking well, but after this day our needed enrollment fell-off even though we nudged students again.

[Slide 9] There is always a plan to enroll a buffer since the number always drops off in the summer, but we have renewed and stepped up our efforts this May. The intent to enroll process

is still open and new students have been admitted even after May 1. This year 2,500 students could not be admitted across the system and they were redirected to become applicants at seven other CSUs. We have admitted some 1,259 additional First-Time Freshmen and continue all of our communication and outreach efforts. Competition from the CSU's, UC's, Community Colleges and other states continues to grow.

Ford asked about other ideas to increase Spring enrollments. Fortin noted that in the model [Slide 4] they also plug in numbers from New Student entering in Spring 2020 (1,214) and if this number can be duplicated that would be an additional 100 students from where we are now. Ford said this is a March 31 chart, he wondered what changes should be recommended to increase enrollment by May 1, 2020.

Jeff Bell wondered about information about impacts on Returning Student numbers. Fortin said this is not clear yet. She explained how priority registration practice and accounting is changing. She can conclude that headcount is down 282 for 1.8%, but it was expected that headcount for 2018-19 would be down 1% anyway. The unit load of priority registration was also raised and this will change our numbers as well. As of this morning resident FTE was up 208 or 2%. All FTE is up 200, or 1.9%. The resident average workload is 13.39% (last year it was 12.90%,).

She said that the current enrollment numbers will be checked again after priority registration closes.

[Slide 9] Fortin remarked that Butte College is estimating that their headcount will be down 1,200, or just over 1000 FTES, which will impact us.

[Slide 10] This is a chart of enroll rates projected through 5/13/19. Fortin thinks the stellar service being extended to incoming students will raise admits anyway.

[Slide 8 bullet 2] Fortin will focus on the Intent to Enroll numbers and promoting these for the next three months. Last year, system first-time freshman numbers were down, but numbers were up for transfer students (see bullet 3).

[Slide 11] There are other groups of enrollment that we can continue to impact (Transfers/Graduate/International). Her office will prompt continuing students to sign up now before registration closes Friday. She said if departments could know the names of these continuing students they could interact with them as well. Zartman said that new students used to be contacted regularly like this. Fortin said any efforts to increase the continuing student rate from 74% by 1% would be significant.

[Slide 12] Fortin described the milestones used by enrollment planning to assess 2019-20 numbers and make adjustments. She thought the most significant of these would be July 1 when planning to accomplish Spring 2020 new student goals would have to be launched.

Ferrari asked Sara Trechter, Interim Associate Vice President of International Education and Global Engagement, if she would comment about how changes in curriculum can really impact international enrollment and some of the reasons our enrollment has gone down some 50% in the

last five years. Trechter said that our understanding of why students have attended and where they are from has improved markedly with our new tracking software. What affected us in the last five years in particular were relationships we had:

- we had an agreement with the Brazilian government and many Brazilian students attended but that has ended and they have gone elsewhere
- We used to be on the Saudi scholarship list which brought a noticeable population of students but we are no longer on the list because of examples of religious conflicts with our students.
- We have particular departments that attracted many foreign students: Computer Science has reorganized their master's program and they are attracting students again
- We no longer have large populations from one place like we used to, but we are diversifying and our applications from international students are up 30%. On average the number of graduate and undergraduates from this population will be close to 20%.

Zartman asked what management strategies were to respond to the great loss of students from Butte County Community College since they are so important to our student growth. Fortin said we need to expand how we are working with all California community colleges and we attract those students from across the state. She said the evidence of the magnitude of Butte County transfer students is unclear. Hutchinson said that our cabinet had a meeting with the Butte County Community College cabinet today and they could not answer the question about how many transfers we would be losing.

[Slide 13] Kitchell addressed information that tied budget planning to enrollment planning. For 2017-18 15,875 was our budget planning annualized FTES. The actual was 16,281. This gave us a budget surplus.

For 2018-19 16,130 was our budget planning annualized FTES. The actual was 16,061. This gave us a shortfall between the planning and the actuals. We did not have **-69 FTES** which generated a **824,148 shortfall**

[Slide 14] For 2019-20 our preliminary budget estimates look negative. Our funded target is 15,479. It looks more reasonable from enrollment data to budget for 15,250 Resident FTES and 364 non-resident FTES. This creates a projection of 15,614 total FTES, which is a **-516 FTES** shortfall. That is a tuition reduction for budget planning of **- \$3.8M**

The state funded amount does not change but we were 2.5% over the funded target.

