

Agenda
RS Board of Directors Meeting
Monday, June 14, 2021 (1:00 to 3:30 p.m.)
Join Zoom Meeting / <https://csus.zoom.us/j/96918342112> / Meeting ID: 969 1834 2112
(Attachment 1)

1. Opening

- 1.1. Call to Order
- 1.2. Introductory Remarks
- 1.3. Announcements (New Information)

2.0 Agenda

- 2.1. Additions to Agenda (New/Urgent Business)
- 2.2. Approval of Agenda [ACTION item – VOTE]

3.0 Updates/Reports from Officers, Staff, CSUS Liaison

- 3.1 Secretary's Report (Bob Benedetti)
 - Draft Minutes/Approval for May 17, 2021 Meeting (see **Attachment 2**) [ACTION item – VOTE]
 - Condolences [Rufus Smith]
- 3.2 Controller's Report (Norv Wellsfry)
- 3.3 Office Manager's Report (Shari Lowen)
- 3.4 CSUS Liaison's Report

4.0 Specific Agenda Items

- 4.1 RS Board Policymaking & Procedural Responsibilities:** David Abelson (**Attachment 3**) [ACTION item – VOTE]
- 4.2 RS Honorary Memberships for Forum Speakers:** Tom Suchanek
- 4.3 Logo design update:** Christie Braziel (**Attachment 4**)
- 4.4 Program Committee budget presentation:** Allan Keown & Cindy Suchanek
- 4.5 RS final 2021-2022 Annual Budget:** Controller Norv Wellsfry (**Attachment 5**) [ACTION item – VOTE]

5.0 Committee Updates:

- 5.1 Communications and Marketing committee:** Deborah Seiler
 - *Annual report committee input needed – Deborah Seiler.*
- 5.2 Forum committee:** Tom Suchanek
 - *Spring 2022 Forum Speaker Series search underway.*
- 5.3 Resource Development committee:** Nancy Findeisen
 - *Thank you cards signing party June 5, 2021.*
 - *2021-2022 member registration “something extra”.*
 - *voluntary donation check-off status.*
 - *Sac State-RS Estate Planning seminar Fall 2021.*
- 5.4 Finance & Administration committee:** Norv Wellsfry
 - *UEI accounts payable update.*
 - *RS Office relocation update. (Attachment 6)*
- 5.5 Program working group/Seminar committee:** Cindy Suchanek and Allan Keown
 - *Seminar leader, SIG (shared interest group) and presentations sign-ups for the Fall 2021 semester.*
 - *Fall 2021 catalog development process.*
 - *Summer Speaker Series 2021 – Allan Keown and Deborah Seiler*

- 5.6 Technology working group/committee:** Sarah Ryan-Roberts and Jeff Hendy.
- *IRT support – CSUS Zoom accounts storage of Forum Zoom recordings, MS 365 software and Team feature training.*
 - *IRT classroom technology upgrades.*
 - *CCE membership registrations issues.*

- 5.7 Scholarship committee –** Chris Budwine
- *2021 Sac Student Scholarship program recipients’ pictures and bios on RS website*
<https://www.csus.edu/college/social-sciences-interdisciplinary-studies/renaissance-society/scholars.html>

- 5.8 Gerontology:** Evie Boggs
- *GERO 121 & 221 looking for mentors for the Fall 2021 semester.*
 - *Age-Friendly University* <https://www.geron.org/programs-services/education-center/age-friendly-university-afu-global-network>

- 5.9 Membership, Diversity, and Community Engagement (MDCE) committee:** Ken Cross
- *June 2021 Special Membership Edition Recorder newsletter.*
<https://www.csus.edu/college/social-sciences-interdisciplinary-studies/renaissance-society/internal/documents/recorderjune21.pdf>
 - *RS membership portal opened Tuesday, June 1st, 2021.*
 - *Social activities – Allan Keown*

5.10 Announcements, Board Direction and Next Steps

6.0: Reports:

- 6.1** Technology Committee (Jeff Hendy) (see **Attachment 7**)
- 6.2** Gerontology Committee Report (Evie Boggs) (see **Attachment 8**)
- 6.3** Membership (MDCE) Committee (Ken Cross) (see **Attachment 9**)

7. New or Urgent Business

8. Adjourn

9. Next Board meeting 1:00 p.m., Monday, July 12, 2021

Key dates:

- June 1, 2021 CCE Membership registration portal opened Tuesday.
- August 6, 2021 Seminar Leaders’ Workshop, 10:00 a.m. to Noon, Friday.
- August 9, 2021 Catalog posted on the RS website on Monday.
- August 16, 2021 CCE Seminar registration opens on Monday.
- August 20, 2021 Orientation & Rendezvous (virtual, 10:00 to 11:30 a.m. on Friday.
- September 7, 2021 RS programs begin.
- December 13, 2021 RS programs end.

