

# 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

### Ex Officio Members

Gavin Newsom  
Governor

Eleni Kounalakis  
Lt. Governor

Anthony Rendon  
Speaker of the Assembly

Tony Thurmond  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

Joseph I. Castro  
Chancellor

### Appointed Members

Lillian Kimbell  
Chair

Wenda Fong  
Vice Chair

Larry L. Adamson

Diego Arambula

Jane W. Carney

Jack B. Clarke, Jr.

Adam Day

Douglas Faigin

Debra S. Farar

Jean Picker Firstenberg

Maria Linares

Julia I. Lopez

Jack McGrory

Anna Ortiz-Morfit

Krystal Mae Raynes

Yamilette Rodriguez

Romey Sabalius

Lateefah A. Simon

Christopher Steinhauser

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

## Faculty Trustee Report

### CSU Board of Trustees Meeting – January 24-26, 2022

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 and to the public, on my personal notes, my memory, and a partial review of the archived livestream of the meeting accessible at <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/past-meetings/2022/Pages/January-24-26-2022.aspx>.

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](mailto:Romey.Sabalius@sjsu.edu)).

Due to the spread of the Omicron variant, the Board of Trustees had to revert to meeting virtually again. The public was invited to comment live via audio at the beginning of the meeting or to submit their comments in writing.

In this report, I presume that the topics of the greatest interest to the faculty would be the proposed Discontinuation of Standardized Tests for CSU Undergraduate Admission (item 14.b), the planned Sponsored State Legislation for 2022 [discussion about independent professional doctorates in the CSU] (item 16.a), the 2021-2022 Student Fee Report (item 15.a), and –as always– the 2022-2023 Operating Budget Update (item 15.b).

Lastly, I am pleased to report that the Board of Trustees ratified the new collective bargaining agreement with the California Faculty Association.

I wish you a successful, smooth, and safe semester,

Romey Sabalius

San José, CA – February 8, 2022

# Faculty Trustee Report

## **CSU Board of Trustees Meeting: January 24-26, 2022 (virtual)**

On January 24-26, the CSU Board of Trustees meeting was held virtually via Zoom due to the spread of the Omicron virus.

On Monday, January 24, at 9:00 am,

The **Board of Trustees** convened in **Closed Session** on *Executive Personnel Matters*.

After interviewing the finalists for the position of President at CSU Channel Island, the Board unanimously decided to hire current Interim President Richard Yao (see item 13.b).

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

On Tuesday, January 25, at 8:00 am,

1. The **Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees** met in **Closed Session** to finalize the list of honorary degree recipients.
2. The **Committee on Educational Policy** gathered in **Closed Session** to approve the proposed recipients of honorary degrees. The actual bestowal depends on the acceptance by the nominated candidate and their attendance at an official campus ceremony, which normally coincides with commencement.
3. The **Board of Trustees** convened in **Closed Session** to discuss *Executive Personnel Matters* and to receive a report on *Pending Litigation*.
4. The **Committee on Collective Bargaining** deliberated 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** of the **Board of Trustees** started at 10:45 am.

5. The meeting began with **Public Comment**.

Approximately 150 speakers had registered to provide their input live via audio; yet, not everybody logged into the meeting. The speakers were encouraged to keep their comments to under one minute and to avoid repetition if possible. Additionally, comments were submitted in writing.

A very large group of speakers commented on the inclusion of caste as a protected category in the collective bargaining agreement with the *California Faculty Association (CFA)*. The majority of them was in favor of prohibiting caste discrimination, and they asserted that “Dalit rights are human rights.” Angry opponents feared that it would “create Hinduphobia,” a “de-Brahmatization,” and they see it as an attempt to “destroy the Hindu religion.”

*Students for Quality Education (SQE)* again called for defunding and “de-militarizing” University Police, which they see as upholding a “violent, white supremacy state.”

Representatives from labor unions –among them the *CSU Employees Union (CSUEU)*, *Teamsters Local 2010*, and *Academic Professionals of California (APC)*– demanded “livable wages” in California’s high cost-of-living areas, they requested extended COVID and parental leave, and they articulated their concerns about the safe repopulation of campuses.

