

The California State University

Bakersfield • Chico • Channel Islands • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt
Long Beach • Los Angeles • Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento
San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus



Board of Trustees

Telephone: (562) 951-4020
Fax: (562) 951-4949

Ex Officio Members

Gavin Newsom
Governor

Eleni Kounalakis
Lt. Governor

Anthony Rendon
Speaker of the Assembly

Tony Thurmond
*State Superintendent
of Public Instruction*

Timothy P. White
Chancellor

Appointed Members

Adam Day
Chairman

Lillian Kimbell
Vice Chair

Silas H. Abrego

Larry L. Adamson

Jane W. Carney

Rebecca D. Eisen

Douglas Faigin

Debra S. Farar

Jean Picker Firstenberg

Wenda Fong

Juan F. Garcia

Maryana Khames

Jeffrey R. Krinsk

Jack McGrory

Thelma Meléndez de Santa Ana

Hugo N. Morales

Romey Sabalius

Lateefah A. Simon

Christopher Steinhauer

Peter J. Taylor

Faculty Trustee's Report

CSU Board of Trustees Meeting – September 24-25, 2019

Hereby I respectfully submit a summary of the Board of Trustees meeting. My report is largely based on the agenda materials provided to the trustees, on my personal notes, on my memory, and on a partial review of the archived livestream of the meeting.

I tried my best to accurately reflect the deliberations, and I hope to have quoted correctly and paraphrased in the spirit of the speakers' and presenters' intentions. If you notice any inaccuracy or misrepresentation, please let me know (Romey.Sabalius@sjsu.edu).

Please bear in mind that this is just a concise summary of a two-day meeting. I tried to focus on the most pertinent topics and the most salient comments. You can access the archived livestream of the full deliberations at <https://www2.calstate.edu/csusystem/board-of-trustees/past-meetings/2019/Pages/september-24-25-2019.aspx>.

At the September Board of Trustees meeting the most debated and controversial issues were the proposed *4th Year of Quantitative Reasoning Requirement for Admission to the CSU* (item 3c), the *Planning for the 2020-2021 Operating Budget* (item 9b), and *Executive Compensation* (item 11a).

I wish you a spooky Halloween week and hope that the many challenges of the CSU are not too scary for the season,

Romey Sabalius

San José, CA – Oct. 28, 2019

Faculty Trustee's Report

CSU Board of Trustees Meeting: September 24-25, 2019

On September 24 and 25, the CSU Board of Trustees meeting was held at the Chancellor's Office of the California State University at 401 Golden Shore in Long Beach, California.

On September 24, at 8:00 am

1. The **Board of Trustees** met in **Closed Session** to discuss *Executive Personnel Matters* and *Pending Litigation*.
2. The **Committee on Collective Bargaining** met in **Closed Session**.
[Note: According to California Education Code § 66602 (c2) the faculty trustee "shall not participate on any subcommittee of the board responsible for collective bargaining negotiations."]

The **Public Meeting** started at 10:30 am.

3. The **Committee on Educational Policy** began with *Public Comments*. Representatives from the California Teachers Association (CTA), the California Faculty Association (CFA), the Campaign for College Opportunity, and Students for Quality Education (SQE) spoke in opposition to the planned 4th year of quantitative reasoning as a CSU admission requirement based on fears that it would disproportionately affect students of color and those living in communities with great socio-economic challenges. Two speakers articulated their position in favor of the additional requirement. A CSU alumna told the Board that the CSU Summer Algebra Institute and a 4th year of high school mathematics better prepared her to succeed in college, and Deacon John Wilson called it "soft bigotry" to expect that certain students cannot succeed. He called on the critics of that measure not to assume that by 2026, high schools will not be able to offer the required classes.
 - a. The committee received as an information item a proposed *Amendment to Title 5 Regarding Student Organizations*. The proposed Title 5 amendment "would align and update CSU policies related to student organizations by conforming the requirement that student organizations cannot discriminate on the basis of any protective class," adding as protective classes "ethnicity (including color and ancestry), religious creed, nationality, medical condition, genetic information, sex, gender identity (including transgender), gender expression, sexual orientation, veteran and military status." Furthermore, "the language has been amended to retain 'citizenship' as a protected class."
 - b. The committee received a report on the *Educational Opportunity Program*. "For 50 years, the California State University's (CSU) Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) has provided educational access and opportunity to a quarter of a million students from historically underserved communities. EOP is designed to support and

