**Staff Association Executive Board Meeting**

Minutes for 4/5/2023

1. Call to Order - Sarah Long 9:02am
   1. Establish Quorum/Attendance - Chelle Martinez
      * Beckie Pyles Munoz- Present
      * Leyna Bencomo- Present
      * Lily Cosgrave- Present
      * Matthew Beckwith, Vice President - Present
      * Mikayla Greenfield, Treasurer - Present
      * Yvonne Weeres, Classified Staff Pay and Benefits Committee Chair- Present
      * Paul Mendoza- Present
      * Charles Kuehler- Present
      * Chelle Martinez, Secretary - Present
      * Terri Wagner- Present
      * JoAnn Delgado- Present
      * Rhonda Glazier- Present
      * Amy Sutz- Present
      * Brett Mayer- Present
      * Cindy Rhoads- Present
      * Deann Barrett, Chair of University Staff Pay and Benefits Committee & UCSC Representative - Present
      * Deborah OConnor, Policy Committee - Present
      * Erin Klein- Present
      * Joanne Delgado- Present
      * Jonathon DeWitt- Present
      * Joseph Bono- Present
      * Laura Chandler, UCSC Classified Staff & Staff Award Committee Chair - Present
      * Lindsay Coppa- Present
      * Lisa Jones, Staff Member at Large - Present
      * Mary Lile- Present
      * Melissa Willers- Present
      * Morgan Easter- Present
      * Nancy Mars- Present
      * Polly Knutson, Communications Director - Present
      * Sarah Hutton- Present
      * Sarah Long, Past President - Present
      * Shawn Hood, Staff Member at Large - Present
      * Shonda Johnson- UCSC Representative General - Present
      * Valerie McClinton, Women Identifying Staff Committee - Present
      * Vonda Weiss- Present
2. Approval of the Agenda
   1. Motion - Matt
   2. 2nd - Mikayla
   3. Aye - 8
3. Approval of Previous Minutes
   1. Motion - Matt
   2. 2nd - Yvonne
   3. Aye – 8
4. (9AM-9:30AM) Budget Redesign Task Force Presentation
   1. Presenters:
      1. Charles Kuehler – Enrollment Management Business Manager
      2. Kyle Gruenhagen – Academic Affairs Financial/HR Specialist
      3. Paul Mendoza – Director of Finance, Division of Student Affairs
      4. Rhonda Glazier – Kraemer Family Library Director of Collections Management & Associate Professor
      5. Terri Wagner – Director of Campus Budget Operations

Sarah – So if you could reintroduce yourself and use your outside voice.

Paul- So and as you all know that we were tasked to look at or take a pause on the budget model and get feedback from the campus. So what we've been doing for the past, gosh, when did we start November? We've been meeting weekly. We’re looking at priorities and really looking at how this is going to roll out for the campus looking just at general fund, auxiliaries will not be part of this. So our priorities are simplicity, transparency, predictability, stability, and incentives. This is something that’s been given feedback by us but also a directive from the Chancellor.

Here’s your overview, and committee charge. Like we said when we met with the Chancellor, we have our anonymous feedback on the website and taking that into account in our meetings. This presentation is going to talk about what we have done so far. We do have a presentation April 17th. It’s a town hall. If you have not registered, there's a link out there that that the Provost Office sent out, so please register. That gives us an idea of who's gonna participate. It will be live. So very similar to the town hall that the Chancellor’s Office gives out. And we'll talk about the model overview, and then we're gonna open it up for discussion for any feedback from you all.

Terri - Ok, so this is the big picture. We have a pot of money. The revenue comes in, we're gonna consider tuition and State support for the revenue that pours into the model. We do not consider F&A. We do not consider auxiliaries. It's only the general fund and no fees and no F&A. So that's very important.

After we have compiled the allocable revenue. Then right off the top, we're going to take the core campus cost. Those are costs generally that we don't have any control over and or the units don't have any control over. So then that leaves about 134 million, don’t take these numbers to the bank, these are only for show.

So the first thing from the 134 million will be the incremental pool. Some people call it the budget pool. What that will consist of is anywhere from 70 to 90% of total based budget to all the units will be allocated July 1. Then after that it's about 96 ish million. That leaves 38 million that will be distributed to the next two pools. The incentive pool is where metrics will be applied per unit. So they'll be different for academic units and support units. And then the next pool will be what we consider the UCCS pool, which will be a sync or swim together type of situation. All those things, hopefully the goal is to the incentives be towards the strategic plan so that we all have the same goals to work towards - academic unit and support unit. Next slide please.

Charles – Alright, so this is even more fake numbers. I'm not comfortable using the real ones, so this is just an example of how this pours down into the different buckets on the model.

So we start with $10,000. We're gonna say this is how much the university is bringing in in its general fund - is what we're expecting here. So we've got the revenue we bring in that we're budgeted to bring in from tuition, that $6500, we're budgeting bringing in $2500 from the State, and then we also budget for about $1000 of those items that aren't going to flow through the model. They would still exist.

They still exist, but they're not going to flow through the model. So for example, if you are self-generating revenue and it is in a fun 10 speed type and you have a continuing budget for it, that would be the sort of thing that conceptually goes there. Is that an accurate representation Terri?

Terri - Yeah.

Charles - OK. But it doesn't flow in. It isn't something that we're changing. The model isn't going to say, hey, this is how this gets split out. Those things have their own unique cases. So we're gonna work with what's left. So the $6500 plus is $2500 is $9000 of tuition and State revenue. We're gonna take off those campus costs first - so we're going to budget for utilities, probono obligations and various other items that are decided. Specifically, there also not flowing through the model.

So if we get $6500 left to allocate from all of that revenue that we're budgeting bringing in. First, we're going to take an amount to put it into pool one - into this incremental pool. This pool right now we we've got 70% plugged in there. But any of these numbers that are in blue are sort of the ones that are floating these ones, these ones can still change. These ones are very much under discussion about where they need to go, what they need to do.

The purpose of the 1st pool is to kind of put the brakes on the rest of the model. It provides stability, it says, hey, if we don't get it exactly right about what the incentives need to be and these we're not going to change the budgets too much. So all of this is, is gonna work just like your existing incremental model. You're going to have whatever you had last year, 70% of what you had last year is just going to come to you, straight on that.

So after we allocate that out, and that's going to be $4670 on here after we allocate that out, we've got $1830 left allocate. So again just made-up numbers that we have in there placeholders because all this stuff is still under discussion. You've got 50% going into the unit incentive and so that's how good did your unit perform based on whatever metrics we decide. This one is helping with the goal of visibility, making people feel seen, making departments feel like they have agency.