CFA President Charles Toombs and Vice-President Kevin Wehr lauded the tentative agreement on a new contract for faculty, librarians, counselors, and coaches, and they urged the ratification by both their union members and by the Board of Trustees (see item 8.a).

Rollin Richmond, President Emeritus of Humboldt State University, and several external stakeholders voiced their enthusiastic support for the conversion of Humboldt State into the third California State Polytechnic University.

6. After a lunch break, the **Board of Trustees** received the following **Reports**:

**Lillian Kimbell**, *Chair of the Board of Trustees*, explained the rearrangement of the Board’s agenda. The reports are now at the beginning of the meeting, rather than at the end, in order to inform the deliberations of the various committees of the Board [a change that Trustee Sabalius had promoted repeatedly].

This spring semester, campuses will start in-person classes at different times. “To account for differences in student populations, academic programming, facilities and operations, as well as local disease progression, each CSU campus president has been given appropriate flexibility to tailor strategies to address their specific circumstances.”

Chair Kimbell assured that the CSU will be in compliance with federal and state laws that require the repatriation of physical remains of Native Americans and Hawaiians, and she also announced the inclusion of caste as a protected category against discrimination in CSU policies.

Lastly, she congratulated the two Cal Poly universities for their award-winning float in this year’s Tournament of Roses Parade.

**Joe Castro**, *Chancellor*, reflected on his first year as the CSU’s leader during what he called “the most challenging period in the university’s history.” Despite the enormous difficulties, the CSU registered “record high graduation rates for students from all backgrounds” and “celebrated the largest ever graduating class –almost a 133,000 strong– adding to our global alumni network that has now surpassed 4 million.” The CSU also contributed to increased “tech equity” by distributing “almost 30,000 new high-quality, mobile technology bundles during this academic year through our CSUCCESS initiative, which launched last fall and has now been expanded to 14 campuses through the spring term.” The CSU also “inspired historic levels of state and philanthropic support.”

The Chancellor acknowledged that many initiatives and worthy goals remain, “but [his] over-arching priorities remain unchanged: supporting the physical, mental, and emotional health and well-being of our faculty, staff, and our talented and diverse students; continuing to address the digital divide [...]; accelerating the diversification of our faculty and our staff; inspiring additional public and private support and partnership; and of course re-doubling our work to eliminate equity gaps [...].”

Chancellor Castro thanked both bargaining teams for reaching a tentative agreement on a new contract with the faculty [which was ratified later by the Board (see item 8.a) and in early February by the membership of CFA]. It will “lift up the CSU’s faculty through respect, equity, and fairness, while balancing the need to meet the CSU’s critical student mission.”

In closing, he expressed his satisfaction with the Governor’s January budget proposal, but in particular for having obtained a 5-year compact agreement for funding the CSU (see item 15.b). Finally, he announced that there is “no plan to raise tuition for the coming academic year.”

**Robert Collins**, *Chair of the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU)*, spoke about the efforts of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) to create a common transfer pathway to the CSU and UC for students from California Community Colleges as required by recently passed legislation (AB 928).

He summarized some of the resolutions that the ASCSU passed during its plenary in January, first and foremost one that asserts faculty control over curriculum and pedagogy, including the instructional modality, even in times of emergency.

Like in previous Board meetings, Chair Collins assured “that the ASCSU continues to monitor campus repopulation concerns raised by faculty and the implementation of the new Ethnic Studies requirement through our Academic Affairs Committee so that campus concerns arising during implementation can be discussed and addressed.”

“The ASCSU will also continue extending invitations to trustees for meet-and-greet conversation,” which “have led to shared understandings of our common aims, goals, and values in the CSU.”

**Isaac Alferos**, *President of the California State Student Association (CSSA)*, began his report by stating that “CSSA supports the addition of caste oppression to the CSU’s anti-discrimination policy and we continue to stand firmly behind our Dalit and oppressed students.”

He reported that “students are generally supportive of the discontinuation of standardized tests” and that “CSSA will be co-sponsoring legislation to modernize the CalGrant program.”

President Alferos articulated the students’ confusion about the mixed responses from campuses across the system on when to commence classes in person for the spring semester. He wishes that there would be clearer communication and more system unity.