Trailer wondered if our choice to add more students would only impact us as a shortfall the first year, since the state will pay us the expanded cost next year based on the previous year's need. Sherman said we can't assume that the targets will change since they are set at the state level in a way that is not based on our previous actuals.

5. Engaging the Campus on Enrollment (20 Minutes) [59:53-1:20:37]

Wyrick allowed item five to be considered as a follow up to item four.

Fortin reiterated that everyone's help is needed to address our enrollment shortfall. She called on members to volunteer their ideas:

- ♣ Support continuing students to persist from spring 2019 to fall 2019
- ♣ New first-time freshmen and transfers orientation programs: June 11 through July 25 → Major advising → Post-orientation follow-up
- ♣ Support new international and graduate students
- ♣ New student welcome activities

She asked if anyone had ideas?

Trailer reported hearsay he heard that some students had been recommending that other students not attend Chico State because it is too unsafe. He thought during training of student ambassadors and tour guides we allow honest feedback about what students are hearing to draw out rumors and address them.

Larson pointed out that our faculty sometimes have been heard to say there is a housing shortage and this is getting shared outside this community. It is important that people understand the impact this is having at this critical time. We must be proactive to govern our speech to not instill inaccuracies.

Lang agreed that we are our own worst enemies and that faculty and staff need to talk about the true realities of where we are at as a campus. It is frustrating when we include announcements to many groups as well as the Senate and say there is student housing available and people tell us there is no student housing available. We have the facts but this is sometimes not enough. He said we can talk to students in student advising, but we will need your help to identify who some of the ambassadors on the academic side of the house who are misinformed.

Boura said that he personally struggles to believe that any student ambassadors would be misconstruing facts this way, and he agreed with Lang that it will take all of us, students, faculty and staff to be part of this process to correct rumors. He said the communications department has been telling people there is housing available and we need individuals to ask for help to find it if they cannot. He said that there are sometimes occasions when some people experience panic about housing but that happens in small and large communities alike.

Sistrunk noted that Dan Herbert said that if someone is a married student, or a graduate student, or new faculty that it really is a hardship in our market to find housing. That is a real problem, we had a fire, but we can say affirmatively that we are working on it. Hutchinson said it was a good point to say "we are working on it" but it is problematic that rumors can exaggerate what is happening here. She said we will need to keep working on telling our story.

Paiva asked where the data was coming from that says there is no housing crisis. Hutchinson said we should not say that there are no housing crisis, but Lang pointed out that Dan Herbert had connections to property owners who said they have two, and three hundred beds available. He said there is no student housing shortage.

Hutchinson said there are different challenges if people have a family or were looking to buy a house. There may also be a culture shift that people should think about housing with each other so that individuals share occupancy of a home. She said students need to reach out to the university for help if they have problems with landlords, or need help finding a place. We know different sectors of the population will have different challenges, but the danger of blanket statements that there is no housing contributes to the problems of enrollment declines.

Ford noted that we are guessing about the reasons for the drop in enrollment. We know this is happening and he recommended two courses of action:

- Message the Chairs about this information and have them react in scheduling for the Fall (this would be internal)
- The next thing we should do since we are “being held harmless” is to ask the CO for \$3.8M extra to help us with this shortfall

Hutchinson said as soon as the fire occurred, she had started conversations with the CO about “being held harmless”. She said she is taking documentation to the CO to work out what it means to be held harmless and to demonstrate how we are doing everything in our power to reduce this gap.

Pittman wanted to recognize that there is a difference when we talk about housing between “beds available” and affordability. We can’t get glib about the problems of rent gouging and having families to support. We should remain realistic about what we have available and what we don’t and talk honestly about what we are doing to solve the problems.

Boura said there is a big difference between the kinds of people looking for housing. He said Dan Herbert came to Senate to talk about the options and possibilities. If anyone knows of students or people with problems we should recommend them to Dan’s office because that is why it exists. He said there are issues with faculty and staff who need housing since prices have gone up, but on the student side, we are in better shape and should impart that. We should help them to find help because it is available and we need to be part of this recovery process.

Lang said that our area is one of the cheapest places in the system to get housing. He said students may need to strategize about how to afford housing. We need to embrace the realities of what we can and cannot do. Students may need to adjust their thinking about how to make their financial need work. We can only do so much and then the student must make the decision.

Hassenzahl noted that we are getting more expensive in Chico than used to be true, but we are still a pretty good deal in California terms. We should couch things this way.

Hutchinson said she wanted to remain sensitive to students who are suffering homelessness and that she hoped people would know that the cabinet is fully aware of this. She said the CSU is also aware of this and Governor Newsome has put funds in his May revise to address this specifically. (Something like \$6.5M to begin addressing housing needs).

