



**ACADEMIC SENATE
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 17, 2022**

ASD 22-109

Approved 1-26-23

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-120

Present: Badal, Barber, Barros, Bauer, Brown, Brusckke, Casem, Castelo, Childers, Evanow, Galvan, Garcia, Ghosh, Graewingholt, Henning, Jarvis, Kanel, Ketchum, Kleinjans, Landeros, Lewis Chiu, Luker, Meyer, Miller, Milligan, Nair, Ordonez-Jasis, Parry, Perez, Plouffe, Robinson, Salvador, Self, Stambough, Stanley, Swarat, C. Thomas, Virjee Walsh, Wilson, Wood, Wynants

Absent: Bonuso, Bruce, Dabirian, Fry-Petit, Mallicoat, Shepard, E. Thomas, Valencia, Weismuller

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Walsh called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM.

A moment of silence was observed.

In Memoriam

- Dr. John Patton, Professor of Anthropology [died November 4, 2022]
- Chair Walsh had comments about John Patton. There was a video presentation tribute in honor of John and following the video, Chair Walsh opened the Senate floor to allow sharing of memories of John.

II. URGENT BUSINESS

No urgent business.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (Walsh) Joao Barros has stepped down from Senate because he has been promoted as the interim Associate Dean in HHD. We will hold an election at the December meeting to fill his seat on the Executive Committee and a special election to fill his seat on the Academic Senate.

Q: (Kanel) Do we have to wait until the new Senator is elected to fill the vacant seat on the Executive Committee?

A: (Walsh) No, we can do that from this body.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/S/P (Brown/Self) Motion to approve the minutes. Minutes approved.

4.1 ASD 22-107 Academic Senate Minutes 11-3-22 (Draft)

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

M/S/P (Childers/Kanel) Motion to approve the consent calendar. Consent calendar approved.

5.1 ASD 22-108 GE Course Proposals - Fall 2022

VI. REPORTS

1. [Chair's Report](#)
2. Provost Report - no report.
3. [Statewide Report](#)
4. ASI Report - no report.

5. [CFA Report](#)

Q: (Bruschke) Do you have any updates on the UC strike and any insight on how that might affect our campus?

A: (Brown) CFA Statewide has put out a statement of support of the UC strikers and our Executive Board is going to take it under consideration tomorrow to contribute \$1,000 toward the strike fund. Our 23 Chapters and state are supporting the strikers, we are with them 100 percent.

Q: (Henning) I heard our CFA Chapter had a meet and confer about the license plate recognition system that is going to be used. So, I was wondering if there were any updates from that?

A: (Brown) We met with the CFA Administration this week to get details about the license plate reader. We have been informed that it's only in parking and transportation, it's not going to be shared with the police department on this campus or any outside entities. The whole concept and idea were explained to us, to our satisfaction, at this point. One question I had that wasn't answered is where the funding comes from. So, we are going to follow-up and find out where the funding for this program came from.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

7.1 Fiscal State of the University - Fall 2022

Q: (Brown) We have been dealing with structural issues, as it relates to funding, has the Cal State Fullerton Administration talk to the Legislature or any other bodies to try to change our funding to make it more equal with the other campuses?

A: (Virjee) In fact, two years ago in conjunction with the budget process, we wrote letters to all our Legislators and all the Chambers in Orange County and asked them to share with the Chancellor's office their concerns on that issue. That's what prompted, I believe, the equalization formula that was created last year.

We had that equalization funding for one year. It was supposed to be a seven-year process to get to equalization. This year they did not fund that equalization formula, so we are pushing with the Chancellors' office to understand why and whether that was a one-time approach or that's because we have a new Chancellor, and they are going to be taking a different approach.

I think all campus funding is in a state of significant flux right now, in light of the decline in both enrollment within the CSU and the budget news that came out of the Legislative Analyst's Office.

Q: (Stambough) What's the chatter about what impact that might have on our system? Is there anything that different collection bodies can do?

A: (Virjee) Prop 98 is statutory, it's the law, that amount of money must go to K-14 so there is no discussion or debate about that. What that means is there is a very small band of the state budget that is in any way discretionary. We are discretionary under the budget for how much they fund us, prisons, and a couple of other things. We end up, whenever there is a shortfall in revenue in Sacramento, bearing the brunt of that. We experienced that during the Great Recession and during the Pandemic, where our budget was cut ten percent. It would not be surprising if our funding is flat or goes down, in light of the fact we are down in enrollment and the state coffers are down. The only thing that is the counter pressure to that is the state compact that we have with the Governor, where the Governor has promised us that he will give us this money year over year, but he also asked for one percent growth.