He criticized the “historic” understanding of shared governance “as the collaborative decision making shared between faculty and administrators.” He considers this definition as “antiquated,” and instead “we must partner with our student leaders as well to ensure that all voices are empowered and present.” He made a passionate plea to include students in the decision-making process, especially in regards to COVID measures, rather than merely informing them after such decisions have been made without their input.

**Jeremy Addis-Mills**, *President of the Alumni Council*, expressed his appreciation for the rearrangement of the agenda to have the reports at the beginning of the meeting.

He shared that alumni participated in many initiatives, work groups, and committees, and noted that “the Alumni Council has been involved in the Graduation Initiative 2025 since its inception, focusing on how alumni can support the GI 2025 effort.” As an example, he relayed that the Council received very positive feedback from students and faculty about the mentorship of alumni in supporting student success. The over four million strong network is filled with members “that are passionate about giving back to the university that shaped them.”

Trustee Sabalius commented that as a professor, he had never heard about the opportunity to invite alumni into the classroom, and he encouraged the Council to “seek wider promotion of that possibility.”

**7. The Committee on Organization and Rules**

- a. received as an information item in consent the *Proposed CSU Board of Trustees’ Meeting Dates for 2023*.

**8. The Committee on Collective Bargaining – Open Session**

- a. approved as an action item in consent the *Ratification of the Successor Collective Bargaining Agreement with Bargaining Unit 3, California Faculty Association (CFA)*.
- b. approved as an action item in consent the *Adoption of Initial Proposals for a Successor Collective Bargaining Agreement with Bargaining Units 2, 5, 7, 9, California State University Employees Union (CSUEU)*.
- c. approved as an action item in consent the *Adoption of Initial Proposals for a Successor Collective Bargaining Agreement with Bargaining Unit 8, State University Police Association (SUPA)*.

Faculty Trustee Sabalius –who is not a member of the Committee on Collective Bargaining– claimed a “point of personal privilege” to highlight the momentous occasion of the ratification of the collective bargaining agreement with CFA. He recalled that the last contract under Chancellor Reed was forced to come about by a strike of faculty, and before the last ratification under Chancellor White, it came close to a strike. Sabalius appreciates that this agreement was achieved without the threat of labor action, and he complimented the Chancellor and the bargaining teams for their work.

Trustee McGrory wished that the inclusion of caste as a protective category would have been discussed and decided by the Board, rather than being embedded in a labor contract.

**9. The Committee on Audit**

- a. received as an information item in consent the *Status Report on Audit and Advisory Services Activities*.

“This item provides an update on internal audit activities and initiatives. It also includes a status report on the 2021-2022 audit plan. Follow-up on current and past assignments is being conducted on approximately 27 completed campus reviews. [...]

Audit and Advisory Services continues to make progress on the 2021-2022 audit plan. Eight audits have been completed and 24 audits are currently in-process. It is anticipated that on-campus fieldwork will resume in 2022.”

**10. The Joint Committees on Educational Policy and Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds**

- a. received as an information item the Report on Sustainability Goals and Proposed Policy Revision.

The report “identified the major goals of the May 2014 policy and proposed new goals.” It also recommended policy revisions, which “align with recent changes in state law, modernize language, and expand campus transportation planning.”

An extended question and answer period followed the report. Trustee Lopez expressed her admiration for the “ambitiousness of our goals,” which –given the enormous footprint of the CSU– “could really make quite a substantial difference.”

Trustee Kimbell wondered why “only twelve of our campuses have academic programs around sustainability.” Lindsey Rowell, Chief of Energy, Sustainability and Transportation, confirmed that those are “dedicated sustainability programs,” yet, other campuses “have elements of sustainability incorporated into their programs.”

Trustee Sabalius questioned why the CSU has fallen short by a large margin on their own energy generation on campuses, given that we are in sunny California and could take advantage of plentiful solar energy that could be generated by panels above parking lots and on the rooftops of our many buildings. Vy San Juan, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Capital Planning, Design and Construction, stated that the CSU has made progress on solar energy generation, but acknowledged that there are greater opportunities to be explored.

Trustee Steinhauser encouraged the installation of electronic charging stations to promote the use of electronic vehicles, and Trustee Rodriguez would like to see intensive “student engagement” in sustainability initiatives.