empower students who have the potential to perform satisfactorily in the CSU but have not been able to realize this potential because of their economic or educational background. On all 23 CSU campuses, the program provides admission as well as academic and financial assistance to accommodate the needs of the individual campus student population.” In Fall 2018, students enrolled in EOP were 64% Latinx, 13% Asian, 6% African American, 5% White, and 12% Other. 2/3 of the EOP students are female, and the 6-year graduation rate for EOP students is 58%.

In light of the success of the EOP, Trustee Taylor asked why we do not enroll more students in the program. Unfortunately, enrollment is limited by existing funds for the program, which amount to approximately \$35 million a year. Trustee Adamson and Trustee Sabalius suggested to involve alumni and retired faculty as mentors for EOP students.

- c. The committee received as an information item *A Proposal to Modify First Year Admission Requirements for the California State University*. Members of the Chancellor’s Office (CO) presented a comprehensive report about the anticipated consequences and benefits of a 4th year of quantitative reasoning (QR) requirement for CSU admission for the fifth time (BoT May and July, Special Forum by the Committee on Educational Policy in August, as well as a Hearing in Sacramento scheduled by State Superintendent for Public Instruction Tony Thurmond in Sept.), addressing practically all concerns that have been raised by the public and various organizations over the past half year. In sum, Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, stated that improving students’ academic preparation will provide “authentic access,” “ensuring that students from all backgrounds are not only admitted, but that they also earn a CSU degree.”

As during previous meetings, a long debate ensued. Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Educator Preparation and Public School Programs, reported that the CSU plans to double its output of STEM teachers from currently 1,000 to 2,000 a year. Trustee Sabalius pointed out that this matter is not being rushed and that over a decade will have passed from the inception of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force in 2015 to the planned implementation in 2026. He also mentioned that we cannot measure statewide what we have not implemented yet (in response to the critics’ fear of unintended and adverse consequences in some districts and regions), but that the Long Beach Unified School District already did implement a 4th year of QR several years ago and achieved great improvements in student graduation and college preparation.

Chancellor White concluded the extensive debate by observing that “we are all on the same side.” He stressed that “the social justice issue of our time is not access, but it’s about completion.” He urged the trustees “not to get paralyzed by analysis.”

[The CO report and the trustees’ debate lasted over two hours, which is a very long time for a single agenda item.]

4. **The Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds** began with *Public Comments*. Many members of the Carson community expressed their support for the adoption of a new master plan for CSUDH.

- a. The committee approved the CSU Dominguez Hills Campus Master Plan Revision. The new master plan will enable the continued build-out of the campus and intends to leverage the availability of land for prospective public-private partnerships (P3s), such as a University Village and a Campus Business Park, which would enrich the campus as well as the community.
 - b. The committee received a report on the Preliminary 2020-2021 through 2024-2025 Five-Year Plan. Steve Relyea, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer, explained that the plan is developed in consultation with each campus, annually updated based on campus capital priorities and funding needs, and provided to the legislators to account for our use of funding and to justify additional funding from the state. Vy San Juan, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Capital Planning, Design, and Construction, presented further details of the plan. Since 2014, the CSU has spent \$2.45 billion on academic projects. The Preliminary Five-Year Capital Plan envisions expenditures of \$17.4b, broken down in \$8.3b for academic projects, \$6.2b for self-support structures, and \$2.9b for infrastructure and deferred maintenance.
5. **The Joint Committees on Finance and Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds** began with Public Comments. Union members criticized the developer for a hotel on the campus of CSU Northridge. Allegedly the firm built substandard housing for the military as part of a consortium with four other contractors. The speakers also demanded the construction of student housing instead of commissioning a hotel.
- a. The committee approved Various Actions Related to a Hotel Development Project at CSU Northridge. Dianne Harrison, President of CSUN, responded to the criticism by saying that Corvias, the selected contractor, “has completed over 700 higher education projects, including 75 across the CSU system.” She also clarified that “this project does not compromise other master plan priorities, such as student or faculty/staff housing.” “The P3 partnership allows this project to be developed without the use of state funds or student fee revenues.”