I did this thing, yes, the whole campus is doing good, but I specifically did this thing I should get a portion of budget allocated mean based on my performance, based on whatever that driver is And I'm using terms like whatever that driver is because we haven't decided what they are. We're looking at what things were, what things make sense, and if you've got really good ideas for what those things should be, use the anonymous feedback form or send it non-anonymously. But the anonymous feedback from will definitely put it in front of all of us and we'll take a look at it.

The 3rd pool and so again this one is doing a 50/50. So the 3rd pool here is the enrollment and retention pool.

This is the one that like Terri said, our fortunes rise and fall together. So $915 here this should represent an amount that we, the university, are all doing well. This is going to to have us all do better. If we, the university, are not doing as well, we're all gonna be in the same trenches together.

So the percentage that we allocate to this pool helps reinforce that community aspect and make sure that that's accounted for. Now these things all have competing interests with each other and that's ok. All of those things are important. Stability is important. You want a unit to feel like just because they had a bad year - they're not all of a sudden going to have the rug pulled out from them completely. They need to have stability, if it changes are coming down as a result of model, they need time to react to those. How do they plan for those? That's an important thing.

But if this is too high, then people feel like they don't have agency to change things. Things are always gonna stay the same. Nothing I do will actually matter. The higher this is and the lower that is sort of trades off on those.

The opposite is occurring over here. So in this pool, the higher you have for full #2 for the unit incentive, the more you're telling units, hey, what you do matters. I need you to care so much about how the campus is doing as a whole, but what you were doing matters. So the danger of having that one too high is that you create toxic competition and that you don't want that to happen. But if you have a too low, then it feels like every department isn't really benefiting from their own actions. And, you know, I put in all this work - how come they're getting a boost too? Shouldn't I get more of a boost since I'm going to put in more of that work? And so that's what makes it tricky to figure out what those drivers need to be.

Opposite of that is the 3rd pool, so enrollment and retention. Talking about community, if you have it too low, you create that toxic environment, but if you have it too high now we're all in the same boat, but we're not really ever showing our individual actions in an undercuts that agency, and it undercuts some of that incentivization. So all of these come together. They're going to give you your final total continuing budget that's in the general fund that we're going to have to work with to allocate out to the areas. They're going to have the $6500 that flows through the model based on those drivers. The $2500 that was pulled out for the core campus costs. And then the $1000 that's coming in from those specific activities. So this talks about how we fill these pools, how we fill these buckets. Terri's going to talk about how these individual buckets get separated out to the departments.

Terri – OK, so this is the first pool, the incremental pool. Iincremental pool gets allocated to the different units. A unit is an academic unit or a support unit. It's usually at the VC level, so there's nine different support units and five or six academic units. Everybody is treated equally and again that percentage is 70 to 90% of everyone's total budget. So there's a couple things to note here. Don't get trapped into thinking that's all you're getting that you're only ever gonna get 70% of your total budget. That's not true because we have two more pools to allocate that will give us our total budget. The point of this pool is to give you that predictability and stability. So as of June 30th 0 that's the budget - that total budget number in your unit - that's the amount we will make our calculations off of. So you can take that to the bank that some percentage 70 to 90% of that base budget from June 30th will roll to the next fiscal year, July 1. The important thing just to keep in mind that that the first pool is subtracted from the allocable revenue. so whatever that amount will fluctuate depending on the percentage that that the task force comes up with and these are the things that we are open to suggestions to. So again, the anonymous feedback on the Provost website- that's the best way to give us suggestions. Again, this pool will be known by July 1. The goal eventually is for all budgets and a good projection to be known by May. But we're working out the kinks still. Next slide, please.

The 2nd pool is a unit incentive pool. These the way we get this is again, we subtract off the incremental pool. It leaves us on amount 38 million for this and then some percentage of that 38 million will be allocated to the unit incentive pool. Another thing to realize about the next two pools after the incremental pool is that the percentage leftover, not the 70%., so the metrics whatever metrics are applied will be applied to the smaller amount, not your total budget. It will be applied to what's allocated from the incremental pool, and then what's left from your total budget. So say a unit has a total budget of 10 million and then the budget pool is going to give $7700 or I don't know, $100. We're gonna give $70. And then there's $30.00 left over - that $30 is what the metrics will be applied to. What that does is it creates less risk and has the opportunity to allocate more or less depending on what that what that leftover is - that $30.00 or $20, whichever.

So here's where the task force has spent most of their time. We have looked at different metrics. There's been a lot of different things proposed here. What we wanna do is stick to the strategic plan and make sure that our goals and that all the units are working towards meeting our strategic plan and unit incentive at the performance as well, within. So we don't know what those metrics will be. We are taking suggestions for those metrics. I think the last discussion that we had was to measure the units against themselves because metrics are great - it's the standard of measurement that we're a little stuck on. So if we measure our performance on what each unit did last year or the last two years, that will probably give us a little bit more stability than trying to figure out national averages at this time. Everything about this model could change. That's the beauty of it. The flexibility of this model is very beneficial to our campus.

??? - I was just gonna make a comment. I think it was you who made the comment about, you know, everything's formula driven. But at this point like for the incentive, we don't want to I guess for lack of better word punish a unit based on these metrics. But also maybe look at how can the VC's intervene to say hey, yes, this this department is not meeting metric but these are the reasons why and then we're going to help them out get out of that kind of like that whole.

So that's we've had that discussion and like that intervention piece based on on the formulas and that the KPI and metrics.

Terri - So this was leaves the last pool. This is our community pool. Again, it will be some percentage of that of the allocable revenue left over from the allocable revenue minus the budget pool. So say the incentive pool is 90% then then this pool will be 10%. The probability of this pool being allocated will probably be in February after we see what our spring numbers are. The reason for that is if we were to bring in more tuition dollars, we could allocate that out at this time. And the opposite, unfortunately could be true as well. If we do worse, you know, maybe we can't give out the rest. It just depends on the performance of the University as a whole. I think it's back to Charlie.

Charlie – So again this is just talking about where they are and what makes this the hybrid model. So stability is working basically just like our existing incremental model, the amount of budget you have to work with is based off of how much budget you have to work with last year's. That's our current budget model. The next two start to make it more incentive based, so it's not just based on how much did you have to work with last year but based on metrics that that you can arrive toward.

Terri - So the key takeaways then, the discussion points, are about what those metrics should be. We say KPI's here, it could be just about anything. There's a lot of concern that maybe it's difficult for support units to have performance metrics and that's probably true but it is possible and I believe that, you know, we're all professionals and experts in our fields and so even without knowing, we do it. We do rate ourselves on our performance within our own unit and department, so flushing out the metrics is what is next. The KPI's - that's what's next for us. Umm, so again the anonymous feedback or like Charlie said, just send either any one of us at an e-mail if you have suggestions or concerns - we do share that we want everyone to know that we do look at it. As soon as the feedback comes in, it is shared with all of the task force and we do consider and talk about all the feedback. So don't think that it's just gonna go unnoticed. We really take those that feedback seriously.