Item 3.1 Report of Secretary, Robert Benedetti

Date: June 9, 2021

Title: Secretary's Report, June 2021

Action: Information only

I just today received a report of the passing of Rufus Smith. I have drafted and sent a letter of condolence to his family. As I could not obtain an obituary, I could not get more detail.

ITEM: 4.1

DATE: June 14, 2021

TITLE: RS Board Policymaking & Procedural Responsibilities

ACTIONS: Discussion X Direction X Decision X

RS BOARD POLICY-MAKING & PROCEDURAL RESPONSIBILITIES

I. Purpose

At the last RS Board meeting there was a somewhat lengthy discussion about the Board’s policy-making and procedural responsibilities when being asked to consider and perhaps vote on specific agenda items. The purpose of today’s Agenda item is to ensure that (i) all board members (i.e. Committee Chairs, Executive Committee members, and Members-At-Large) have a clear and accurate understanding of the Board’s policy-making and procedural responsibilities; and (ii) all board meetings and decision-making actions are conducted in a manner consistent with these responsibilities

II. Background

At its meeting on May 17, 2021, the Board was presented with and asked to vote on an agenda item concerning a draft budget prepared by the Administration & Finance Committee for fiscal year 2021-22. The agenda packet for this item contained a single, multipage-page table, listing (a) specific budget items; (b) the amounts approved for last year’s fiscal budget (2020-21); (c) the funding requests from each Standing Committees for the upcoming fiscal year (2021-22); and (d) the Finance Committee’s recommended budget for each item.

The largest discrepancy between the “requested” and “recommended” amounts for next year’s budget pertains to certain consultant fees for the preparation, design, formatting and publication of the 2021-22 Fall and Spring Course Catalogues. Specifically, the Program Committee requested \$16,000 for these expenses, whereas the Finance Committee’s draft budget recommended \$11,000. This funding disparity has been and remains *unresolved* between the Program Committee and the Finance Committee.

While the May Agenda listed the Finance Committee’s draft budget as a “**Specific Agenda Item 4.2,**” the materials provided by the Committee did not ask for either a “*decision*” or “*direction*” from the Board.¹ However, when introducing this agenda item, the Presiding Officer requested and received a motion and a second for a Board decision to approve the draft budget.

¹ “Request for Agenda Items” are routinely sent to all board members by the Chair about 10 days before the meeting. These requests state the following concerning “direction” or “decision” items:

“Part I: Board Decisions and Directions -- Because of the many dynamic changes necessitated by the pandemic, the first part of the business meeting will focus on topics that definitely need a **"decision"** or **"direction"** from the Board at this time. These topics will be based on your input to this email.” (Emphasis in the original)

Following a discussion of this agenda item, the Chair called for a vote to approve the draft budget. Before the vote took place, the RS Past President raised concerns about asking the Board to vote on a draft budget that was not on the Agenda for either “Decision” or “Direction,” and for which the Program Committee’s representatives (Allan Keown and Cindy Suchanek) were not asked to present a formal statement of opposition. These concerns were fundamentally *procedural* in nature, and did not reflect a preference for either of the budget proposals.

In response to these procedural concerns, the Chair asked whether the Program Committee representatives still had disagreements with the Finance Committee’s draft budget, and their answer was “yes.” Although there was no formal request to “lay the motion on the table,” the Finance Committee chair offered to further discuss the issue before submitting a final budget proposal to the Board in June. Notwithstanding the procedural concerns raised above, and the Finance Committee’s offer to further discuss the issue, the Chair called for a vote, and the board decided by a split vote to support the draft budget recommendations.

III. The Board’s Policy-Making & Procedural Responsibilities

In the past, conflicts over RS program needs and financial constraints have usually been settled between Committees without requiring a formal Board evaluation and/or decision-making process. This year, however, that was not the case, so it is important to review the Board’s policy-making and procedural responsibilities. The RS Bylaws specifically address both issues.