She said questions people raise and data sets are helpful as we all begin working on the problems. It is not helpful to simply speculate about problems instead of addressing ways to

help the people who want to come here for the quality of education we can provide. Our data is not all in place and we will work on that, but we will keep coming together to ask questions and seek more accurate information until we are out of the woods.

3. Budget Cycle & 2019-20 Budget Update [1:20:37-1:26:37]

[Slide 2] Kitchell said she would talk quickly. Here we are in May when the Governor has just released his May revision. We did not get much new funding. He reaffirmed the \$300M ongoing funding for the CSU and the \$264M onetime funds for infrastructure. State taxes have increased but he chose to put those surpluses in reserves to service debt and create a reserve to meet any future economic declines so we don't suffer as we did in the Great Recession.

The one change that we did see in the January budget there was \$15M onetime funding for student basic needs. This has changed to \$6.5M of ongoing funding to address student homelessness. (This "will support rapid rehousing of homeless and housing insecure students"). This is for the entire system, so it is unclear how that will be allocated and more will be heard in the next few months.

[Slide 3] March 15, we received the preliminary estimate for Chico. There will be GI funding increases, compensation increases to cover the collective bargaining agreements, resident enrollment and mandatory cost increases.

[Slide 4] The Resident Enrollment Increase included a 2% increase across the system. Chico was given 1.5% increase which means our resident funded target increased to 15,479. This will remain the same regardless of our enrollments.

[Slide 5] This is the Preliminary: 2019-20 Campus Budget Plan which shows the allocations of the new money and our base budget are looking at this point. Our Budget Plan from 2018/19 was \$238.5M and this first line shows the share of the budget for each of the divisions.

The next three lines show the changes in the base budget. These are the preliminary changes for Chico. Health & Dental Costs/Retirement/Compensation and Minimum Wage are mandatory cost increases. Next follow: Graduation Initiative 2025/ Enrollment Growth/ and Tuition changes (minus \$3.8M). This shows our planning about how to account for this.

Our total budget would go from \$238.5M to \$246M.

6. Academic Affairs Budget Update (20 Minutes) [1:26:37-1:52:56]

[Slide 2] Larson wanted to give an overview of the way the shortfall in enrollments has impacts on Academic Affairs.

[Slide 3] shows how we were projecting a balanced budget in our planning for the division in 2018-19. The yellow cloud symbols mark the extra tuition dollars we get that are then redistributed back into next year's budget as one-time money. In 2017-18 over enrollment produced \$2.1M in onetime money. We have been living on these one-time dollars in terms of being able to do flexible things.

[Slide 4] Shows the divisional reserves and how we are thinking of carryover comparatively. We estimated our carryover for 19-20 to be \$2.4M which is down from 18-19 which was \$3.3M.

[Slide 5] We are down because we are spending a lot of money on infrastructure renewal projects. We are spending close to \$908,000. Larson said this was highly supported. The biggest spender is ECC which had a substantial rollover from last year and now they are committing that rollover. They are upgrading 4 labs. The College of Business is projecting to run a sizable deficit, and they will be covered with \$440,000. This was unforeseen

[Slide 6] This slide shows the tuition revenue projections from 2017 to May 2019. [Slide 7] There will be a shortfall which means there will be no projected carryover coming in. We will have no one-time coming in in 19-20.

A paper chart of Academic Affairs GF Planned Sources and Uses 2019-20 was passed out that captures the deficits created by our projected loss of tuition. [this is not the exact same information as the power point attached to the agenda] Everything was collapsed into this list of Sources and Uses.

[Slide 7] AA is projecting another deficit of \$2.4M after all the efforts to reduce our spending. The enrollment shortfall is coming in pretty hard for us. The budget change depicted in the 2019-20 Estimate of \$3.8M will come to AA as a reduction in our base allocation. This is shown highlighted on the handout under Sources as a change of **(\$2.76M)**. Our base allocation has actually declined to \$142,627,868 according to the paper sheet for the coming year. We have been relying on the GI 2025 money as more flexible dollars and in the May revise this is about \$45M which is a reduction of about \$1M.

Academic Affairs has so little flexibility because most of what is spent is on fixed costs like salaries and benefits. She said it is time for the unit to be more careful about how we allocate work and how we hire. [See paper, top of column 1, Uses and power point Slide 9] She wants to talk to the department chairs and deans in the hopes of reducing the benefits given out to faculty which might free up \$500,000 (by employing Lecturers with higher class loads than just 1 or 2 courses since the benefits are the same [see slides 15 and 16]).