So now the next step then for us is we bought wrapped up the red team. The next piece of the puzzle is a town hall like Paul said earlier. The town hall is hopefully sharing more specific numbers. We've just received the final parameters from the system so we can better project what our budget is going to be next year, so we're putting all that through. Again remember that next year is a parallel year. So we'll still be operating in an incremental sort of way in 2024 and this redesigned budget model will be working in tandem to hopefully flush out some issues that may be, you know, just weren't highlighted before. So we can fix that before full implementation in fiscal year 2025. So come to the town hall, that again, register that or it's in person I think too, so that's awesome. And then hopefully by June 30th, we'll be ready. That is the goal. We've got a lot of work to do still. Again the metrics is what's holding us back right now. Do you have any questions for us?

Paul- I'm going to make one comment all four campuses are going through an update on their budget model. And every campus is at different states of kind of what we're doing. So I just wanted to share that that's we're not the only campus in this new system that's doing that. Questions. Comments. Concerns.

Lilly Cosgrove - I have a question slash comment you have concerned, so at the most recent UVAC or the one that happened last month some questions were brought up in regards to undecided students and where they fall, has that been discussed in your group or has you know, has any feedback from these red team meetings and presentations been discussed and have you guys come up with any possible solutions?

Terri - We're blending the revenue, all tuition is just tuition. With a blended tuition and all revenue in one bucket, that's how we're allocating the spending authority, much like an incremental model.

Lilly - Thank you.

Charlie - But to tie that to the information that we're seeking. It's almost to bounce it back to you and say of that revenue if we've got $20.00 on the table - Who gets what portion of that $20.00 and why? What thing can we actually go in and measure that says, well, my department gets this, and if that's something that needs to be reflected from undecided students, OK, what thing are you gonna measure and how do you tie that to an area? Should it get split out to each unit evenly? Should it be based on where their credit hours are instead? We don't take a look at that at all. I mean is it something that that's not gonna be enough of an end to really change where it's gonna go. Those are those are the kinds of things that we really need the feedback on is as what thing would you measure to feel like its fair? So one of the one of the feedback items that we got was a department coming back and saying that they didn't feel, or they felt that they were underfunded, which hey valid, I think everybody feels that way, but that doesn't make that feeling invalid. The part that you wanna tie it into the model though is proportional to what? Why are you feeling like you deserve a higher cut of the money than what someone else is getting? Not saying that you don't. I'm saying that what thing do we need to look at to measure that. What does that amount of funding that you get need to be proportional to? Because that's what's gonna help answer those KPI questions.

Paul - I think another piece to that is looking at the priorities. We really wanna make it simplistic, but you we can really go in and you know add different variables but that just creates complexity and we won't be able to predict what next year's budget like if you're finance people in those departments. One of the things the model is not going to solve is right sizing people's budgets, but that's where we can maybe, you know, at the either at the cabinet level concern saying hey, you know, it's discretionary money that they can provide to different departments based on some type of, you know, governance and what that looks like. So we've talked about stuff like that.

Thank you guys.

Rhonda – I can answer the feedback question, we talk about all the feedback that comes in. However we get it and we've had some really heated and interesting discussions and we're continuing those and it really is helpful when we know what people are thinking and what they're concerns are because we can't address a concern that we don't know and everybody has a different perspective and have you know different things you can bring to the table. And this is your chance to bring that, you know, let us know if you have a concern. What is the concern so that we can talk about it and see if we can figure out a way to address it within the model. If we can't, we'll say that too. There may be things that are concerns like right sizing that we can't truly maybe address, but we at least know it's a concern and we can talk about it and at least look at it and analyze it and then come back and say we've looked at it, we talked about it and this is why it's what it is. So really the red team meetings we’re hoping to encourage people to tell us what they think. You know what's good, what's bad, you know, what do you think would work? What about it, do you think whoa, wait a minute, that doesn't make sense to me. Because those are the kinds of things we need to know as we try to finish out this model and make sure it's fair and that it works for everyone, right?

??? - You don't know what you don't know.

Rhonda - That's right. So, yeah. So I would just encourage everyone. Yeah. Let us know.

Leyna – I have a question. This is leyna Bencomo with the unit incentive pool and the enrollment retention pool, the percentages that go to each one of those, is that determined for the whole place or is each unit gonna say, you know what, I want 20% of mine to go into the incentive.

Rhonda - No, the percentage is like how much of the total goes into each of those pots. Once that’s set it’s set for everyone on campus. It's so like that's the reason we don't know. Is it gonna be 50/50? Should it be, you know, one should be 80 and one should be 20%. The money that's left over. So it's at that level. It's like, what, how much do you need to those pots to be given out?

Leyna - Cuz it does seem like some units have more to do with enrollment retention than other units. Like I would say, you know, the coffee shop doesn't have much to do with enrollment retention. I mean, it does in a in a sort of a way that it creates an ambience, you know that some students might like more, but still, it does seem like that percentage maybe could be decided at a lower level as long as it's the same money. The other thing is the KPIs are huge. Like if I personally in my job had to do KPIs and you want numbers - I'd have a really hard time with that because one of the things I do is convert books to make them accessible to students with disabilities, right? So OK, so maybe I converted 40 books last year, so now I should do the same this year. Well, no, because the playing field has changed drastically. We're going into this tap model for books. There are more digital books since the pandemic, so maybe I have to do less conversion, but now I have to do something differently that I didn't have to do before. So my job changes over time, partly because it's technology, but I would be very hard pressed to come up with KPIs based on the past for the future, and those probably wouldn't hold up for the following year.

Paul - I think you know finding that measuring that ruler that you can measure ourselves and in my head I, you know, I think that could change that ruler can change over time. Like you said with technology. So it has to be something that we probably have to be aware that that's gonna could change potentially every year. And how does that fit into the model. So I think that's a good point.

Terri - Another thing to consider is that you're in IT. IT is a small unit. Are you an IT?

Leyna - Yeah, there's 50 some right.

Terri - But what I'm saying, I guess it's small. Just your department is blended with the whole department and so that's sort of a safety net for you that you don't have to be so specific. You know those KPI's are in general for that unit.