Trustee Taylor remarked that “UC Davis and UCLA have hotel projects that have been transformational” and that it “will be great for the campus and for the community.”
 - b. The committee approved Various Actions Related to a New Student Union Project at CSU Fresno. Trustee Sabalius pointed out that the financing of the Student Union required a 124% increase in student fees from \$240 to \$538 a year. He complimented President Castro for holding a student referendum on the new fee and not passing it by alternative consultation. Trustee Sabalius cautioned the students that they are partially responsible for the increase in the cost of their education. It is understandable that students like to have first-class facilities, but these come with a price.
6. **The Committee on Institutional Advancement**
- a. approved the Naming of The Lynda and Stewart Resnick Student Union at CSU Fresno. “The proposed naming of the new student union at Fresno State recognizes the distinguished leadership of philanthropists and entrepreneurs Lynda and Stewart Resnick and their generous \$10 million investment for the design, construction, operation and maintenance of the facility. The pledge will be paid in equal

installments over a ten-year period. A portion of the investment will be used to add a Wonderful Scholar Center within the student union.”

- b. approved the *Naming of the Viasat Engineering Pavillion at CSU San Marcos*. “The proposed naming of the facility recognizes commitments of \$1.5 million pledged in 2018 by Viasat and its employees, of which \$1 million has been received. The request is for a term of 20 years. All funds are committed to providing space renovation, equipment, instrumentation, faculty recruitment and student support for the current and proposed engineering degree programs at CSUSM.”
- c. awarded the *2019-2020 CSU Trustees’ Award for Outstanding Achievement* to one student from each CSU campus. “These distinguished awards are funded by contributions from the CSU trustees, employees and friends of the university. Scholarships range from \$6,000 to \$15,000. Sixteen runners-up received \$3,000 scholarships. Travel for the scholars [to the BoT meeting] has been generously provided by Southwest Airlines and the reception is sponsored by TELACU and Cisco.

7. **The Board of Trustees met in Closed Session to further discuss *Executive Personnel Matters*.**

The Board adjourned at 6:00 pm and resumed its meeting on September 25 at 7:30 am.

8. **The Committee on Governmental Relations**

- a. received the *State Legislative Update*. AB 829 (Bloom), a CSU-sponsored bill, passed with great bi-partisan support and allows the CSU to offer an independent doctorate in Occupational Therapy (currently offered at SJSU and CSUDH). SB 206 (Skinner), the Collegiate Athletics: Fair Pay to Play Act, is the only bill opposed by the CSU that made it through the legislator and awaits the signature of the Governor. The CSU submitted a veto request letter [yet, in the meantime, the bill was signed into law].

The much-debated AB 1460 (Weber) bill, that would make Ethnic Studies a CSU Graduation Requirement, was made into a two-year bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee and it was not further addressed at this meeting.

- b. voted in support of *AB 48: Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2020*. “This legislation places a proposition on the March 3, 2020, ballot to enact the Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2020 worth \$15 billion, with K-12 receiving \$9 billion and Higher Education receiving \$6 billion. Of this amount, the CSU would receive \$2 billion.”

Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis stated that due to deferred maintenance challenges there is “a real possibility that some of our facilities will have to be shut down,” and therefore, this bill presents a very exciting and rare opportunity to address these issues. Trustee McGrory wanted to make sure that the trustees support this bill with the “expressed understanding that the debt service is the obligation of the State of California and not the CSU system.”

9. The **Committee on Finance** began with *Public Comments*. Kevin Wehr, Vice President of the California Faculty Association (CFA), demanded accountability and transparency for the \$35 million earmarked by the legislators for new tenure-line hires, especially for faculty of color to better reflect our student diversity. Tesse Reese, Chair of Bargaining Unit 2 (CSUEU), implored the trustees to consider fair compensation for CSU employees when making their budget request to the legislators. Martin Brenner, Vice Chair of Bargaining Unit 2 (CSUEU), stated that campus safety and security should not be dictated by limitations of designated campus budgets, but that they should be addressed system-wide. Leland Wessel, a physician at SDSU and Unit 1 representative of Student Health Services, again deplored that CSU medical staff is not covered by malpractice insurance in Title IX cases, despite their professional obligation “to ask invasive questions and to touch patients’ bodies.”

Generally, the trustees do not respond to public comments, but Trustee Carney believes that the CSU medical staff should have malpractice coverage, and she further requested that the report of the Chancellor’s Office to the legislators, on how the \$35 million for tenure-line faculty hire were applied, be sent to the trustees as well.

- a. The committee received by consent the *California State University Quarterly Investment Report*. As of March 31, 2019, the CSU had total investments of \$4.77 billion and “\$850 million in bond proceeds, which by law are required to be held by the state and are invested in SMIF” (Surplus Money Investment Fund).
- b. The committee received as an information item the *Planning for the 2020-2021 Operating Budget*. The CO finance division suggested to request an augmentation to the base budget of \$497 to \$620 million and a one-time allocation of \$250 to \$500 million for facilities and infrastructure. From the increase in on-going funds (base budget), \$105 million should fund the Graduation Initiative 2025, of which \$75m would be for the coming budget year and \$30m are intended as a restoration of the funds that were only appropriated as one-time funds in this year’s budget. Between \$172m and \$215m should be requested for an enrollment growth of 4% to 5%. \$150m to \$200m are expected to cover employee salary and benefit increases. The rise in mandatory cost should be off-set with \$20m. Lastly, \$50m to \$80m should be requested for an annual debt service for bonds in the amount of \$750 million to \$1.2 billion to address our aging facilities.

Trustee Sabalius expressed satisfaction that the deferred maintenance and infrastructure needs will be addressed by a three-pronged approach with \$2 billion if the proposition for a higher education bond will pass in March, with on-going funds to service a loan for approximately \$1 billion, and with a one-time allocation of ¼ to ½ billion dollars. If all three funding sources would materialize, the money would be adequate to address the system’s deferred maintenance needs of \$3.7 billion as stated in our last year’s budget request. As much as he pushed last year for a big request to address CSU facilities issue, as much he wants to assure that this year the trustees will ask for sufficient funds for employee salary and benefits increases. We still have a strong economy, a Governor cognizant and understanding of our budget needs, and faculty and staff who are struggling to make a living as costs are rising.

Trustee Garcia reminded the Board that last year, the trustees requested one-time funds of \$15 million for student basic needs. The one-time request was made for

strategic reasons, to prove the appropriate and effective application of these funds, with the hope to receive these funds on an on-going basis in future years. EVCs Relyea and Blanchard responded that student basic needs (including housing and food insecurity as well as mental health) are an integral part of the Graduation Initiative 2025 and funded in the amount of \$7 million from the GI 2025 allocation. Trustee McGrory was not satisfied with the explanation. He argued that if \$15 million were necessary this year to address students' basic needs, then we will need these funds in the future as well and hence should request a line item of \$15 million to our base budget [as, by the way, the UC received this year].