This kind of savings might be allocated to computer refreshes [highlighted in green in column 2 of the paper handout, and Slide 10].

[Slide 11] shows our Salaries and Benefits are growing to exceed our Base Allocation. This is the next area we need to work on. We have picked the easy apples –we need to work on the challenging issues.

[Slide 15] shows how we might start to reduce our benefit load. This can happen by fully employing Lecturers by moving them from .4 to .6 so that their overall numbers can be reduced and the benefit costs per WTU can be lightened.[Slide 16]shows the same logic with higher course loads.

[Slide 17] Larson suggested many ideas to take up next year:

- After June 15 or so, Establish with the PAC the 2019-20 Balance Budget Plan
In the last year we already took 17.5% from all the unit surpluses and there is not much more we can do
- Next AY: Getting to a Balance Budget in the Longer Term
- The slow walk in lecturer hiring towards .6 and greater
- Curriculum
 - We need to do the hard work of looking at how we deliver our instruction.
 - We need to think about what is in our curriculum.
 - We have opportunities in our curriculum just by the way we are organized.
 - We have courses that are very low enrolled courses, low enrolled options and minors,
 - with heavy work loads,
 - duplication where the same learning outcomes are taught in different classes in another college
- Larson would like to set up a Task Force: Leveraging Excellence & Access Now (LEAN)
She explained that the word “LEAN” does not imply cutting and narrowing down organizations, it means:
 - the organization is looking at its purpose and reassessing options
 - redesigning systems so that you are doing the best job for a focused set of goals
 - with the resources that you have
 Larson would want representatives from every college

She asked for questions before we turned to the exercise in item 7.

Hassenzahl asked about the ABC Model, includes Fac Prof Dev calculation (on the paper budget, top of column 2, under Uses) that listed \$72,413,657. Jennifer Mays answered that this number was purely based on last year. Hassenzahl said that the figure did not include savings from last year. Jennifer Mays said the ABC Model has not been updated yet in this presentation.

Ferrari wanted to make sure that the Chair of EPPC be included in the Taskforce since it will be a curriculum committee. Larson approved that.

Ford asked about divisional reserves and carry over and what is a proper carry-over amount? Looking at [Slide 5, pg. 28] you will see expenses from ECC and CME. These appear to be spending on what appear to be capital improvements. Are the Deans and colleges allowed to allocate funds for rollover based on capital improvements they are planning for the future? He thought in general that capital improvements should not come out of allocations to the colleges and it seems confusing to reference the ABC Model allocations and tie them in conversation to capital expenses.

Larson thought this was acceptable. She liked the idea that colleges would keep their surplus because it promoted planning for important things that colleges should be doing with one-time dollars. There must still be conversation. One-time dollars don't work for personnel hiring decisions, for example.

Ford said the ABC model deals with instructional costs averaged out in different ways. Surpluses left over should be thought of as errors in the allocation model. Because we are supposed to be allocating the costs of instruction, not for capital improvements. And if we are going to improve our ABC model over time we need to line up the costs of instruction with the allocations for instruction. We need to understand what those costs are because they do vary from discipline and grade level. We should not contaminate our efforts with rollover into capital expenses.

Larson said we should reward the colleges that have been smart about the delivery of their curriculum in lean ways so that they generate surpluses based on the FTES.

Jeff Bell, Biology, said that the ABC model is not strategic. It is a model designed to be fair and equitable. This doesn't mean that the colleges can't be strategic about the funding that they get. The college can decide not to hire, but they save money by doing that, so that they can pay for something else that benefits the college. The colleges can improve a program and try to draw majors by lowering the class size and hiring more tenure track instructors. They will have to pay for this by having larger classes and hiring lecturers somewhere else.

Currently, the model is just allocating out to the colleges. If they decide to do something cheaper, they can use their excess funds for capital improvements.

Sistrunk reminded the committee that at the last UBC when this notion of a taskforce was posited, it was agreed that Lecturers should serve on it because that is a good idea. He also wondered if it would be easier to cooperate with the Executive Committee of the Senate and just create a taskforce in that way.

Boyd wanted to clarify what FML meant. Larson said: "Family Medical Leave."

7. Exercise: Leveraging Excellence and Access Now (20 minutes) [1:52:56-1:54:04]

Larson wanted to get feedback about ways we could think about making our curriculum leaner. The plan was to get into small groups and discuss what we can do, how we should look at the issues, how we should begin to process where the opportunities might lie. Time ran out, but Wyrick offered to collect people's suggestions and send them to Larson via email.