**11. The Committee on Institutional Advancement**

- a. approved as an action item the Naming of Snapdragon Stadium at San Diego State University.

“SDSU has secured a sponsorship agreement with Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. (Qualcomm) to be the naming partner of the new Stadium, naming the stadium as Snapdragon Stadium, in recognition of Qualcomm’s consumer-facing premier mobile platform brand. In recognition of this investment, Qualcomm will obtain the stadium naming rights for a 15-year term. This agreement includes a total cost of investment of \$45 million. It is among the most lucrative facility naming agreements in the NCAA, carrying an average annual value of \$3 million over the 15-year term.

In addition to the Stadium naming rights, Qualcomm will partner with SDSU to implement 5G cellular technology throughout the Stadium. Qualcomm will also receive stadium-related hospitality, community, business integration, and retail and technology activation opportunities, as well as multi-media rights.

The annual revenue from the naming rights agreement will support repayment of the Systemwide Revenue Bonds already secured for the stadium project.”

Trustee Sabalius referred to the “total cost of the project of \$310 million, of which \$200 million has been financed by CSU Systemwide Revenue Bonds and the balance of \$110 million is from philanthropic gifts and donations.” He wondered whether the \$40 million that SDSU has secured so far is satisfactory at this point in time. SDSU President de la Torre feels that they “are at a very good level and trend-line.”

Trustees Day, Adamson, and McGrory congratulated President de la Torre and applauded the realization of this project.

- b. received as an action item the Annual Report on Donor Support for 2020-2021.

“In 2020-2021, the California State University secured over \$634 million in new gift commitments, equivalent to the previous record, and reaching a new record on gift receipts with more than \$552 million received.

Seventeen campuses had increases in giving. The CSU’s total endowment market value also reached \$2.4 billion, the first time surpassing the \$2 billion mark. [...]

Donors designated \$230.7 million for current use, which included:

- \$68.7 million for faculty support and academic enrichment
- \$41.6 million for public service programs
- \$36.2 million for student scholarships
- \$4 million for equipment and facility improvements
- \$80.2 million for additional university priorities.

Donors committed an additional \$6.7 million in irrevocable deferred gifts.”

Trustee Sabalius remembered a line item for money given to Athletics in last year’s report on donor support. It was a disappointing \$15.4 million for the entire CSU, which debunks the myth that Athletics brings in a significant amount of donations, and it hardly justifies the maintenance of very expensive athletics programs. He wondered why this line item was omitted in this year’s report, and he would like to know what amount was donated to Athletics this year. Furthermore, he wishes to see that line item re-introduced in future reports.

Lori Redfearn, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Systemwide Advancement, replied that “Athletics funding is spread across several different categories of this report,” such as student scholarships and capital projects. Hence, Trustee Sabalius would like to be provided with the disaggregated data. He quoted the CSU’s frequent insistence on making data-driven decisions; however, in this case, he has the feeling that decision are only based on data when the data is favorable. Trustee McGrory asserted that there are “indirect benefits” that Athletics bring to campuses beyond the monetary returns.

## 12. The Joint Committees on Institutional Advancement and Educational Policy

- a. presented as an information item The Wang Family Excellence Awards.

This prestigious recognition, which comes with a \$20,000 stipend, was awarded in the following categories:

- Outstanding Faculty Innovator in Student Success – Dave Moon (Northridge)

- Outstanding Faculty Scholarship – Steve Arounsack (Stanislaus)
- Outstanding Faculty Service – Loucine Huckabay (Long Beach)
- Outstanding Faculty Teaching – Don Edberg (Pomona)
- Outstanding Staff Performance – Keith Humphrey (SLO)

The Board adjourned for the day at 4:30 pm, and it reconvened on January 26 at 8:30 am.

### 13. The **Committee on University and Faculty Personnel**

- a. approved as an action item the Executive Compensation for the Interim President at San José State University.

Dr. Stephen J. Perez will receive an annual salary of \$403,433 plus a \$1,000 monthly auto allowance (the same salary and allowance as the previous president). Dr. Perez will be required to live in the university's presidential residence as of April 2022. He will receive a temporary housing allowance of \$5,000 per month until his move into the University House.