Trustee Taylor endorsed their suggestion, and he inquired why we do not request more funding for a proven and successful program as EOP. Again, both vice chancellors explained that EOP funding is incorporated in the GI 2025 allocation. Yet, Trustee Abrego would like to see a separate line item to finance EOP and Trustee Morales demanded more clarity on the exact amount that is allocated to EOP. EVC Blanchard referred to the EOP report from the previous day, which indicated that about \$35 million are spent on the program annually.

In light of the success of the GI 2025 in graduating students faster, Trustee Faigin wondered if the CSU still will have sufficient student demand to justify additional enrollment funding. EVC Blanchard replied that there is an increase in students who fulfill the A-G requirements and hence qualify for CSU admission. Chancellor White further clarified that while the number of high school graduates is slightly shrinking, the share of CSU-eligible high school graduates is increasing.

10. **The Committee on Collective Bargaining – Open Session** began with *Public Comments*. Several members of the Teamsters Local 2010 (Unit 6, skilled trades worker union) complained about safety risks due to deferred maintenance, the lack of adequate pay in high cost regions and within the respective trade, and about outside contractors, who do not have the same dedication to the CSU as the regular employees who spent their whole career on our campuses. Another member reminded the Board that the CSU has a responsibility to the community to provide good union jobs. Several members of the Employees Union (CSUEU) issued strong statements in anticipation of contract bargaining that will commence next year and they called for respect and good faith during the process. Another member deplored that security technology for the safety on campuses is re-purposed for employee supervision. He considers this a “perversion of necessary technology to create an Orwellian work environment.”
 - a. The committee approved by consent the *Adoption of Initial Proposals for a Successor Collective Bargaining Agreement with Bargaining Unit 6 (Skilled Crafts), Teamsters Local 2010*. These proposals (sunshine proposals) mark the official beginning of the bargaining process with employee unions.

11. **The Committee on University and Faculty Personnel** began with *Public Comments*. Rocky Sanchez and Tessy Reese (CSUEU) hope that the same concern and respect that the Board extends to the campus presidents will be extended to all CSU employees and that market equity will also be addressed during their contract negotiations.

- a. The committee received as an information item the *Executive Compensation Study: Policy Implications*. Chancellor White introduced the item by saying that the goal is to “implement a reasonable, consistent, competitive policy that has clear and transparent benchmarks for setting and adjusting presidential compensation.” A compensation study conducted by Sibson Consulting showed that the vast majority of CSU presidents are paid lower than 15% below (the lower end of market compatibility) median salaries for their peers. When taking into account benefits, which are regarded as generous in the CSU, then the presidents’ total remuneration falls even further below their peers. A recommendation was made to adjust the base salaries for all CSU presidents to 15% below the market median. If done so in one year, the total cost would be \$851,709, and if spread over three years, the total cost would amount to \$1,524,056. Additional suggestions by the consulting company are to offer an “optional retirement plan, to incorporate a variable incentive compensation program, and to adjust housing allowances to reflect current and future cost of housing in California.”

Not surprisingly, the discussion following the report took over one hour. Chair Day expressed the Board’s commitment to pay fair salaries to all CSU employees, including faculty and staff, within the constraints of our resources provided by the legislators. He does, accordingly, find it insufficient to bring the presidents’ salaries to 15% below the peer group, but firmly believes that our campus executives deserve to be paid at the median rate.

Trustee Sabalius pointed out that the presidents’ homes or their significant housing allowances (between \$50,000 and \$60,000 each year) were not considered in the study, which would have presented clearer and fairer data for comparison. Trustee McGrory questioned the comparative institutions, and he believes it would be more illustrative if we compared universities in the western United States. And Trustee Eisen observed that despite the below-market compensation, the CSU was able to attract extraordinary talent and that there is a low turn-over in president positions. She regrets that the report did not take seniority into account.