8. University Advancement & Foundation Update (10 minutes) (1:54:04-2:03:51]

Boura wanted to give an update on the fundraising efforts as of today:

April 27 was the beginning of the public face of the Capital Campaign and he thanked those who have participated and encouraged those who have not to get a piece of it so they could see what has been done. We have invited students, faculty and staff as well as donors to give 5 dollars or 5.7million to come back to campus. If people were unable to get to campus, Advancement web-streamed the event live so people can feel appreciated for what they have done. Cookies were also handed out and they were pretty good as well.

The intent of the public face is to let the world know (our alumni, friends, faculty members, staff) that we are now launching a Comprehensive Campaign. We have exceeded 70% of our

goal and we are almost there, though we are not there yet. We need people to jump on board and to engage more donors. We need to expand our donor base so that our next campaign can be strongly supported. As our goals expand.

The President gave an exciting speech and everyone was dancing. It was a lot of fun.

Boura played a video clip that captures what we're all about: "What do you want the future to be all about? What goals would you like to follow? How can we work together to shape our tomorrow? Together we can transform Tomorrow!"

Three goals for the campaign were articulated. An overview of the campus and history were treated and facilities and exciting learning and research were featured with speakers and voice from across campus. The need is still great –and everyone wants to help shape what the future looks like. To Transform the future wildly.

Boura said what he loved about the video was that despite all the challenges we face, we still provide an amazing experience for our students as we all come together to give the best possible education to our students.

This is the responsibility of Advancement to meet all the endless needs. They want to be part of this process.

As of May 13, we still have time because the fiscal year ends on June 30.

- The campaign has made \$76M
- For this fiscal year between July 1 and June 30 we have surpassed \$10.2M
- \$7.7M in cash came in
- We have people who have committed to multi-year pledges
- Every bucket continues to grow and every bucket can have a specialized purpose

In three and a half years we have:

- 140,000 alumni who have joined our database
 - 604 people gave us over \$6M this year –this should give you a sense that people are investing in our work because it is remarkable
 - The same 604 people gave \$3.6M
- People give for many reasons –love, investment and especially because they were asked

We need to use the money that has been given for many different reasons because that will allow us to create a story that will allow us to get more money next year.

Last, but not least, Student philanthropy continues to grow. We got over \$53,000 to support our food pantry so that it will continue to grow. We are helping the students to engage and participate in a culture of philanthropy that will last a lifetime.

We have over 18,000 donors when last year we had 15,000. This growth was fueled by the tragedy we experienced. We will work to retain these donors and give them a meaningful experience so they can increase their giving next year.

9. Other [2:03:51-2:07:26]

Boyd noted that at the end of Academic Senates we provide certificates to our senators. We would like to read a resolution to honor the extraordinary work of Jeni Kitchell:

Whereas, Jeni Kitchell has shown extraordinary dedication and perseverance at Chico State throughout the years, and

Whereas, Jeni Kitchell has served to train multiple Vice Presidents of Business and Finance, and

Whereas, Jeni Kitchell has herself served as Interim Chief Financial Officer and Vice President of Business and Finance, and

Whereas, Jeni Kitchell has served steadfast (survived) over many University Budget Committee meetings, Chaired by three different Senate Chairs and three different Presidents, six different Provosts and four Vice Presidents of Business and Finance, and

Whereas, Jeni Kitchell has provided transparency in budget and allocations by providing presentations and central and sometimes one on one training to members of the Executive Committee in UBC, and

Whereas, Jeni Kitchell demonstrates leadership through professional and open responses to countless questions on the Governors', the CSU's and Chico State's budget including, but not limited to enrollment, tuition, headcount, learning fees, benefits, Open gov.org, etc., etc., etc., and

Whereas, Jeni Kitchell has proven to be an indispensable resource to the California State University, Chico, therefore be it,

Resolved, that the University Budget Committee and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate hereby bestow this commendation of appreciation to Jeni Kitchell for her outstanding service, accomplishments and leadership at Chico State.

The applause was loud and sustained!

Wyrick presented a certificate to Jeni Kitchell.

Jeni Kitchell thanked the assembled. She said the work was great and a challenge. She said she appreciated the conversations with everyone and hoped she would remain helpful as we continue moving forward.

10. Announcements [2:07:26-2:08:29]

Zartman noted that this will be the last meeting the Chair of the Senate chairs and he was grateful for Wyrick's thoughtful leadership.

11. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 5:06 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](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://csuchicoca.opengov.com>