Charlie - Once we talk about getting split out to the unit level that's where I think it doesn't go all the way down to the departments, right, but we're going to give Carlos a portion of money for student affairs and how he gives that out to each individual department is up to him. What this should do though, or should better facilitate, is if you know what KPIs your area was getting funding based on. That should empower you to be able to have that conversation with the head of your unit. Say you know 50% of our new money came from this KPI and I got to tell you all this work that I did was directly related to that thing. I should get a cut of that, giving me more will let me bring in more for our unit should help tie that in and make it so that everyone is having those conversations on the same page.

But that also only works to your point when we have KPIs that are appropriate for the area.

Leyna – I can't imagine trying to come up with KPI for the entire IT department. Because every area does a drastically different job, you know everybody lumps IT together, but it's like there are so many different variations in our jobs.

Kyle - I understand that concern and we've talked about that quite a bit in this task force. And some of the danger of having misaligned KPIs with a formula driven model, could really quite ruin the prospects of exactly what you're saying. So how do we balance in judgment with formula but still retain trust? So that's I think the most difficult part of both the red team meetings, meetings like this, and the town hall which is that incentive pool is that given to the VC's area and they review metrics independently that have been come up with collectively they are potentially benchmarks or trends within the unit to appropriately measure their success. So that's another discussion point too. It's not that you converted 18 books - congratulations, you get 100% of your budget, but it's gonna have to be much broader than that, right?

Rhonda - I think that goes back to what Terri said about comparing to your unit against your unit, you're not comparing across units. That's why it's important that the metrics makes sense for you and it's gonna be a decision at that level. I think we aren't sure yet. We haven't like figured that out yet, but part of it would be, as Kyle said, benchmarking are you improving? Have you set things in place that mean that you're improving services or you're improving things and how do you measure that is kind of what I would look at. If I was doing this and having to set my KPI I'd be saying I'm starting here, this is where I'm at. I'm in the library, so we work with students all time as well and you're right, it's very random. You can't control it, but other things I can look at and say, OK, this is an area of service that we want to improve and how do I measure that? And then you would talk to whoever would like VC or whoever is above you on what those are going to be and make that agreement going into the year. So that you know these are what it's gonna be used by that person, but the next year when the budget is done. But again, this is still all like very theoretical. We're talking about it. We're thinking about it. So having concerns and doing what they are is important for us because if it won't work, we want to know that and and we want to have those conversation.

Sarah - So I wanna respect time and let folks know that maybe one more question but know that there's anonymous feedback, there's the town hall. This conversation is definitely not over, but I know that you all have stuff that you probably need to do. And then we also have another presentation. So do we have like maybe one last question?

Charlie - We can go to our questions slide, which is what did we get right? What things are we keeping that that we need to say, OK, good, you nailed that one. Don't tweak that one or more. Focus on these ones. But what things are working.

Mikayla - I don't have a question, but I do have some feedback and I just wanted to say thank you to all of you for all the hard work you've done to put into this, because I think it's a lot better than the route we were going. It's a lot more clear and transparent. And while there's still some bugs to work out on, some of the metrics and how the incentives are figured out overall I think a really good model that will be able to follow and adapt as needed throughout the years.

Terri -Thank you. That was very nice. It was very helpful.

Sarah – I also want to acknowledge that a lot of this work is above and beyond what you are actually what your job is. So I just want to thank you too, because I know that UCCS we ask you often to do so much more than what your original job description says. So we are very, very grateful that to be in this space for you to come to us for you to be on this task force and everything. So thank you.

1. (9:30AM-10AM): Tiered Parking Presentation
   1. Presenter: Leyna Bencomo
   2. Present to Cabinet in early May?

Sarah – We are going to be talking about employee parking and the salary based tiered pricing proposal. Take it away. I think Lena right, is that or Mikayla was gonna start?

Mikayla – Sorry I couldn’t be there in person. This is a presentation from our salary based tiered parking subcommittee. This group is made up of myself, Matthew Beckwith, Beckie Pyles Munoz, Lily Cosgrove, Leyna Bencomo, and Yvonne Weeres. We’ve been working for a couple months now. We’ve done some surveys in Staff Association and the Faculty group. Here are some we think are good solutions. And this is some of the proposals that we have come up with that we think may be good solutions for our parking pricing on campus.

Matt - Awesome. Thank you so much, Michaela. Hi, everybody. I'm Matt. I'm on staff association vice president and I work in the parking department, and I'm just gonna start us off with the first section, which is just background and kind of reminder of what is our current model for employee parking as well as what are some considerations that this committee took into account. . So I'll I'll just do a quick overview of what is our current model for employee parking as well as some considerations that we took into account now this year is an unusual year in that we got a one-time donated money that paid for all employee parking. That is not always the case in the coming this fall we're going back to what is the status quo. And so the status quo is that employees do pay for parking, you can pay for hourly, you can pay for daily, which is $2.50 an hour, $12.50 per day. But we have significantly discounted parking. If you purchase a long term permit. If you look at our most expansive permit, so that's the full annual permit. It lets you essentially park anywhere, anytime for the entire year. That comes out to $702.00 a year. If you do payroll deduction 58.50 a month and if you were to park all 200 days of the campus is open, that averages out to $3.51 per day. That's our most expansive permit, but we also have a lot of other alternative cheaper options that are limited by day, time and location.

And then we have 500 series lots. So these really are the parking lots that are more on the side of campus over by the ENT Center. And these historically have been free for employees due to a parking audit that happened recently, the parking department is required to charge employees to park in those lots. So coming up either fall 23 or fall 24, employees are gonna have to pay to park in the 500 series lots. And the price that's been set is $270 annually. So the big takeaways here is that employees pay for parking, and that's gonna start up again in the fall. And there's numerous permit options, but there will be no free parking option on campus for employees coming up sometime soon.

Now this is a lot of information on this slide, I don't expect anyone to fully absorb this, but I just wanted to show the different permit options that we currently have available and we haven't broken down. So you can buy it by semester, you can buy it by the annual year, you can buy it by the academic year. And as I mentioned before, there's numerous alternative options from that full permit that are limited by day, time or location. So just a quick snapshot, there's a lot of different permit options here and a big question is why do employees pay?

For one, parking is expensive, limited and in high demand, and I really can't stress enough the expensive part, building, maintaining and repairing lots is significantly expensive. We have huge bond payments and you know, Paul and doses we're chatting before the meeting started about these balloon payments that are coming up in about 15 years. And so these are going to be huge payments that we need to prepare for. And the big take away parking is expensive because of State regulations, State monies cannot be used for employee parking. And another big one is that employee parking revenue has been built into parking financial structure and like I mentioned, parking is quite expensive and we just got done talking about budgeting. I think everyone across campuses feeling budgeting concerns and constraints. The parking department is no different and so a big part of any proposal that we even considered is that it has to be revenue neutral for the parking department.

