

Staff Council Plenary Meeting
Minutes
Friday – October 6th, 2023
Zoom
9am-10:30am

<https://sfsu.zoom.us/j/85181548846?pwd=OExZb0syME5wcmNJTWhERTJuNHE3dz09>

Present: Caroline Alcantara, David Apelt, Kendra Harris, Peter Hendricks, Paula Hsieh, Chanda Jensen, Carlos Julio, Ashley Klein, Herman Lee, Chelsea McNutt, Mary Menees, Dylan Mooney, Janet Remolona, Devi Ruslani-Reyes, Anarose Schelstrate, Dominic Sciuccchetti, Jamil Sheared, Denzel Vaovasa, Mirna Vasquez, Samantha Ward, Ingrid Williams

Guest: John Kim

CALL TO ORDER: 9:05am

1. Approval of the Agenda for October 6th, 2023
Agenda accepted by acclamation.
2. Approval of the Minutes for September 29th, 2023
Minutes accepted by acclamation.
3. Announcements from the Floor – Janet shared that the Fall Kick-Off was a super fun event with great weather and did not run out of food. Alli-Gator also showed up! Caroline thanked Devi for coordinating the even, great job! Thanked Ingrid for funding the event and thanked Mirna for helping.

Reports

4. Chair's Report – Dylan and Chanda attended the extended cabinet meeting yesterday where time was spent catching up since it is the first of the year. It wasn't a focused meeting on a specific topic. Dylan has recently been having conversations with other CSU Staff Councils in regard to lack of statewide Staff Councils and lack of representation at the Board of Trustees. It's been an interesting/invigorating thread, good to hear staff talking about positive change. It's good to remember that as difficult a space we are in sometimes, we also need to remember the good things. Not every campus has a Staff Council – CSU East Bay does not have an SC but not for lack of trying. East Bay administration is not willing to entertain the effort. They have 1 representative in Academic Senate, and this also serves as the de facto staff council. What we have here, is especial in that we have a little bit more on policy which makes us different. We thread lightly in terms of representation. What we are doing is difficult, but it is through the honesty of the process that's important. Making sure that folks are aware – transparency in terms of budget, staff forum, and UBC. Foolish to not utilize what we have. Working together to come up with solutions. How can SC play that role of providing that assistance. How can these things broadcast to the bigger group. We are at a place where people are listening.
5. University Reports (UBC, Senate, etc.) - None

Guest Speaker

6. Interim Vice Provost, John Kim – Academic Affairs Budget Realignment & Staffing Plans

Dylan introduced John Kim and thanked him for coming to speak with us. John shared that this is not the first time in this role – when he first started in 2006, the portfolio was pretty much the same, was AV to now AT. It's been helpful since those folks in those roles were pretty much the same. He re-ordered questions that were sent by Dylan. 1) Are we really being told how bad it is, and how bad compared to 2008? Enrollment has been down since 2019 but we didn't make cuts. There were one-time funds and HERF money which made it difficult to convince people that there really was a problem. The problem is that those are one-time monies. He has been here since 1995 and we've gone through different budget issues and this time is really different. The message is very difficult to make consistent. We didn't make the cuts that we should have made gradually. The budget decline due to tuition fee revenue. Problem is that our funding is not solely on tuition revenue, the other part is state appropriation, based on funded FTES. FTES is the measure of how many students we are supposed to be serving. The chancellor's office starting next year will do a permanent reduction on an ongoing basis until the budget matches the FTES. Budget is aligned to the number of students we are supposed to be serving. The impetus of the glide path. The university is engaging on its own glide path, permanent reductions. Academic affairs, two thirds of the overall budget - 24M is academic affairs' part, 16M in salaries. Why reduction has to come out of salary – because salary needs the reduction in benefits as well. Not budgeted in our general fund, money for operating expenses. We don't have enough of none salary pieces in academic affairs. 36 million in university, and 16M is 2/3 of academic affairs. The charge John was given is to help academic affairs go through this because if academic affairs fail, the university fails. First 3 months, trying to convince folks that there really is a problem. The next year problem is what puts it over the top. The question is fair about are we really getting the right information. John shared that he is not planning for anything other than the glide path. Jeff hasn't said anything about the impact of salary increases due to GSI. He is not in a position to do so. It could be said that things could be worse, but this is not included in the planning. The glide path is based upon the hope that enrollment will start increasing again. Found that we didn't level up - 5 to 6 percent lower. John thinks things are worse, and we are all in the same boat. Enrollment piece is a major factor. Would encourage people to attend UBC this month. Jeff will talk about the kinds of assumptions. This is many ways worse than 2008, what he remembers is that it was a 2-year problem. Reason that it's worse now is that before we were coming from a better place. John Gemello was provost and Leroy Morishita and Corrigan were here. We were able to use a lot of one-time funds. We don't have that time now. Within fiscal year, reduce payroll by 1 month. We had furloughs then which was possible then, but not now because it's not all campus, only dealing 7 campuses. Morale was better then because of Gemello and Morishita largely. We were able to do things in 2006-08, we as a campus were leaders in showing the legislators what we do on campus. This is not part of campus culture now. 16M was not the total reduced, were able to do other things to reduce that back then. John sees that it's very different. 2) Staff raises impact the budget. Do we have enough funds for 3 percent raise? At most get limited support for the GSIs. Number doesn't come near, has to be taken out from university budget. Johns said this is a good question for Jeff Wilson. He would know whether or not an answer is appropriate. John says yes, we have enough money to cover the 3% GSI. Deficit spending using university reserve. Plan is not to make full reductions, glide path. 3) sweep of vacant position funds –