Q: (Jarvis) What are we doing about earmarks? What are we doing on a campus to establish ways in which we determine what we ask for in terms of earmarks and is PRBC involved in that? With COVID, for the last few years, what have you heard about changes to the GI 2025 goals or the mix of carrots and sticks that will be employed as campuses either fail to reach or reach those goals.

A: (Virjee) Last year was the first time in any recent history where we have been untethered by the Chancellor's office to seek earmarks and it was done fairly dramatically and quickly. There was word from the state that there was a great surplus and the Chancellor's office decided that we could go after earmarks. There were limits on what we could go after, it could only be for one-time money, no ongoing baseline revenue and it could only be for continuing infrastructure support. We had to seek approval from the Chancellor's office for what we were going after, and it had to be approved there first. We were very successful as a campus with earmarks last year, I think we came out on top of any of the 23 campuses with \$67.5 million for the Engineering and Computer Science Innovation Hub, \$89 million for our next phase of low-income, low-cost housing for students. We also received \$5 million for the Asian Language Dual Immersion Program. We received \$2 million for the Center for Healthy Neighborhoods and since we are the anchor campus, we received money for Project Rebound.

The Chancellor's office is thinking about whether to allow us to go after earmarks again, or not. Because as predicted, when you allow campuses to go after money individually, it reduces the money that goes to the system overall and creates relative inequities among the campuses.

On GI 2025, for the first time, we heard the Chancellor's office moderating their expectations with respect to the GI 2025 goals and objectives in light of the Pandemic. With respect to carrots and sticks, there have been no real sticks used with any campuses for GI 2025 since it was put in place, there have only been carrots. So, I don't anticipate any sticks going forward, but I do anticipate they will continue to use GI 2025 funding as a mechanism to motivate campuses towards those goals.

Q: (Bruschke) If a school does not meet its target they still get fully funded, but when Cal State Fullerton over enrolls we are only partially funded for the over enrollment, so that's actually a financial loss to us. So, if enrollment overall is going down and that's hurting the system as a whole, doesn't it make sense to shift some of the FTS out of the campuses that perennially under enrolled to our campus, which perennially over enrolls? Which would be a net win for the system and a net gain for this campus.

A: (Virjee) We are not partially funded at all, we get the tuition, but we don't get any money from the State for over enrollment. There are target enrollments for all campuses and that's what you are funded from the Chancellor's office on. So, if we enroll 100 students, we get paid for 100 students, if we enroll 110 students, we get paid for 100 students and if we enroll 90 students, we get paid for 100 students. Some campuses have been chronically and perennially under enrolled, and they have been paid at target forever and some campuses have been over enrolled, like us and we have been paid at target forever. So, that's part of what creates the inequity and when I mention the word rebenching, that's exactly what we are talking about. We have to recognize that you can't just take the money away from a campus that has been getting it at a certain level, you'll create dramatic deficit spending and structural deficits for those campuses, you've got to create a glide path for that.

Q: (Wood) Given that we are a large campus with a large portion of first-generation college students and underserved students, and we're funded towards the very bottom, if there are cuts across the board, those cuts would hurt our campus and our students more and would be more damaging to the education they get. I'm wondering your thoughts about how we can use that in the discussions when we think about the rebenching that happens and how we address the current situation in a way that doesn't put our students in an even worse position, even more underfunded?

A: (Virjee) The system serves a demographic of students that is dramatically different than the UC or private colleges and universities. So, while we serve a high priority of first-generation college students, so do most CSUs and you would be surprised at how close we are with them. We probably have the largest first-generation population by numbers, because we are the biggest, but as a percentage, there are campuses that have a larger first-generation percentage or a larger Pell percentage than we do. We are towards the top for first-generation, for Pell, and for underserved students. So, when cuts come, every campus is going to say you are hurting our underserved students, our Pell students, our first-generation students, and they will all be right. In the past, when cuts have been made, there has been recognition of that population. The last time we went through cuts, there was a cut to the system at a certain level, every campus took a percentage cut. The campuses with higher Pell populations took a lower cut from the next swap than those with lower populations. The cuts were greater for those campuses that had low Pell populations and we took a lower percentage cut than San Diego, San Luis Obispo, or San Jose who have lower Pell populations than we do. I hope to continue to lobby for that.

- (Wood) It would be nice if another factor in that formula could be where that campus is in the ocean of resources. That would make sense.
- (Virjee) It would make sense for when they give us money for that to be a factor too, and we have been pushing for that. So, when they take it away, what I've told them is when you don't give it to us and then you take it away without considering that you're hitting us twice. That's the argument we had last time.