The Parking Department just simply is not in a position to be able to forego any revenue right now and really for long term financial sustainability, we should be bringing in more revenue. And so that's a big consideration of this committee took into account is that every proposal is revenue neutral for the parking department. And the last thing that I'll touch on before I pass it over to Leyna is what permits to employees buy. And this really is what permits are important to employees when it comes to parking? The most, the largest group of employees that purchase a permit are purchasing full permits. These are permits that you park generally speaking anywhere, anytime. So this is annual academic year semester permits. So that is the most important chunk of permits for most employees that are buying permits. The second most important one and the second largest group of employees that are buying permits are buying single day permits. So this would be a Monday permit. So you can park every Monday or every Tuesday at cetera for the different days of the week.

So those two are the biggest permits. I think it really speaks to most employees either are parking multiple days on main campus throughout the day or are parking on single days or have flexible remote schedules. That's one feedback that we've heard is what are the flexible remote schedule options when it comes to permits? It is a big concern, something that people really are wanting. So with that, I will pass it over to Leyna.

Leyna - So, since this is all set and it looks like you know, the parking department is gonna get what they need why do we wanna change things? There's a couple reasons. So the number one reason is because the employee morale has been kind of low and this is one of the major complaints. It seems to rub people the wrong way that they have to pay for parking. And it's such a substantial amount and it does affect the bottom line of their income, their earned income. So a lot of people are upset about that and we are trying so hard to address employee morale. So we just this is one of the areas we can address. I called HR couple weeks ago and as of a couple weeks ago we had 263 new employees. Since the fall of 2022, which means none of those has ever paid for parking yet, so this coming fall we're a little concerned. And when you look at it, 263 employees since last September that averages to about 37 new employees every month. So we could get another 100 or 150 by the time fall of 2023 comes around. I don't know if it's gonna be the high, but let's just say we'll have 300. So we'll have 300 employees who've never paid for parking and suddenly their salaries, their paychecks, are going to drop a little bit because of parking. So we're concerned that their morale is also going to be affected, the new employees.

And we already have high turnover and high turnover means, of course, UCCS suffers in general. And we all have to worry about, OK, we're losing somebody - how much more work do we have to do now? We have to do another search and the new employee needs to be trained and so on and so forth. So again, morale is a big deal. And then the other thing is a lot of people perceive paying for parking as very inequitable because the highest paid employees are paying less than 1/4 of a percent for parking of their salaries and the lowest paid employees are paying 2.5% of their salaries towards parking. And that kind of doesn't help morale. Again, that idea.

Couple things I want to say about employee morale. We did do some surveys and talk to people about why can't you walk or take a bike or take the bus to work. And there were a lot of legitimate reasons people saying no, I can't do that. First of all, I live too far. I can't walk. Secondly, if I did walk during the winter, it's too cold and it's dark when I go, when it's unsafe and there are no good pathways to walk from my house to UCCS. And I can't take the bus because to catch the bus, it's a mile and 1/2 away from my house, so I'd have to walk a long ways first. It takes an hour and a half if I was to take the bus route with the transfers to get from my house to work. And just a safety issue, even for people who have been parking in the 500 lots, a lot of the lower paid employees have to come in to work early and it's still dark. And the shuttles are not running. So it's becoming a safety issue as well as it's very inconvenient. So those are some of the reasons why the parking itself needs to be addressed because we don't have many other options, at least most employees reported that a good percentage. So as far as the inequity - this is just a graph that shows that inequity. So you can see on the bottom the X axis, the horizontal access at the bottom shows the different salary levels and the Y axis on the left is showing the percentage of salary. And as you can see this blue curved line.

Again, people who are making below $50,000 are having to pay more than 2% of their salaries towards parking, whereas people who are making say above $150,000 a year are paying less than half a percent of their salaries towards parking. This is not our proposal. We're just showing you what it how things stand now. And here's another example of how it looks. And this again is showing the dollar amounts on the Y axis on the left on the left and the salaries once again on the X axis on the bottom. And let's just look at that blue line and you can see in actual dollar amounts if everyone on campus paid 2.25% of their salary like our lowest earners do, how much money they would spend on parking. And as you can see, if you made say $100,000, you'd be paying maybe $2,500 for your parking. If you made $200,000, you'd be paying $4,500 actual dollars if you had to pay 2.5% of your salary, so or 2.25 rather. So this is just showing you an example of how much people would be paying right now if they had to pay that large a percent of their salaries. We just wanna show you what that inequity actually looks like right now. And I want to pass it on to Lily.

Lily - Hi, guys. I'm gonna go through our two different proposals and will kind of get some feedback. I'd like to hear what everyone's thinking, how everyone's feeling about our proposals. So here in proposal one is our discount model. In the second column you can see it shows the percent increase or the percent discount on that each salary range would be getting. The pro of this kind of proposal is that all of the current permits would remain available. So as Matt just pointed out, the single day, the border, motorcycle, evening, etc. So that's going to be a pro of this that helps with the you know, the hybrid and the remote workers we still need that flexibility and variance for some of those individuals. In the chart below, you can see someone making about $35,000 can get up to a 30% discount on the current $702 dollar full annual permit and then that last column you'll see the price examples for a single day pass. But remember, all passes remain available so that discount percent is accounted to the border, or the Alpine or the evening pass.

One of the issues here is that there may be some implementation problems through HCM, we have been talking with HR and other individuals to make sure that these types of models are even possible. And there may be - that this has to be added to HCM. It could take time and could possibly do some administrative burden for some other staff member on our team. So that's one of the issues in this proposal. But we do like it because it has all of the current permits that are available. And here's just some examples of those prices and what that would mean for ending one in those salary ranges. Do we want to pause here for any questions that anyone has real quick? If this doesn't make sense, if there's any concern, any feedback, again, we'll go through one more proposal and we can also answer questions at the end.

Erin Klein - This would be a huge blessing to our lowest paid employees! As mentioned before, these are often the ones who are required to be on campus!

Lisa - Quick salary question. Some people on campus have additional contracts, right? There's your base job and then you're paid to do XY and Z. Is X,Y and Z added all together for salary or just your base, so regular job?

Lily - It depends on how you pay for your parking pass, right? So if you are paying at the beginning of the year, you don't have any extra work and your salary is a certain amount and you're paying full for it in full it's a certain price. But yes, it does change if you do get a contract and you're getting it reduced from or having it pulled from your paycheck. So if you just opt into that kind of option then yes, when you do get an additional contract or a stipend or something of that nature, yes, it would be attached to in that would be included in your salary. Am I correct on that?

Matt - yes there would need to be regular checks, essentially updating what payroll file comes to the parking software to let us know what to charge.