- b. approved as an action item the Executive Compensation for the President at CSU Channel Islands.

Dr. Richard D. Yao will receive an annual salary of \$338,514 plus a housing allowance of \$5,000 per month as well as a \$1,000 monthly auto allowance (the allowances are the same, but the salary is 10% higher than that of the previous president).

### 14. The **Committee on Educational Policy**

- a. approved as an action item a Recommended Amendment to Title 5 Regarding the Proposed Name Change for Humboldt State University.

The name change designates the university as the third polytechnic university in the California State University system and the first polytechnic in Northern California. The planned transition to a Cal Poly is supported by a special state government allocation of \$433 million in one-time funding to improve facilities and infrastructure and a \$25 million addition to the recurring campus operating budget. The campus plans to double its enrollment within seven years and to diversify its student body.

Trustees expressed their enthusiasm for this change and congratulated the campus.

- b. received as an information item the Recommended Amendments to Title 5 Regarding the Discontinuation of Standardized Examinations for CSU Undergraduate Admission.

"The California State University (CSU) suspended the use of standardized test scores for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 academic years for undergraduate admission due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the unavailability of examinations for prospective applicants. Preceding this temporary action, the CSU had been engaged in an ongoing discussion about admission eligibility. In spring 2021, the CSU's Admission Advisory Council (AAC), comprised of faculty, administrators and students, was asked to consider the future use of standardized testing in CSU undergraduate admission. In addition to consideration of pandemic-related hardships and concerns brought forth by PK-12 school districts and community-based organizations, the committee considered equity and fairness, academic preparation,



Graduation Initiative 2025 goals and extensive research on the topic of standardized testing and college admission as part of its deliberations.

Although standardized test scores have a long tradition in higher education, dating back to 1901, the council found that standardized tests provide negligible additional value to the CSU admission process. The negative impact of stress on students, families and high schools as well as the consistent differential tests results between students in more affluent communities relative to less affluent communities cannot be ignored. Ultimately, the council recommended the permanent discontinuation of the use of standardized test scores in CSU undergraduate admissions. [...]

In lieu of an eligibility index [a weighted combination of GPA and SAT or ACT test scores], CSU campuses are calculating a Multi-Factor Admission Score (MFAS) based on a number of supplemental factors. During this interim period, CSU campuses continue to have autonomy and wide latitude in determining an admissions evaluation approach that is best suited to their enrollment management priorities and needs. Campuses ensure that “a-g” GPA and academic preparation are the most heavily weighed variables. Campuses determined their specific value scale so that each variable can be quantified, and an objective review of applicants can take place. CSU campuses evaluated the admission factors that were available, based on admission application information, and chose a combination of factors that would work best for them. Campuses are not using all factors, but only a subset that best fit their campuses requirements. They are:

1. “a-g” GPA
2. English GPA
3. Laboratory science GPA
4. Math/Quantitative reasoning GPA
5. History GPA
6. Language other than English (LOTE) GPA
7. “a-g” courses beyond 15 years/30 semesters
8. Number of History courses
9. Number of Language other than English (LOTE) courses
10. Number of Math/Quantitative reasoning courses
11. College Promise/Partnership programs
12. Free and Reduced Lunch School (66%+)
13. First generation student status
14. Qualification for an application fee waiver
15. Participation in college preparation educational programs
16. Foster youth student
17. Military status
18. Work experience
19. Extracurricular activities
20. Leadership roles
21. Local Admission Priority (if applicable)”

Trustee McGrory asked how campuses will deal with the differential in high school quality. April Grommo, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management Systems, replied that also currently this is not taken into account. She noted that campuses have local admission areas and they give priority to students that are from the region. Some campuses also consider the “school context,” such as schools with a high percentage of students eligible for subsidized or free lunches.

Trustee Raynes wondered whether campus impactation might change due to these new admission criteria. AVC Grommo stated that “the CSU has admitted almost 93% of the students that have applied to the CSU for admission.” She also pointed out that the Governor’s budget proposal included an expectation of enrollment growth.

