

# 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

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 Steinhauser

Peter J. Taylor

401 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, California  
90802-4210

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

## Faculty Trustee's Report

### CSU Board of Trustees Meeting – November 19-20, 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 and to the public, 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](mailto: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/csu-system/board-of-trustees/past-meetings/2019/Pages/november-19-20-2019.aspx>

At the November Board of Trustees meeting the most debated and controversial issues were the *Approval of the 2020-2021 Operating Budget Request* (item 3b), the new *Policy on Executive Compensation* (item 6c), and an *Amendment to Title 5 Regarding Admission Requirements: Quantitative Reasoning* (item 10b).

I wish you a successful and rewarding new year, and I trust that jointly we will be able to navigate the many challenges that the CSU will inevitably encounter,

Romey Sabalius

San José, CA – Jan. 18, 2020

# Faculty Trustee's Report

## CSU Board of Trustees Meeting: November 19-20, 2019

On November 19 and 20, 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 November 19, at 8:30 am

1. The **Board of Trustees** met in **Closed Session** to discuss *Executive Personnel Matters* and *Pending Litigation*. The selection process to replace Chancellor White, who announced his pending retirement in October, was discussed.
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 Finance** began with *Public Comments*. Several leaders of the California Faculty Association (CFA) lamented that during the previous and the current fiscal year, funds were not spent as allocated by the legislators, and they demanded accountability and transparency for the \$25 and \$35 million respectively that were earmarked for new tenure-line hires and for the conversion of lecturers to tenure-track positions. Leaders of the CSU Employees Union (CSUEU) called for a re-instatement of salary steps and they cited support from Governor Newsom. They also implored the Board to increase the amount to be requested for next year's compensation pool.
  - a. The committee received by consent the *Systemwide Hate Violence on Campus Report* as an information item. "In the 2018 calendar year there were a total of ten reported incidents of hate violence on five campuses and one reported instance of non-criminal acts of hate violence."
  - b. The committee discussed the *Approval of the 2020-2021 Operating Budget Request* as an action item. Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer, Steve Relyea, and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget, Ryan Storm, presented the revised budget request for the coming academic year (first introduced during the September BoT meeting). Faculty Trustee Sabalius proposed to increase the request for the compensation pool. According to EVC Relyea, the requested \$139.8 million would allow for an average salary increase of approximately 3%. Trustee Sabalius feels that this is not sufficient in times when the state commands a solid budget and during robust economic growth, and he requested to increase the amount by \$69.9m, which would be 50% more. In the context of the CSU's over \$7 billion operating budget, it would only be less than 1% more in expenditures. An extensive discussion ensued,

and although several trustees voiced their desire for fair and competitive salaries for the over 50,000 faculty, staff, and administrators, there was not sufficient support to pass Trustee Sabalius' request.

Student Trustee Juan Garcia reminded the Board that last year, \$15m were asked for Student Basic Needs as one-time funds. The University of California requested the same amount as recurring funds and did receive them. Trustee Garcia proposed to switch the \$15m for Basic Needs Partnerships from the one-time to the on-going request pool. The motion was voted on and it passed with a 2/3 majority.

- c. The committee received the California State University Annual Investment Report as an information item. The CSU investment total stands at \$4.4 billion, allocated to a Liquidity Portfolio (\$3.7b), a Surplus Money Investment Fund (\$156m), and a Total Return Portfolio (\$559m). These investments yielded a gain of 3.12%, 1.97%, and 7.03% respectively. Assistant Vice Chancellor for Financing, Treasury, and Risk Management, Robert Eaton, was pleased to report that from the earnings of the Total Return Portfolio, \$22.4m were distributed to the campuses for deferred maintenance. Trustee McGrory asked whether the CSU could not invest a greater share in the more profitable, but slightly riskier Total Return Portfolio. AVC Eaton explained that the amount that can be allocated to this type of investment is capped by the statutes, but the Chancellor's Office intends to gradually shift funds into the Total Return Portfolio up to the allowed maximum of 30%. Trustee Krinsk asked whether the CSU can pool its investments with the University of California in order to save fees and take advantage of their much larger staff of financial experts. Trustee Taylor would welcome such a partnership because of the UC's greater flexibility in investment options. Yet, it would require a legislative change that may be hard to achieve.
4. **The Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds** came to order and there were no requests for Public Comments.
    - a. The committee approved the 2020-2021 through 2024-2025 Five-Year Capital Plan as an action item. "The Five-Year Capital Plan totals over \$22.1 billion and is comprised of academic, self-support, and infrastructure improvement projects. In keeping with direction provided by the Board of Trustees, project priorities include seismic strengthening, correcting building code deficiencies and failing infrastructure, campus resiliency, and addressing regulatory changes which impact campus facilities or equipment."
    - b. The committee received a status update on the California State University, Sacramento Off-Campus Center in Placer County as an information item. EVC Relyea, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Capital Planning, Design and Construction, Vy San Juan, and Sacramento State President Robert Nelson presented development plans for the center (satellite campus) on 300 acres of donated land approximately 25 miles northeast of Sacramento. The trustees had a variety of questions, mostly related to the interaction with the public Sierra College that is in close proximity. President Nelson reported that Sacramento State already has a strong cooperation with Sierra College, and that the college and the new center plan to establish 2+2 programs on

shared space, in particular a joint Registered Nursing Program. Technical training is also envisioned in cooperation with local industry.