Trustee Faigin believes that the proposed salary augmentations are too high. “The CSU is not a private company and it is tax and tuition dollars that we are given to spend.” He is concerned about the public’s perception and the legislators’ reaction if we increased salaries for some presidents by very large amounts. Trustee Morales agrees that the weight of the optics is heavy, but that it is necessary to adjust the presidential salaries. Yet, he also expressed his wish to see a similar study on compensation for faculty and staff as well; a suggestion that Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis in a later comment endorsed enthusiastically.

Trustee Taylor expressed his astonishment how much everybody in the CSU is underpaid and he hopes that it can be adjusted over time. He and Chancellor White discussed the implications of PEPRA, the Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act from 2013, which set limits on pensions and therefore makes the benefits package less attractive.

Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis suggested that there be no blanket increases for every president, but to determine their salary on a case-by-case basis, which would allow for greater flexibility and more targeted adjustments.

Chancellor White and General Counsel Andy Jones, however, pointed out that the Board only determines the salary of 30 executives (23 campus presidents and 7 executive officers at the CO). Salaries of individuals are discussed in Closed Session and then reported out, whereas policy on salary must be voted on in public.

Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis finds it desirable to talk about salaries on a case-by-case basis in Closed Session, and Trustee Carney suggested to talk about pay equity when presidents are being reviewed, which also happens in Closed Session.

Speaker of the Assembly Anthony Rendon said that while the study “points to a need for additional compensation for our fine and talented and devoted presidents, [...] there is a tremendous amount of need throughout the Cal State, there is a tremendous amount of need on the part of students to get relief from tuition, there is a tremendous of amount need on part of faculty and staff to make sure that they get the wages that they deserve [...] and there is a tremendous amount of need to make sure that our collective bargaining units are negotiated with fairly.” Finally, he agreed with Trustee Faigin that the suggested salary increases would not be received well by the legislature.

Trustee Firstenberg emphatically insisted that “the only way we can keep the character and quality and integrity and commitment of 23 presidents is to be fair to them.”

Newly appointed Trustee Krinsk wondered whether CSU presidents receive incentives, and Evelyn Nazario, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, clarified that the CSU “does not provide incentives to presidents.”

12. The **Committee on Committees** began with one *Public Comment* by Martin Brenner (CSUEU), who briefly pointed out some unintended consequences as a result of the institution’s focus on time-to-graduation rates.

- a. The committee by consent made *Amendments to Board of Trustee’ Standing Committee Assignment for 2019-2020* to include newly appointed Trustee Jeffrey Krinsk. Maryana Khames is the new Student Trustee; yet, it seems that the junior Student Trustee is not assigned to any committees.

13. The **Committee on Audit**

- a. received by consent the *Status Report on Current and Follow-up Internal Audit Assignments*. “For the 2019 year, assignments were made to develop and execute individual campus audit plans; conduct audits of Information Technology (IT), Sponsored Programs and Construction; use continuous auditing techniques; provide advisory services and investigation reviews; and continue implementation activities for the redesign of Audit and Advisory Services. Follow-up on current and past assignments was also being conducted on approximately 39 completed campus reviews.”
- b. received as an information item a *Status Report on the California State Auditor Report on Accounts Outside the State Treasury and Campus Parking Programs*. Larry Mandel, Vice Chancellor and Chief Audit Officer, presented the 60-Day Responses to CSA Audit #2018-127. Most of the ten recommendations by the State Auditor will be implemented between October 2019 and January 2020.

Trustee McGrory reiterated that of the \$1.7 billion in the CSU budget that are labeled as “designated reserves,” only \$500m are unencumbered “rainy day reserves,” which would provide only three weeks of operating expenses for the CSU. He further explained that the trustees have set a maximum limit for reserves at six months of operating expenses. However, we have no set minimum, and that is what the State Auditor wants the CSU to enshrine in policy. To do so would limit our flexibility and, moreover, it would require to set aside another \$1 billion or more if we would decide that we need three months of operating expenses as a minimum.