Q: (Stanley) Can you break out the percent that is loss of Community College feeder students versus first-time freshmen for this campus and the state? Some of my own reading is showing that the community college group are really impacted still by taking care of family members and want more online sections. I don't know if there is a discussion with WASC regarding more targeting of online sections to help enrollment during this remaining illness period.

A: (Virjee) I have not seen system-wide data on this yet. I can tell you where we are as a campus and anecdotally where I hear where other campuses are. Our first-time freshmen applications and yield are up, not down. There are three components to enrollment, first-time freshman, Community College transfers, and retention. Do we retain our students once they get here? Our first-time freshmen are up, our Community College transfer student applications and yield are down, and our retention numbers are down.

The number of students that we keep once they get here, we are losing more students than we normally do and those students that are staying are taking fewer units than they normally do. So, each one of those components has an impact on our enrollment. On the Community College transfer front, what we're seeing is Community College enrollment is down substantially, much more than the CSU. Some community colleges are down 15-35 percent and those students that are there have not come back from the Pandemic to be in person, they are still virtual. The move of our Community College transfer students from virtual learning at the community colleges to in-person learning at or campuses is not robust. We are having to look at and evaluate how we draw more Community College transfer students to come to us.

Q: (Kanel) Is it on your radar to think about the fact that many community colleges are now offering bachelor's degrees? Is that in any way drawing from the Cal States? Also, the fact that the UCs have dropped a lot of their standardized testing for admittance. And my understanding is that the community colleges and the UCs often get more funding than the Cal States. It seems like there's both teamwork collaboration, but perhaps some competition for funding amongst the three levels of our California Higher Education Public System and that's a little bit concerning.

A: (Virjee) Right now community colleges are authorized to offer 30 different bachelor's degrees, they've gone from a pilot program into a full-blown program. Those bachelor's degrees are permitted on a basis where they do not compete with our degrees, they do not offer degrees that we offer. So, if someone wants a particular bachelor's degree, they are going to have to come to us to get it. I don't think we have seen the full impact of that yet because it's so new that most of the community colleges, even though they are authorized to offer those degrees, are not offering them yet. This is going to be another challenge for us. You are also right that there is a paradigm of competition between and among the UCs, us, and the community colleges and AB 928 is a perfect example of that, the aligning of GEs. Right now, as we speak, we are talking to our local community colleges, especially Fullerton, Santa Ana, and Santiago. We are meeting with them and talking about how we can work together and how can we create dual enrollment, dual admission, and create more pathways.

One of the reasons that our Community College transfer population is down is because the UCs are taking more of them because they are experiencing the same enrollment challenges that we are experiencing. The population of college-going students is going down in California and it is projected to go down for the foreseeable future, so all these universities will be competing for the same students. What we have to do is find a way of creating pathways with our community college partners, such that they come to us, rather than go to the UC and recognize that we have a real retention issue that we have to keep a hold of.

Just as the community colleges are competing with us for bachelor's degrees, we are competing with the UC now on some doctor programs. There is legislation going in front of the legislature to create a pilot program with four or five campuses, one of whom is Cal State Fullerton to allow us to provide more doctorate programs. We are also looking at four plus one programs more robustly because it will encourage students to come here. We are looking at new innovative ways to pull students into the CSU and into Cal State Fullerton.

Q: (Perez) What role does the variable of our ARDI efforts play in leveraging the discussion for resources?

Q: (Walsh) It was a surprise to me to hear in the presentation that the CSU is self-insured, that means all 23 campuses have a loss we all chip in. Do we purchase an umbrella for catastrophic excess surplus insurance for the system?

A: (Virjee) We have many layers of excess liability insurance. Each campus is self-insured up to a certain level, then the system provides insurance above that for a certain level and it is become more and more sophisticated as the years go on to the point where there are penalties for campuses who chronically have problems, such they have to absorb a greater amount of a loss than they otherwise would which creates a benefit for those campuses that do well in areas for liability.

7.2 ASD 22-104 Revisions to UPS 211.100 - Appointment of Department Chair and Vice-Chairs

- (Walsh) This document was carried over from the last meeting with two motions on the floor.

[Motion on the floor]

- M/S/ (Kanel/Brown) Motion to approve ASD 22-104 Revisions to UPS 211.100 - Appointment of Department Chair and Vice-Chairs.
 - M/S (Stambough/Graewingholt) Line 37: Motion to restore the wording "or tenure track".

- M/S/P (Kanel/Wood) Motion to move this document into discussion to gain feedback and suggestions, then send the document back to the Faculty Affairs Committee to rework the document with the input from this meeting.
 - The Senate discussed the document and Senator Kanel will take the input back to the Faculty Affairs Committee to assist them with editing the document.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Meyer/Stambough) Meeting adjourned at 12:40 PM.