Lily - So yeah, I mean, you could pay less at the beginning of the year because you haven't added on those additional salary contracts. But if you were to pay monthly it could. It could cause you some differences.

Lisa - And one follow up. Sometimes when we give prizes, I think it counts as income. Umm, there's a prize. There's winning an award affect it?

Lily - I think that would be an HR question on how like additional pay or a stipend would be counted into your style. But yes, I would assume it's the same sort of situation. OK. So we'll move on to our proposal two. Just to start off the proposal two, we wanted to make sure that we were clear on some things in this proposal, only three permit options would become available. The central campus, the border lots and the 500 series lots would be the only passes that would be available. In these proposals, we are asking that employees do receive a 50% discount of their daily passes, so in this case it would be $6.25 per day. This would allow for those remote and hybrid workers to come in and have a discounted price in hopes that it could save them money as well. The reason we did this was because many of employees do come to campus on Tuesday, but they also come on Thursday and then next week they don't come at all. So we wanted to try to come up with a solution for someone that doesn't have a Tuesday that they come in on every single week. Maybe they come in three days a week and then they come in it none the next.

So we wanted to do 2 implementation options of this. A direct percent of the salary and then our salary tiers based on salary that's changed a little bit based on information that we received from HR. But here's our proposal to A. In this situation, we've capped the top at $1000. Part of this is also in response to some of the survey responses we got to not increase or to punish those who have been doing well, who have gotten raises and that is not in any way our goal is to feel like we are punishing those or anything of the sort. We are just trying to look at different options and ways we can do better and we're not gonna do this perfectly for everybody, but we're gonna try our best to do the best we can for as many people as we can. So in this case, we have a cap of $1000 and you can see an example salary on the left. And as you go again, these are the three permits that would be available. No other permit would be available. And we thought that this was a pretty good option since 66% of employees would be receiving a discount and about 34 ish people would be paying more. Does anyone have any questions at the moment for this before I move on to the final proposal?

Brett Mayer - What affect the total funding to PTS? Did this take into account the number of employees in each salary range?

Lily - So yeah, Matt had extensive spreadsheets on salary and who was in salary and what the average and what the meeting salaries were for individuals. So yes, that was taken into consideration and Matt and I almost that length talked about the median salary and what that meant. And I think we decided that roughly was about $58,000 is the median salary. But that really depends, we have part time employees we have lectures that are only teaching one class.

Matt - Yeah, when it when it comes to so the main question there as far as the financial impact is that every one of these proposals is set up based on fiscal year 22 numbers. So there's some limitation as far as predicting, what if we make a big change and also I think another thing is that we've a lot more people are going to flexible remote schedules. But based on fiscal year 22 numbers and based on the percentage of employees that fall within each salary range, all these proposals should be revenue neutral for the parking department. So that's one very important that's kind of #1 as far as looking at any proposal is that we had to make sure the parking department was not going to be foregoing revenue and then to the to the comment on median salaries.

It's different based on how you break it down differently. If you look at all employees part time, full time, staff, faculty, the median salary, so median meaning 50% of people make less, 50% of people make more, the median salary is 55,000 if you include everyone. One thing to note is that if you look at just full time faculty, the median jumps up to somewhere around 70,000. If you look at just full time staff, that median still stays right around $55-56 thousand. So just some notes just on kind of like where do people fall within the salary ranges and what percentages.

Jim Spice - So you said you went off of FY22 permit sale numbers, is that right? So one thing that we need to point out here is that we're guessing then on FY24, if this becomes available in FY24, how many will it mirror the number of permits that were bought in FY22? Like for me, if I'm gonna be be expected to pay more, I'm not going to do it. I'm just going to go park in the free lots or whatever so I will no longer buy a main campus permit and there might be a lot of people like that. Then it's no longer neutral. We're guessing that the habits will stay the same because I just wanted to point that out.

Matt- Yeah, I think a really important point is that, first of all it this year we had free parking and so we don't have data as far as all these new employees and all these change to remote work. We don't have really solid data that says this year at this moment in time, this is what employees will purchase, right? So we're we are basing off of fiscal year 22 data. So there's some limitation there. And then also any time you make any sort of change is going to be a little bit of a blind spot. It's impossible to predict exactly how people will react to that. You know, if certain permits are being more expensive or less expensive, how will that affect demand? Is a particularly challenging question. I think the calculations that we have, I really do feel confident that they're gonna show pretty close numbers, but I think it's really important that we acknowledge that there is a gap in our knowledge. We cannot predict the future, so we just simply can't know 100% for sure that these absolutely will be the permit sale numbers.

Jim - My, my other question is in terms of that hourly parking, what was the percentage that you said that skipped the buying a permit and actually just bought a day pass?

Matt - it's six. So as far as the percentage that did not register for a 5S permit, so 500 series permit, did not purchase any type of permit at all, did not purchase a day pass either. That's 29% of employees, that's really about 450. And out of those 450, I think one thing is important to know is 105 of those are out of state employees, they're never gonna park here. So it's really we're looking at about 350 employees that didn't purchase day passes. I think the three categories that they fall into is either they paid through park mobile or through pay station. We have no way of knowing if the employee paid that way. If that's the case, they're only coming on to campus every once in a while or they're throwing money away and they're paying that way it coming all the time. Option two would be the parking the 500 series lots, and they just didn't register for a 5S permit. We don't enforce that. So the people that do register, if we're going through the 500 lots we don't enforce, if you didn't register and then the third option would be that they truly are just fully remote and they never parked at all. I think it's reasonable to assume that there's a fair amount of them that are parking every once in a while and paying hourly, daily, and a fair amount that are probably parked on the 500 lots when they come to campus, but just not registering for a permit.

Jim - So as you mentioned, revenue neutral is a very important part of this plan. And if we don't know, this is not a revenue neutral decision. If we offer $6.50 an hour or $6.25 an hour for hourly parking and these are the people that have been paying $12.50 an hour, right? So now we're giving them 50% off. That's not a revenue neutral decision, but I don't know what percentage that would look like. That's the problem and we're we might be talking about minimal amounts of money and it won't matter. But that's a concern for sure.

Lily - Yeah. I think part of part of the desire, at least for us in, in the proposal too and offering a 50% discount was to address the issue of remote work and trying to be flexible with those individuals in particular. Since proposal two is coming from how many permits do we have, 20 some odd permits currently available down to just three, that's a drastic change for employees. And we know for a fact that in FY 22 256 people played for a single day. And so we're just attempting to reach to those people who do have flexible schedule needs that are working remote but don't necessarily need the full permit. But with understanding that as from this graph you can see there is a large percent of employees that need to be on campus. And I think someone in the chat also mentioned a lot of these payer, higher played employees and lower played paid employees all have to be on campus 100% of the time, whether you're in facilities are dining. Or you're the chancellor, right? Those two kind of groups of individuals are often asked to be on campus quite a bit. So we're trying to find a happy medium of yes. We reduce the number of permit options available, but we are kind of lending an olive branch over here to say we want to understand that there is a need for this flexible hybrid option. You're correct, though.