Regarding policy-making the Bylaws state the following:

Article VIII: Board of Directors

“A. The Board of Directors shall be the policy-making body of the Society. All decisions shall be consistent with CSUS policy. . . .” (Emphasis added)

It is certainly desirable and efficient for Standing Committees and/or Board Officers to strive for consensus on important policy and finance issues. However, in the event of unresolved conflicts on these issues, it is the Board’s responsibility to hear, evaluate and decide the matter. Committees and Officers can and should develop policies and financial *recommendations* for the Board to consider, but they are not authorized to unilaterally make such decisions for the organization. These determinations are clearly the responsibility of the Board itself.

Regarding procedural safeguards the RS Bylaws state the following:

Article XII: Parliamentary Authority

“Business meetings shall be conducted in accordance with the rules contained in **the current edition of Roberts Rules of Order** except where these rules are inconsistent with the Bylaws and Standing Rules.” (Emphasis added)

“Robert’s Rules of Order” is considered to be America’s foremost guide to parliamentary procedure. These rules are used by more professional associations, fraternal organizations, and local governments than any other authority.² Therefore it is important for the Board to *fully and accurately* understand and comply with these rules during its business meetings, as expressly required by our organization’s Bylaws.

Some may believe that Robert’s Rules limit decision-making bodies (such as the Board) to a simple binary choice of “up-or-down” votes on specific agenda items. However, this is not correct. Robert’s Rules expressly allow for “**Motions to Amend**” proposals, “**Motions to Substitute**” different proposals, and many other motions as well.³

Most issues presented at RS Board Meetings are relatively simple, straight-forward and non-controversial. However, the Chair must follow Robert’s Rules, as mentioned above, particularly when important issues concerning budgets and programs are unresolved. While “micro-management” of an organization by its governing board is never desirable, principles of fairness, transparency and informed decision-making are essential. To achieve these ends, Robert’s Rules should be properly complied with at all business meetings of the Board.

For example, after a main motion is presented, motions to “amend” the proposal (or “substitute” a different proposal on the same topic) should be allowed by the Chair, then discussed and voted upon by the Board. If the amendments or substitutions pass, they replace the main motion; if they fail, the main motion is then presented to the Board for a vote.⁴

III. Conclusion and Recommendations

Requirements concerning the Board’s policy-making and procedural responsibilities are important and should be clearly understood by all board members. Accordingly, the following motions are presented for approval.

Motion 1: Unresolved matters between Committees or Officers concerning RS policies and/or finances shall be presented to the Board of Directors for discussion, direction and final decision.

Motion 2: In accordance with the current edition of Robert’s Rules of Order, motions to “Amend” and/or “Substitute” proposals being presented to the Board for decision shall be allowed.

Presented by: David Abelson, RS Past President

2 See “Robert's Rules of Order”

3 See, for example, the following sections of the *Quick Study Business Guide to Roberts Rule* --“**Main Motions**” “**Subsidiary Motions**” and “**Special Notes on Amendments.**” Quick Study of Robert's Rules

4 Proper procedures for addressing various motions are contained in Robert's Rules of Order (12th Edition, 2020, Robert's Rules). The California League of Cities has prepared a detailed document explaining how these procedures are to be carried out (see "Basic Parliamentary Procedures"). For a simple example of the process, see a "Quick Guide to Motions and Voting"

(The RS parliamentarian routinely refers to the "Quick Study Guide" and each Board member should have their own copy of this six page laminated document.)

ITEM 4.2 Honorary Memberships for Forum Speakers

DATE: June 8, 2021

TITLE: Renaissance Marketing Proposal - Provide Honorary 1-yr Renaissance Membership to Forum Speakers

ACTIONS: Discussion X **Direction** X **Decision**

Background and Purpose:

We have received feedback from many people that our two most recent Renaissance Flip Book Catalogs have been a smashing success and significantly more interesting and impressive than most other Life-Long Learning organizations out there. This success will likely be attracting more interest and new memberships over time as more people are made aware of our Catalogs and superb classes. However, we believe we still need to use all the tools in our toolbox to increase our Renaissance membership.