Trustee Faigin inquired about additional costs or savings due to the proposed change. Sylvia Alva, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, responded that “there are no resource implications.” Trustee Sabalius is skeptical about this reply and assumes that the much more complex “Multi-Factor Admission Score” would necessitate an increase in the workload for admission officers. Yet, AVC Grommo asserted that the calculation of the multi-factor admission scores would be automated and systemwide.

Trustee Carney wanted to know if the CSU or individual campuses could include an “optional consideration of SAT or ACT test scores.” AVC Grommo replied that it would send “mixed messages to students,” and the CSU decided to go “test-free for admissions decisions.” However, “if a student did take the test, that could be used as one of the multiple measures that we use for academic preparation placement, which would be in the English and Math courses for incoming freshmen.”

Trustee Sabalius is “concerned about the reduced GPA” during the pandemic from 3.0 to 2.5 with consideration also of students with a GPA of 2.0 to 2.49. He wondered whether there were plans to revert to the old standards, “to not erode the CSU’s claim to excellence.” EVC Alva explained that taking the SAT or ACT had been an opportunity for students with low GPAs to still gain admission to the CSU by achieving high test scores. Since this option will be eliminated, it is deemed appropriate to lower the GPA threshold. AVC Grommo added that the test results were needed for admission to impacted campuses or programs. “Prior to the pandemic about 98% of our freshmen applicants actually submitted an SAT/ACT score.”

Trustee Lopez would like the CSU to clearly document that there would be no reduction in quality to counter the concerns of critics, and Trustee Clarke suggested that we should prepare our responses to opponents.

Trustees Rodriguez, Arambula, Steinhäuser, and Kimbell articulated their enthusiastic support for this proposal. Rob Collins, Chair of the Academic Senate of the CSU, expressed the support of faculty for the elimination of the SAT/ACT for admissions, primarily because “the disparities in terms of access outweigh the benefits of the SAT/ACT” regarding predictability of college success.

EVC Alva reaffirmed the institution’s desire to “stay closely aligned with our core values in the CSU for access, opportunity, and inclusive excellence.”

## 15. The Committee on Finance

- a. received as an information item the 2021-2022 Student Fee Report.

“The table below compares total campus-based mandatory fees, by campus, for the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 academic years. As shown in the table, the systemwide average of campus-based mandatory fees increased by \$79 (4.9 percent). Increases in these fees in 2021-2022 occurred for various reasons. Some campuses have authorized annual incremental increases for certain fees that keep pace with inflation such as the California Consumer Price Index or Higher Education Price Index. The San Francisco and Dominguez Hills campuses increased health facilities and services fees to fund rising health costs and provide increased services to students. Bakersfield, San Bernardino, and San Diego increased their student center fee to expand space and services provided in the student union centers. Due to the COVID-19 emergency, Sacramento temporarily reduced their transportation fee in agreement with their local bus provider. Fee rates noted below were effective August 2021 and may have been subsequently and temporarily adjusted.”

### Comparison: 2020-2021 and 2021-2022

#### Category II Campus-Based Mandatory Fee Rate Totals by Campus

Campus	2020-2021	2021-2022	Change
Bakersfield	\$1,757	\$1,837	\$80
Channel Islands	1,075	1,075	0
Chico	2,064	2,122	58
Dominguez Hills	1,204	1,318	114
East Bay	1,253	1,253	0
Fresno	901	911	10
Fullerton	1,212	1,234	22
Humboldt	2,122	2,122	0
Long Beach	1,104	1,104	0
Los Angeles	1,043	1,043	0
CSU Maritime	1,374	1,374	0
Monterey Bay	1,401	1,476	75
Northridge	1,275	1,301	26
Pomona	1,697	1,697	0
Sacramento	1,676	1,650	-26
San Bernardino	1,247	1,471	224
San Diego	1,978	2,394	416
San Francisco	1,268	1,562	294
San Jose	2,110	2,110	0
San Luis Obispo	4,329	4,453	124
San Marcos	1,981	1,985	4
Sonoma	2,210	2,246	36
Stanislaus	1,860	1,902	42
<b>Weighted Average</b>	<b>\$1,618</b>	<b>\$1,697</b>	<b>\$79</b>

As in past years, Trustee Sabalius complimented CSU Fresno for having the lowest campus-based student fees in the system, despite having modern student facilities and affording a Division 1A football team. He further reiterated his desire to have the Board oversee and approve increases and changes in campus-based mandatory fees. Determining the cost of attendance should be one of the most important responsibilities of the trustees. Sabalius is especially concerned when student fees are implemented by alternative consultation in lieu of a student referendum. He does not expect the Board to reject reasonable proposals; yet, he would like the trustees to have the final authority to approve them.