Matt - To address the single day permits - that's a like it's a really good point. And I'm gonna keep repeating this as that we can't know 100% the future or how many people are gonna purchase. This really is gonna there is some limitation to that and when it comes to the single day premise, as far as the calculations go. The assumption was that this 29% of people, these 350 that aren't registering for permits, if they are paying for hourly parking, it is unlikely to be a significant amount of revenue for the parking department because it's so few people. And if they pay for hourly the assumption is that they would be making that calculation in their head - is it worth it to pay or is it worth it to get a permit and if they find it worth it to pay hourly. They're probably only coming every once in a while, so that's the assumption there is that that chunk of people is probably a pretty small percentage.

And then as far as offering the 50% discount for a single day pass - To replace that single day permit option, we fully took into account the how many people bought one single day permit, how many people bought two single day permits on Monday, Wednesday and then also it kind of adjusted down essentially took what would be the expected revenue from this and cut it significantly because the idea is that if you're buying a Monday permit - there's a holiday on Monday. There's a day where you're sick. There's a day where there's a campus closure. There's a day where maybe you just didn't have to come into work that day and you got to work remote. So you're not gonna park every single Monday. And so the idea here is the single day pass will be slightly more expensive than the $4.50 per day that a single day permit would be $6.25 but you've only purchased it the day that you come to work, so you're only actually paying for it when you come in.

And as far as the calculations for revenue neutral? I feel confident that we got close to it, but I also absolutely have to recognize there's no way we can say with absolute certainty. There's gonna be some variability. So those are really good points. And I really do wanna make sure that's understood. And did you talk through the abuse, possible abuse issues as well in terms of employees giving that 50% discount because the public price is $12.50. They can essentially buy as many as they want and give that discount to anyone at that point.

Lily – We contemplated and talked about it a little bit. One of the hoops that we think would probably have to be done is that it has to be purchased through your UCCS credentials ahead of time or day of instead of at the park mobile stations themselves. So that's not gonna be a code you can type into the park mobile stations to get the 50% discount, you would have to actively know that I'm going in on Monday and you would have to go on to the parking portal to purchase that single day permit.

Jim - I don't know if that's gonna necessarily matter as far as stopping abuse, because either way you can put in whatever license plate you want through the pay station.

Matt - I think that's absolutely a good point. Offering any sort of discounted parking to employees opens up the possibility that employee could purchase that parking and give it to a student purchase that parking discounted give it to a friend visiting. That’s absolutely a possibility. When we were talking about it, the thought was that it would probably be a minimal level of abuse that would, financially speaking, not have a significant impact on parking overall. But I think it's really important to recognize that. You know, even currently we can get permits and you can put a bunch of different plates on and you could share it with a student. You know there are ways that the system could be abused.

Lily - I mean we even talked about at length the possibility that if we implement these issues or these proposals that people could park in the university center that people could go into the neighborhoods and start parking there. But I think that already had happened. Started happening, was happening, is happening. And I don't think that's going to change much. Our hope is that by giving 66% of the employees more of a discount that maybe even more of them would purchase a pass, they see the price drop from $700.00 to something like $240, maybe more of them are willing to purchase that pass and Park on campus instead of parking in the neighborhood. So I think part of our hope was that in order to be revenue neutral, we wanted to give larger discounts to the lowest paid employees in hopes that maybe they would wanna park on campus. Because they don't have to then walk or take the, you know, shuttle or be here at 4:00 o'clock in the morning with when it's dark and not be able to park close to where you work. So I think there's a little bit of an ebb and flow there where, yes, we are increasing prices over here possibly, but we are trying to encourage more people to park with some sort of equity.

Jim - You guys did an amazing job. Honestly, that you you did a lot of homework on this. So thank you for that.

Lily - Yeah, no problem. I will. And put out that we did create a proposal B and this was in part in response to some of the survey responses that we heard from people saying why are you increasing my price like I already pay a ridiculous amount of money? Why are you asking me to pay even more? And so here's an example of where we decided to try to cap it at our existing price of $702.00. This does kind of shift and I will just toggle back just for a moment. You can see that the prices have changed slightly, right? So at 1% of salary roughly we're going up to about 1.3% of salary now. So in this circumstance, I believe it's 44% of employees receive a discount versus 66%. So that's a little bit of a difference there. But we're willing to try to meet people halfway. We want this to work, we want to encourage people to come back with feedback and tell us how these are being felt and we understand it's gonna be hard to ask - I think someone made a comment from the budget team - How do we ask the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor's to spend $1000 on a parking permit?

How do you do that? And so this is an option where we recognize that that ask may be difficult. And we're willing to have the conversation or discussion about maybe we cap it somewhere. Do we cap it $1000? So we cap it at the current amount and where that employee discount kind of lays then a little bit below 50% or maybe above.

Jim - When you say cap it does that take into consideration that most of the folks that are making that higher amount are already paying higher than what everybody else pays for their reserve space?

Lily - So we did touch on that. We didn't wanna shed a light on it too much. There was some feedback that maybe those reserve spaces should be even higher than what they are currently based on the survey responses. But then we also heard feedback and we talked to individuals and spoke with people who do have those reserved spaces and they are often having to travel up to Boulder and they need to come back and they have a meeting right away and they need to be present. They are coming and going from campus often and that's part of the desire for having these reserved spaces. But just like all of the current parking permits are optional, so are these reserved spaces. So if a Chancellor or if a Dean, or if the Vice Chancellor chooses to pay for this reserved space, they're making that active choice to pay that slightly higher price. But no, we kind of left that off to the side. We haven't touched that as far as the reserve pricing we would remain the same. It's kind of just stays as is, but it would be added to the existing price that we have here.

Jim - So I guess my question is more right now the the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor is in Dean's that have the reserve spaces are paying $930 would there in this proposal would it go from $930 to $1000 or would it go from $930 up even higher than $1000 plus?

Matt - So essentially as a committee, the decision has been we don't wanna make any proposal to change any reserve spaces.

Amy Sutz – why?

Matt - So whether it's a reserved space that the Deans and chancellors are able to purchase, whether it's a reserved space for departments, any reserved spaces, this committee has decided we do not want to propose any changes. If changes want to be made from the parking department or leadership level, then that's another discussion. But this committee really isn't proposing changes to that as far as the actual employee permit that is available to 100% of employees so those are the things that we're proposing change, too.