One of these additional marketing approaches will be implemented during the promotional phase for our kick-off Forum speaker this coming Fall for world-renowned climate scientist Dr. Katharine Hayhoe. She is also a deeply religious person who encourages people of all faiths to Steward our Planet. As you likely know, because Dr. Hayhoe is a world-famous scientist, this particular Forum will be open to the public. This will be advertised widely to diverse educational, environmental and faith-based communities using Eventbrite as a registration platform for public attendees. This will provide us with many hundreds (possibly thousands) of email addresses which can then be used to solicit new Renaissance memberships in the future.

Recommended Actions:

Yet another way we can enhance the success of Renaissance is to utilize the Forum speakers themselves as emissaries to promote Renaissance. Because Forum speakers are typically well-known pillars of our society, their notoriety and respect can go far to increase the visibility of our organization. By awarding a 1-year honorary membership for each Forum Speaker, we could encourage them to help spread the word about the inherent educational values of our Renaissance Society. In so doing, there would be no revenue lost, only potential revenue gained. Through the support of those Forum speakers, this can help increase new paid memberships over time and would be another tool to raise our prominence. Even if there were only a single additional membership gained for each Forum speaker's 1-year membership, that would be a break-even outcome, with the potential for renewals by that person and others after that. However, logic suggests this approach would be much more effective in potentially bringing in many more memberships because these Forum speakers are held in such high regard within our larger community. Currently, Renaissance members 90 years of age and older are awarded honorary status with a permanent no cost membership, and there are now about 80 such honorary members, with about 5 others who have also been granted honorary status for various other reasons. This proposal is not the same as those honorary memberships. We are recommending a different approach. Remember, adding a limited 1-year honorary membership for Forum speakers would occur at no additional budgetary cost. This is not "lost revenue"; we view this as a great positive marketing opportunity to spread the word more broadly to our community members which would increase the likelihood of

joining Renaissance, thus increasing our financial security. The bottom line: this approach represents a significant potential win with no budgetary cost and no risk.

Presented by: Tom Suchanek – Renaissance Forum Committee Chair

Attachment: none

ITEM 4.3

DATE: June 10, 2021

TITLE: RS Logo Design Options FINAL Recommendations

ACTIONS: Discussion X Direction X Decision

Background and Purpose:

At the November 9, 2020, RS Board of Director Meeting the following attached Scope of Work was approved by the Board.

4.1 Statement of Work for Renaissance Society Logo Re-Design-

- The Board approved the scope of work for the logo re-design as presented by the Communication and Marketing Committee.
- Committee will consider identifying a student graphic artist from CSUS or one of the local community colleges.

The Logo Design Working Group will give an update on the final logo design options created by the independent contractor graphic artist and recommended next steps for selecting the Renaissance Society logo.

Recommended Actions: Provide direction and approval for next steps to finalize the RS logo selection.

Presented by: Christie Braziel, MAL & Logo Design Working Group Spokesperson, Communications & Marketing Committee

Attachment: RS Logo Design Options - FINAL

Statement of Work for The Renaissance Society Logo Re-Design
October 27, 2020

Introduction:

- o The Renaissance Society (RS) Communications & Marketing Committee proposes a working group to oversee re-design of the RS logo.
- o Working group members: Christie Braziel, Nancy Findeisen, Ann Reed

Purpose of the Project:

- o To create an updated, professional logo that accurately reflects the current and future Renaissance Society of Sacramento as a community where older adults can experience the joy of lifelong learning and meaningful social connections.
- o Using the principles of logo design; create a simple, memorable, versatile, and appropriate logo.

Key Stakeholders

- o RS Communications & Marketing Committee
- o RS Board of Directors
- o All other RS Committees
- o Seminar Leaders (optional for preliminary survey input only)