Chair Kimbell inquired whether student fees are included when the CSU states that “77% of undergraduate financial aid recipients have their tuition fully covered.” Ryan Storm, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget, said that they are not.

Trustee Fong asked if there are plans to increase the non-resident tuition, since “it is a bargain for out-of-state students to come to the state of California for our high quality education.” Steve Relyea, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer, indicated that this is currently under review and will come before the Board later this year. He added that market differentials from campus to campus also might be taken under consideration. Trustee McGrory agreed that “one size does not fit all.”

- b. received as an information item the 2022-2023 Operating Budget Update.

“The CSU 2022-2023 operating budget plan calls for continued and increased state investment in the CSU. This budget plan, which totals \$715.5 million in new resources would address necessary new investments in the CSU and build on the momentum of recent years. The budget plan is comprised of a request of \$673 million from the state general fund and \$42.5 million of tuition revenue from enrollment growth. The eight areas of investment are:

- \$75 million for Graduation Initiative 2025
- \$20 million for student basic needs
- \$75 million to bridge the equity divide through technology
- \$223.3 million for salaries and benefits
- \$135 million for academic facilities and infrastructure
- \$129.9 million for strategic resident enrollment growth
- \$16.8 million for Senate Bill 169 State University Grant program requirements
- \$40.5 million for mandatory cost increases

Through the budget proposal, the governor demonstrated his continuing commitment to the university. Governor Newsom’s January proposal totals \$304.1 million in new, recurring funding. Of this amount, \$211.1 million is not categorized for specific uses (i.e., new, unallocated, ongoing funding) and is available to address some of the Board of Trustees’ budget priorities. In addition, \$81 million recurring is for strategic resident enrollment growth and another \$12 million recurring is for foster youth supports.

Also, the proposal includes \$233 million in one-time funding, including \$100 million for deferred maintenance, \$83 million for the Energy Innovation Center at the Bakersfield

campus, and \$50 million for university farm improvements and infrastructure on the Chico, Fresno, Pomona, and San Luis Obispo campuses.

The governor and CSU entered a multi-year compact prior to the release of the 2022-2023 Governor's Budget Proposal. At its root, this compact will provide a significant level of recurring resources over the next five years with the expectation that the university will pursue and achieve several goals.

This is a five-year compact running through 2026-2027. Each year, the governor commits to providing the CSU a five percent state general fund increase (or a 2.85 percent increase to the operating budget). For the upcoming year, that equates to a \$211.1 million increase with annual investments growing to an estimated \$257 million in the fifth year. In the fifth year of the compact, the CSU operating budget will have grown by nearly \$1.2 billion recurring per the terms of the compact."

Trustee Sabalius characterized the Governor's budget proposal as "the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly." He is pleased with the 5-year compact agreement, which would give the CSU financial stability and planning certainty. Yet, he would like to regard the compact as a floor or as a minimum guarantee that could be augmented in good financial years. Sabalius is not content with the proposed recurring state allocation to the CSU operating fund, which amounts to about 1/3 of the trustees' request to cover essential expenses and to fund our priorities. He acknowledges that the proposed sum is about the same or slightly higher than in previous years; but the state had an almost unprecedented surplus, and in that light the allocation cannot be considered generous. Lastly, Sabalius is appalled that the CSU stands to receive only \$100 million for deferred maintenance when the system's needs amount to a staggering \$23 billion. Some of the larger campuses have deferred maintenance needs of \$600.000 (SJSU) or \$800.000 (Fullerton) respectively. In that context, the \$100 million one-time allocation is a mere drop in the bucket.

Trustee Adamson agrees that the compact is a positive development. Yet, it is only as good as long as the current administration stays in place. He also is disappointed by the gap between the Board's budget request of about \$1.7 billion (on-going and one-time amounts combined) and the proposed allocation, which falls far short and represents less than half a percent of the state's surplus. He stressed that this merely should be seen as a starting point in our advocacy with the goal to receive a more comprehensive funding this year. Trustee Faigin further cautioned that "the promise of the compact is only good in good times."