5. **The Joint Committees on Finance and Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds** began with *Public Comments*. Martin Brenner, Vice Chair of Bargaining Unit 9 (CSUEU), pleaded for greater investment in deferred maintenance. Before the CSU builds new buildings, increases enrollment, and offers new programs and services, it should address the dire state of its current facilities, some of which have become unsafe or out of compliance with state regulations.
  - a. The committee received an update on the *San Diego State University, Potential Mission Valley Campus Expansion Status* as an information item. The presentation outlined the purchase agreement of the 135 acre site from the City of San Diego (in compliance with a ballot initiative that passed in 2018) and the envisioned future development. Over time, the multi-billion dollar project could increase enrollment by 15,000 students, will provide a new multi-use football stadium, create research and innovation facilities, establish a variety of public-private partnerships, construct faculty, staff, and student housing, and establish a 34 acre river park. Chair Day closed the session by thanking all participants in this “monumental project that has been years in the making ... which will be transformational for San Diego State and for the entire city and region.”
  
6. **The Committee on University and Faculty Personnel** began with *Public Comments*. Three students spoke against an increase in presidential salaries in light of a recent racial incident on a campus [?], a persisting shortage of mental health counselors, and unmet student basic needs. Five CSUEU leaders bemoaned the inequity when discussing staff salaries versus presidential compensation. They also criticized the Board for not asking for sufficient funds for salaries and benefits in their budget request to the legislators. They pleaded again for salary step increases, which other state employee receive, and again referred to Governor Newsom’s letter in support of solid wages for CSU employees.
  - a. The committee approved by consent the *Annual Report on Outside Employment for Senior Management Employees* as an action item. “In accordance with the California State University Board of Trustees policy on outside employment disclosure requirements, this item presents the outside employment activities of senior management employees that took place during the 2018 calendar year. [...] For purposes of this policy, senior management includes presidents, vice presidents, executive/vice chancellors and the chancellor. [...] The report shows 20 senior management employees with outside employment during the reporting period for the 2018 calendar year.”
  - b. The committee received by consent the *Annual Report on Vice President Compensation, Executive Relocation, and Executive Transition* as an information item. “Current trustee policy requires the chancellor to review and approve recommendations for vice presidential compensation at the initial appointment and subsequently. Additionally, the chancellor is to provide an annual report on vice

president compensation if compensation actions have been taken.” There were a total of “33 vice president compensation actions during the reporting period (September 1, 2018 – August 31, 2019). Additionally, as previously shared with the Board, Chancellor Timothy P. White authorized a three percent compensation pool for eligible unrepresented employees for fiscal year 2019-2020. As a result, vice presidents were eligible for merit salary increases from this compensation pool.”

- c. The committee discussed a Policy on Compensation as an action item. The approved policy stipulates that generally presidential salary increases may be considered when campus leaders undergo their triennial performance review by the trustees. Chancellor White stressed that “any recommendation for salary adjustment will be subject to Board approval during open session.” Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Evelyn Nazario, pointed out that an already existing policy provides the possibility to increase the salary of incoming presidents by up to 10% over that of the incumbent. However, “the Board has not exercised that authority.”

Trustee Faigin, a strong critic of previously proposed compensation policies, expressed his satisfaction that discussions about blanket salary increases based on market compatibility have been replaced by salary adjustments tied to the individual performance of presidents assessed during their periodic review. Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis echoed these sentiments, but she also reminded the Board that every organization has an obligation to keep the salary delta in mind, namely the difference between the highest and the lowest paid employees. In conclusion, several trustees reiterated their wish to examine and reconsider the list of institutions of higher education that are used for comparison with CSU campuses when studies are conducted to determine market competitive salaries.