Several trustees commented that they feel uncomfortable with reserves that merely cover the CSU’s operating expenses for three weeks, and that we should actually increase them.

- c. received as an information item the *Status Report on Consideration of Opportunities for Continued Program Enhancement of the Instructional Control Environment*. VC Larry Mandel referred to the Quality Assessment Review of the Audit Division. He reminded the trustees that his department received the rating of “generally conforms,” which is the highest rating. The peer reviewers made recommendations to further enhance the team’s effectiveness, and Larry Mandel reported on the progress his division made in regard to the various suggestions concerning a Code of Ethics, a Whistleblower Hotline, an Institutional Compliance Function, and clear guidelines for Prosecution of Wrongdoing, which the trustees have established at their May 2019 meeting.

At 11:15 am, the work of the **Committees of the Board** were concluded and Chair Day called the full **Board of Trustees Meeting** to order.

14. The **Board of Trustees Meeting** began with *Public Comments*. William Blischke, immediate past President of the Emeritus and Retired Faculty and Staff Association (ERFSA), announced that while the organization elected Barry Pasternack as their new president, he will remain the liaison to the Board of Trustees. The Association plans to better coordinate their volunteer work on all 23 campuses and to encourage student voter registration and census participation.

Craig Stone, Director of American Indian Studies (CSU Long Beach or Cal State Puvunga, as he prefers to call it), presented a CFA resolution to initiate the practice to recognize the land of indigenous people before all meetings in the CSU.

Andrew Flores, a representative of Students for Quality Education (SQE), criticized the proposed 4th Year of QR as a CSU admission requirement, the GI 2025, the EO 1100R, and the consistent opposition to Ethnic and Queer Studies, claiming that the Board is selling out the CSU to neo-liberalism and “turning our schools into assembly lines where students’ worth is measured by the human capital and how much they will contribute to the workforce.” He sees this as “part of the Board of Trustees’ broader scheme to push students out with a degree as efficiently as possible” and “faster off the graduation production line.”

Several representatives of the CSUEU complained about the newly installed metal detector gates for security at Board meetings (later echoed by Kevin Wehr from CFA, who claimed that metal detectors and police dogs have “racialized impacts”), called for a

systemwide bullying prevention program, criticized inadequate compensation, bemoaned that staffing does not keep up with enrollment growth, requested more speaking time at Board meetings, and demanded greater transparency in regards to reserve funds.

Two speakers from UNITE HERE Local 11 (the hotel workers union) urged the trustees to take the hotel project at CSUN off the consent agenda for a more critical discussion in light of the issues raised about the developer. They also maintained that “the CSU system needs more student housing, not more hotel rooms.”

Charmaine Lawson, mother of a HSU student murdered in 2017, read a statement expressing concern about the safety and well-being of students of color at Humboldt State, claiming that the community is hostile and racist. She called on newly appointed President Jackson to “stop recruiting them, if you can’t protect them.”

The Board received the following Reports:

- a. The Chair of the Board of Trustees, Adam Day, welcomed our more than 480,000 students to the new academic year. He acknowledged that starting college can be challenging and overwhelming, and he expressed his gratefulness that all 23 campuses provide highly skilled mental health counselors. He praised the students’ success as a result of the Graduation Initiative 2025 efforts and pointed out that “Money Magazine’s 2019 List of the Most Transformative Colleges includes 12 CSU campuses in its Top 25” and “Washington Monthly lists all 23 CSU campuses in its Best Bang for the Buck Colleges in the West.”
- b. Chancellor Tim White announced that he was appointed by the Governor to the newly established Council for Post-Secondary Education. He deems this coordinating body to be “a significant integration of our higher education ecosystems” and he hopes for “actionable solutions.” He further announced that Governor Newsom will be outlining his vision for public higher education in California at the Graduation Initiative 2025 Symposium in Sacramento in October.
- c. The Chair of the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU), Catherine Nelson, reported that the ASCSU invited CFA to conduct an Interrupting Racism workshop at their first meeting of this academic year last week. The Academic Senate passed a resolution to explore a systemwide ethnic studies graduation requirement in collaboration with campus senates and disciplinary councils.
- d. Michael Wiafe, President of the California State Student Association (CSSA), reported on CSUnity, the student advocacy conference. CSSA outlined its priorities for this academic year, which are “advocating for ongoing funding for student basic needs,” “to fix the broken financial aid system,” and “to reform Cal Grant to meet the full costs of attendance for our students.” The CSSA Board of Directors will take a critical look at the proposed 4th year of QR as a CSU admission requirement to formulate a formal position.
- e. Jeremy Addis-Mills, President-Elect, presented the report of the CSU Alumni Council, in place of President Michelle Power. At its last meeting, the Council explored ways to build bridges between the alumni and the current student population. At the meeting, Garrett Ashley, Vice Chancellor for Advancement, gave a presentation on how alumni can engage in advocacy activities. Since Trustee

Adamson's term is coming to an end in summer, the Council started the process of selecting the next Alumni Trustee.

Newly appointed Trustee Jeffrey Krinsk and Student Trustee Maryana Khames were welcomed to the Board and given time for personal remarks.

The Board then moved to approve the resolutions that were previously passed in the various committees. Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis expressed the desire to open up discussion on the item Various Actions Related to a Hotel Development Project at CSU Northridge. Vy San Juan outlined the project again and commented that three more suitable sites for student housing are still available on the master plan, Robert Eaton explained that there are "key performance indicators to assure that they meet the expectations of the campus" and financial penalties will be triggered if these are not met, President Harrison reiterated that there was a severe lack of hotel space in the area and that the developer has existing partnerships with many institutions of higher education across the country, Trustee Sabalius summarized the rationale for the committee members' affirmative vote yesterday, and Steven Relyea assured the Lieutenant Governor that the campus has done its due diligence in selecting the developer and will monitor this project very carefully. The item was voted on and approved with the opposition of Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis.

The Lieutenant Governor also requested to take the item Various Actions Related to a New Student Union Project at CSU Fresno off the consent agenda. Again, Vy San Juan summarized the project, Robert Eaton explained that the student fee referendum to finance the project was approved by 67%, and President Castro added that the "current student union was built 50 years ago when our student population was about 10,000 students and today it is 24,000 and growing." Nonetheless, she "continues to be very concerned over on-going fee increases on our campuses when so many students have a really hard time to afford to stay in school." Student Trustee Garcia defended the students' decision on all campuses to pass fees for facilities that offer many services and benefits to the students. Trustee Faigin remembered that in the past, the Board established policies to curb referenda on student fees that were restricted, which subsequently was written into law by the legislators. In case of the student union project at CSU Fresno, however, the referendum complied with the Board's policies and every student was allowed to vote. The item was voted on and approved with the opposition of Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis.

After Chair Day adjourned the meeting, Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis wanted to also comment on the Proposal to Modify First Year Admission Requirements for the California State University by adding a 4th year of quantitative reasoning in high school. It was not part of the consent agenda, since it was only presented as an information item for discussion on the previous day. The Lieutenant Governor insisted to go on record that she has "very, very, very serious concerns," and she asked for additional research from the CO and from opposing organizations to allow the Board to better understand the full implications of this issue. Chair Day pointed out that the Board already provided numerous opportunities for information and feedback, and that this matter can be deliberated again when it will return at the November meeting as an action item.

The Board of Trustees Meeting was officially adjourned on Wednesday, September 25, at 12:30 am.

The **Board of Trustees** met in **Closed Session** to discuss *Executive Personnel Matters* from 12:30 to 13:15 pm.