Chancellor Castro added that the compact "was the Governor's idea," whose intention is to protect higher education in good times and in bad times. AVC Storm reminded the trustees that there is no funding guarantee, not even for our on-going budget, because "there is no statutory requirement" to finance higher education. Therefore, the compact should be seen as a welcomed and strong commitment on part of the Governor, who is willing to limit his discretionary spending in future years.

## 16. The Committee on Governmental Relations

### a. approved as an action item the Sponsored State Legislation for 2022.

“The following are recommended for adoption by the Board as sponsored legislation for 2022.”

- California State Polytechnic University, Humboldt  
(to establish the campus as a new Cal Poly)
- Investment Flexibility  
(to increase the cap of investments in the Total Return Portfolio from 30% to 65%)
- Sponsorship Exemption for San Diego State  
(to allow sponsorship from alcoholic beverages companies at SDSU’s new stadium)
- Admissions Impaction Reporting Requirements  
(to make it easier to discontinue impaction)

Chancellor Castro explained why sponsored legislation to authorize the CSU to provide independent professional doctorate degrees –specifically a Doctor of Public Health– is not on the list. “[He] wants the Board to know that [he] supports the plan to add professional doctorates,” but the Chancellor would like to postpone this proposal until 2023. “This would give us the opportunity to consult our educational eco-system, including our partners in the University of California as well as lay the groundwork in Sacramento to maximize our success.”

Trustee McGrory expressed his frustration that the authority to grant professional doctorates has been delayed year after year since 2018, and he made a motion to include sponsored legislation this year. Trustee Carney agreed, because the independent professional doctorates are important to assist with the workforce preparation in the state. Chancellor Castro maintained that more discussion with CSU-external constituents is needed to avoid opposition, and EVC Alva wishes to have more time “to lay the groundwork for its success,” to work intersegmentally, and to engage stakeholders on multiple levels. After continued discussion (Lopez, Day, Raynes, Clarke, Kimbell, Firstenberg, Sabalius), Trustee McGrory withdrew his motion for lack of support.

### b. received as an information item the Federal Update.

“Last year, the Board approved a Federal Agenda encompassing six broad priority areas:

- Improve College Access and Timely Completion through Aid to Students
- Prepare Students for College Success
- Foster Degree Completion for California’s Diverse Population
- Educate Students for Tomorrow’s Workforce
- Solve Societal Problems through Applied Research
- Enhance Campus Health, Safety and Infrastructure

Consistent with these priorities, the CSU was particularly active in four key areas in 2021: seeking robust funding for priority programs in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022; seeking robust funding for colleges and universities in Covid-19 relief legislation and ensuring that Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSI) and Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (AANAPISI) received an equitable share of such funding;

advocating in support of Dreamers, and the creation of a clear pathway to citizenship; and advocating for inclusion of higher education funding and the extension of federal aid to Dreamers in human infrastructure legislation.”

Trustee Raynes appreciates the attempts to increase the Pell Grant maximum, a notion supported by Trustee Rodriguez, who also wondered whether there is a time limit to receive Pell Grants. George Conant, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Federal Relations, clarified that “previously –many years ago– there was no time limit on how long you could receive Pell benefits,” and that the CSU will push for a re-authorization of that provision.

In response to Trustee Adamson’s request to be more specific on the “benefits to the CSU,” AVC Conant reported –as some examples– that the expanded Pell Grant program could be worth about \$1.5 to \$2.0 billion for our students [up from currently \$1 billion] and the proposed transportation bill includes “a new training vessel for the Maritime Academy,” which would be a value of close to \$350 million.

At 12:45 pm, Chair Kimbell called the full **Board of Trustees Meeting** to order.

All resolutions previously passed in committees were approved unanimously in consent.

The **Public Meeting** of the **Board of Trustees** was adjourned on January 26, at 12:50 pm.

After a lunch break, the **Board of Trustees** reconvened in **Closed Session** to discuss Executive Personnel Matters.

----- *The next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees will be on March 21-23, 2022* -----