- **Scope of Work:**
 - o Secure project approval from Communications Committee & Board
 - o Research cost estimate for graphic artist to complete design work
 - o Review RS documents; Bylaws, Standing Rules, Strategic Goals, Memorandum of Understanding and survey results to:
 - (1) determine the best descriptors representing the mission, values and goals of the RS and
 - (2) identify the varied ways the logo will be used that will assist a professional graphic designer to create a visual representation of who we are and what the RS embodies.
 - o Survey identified stakeholders for their feedback to include in the above review.
 - o Secure budget from Board for design work by graphic artist.
 - o Distill best descriptors for review by Communications and Marketing Committee and Board of Directors for agreement to proceed.
 - o Determine acceptable color schemes for consideration; 1-4 colors
 - o Find graphic artist willing to create needed designs for budget available and to meet final deadline.
- 5
- o Provide descriptors and goal for new logo to graphic artist to create three (3) initial designs
 - o Secure feedback on initial designs from key stakeholders
 - o Provide feedback to graphic artist for modification
 - o Work with graphic artist to distill ideas into a final, acceptable design
 - o Secure final logo design approval from key stakeholders
 - o Secure final logo design & usage rights from graphic artist
- **Where Will the Work Be Done?**
 - o The working team will meet regularly via Zoom to preserve the RS safety protocols by working remotely.
 - o Once a graphic artist is contracted, they will work remotely and report back to the working group.
 - o Online with key stakeholders to review work as it progresses.
- **Schedule:**
 - o Define best descriptors and agreement from key stakeholders by January 2021.
 - o Hire graphic designer to create three first drafts of ideas for consideration by February 2021.
 - o Stakeholders to review designs and rank choices for further refinement by April 2021.
 - o Final product to be completed in time for the Fall Semester catalogue launch approximately July 2021.
- **Deliverables:**
 - o Create an identifiable, memorable, versatile, and appropriate logo for the RS to use on all branding and marketing communications using up to four colors.
 - o Logo must be scalable and equally dynamic in black & white or gray scale.

- o Logo must be available in all current electronic formats for use in a wide variety of collateral design mediums. i.e. .jpg, .tiff, eps, etc.
- o Logo must be completed by July 2021 for use in the fall semester collateral and to update all existing online collateral.
- **Define Success:**
 - o Complete full scope of work on time for use with fall 2021 collateral.
 - o Complete full scope of work at or under budget.
- **Equipment and Program Requirements:**
 - o Graphic artist will provide all necessary works spaces & materials including computer equipment and design programs to complete this project and provide final product.
- **Payments:**
 - o Once budget is approved, payments related to the project will be negotiated with the contracted graphic artist by the working group
- **Closure:**
 - o Deliverables will be provided to the work group to submit to the RS Communications & Marketing Committee.
 - o All final payments are made for services rendered.

ITEM: 4.4

DATE: June 14, 2021

TITLE: Final Budget Recommendation (re Program Committee Catalog Consultants)

ACTIONS: Discussion X Direction X Decision

Background and Purpose:

The Program Committee Chairs, Cindy Suchanek and Allan Keown, need to discuss the Administration and Finance Committee's decision to budget a total of \$4,000 for our two catalog consultants: Kelsey Maher (Manuscript Development) and Vanessa Perez (Graphic Designer).

Recommended Actions:

Fund Kelsey for the Spring 2022 Catalog at \$4,000; and Fund Venessa for the Spring Catalog at \$5,000.

Presented by: Cindy Suchanek and Allan Keown

**Attachments: Program Committee's Proposed Budgets
April 19, 2021 (rev. 6-8)**

Program Committee's Proposed Budgets

I. Remainder of FY 2020-2021:

- Manuscript Development of new material, editing previous material, etc.
for **Fall 2021 Catalog**
- Development of a template for catalog creation purposes going forward focused on reducing hours and expenses
- Kelsey Maher, \$4,000 (Innovation Fund)
- April to June 15, 2021**

TOTAL: \$4,000 (Already Covered by Innovation Fund)

II. FY 2021-2022:

A. Fall 2021:

- Lay Out and Design for **Fall 2021 Catalog**
- Vanessa Perez, \$5,000
- June 25 to August 9, 2021**

TOTAL: \$5,000

B. Spring 2022:

- Manuscript Development of new material for, editing new material for, etc. for **Spring 2022 Catalog**
- Kelsey Maher, \$4,000
- September to December, 2021**

TOTAL: \$4,000

C. Spring 2022

- Lay Out and Design for **Spring 2021 Catalog**
- Vanessa Perez, \$5,000
- September to December, 2021**

TOTAL: \$11,000 (14,,000)

III. Fall and Spring, 2021-2022:

- A. Continuation of Platinum Flip Book Account, \$299
- B. Supplies, \$100
- C. Postage, \$2,000
- D. Printing & Duplicating, \$1,000