emailed CBOs, Deans, etc., to say when a person leaves, leaving a vacant position, John will sweep the remaining money from that vacant position. John needs to know how money is being used. If he builds an OE, he needs to know how monies are being used. Including retirement and unplanned departures. John noticed that after he sent that email, did not received any responses. 4) Do you expect staff layoffs – John said no. spring and fall scheduling is important. John's way of approaching the glide path. Ingrid said that the President tried very hard to not lay off folks. That's the last alternative, layoffs. Really trying to do what's possible, hence the voluntary separation. Attrition does its job. John said that the voluntary separation is needed in other units. They can't rely on attrition. Voluntary separation is a way to reduce. Encourage to use tools to allow everybody to do their part. 6) Metrics being used to guide decision making – in academic affairs, the initial decision he made, were not based on very good metrics because he started on July 1st, no people around and not a lot of information until later. Everybody got the same percentage reduction. It would be a miracle if that turned out exactly right. Addressing the issue after the fact. Very painful thing we are going through. Working with Sutee and Lori Beth to make sure we are serving the needs of the students. Working with folks university wide/ Kind of a workable spring schedule, look at each dept., resources they need to deliver programs to students. Course/sections cuts work out with each college. Idea is not to make changes to the schedule once published online, Nov. 1st. Not cancel low enrolled once students are enrolled, John doesn't like this practice and we need to not do this. John needs to know this. College/unit staffing committees. John feels SC is the appropriate place for this question. How can staff help? John can only speak of academic affairs – if you don't hear from someone who doesn't know what is going on. John mention that 25-26 is where they are planning to make permanent reduction for staff and mpp salaries. **Attrition in not really a plan, it just happens.** Developing an organization plan for staffing – what is the ideal plan? With the constraint that units meet the budget reduction. John and President need those plans to help them with glide path, helps with justification with staff searches. Things approved with respect to plan. John will use the filter of the plan, adjust those plans where it doesn't work. John as well as deans don't know what each staff does. John is hopeful that this is where staff has input in the organization plan. Not everything is a basis of increase and replacement. John can say, news to Ingrid, plan on setting up something in CANVAS where all academic employee is enrolled in it, planning to use it to hold office hours - a lot of discussion in regards to academic affairs because AA issues is clogging up other forums like UBC. Use CANVAS for an anonymous blog, identity remains anonymous. Make more possible for people to speak and provide more input. John is planning to put this together, news to Ingrid, Amy knows about. Ingrid said that this could be highly recommended but not required. Ingrid said this is great, we have made a lot of headway in trying to be as transparent as possible. One of the things Ingrid has learned in the past, that when staff is included in planning, certain staff will go to the union, in exploratory phase, caused friction in some cases. Ingrid hasn't seen this in the past year. Appreciate the fact that the more that can be shared with staff, the better we will be. Ingrid said thank you to John. John said this is what he has in mind – completely democratic and could also minimize misinformation. John doesn't know when this can happen, maybe as early as Monday. AT reports to him. Dylan thanked John for the wealth of information and honesty. Dylan on those last 2 question, he felt very much related to him. Staffing plans, pushed down to the Deans, that maybe committees around this work need staff or need to include staff. Choosing the same person staff that

doesn't know the work that's being done is not productive and causes bad feelings. John said that there's always that assumption, if person representing is not doing a good job at it. It's a problem if it's the same person. Sometime not avoidable. Maybe this CANVAS thing could be a good thing, maybe specific to staff, a blog specific. This being democratic, everybody can say what they think and feel. As far as college deans, AA, John doesn't think they gave them pretty good guidance. Up to the dean but would hope to hear in blog if dean is not including staff. Samantha question in two parts – one in messaging, disturbed since last UBC, about conversation lecturers are talking about, mostly protecting their entitlements, 2) seem that they have not been part of the conversation, don't know where it's coming from. Though we've known that we've had a problem for years, structural deficits. Messaging is important, hear talks about IDC. John said, good sets of points. John, the focus of his work is what it is, with the colleges especially the schedule for the spring. Need to find ways to support colleges/depts. Two things that are unique in the problem we are having now – one is the number compared to fall of 1979, low (this is why different to 2008). There wasn't a lot of talk to the extent to which there is a structural problem with budget. In the 2000s, the university was richly staffed, the colleges as well, this info could be informative. Couldn't do more until November. There's been increasing scrutiny on carry forwards. Going forward, this will be limited. Will be reviewed in 5 years, talks about monies other than IDCs. Task force to look into IDC. It will be the case that these things will come out in general discussion. COSE and HSS rely on IDC funds. More scrutiny and more policy on how they are handled. Given more context as to why it's worse now. No one's done cuts systematically. It will align over the course of two years.

Standing Committees – N/A

7. Break Out Rooms (if time allows)

Close the Loop – N/A

8. Standing Committees Report Back (Approx. 10:15am)
9. Open Floor

Adjournment: Time Approximate 10:30am