So to explain for everyone who maybe might not be familiar with the reserve spaces. A right now a full central campus permit is $702.00 per year. Anyone who gets her reserve space is required to purchase a full permit. So they purchased their permit at $702 per year and then they have the option to opt in to get a reserved space. This is 13 employees right now that are leadership Deans, Chancellor, Vice chancellors and so they would pay an additional $228 if they want to reserve a space. There have been vice chancellors who have opted out of that. They just get a regular permit, they don't pay the $228, they don't reserve a space. And so it is an opt in, it's optional. And we essentially the committee doesn't want to, we don't want to change anything with the reserve spaces. We're really just looking at what permits are available to all employees. So that's that's kind of where the committee stands.

Sarah - So we are running out of time and there is two things that we need to talk about. We need to vote on some T-shirts for pride and then we also need to discuss elections. So here's my ask if you could put together a like a follow up meeting regarding this relatively soon because it seems that there is more discussion that needs to be had and I it's going to exceed the next 7 minutes.

I really do think this is very important. So if you could put in the teams channel like maybe a do a poll or something like that so that folks can follow up and have a conversation with you. Also everyone, you know, these folks are accessible so feel free to e-mail them. I'm just speaking from my personal opinion but I think that this is something that we should at least try. I know it's not going to be perfect, but I think that this is something that would be really beneficial for morale and for campus. So if we didn't get you to your question and really sorry, but I definitely want to have a follow up around this at a later date.

Jim – Cabinet wants to know where we're at on this. Do we know from the from the little bit of polling that you've done, are people generally supportive of this including did you poll anybody that's gonna have increases?

Lily - So yeah, we did poll faculty and staff, I believe based on some of the responses, some people that are in the higher salary ranges and they are they are upset by the fact that we've will posed an increase.

Sarah - As somebody who would happen increase, I also see the benefit to greater campus. So like I have to fix my personal budget and like I honestly feel like it's so inequitable to the fact that like folks are paying the same amount, you know who are making like $30,000. And like I have grown in my positions and now I am making more and like, I'm willing to step up and pay more for parking. To be honest with you because I care about the folks who are here.

Leyna - I feel the same way. And I also think with your concern with the day prices, I know there are a number of US employees who've been told, hey, you have an office, you need to be here three days a week or you're gonna have to share it. And so I'm hybrid. I come in three days a week. And if I were to pay single day, it would be a lot more than my full and an annual pass. So yeah, I think there's a lot of us that are gonna get somewhat of an increase that are willing to say, yeah, that's crazy, that someone who makes $31,000 has to pay this much. Someone pointed out that departments across the street don't have to pay - HR doesn't.

Matt - For the sake of time, maybe this committee can even chat with Jim immediately after this.

Sarah – Folks in the chat like, I definitely don't want to speak on behalf of everyone and I know that slowly people are trickling out. So if you, if you agree with this, if you don't agree, please put all of your feedback in the chat.

Unanswered Teams Questions:

Laura Chandler- Maybe we could propose with HR to allow HRLs to assist with this by campus unit? Not to add more work for HRLs but begin with the lower paid employees per unit. Just thinking out loud on how we can help Robynne and Shelly.

Amy Sutz- I get that leadership and such make more money but however what about people that have been here for a long time?  Typically long time employees make more as well.  This is a disservice to those that have been her for a long time.

Laura Chandler - For example, does a Dean pay for the reserved space or does their college?

Lily Cosgrave - The Dean would pay for the reserved space.

Amy Sutz - I know that other departments that do not pay (across the street)  have their department pay for a reserved spot.

Brett Mayer - The most equitable would be to have only off campus parking and bussing all employees.

1. Budget Updates: Mikayla Greenfield

Sarah - so the last thing, I just want to get voting off of the table. So staff pride would like $1000 worth or $1000 to purchase t-shirts. So I'm wondering can I get a motion to approve the $1000 for T-shirts for the staff pride?

* 1. Voting: $1000 Pride T-shirts (Alexa Salstrand)

Mikayla – 1st

Deann – 2nd

Aye – 10

Sarah - Thank you. And I also wanna say that we do have budget for this. We don't have time but Michaela, could you just put in the chat at some point like our budgets that we do have budget to be able to do this. So all in favor please put I in the chat.

Mikayla Greenfield - After planned event budgets, we have an extra $7,400 in budget to help with the Pride Shirts request. This could be higher because most events have come in under budget.

1. Elections (Lisa Jones and Shawn Hood)

Sarah - And then a very quick update from Sean. I also heard from Lisa that she also would like to support this.

Shawn - Yes, we are not getting as many people that are nominating themselves. So we're gonna think we'll have to extend and send out some more emails asking folks to join. We do have, I just got some emails today we have a University staff member at large, we do have a nomination for President, so we are slowly getting there. So fingers crossed that we get more folks, but I'll be working with Polly and Lisa to see if we can maybe do another outreach, another meet and greet to see if people are interested. So we can kind of pull some strings.

Deann - What positions do you need nominations for?

Shawn – VP, Secretary – We can send out emails.

1. Event Updates
   1. Staff Olympics (Jon DeWitt)
   2. Spring Luncheon (Mathew Beckwith)
2. Executive Board Reports
3. *What is needed from the Executive Board to support you all?*
4. PRIDE Committee
5. Professional Development/Programming
6. Welcome Committee
7. Women Identifying Staff Committee
8. SEEDs
9. Blood Drive Committee
10. Winter Giving Project
11. Employee of the Quarter
12. Garrett Swasey Award - Laura Chandler’s term as Committee Chair for the Garrett Swasey Outstanding Staff Award has ended. She served from 2018-2023. A Chair and Co-Chair that are previous outstanding staff award winners should be recruited to replace me. Laura is willing to walk through the process with the next committee chairs for the 2024 award cycle.
13. Classified Pay & Benefits
14. University Pay & Benefits
15. Policy Review Committee
16. Open Discussion

Sarah – I just want to encourage all of you to attend the Chancellor's listening sessions. So he chatted with me about you know some feedback that he received and good, bad and ugly. And he talked about kind of changing his outlook. So like he's been very outcomes focus and he wants to be very people focused. So changing his entire perspective and it really comes down to us, right. So it comes down to your voice you sharing the things that you feel like are concerning to you and he's there to listen and I feel like we have a window of opportunity where he is like. Alright, what can I do to support help and change? Because I think so many folks are like morale on all the things. So please encourage your departments yourself. Please go to these listening sessions and just share how you're feeling. Please don't feel like there will be any repercussions or anything. I will share that he is very open at this point. So thank you all so much. I appreciate it and. Have a wonderful rest of your week and rest of your month and I will see you next month.

Adjourned 10:31am