TOTAL: \$3,399

TOTALS: \$14,399 (17,399)

Totals:

FY 2020-2021 = \$4,000 (Paid from Innovation Fund)

FY 2021-2022 = \$19,399 (17,399)

ITEM 4.5

DATE: June 7, 2021

TITLE: Renaissance Final 2021-2022 Annual Budget

ACTIONS: Discussion X Direction Decision X

Background and Purpose:

From: Norv Wellsfry, Controller
To: Renaissance Society Board of Directors

Re: Recommended Budget, Fiscal Year 2021-22

Attached is the Annual Budget recommended by the Finance and Administration Committee for Fiscal Year 2021-22. This budget is the same as the budget proposed in the May Board meeting. The critical issue for this budget is the sustainability of the financial resources of Renaissance. The Reserve has provided a financial cushion, an especially valuable resource this past year. However if Renaissance continues to operate with a deficit, its ability to provide the programs desired and valued by our members will be significantly reduced.

Two Committee proposed adjustments to their recommended Budgets.

Technology Committee: The Technology Committee requested the purchase of an Apple Computer to supplement the existing inventory of computers used for member course registration during Rendezvous. This past semester, one member was using an outdated Apple Computer which resulted in slow and delayed access during Zoom sessions. Because of the preference for the video and audio capabilities of Apple computers, it was requested that an updated computer be acquired for the instructor’s use. Efforts to acquire a donated unit did not result in the identification of a viable unit.

Recommendation: The F&A Committee does not recommend that this unit be included in the budget. Current practice does not provide for computers to be used by members. Further, additional oversight should be provided of existing computers so that they are not used by members for instruction.

Program Committee: The Program Committee requested that the initial budget request be reinstated and that the Committee be granted additional funds for the hiring of outside consultants for the preparation of the Catalog. The Committee was provided with an hour at the F&A Committee.

The Board recognized a need to provide flexibility going into the 2020-21 fiscal year and established a one-time “Innovation Fund” of \$20,000 to experiment with alternative processes to ensure the continuity and viability of Renaissance. The Fund was used extensively by the

Program Committee to develop the 2020 summer program and the Catalogs for the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021.

The Program Committee made extensive use of independent contractors to develop the on-line catalogs used this program year. Prior to this year, the catalog had been produced internally by the Senior Clerk at a cost of about \$25,000 per year. The catalog was also printed and distributed to the membership. For this year, the Program Committee used the consultants to move the catalog online. Moving the Catalog On-line was also seen as an opportunity to reduce the production cost of the Catalog as it would not need as many printed copies.

However, the extensive use of outside consultants as proposed by the Program Committee is not sustainable, especially during this time of financial constraints. In addition to the existing Senior Clerk (Lorene Sarne) at an annual cost of \$25,000, the Committee also requested additional consultant funding at \$9,000 per catalog bringing to cost of \$43,000. During its presentation to the F&A Committee, the Program Committee noted that the cost of enabling the flip book application would cost about \$2,300, which had been included in their initial proposal.

Recommendation:

The F&A Committee does not recommend that the Program Committee Budget be augmented to the level of their original request. At present about 40% of the Catalog includes promotional and general information, much of which is related to the Manuscript Developer. The other 60% includes Program and scheduling content. The Catalog is primarily available to members only. Although it has some utility as a Marketing device, that is not its primary function. It is felt that the Flip Book is a non-essential component of the Catalog and the additional cost (approximately \$2,300) does not provide sufficient benefit for the related costs.

The F&A Committee recommends that the Spring 2022 Catalog be consolidated and simplified so that it reflects primarily scheduling and program content. This catalog should also be web-enabled so that it remains an on-line tool for the membership. The Communications and Marketing and the MDCE Committees should be tasked with developing a promotional and marketing strategy for Renaissance.

The F&A Committee recommends that the Program Committee should be funded at the level of \$4,000 per Catalog (\$8,000 per year) to provide for supplemental design and web-enablement. The recommended budget provides for that level of support. At present, it does not appear that an "InDesign" software skill-set is available internally; therefore an outside consultant is an appropriate alternative.

Recommended Actions: Adopt the Recommended Budget, Fiscal Year 2021-22

Presented by: Norv Wellsfry, Board Controller, Renaissance Society of Sacramento

Attachment: Recommended Budget, Fiscal Year 2021-22