7. The **Committee on Audit** came to order and there were no requests for Public Comments.

- a. The committee received by consent the Status Report on Current and Follow-up Internal Audit Assignments as an information item. “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 46 completed campus reviews.”
- b. The committee received the Status Report on Consideration of Opportunities for Continued Program Enhancement of the Instructional Control Environment as an information item. Vice Chancellor and Chief Audit Officer, Larry Mandel, spoke about the Quality Assessment Review of the Audit Division. He reiterated that his division received the rating of “generally conforms,” which is the highest of three possible ratings. The peer reviewers made four observations for continued program enhancement. It was suggested that the CSU should have a *Code of Ethics*, and “senior leadership is in the process of developing a systemwide statement on ethical values and expectation.”

Furthermore, it was noted that the CSU does not have a third party *Whistleblower Hotline* to “provide complainants with greater assurance that their identity will be protected and to limit the possibility of retaliation.” A recent Executive Order (EO 1115–September 2018) “revised the procedures for making protected disclosures (whistleblower complaints) and, among other things, allowed third-party and anonymous complaints. The procedure is available to anyone (employees, students, and third parties) wishing to make a verbal or written complaint and applies systemwide to all campuses and the Chancellor’s Office. The identity of complainants is protected. The EO process is accessible and widely used and Systemwide Human Resources is the office responsible for overseeing and administering the whistleblower policy. It is the campuses’ responsibility to adopt and implement the procedures set out in the EO instead of establishing their own procedures. Additionally, the state auditor maintains a whistleblower hotline where complaints pertaining to the CSU may be made.” In light of these two options, “senior leadership has determined that ... there is a sufficient structure in place to ensure that employees or others that suspect or know about fraud or other wrongdoing have a way to report it anonymously.” VC Nazario assured the Board that even anonymous whistleblower complaints are being reviewed, most on the campuses, but some get subsequently elevated to the Chancellor’s Office.

In regards to the *Institutional Compliance Function*, “the CSU has a robust decentralized compliance function in which each disparate area of compliance is managed by specialized subject-matter experts. The compliance function for the system is dispersed throughout the various divisions at the Office of the Chancellor. [...] Additionally, the systemwide internal audit function periodically audits most major compliance functions throughout the system. Senior leadership has determined that there is a sufficient structure in place to ensure that significant compliance areas have adequate systemwide coverage in addition to the campus compliance responsibility.”

Lastly, at the May 2019 Board meeting, the trustees addressed the *Prosecution of Wrongdoing* by approving a resolution “containing guidelines and requirements for referring cases for prosecution.”

8. The **Committee on Committees** came to order and there were no requests for *Public Comments*.
  - a. The committee by consent made *Amendments to Board of Trustees’ Standing Committee Assignment for 2019-2020* as an action item. Out-going Trustee Meléndez de Santa Ana was removed from committee assignments and the first-year Student Trustee (currently Maryana Khames) was added, who by a recently passed law (AB 514) will become a voting member of the Board as of 2020.

The Board adjourned around 5:00 pm and resumed its meeting on November 20 at 8:00 am.

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

10. The **Committee on Educational Policy** began with Public Comments. All 19 speakers opposed a 4<sup>th</sup> year of quantitative reasoning as a CSU admission requirement. They called for more studies and urged the trustees to seek “less discriminatory alternatives.” Several speakers cited teacher shortages and under-resourced schools. Others referenced school districts and organizations that stand in opposition to an additional requirement. Claims were made that “true equity and access to higher level high school classes does not exist.” Furthermore, doubts were raised that an additional quantitative reasoning class would actually better prepare students for college. As in Board meetings before, some speakers claimed that the Chancellor’s Office and the trustees are moving too fast and they called for more deliberation.

- a. The committee approved an Amendment to Title 5 Regarding Student Organizations as an action item. “The proposed Title 5 amendments would align and update CSU policies related to student organizations by conforming the requirement that student organizations cannot discriminate on the basis of any protected class. This amendment would align this section of Title 5 with other CSU policies as defined by federal and state law.” The change to Title 5, Section 41500 will read as follows: “No campus shall recognize any fraternity, sorority, honor society, or other student organization that discriminates on the basis of race or ethnicity (including color and ancestry), religion (or religious creed), nationality, citizenship, age, medical condition, genetic information, gender (or sex), gender identity (including transgender), gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, veteran or military status, or disability. The prohibition on membership policies that discriminate on the basis of gender does not apply to social fraternities or sororities.”
- b. The committee again (for the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting) discussed an Amendment to Title 5 Regarding Admission Requirements: Quantitative Reasoning (a 4<sup>th</sup> high school year of QR) as an information item. Based on many discussions with stakeholders, trustee feedback and concerns, and extensive public comments, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, Loren Blanchard, presented the following improvements to the previous proposal:

- Automated exemption policy
- Seven-year implementation timeline
- Chancellor’s Office steering committee
- Annual presentations to the Board
- Recommending, not requiring, the course in a student’s senior year
- Additional investment to address California’s teacher shortage
- Leveraging student support and enrichment efforts

Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis asked whether this requirement would be more stringent than the requirement for admission to the University of California. Chief of Staff and Senior Advisor to Academic and Student Affairs, Nathan Evans, confirmed that “this would add an additional course;” however, most UC students far exceed the minimum admission requirements. More questions from the Lieutenant

Governor were answered by CO staff. Nonetheless, she came to the conclusion that “these numbers simply do not add up. They do not create a foundation for such a dramatic change. [...] 93% of the students enrolling already have a 4<sup>th</sup> year of quantitative reasoning, and they are graduating in four years at a rate of only 24%. [...] Adding a 4<sup>th</sup> year of quantitative reasoning is not going to impact significantly our graduation rates if 93% of our students are already coming in with a 4<sup>th</sup> year.”

Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis also maintained that no data was presented that proves that a 4<sup>th</sup> year of quantitative reasoning would benefit students in their time to graduation, and that nothing shows that the reason some students graduate late is connected to the lack of such a class. She cautioned that “just because this process has been going on for a long time isn’t an argument to move forward adopting it.” EVC Blanchard urged not to forget that retention rates, especially after the first year of college, are also important. He sees the 4<sup>th</sup> year of quantitative reasoning as an equalizer to provide students of color, first generation students, and students with a financially disadvantaged background a better chance to get into college, to stay in college, and to graduate, and subsequently also to be well-prepared for the demands of the workforce. Still, the Lieutenant Governor maintained that “correlation is not causation,” and that it is not proven that it is not some other factors that contribute to a lack of retention and graduation than the 4<sup>th</sup> year of quantitative reasoning.

Trustee Eisen found it “odd that a proposal to change admission standards would originate from faculty,” and she asked whether “the Academic Senate is favoring this proposal” since some faculty members voiced their criticism during public comment. Nathan Evans explained that historically this is the established process and that also the A-G requirements were developed by faculty. Assistant Vice Chancellor for Educator Preparation and Public School Programs, Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, clarified that the Academic Senate is the official voice of the faculty, and it initiated the process in 2016. Chancellor White added that at its last meeting in November, the Academic Senate passed a resolution to continue support for the proposal.

Trustee Meléndez de Santa Ana suggested to leverage the widespread attention this proposal has garnered to engage in a year-long conversation and cooperation with the K-12 sector to develop strategies that will make an impact.

Trustee Sabalius pointed out that not getting into the CSU does not mean to be excluded from higher education. The California Community Colleges are providers of a higher education as well, and with Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs) and many Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs), seamless pathways have been created to enter the CSU after two years at a community college. These transfer students also have better persistence rates and they graduate at a faster pace than first-time students, because they already have been exposed to the rigor of college classes. Not being admitted to the CSU after high school “is not the end of the educational road.”

Trustee Garcia wishes that the presented data would control for additional variables other than the 4<sup>th</sup> year of quantitative reasoning, such as the socio-economic background of students, the high schools that they graduated from, and by various levels of their GPAs.



Superintendent for Public Instruction, Tony Thurmond, stated that “the trend in our community, in our state is to move away from adding more requirements,” and he wonders “what is the evidence that this course in particular is the one that will improve graduation and retention rates?” James Minor, Assistant Vice Chancellor and Senior Strategist for Academic Success and Inclusive Excellence, replied that many scholarly activities, such as the Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP), student participation in ethnic studies, high-impact practices, service learning, living learning communities, or intensive writing programs for example, are conducive to student success, but that any single academic preparation, assistance, or intervention can never be point-pointed as the only cause for student success. “Name any interventional program in higher education, you will not have causal relationships for these programs and intervention. [...] That level and standard of evidence just does not exist in post-secondary education.”

Superintendent Thurmond inquired about the additional resources provided to help high school students to prepare for enhanced college requirements. He does not believe in “doing more with less or even more with the same.” He wants to see additional resources directed to this effort and wants to make sure “that we are not shifting away from one group in need to help another group in need.” Nathan Evans and Marquita Grenot-Scheyer referenced the enhancement of existing and the creation of new efforts and investments that would be implemented in conjunction with this proposal. EVC Blanchard assured that “the focus is not simply on leveraging, it’s on expanding.”

In response to Trustee Faigin’s question about historic parallels to the creation of the A-G requirements, EVC Blanchard and East Bay President Leroy Morishita confirmed that there were also intensive discussions and strong opposition based on the same concerns about access and student success. Fears that it would adversely impact students of color were also raised and they subsequently proved to be unfounded.

Trustee Khames wondered if school districts “have the appropriate funds to hire new teachers to teach more classes,” even when the CSU will succeed in preparing a sufficient pool to recruit from. Superintendent Thurmond clearly denied that assumption, saying that “California, like most states, is in a crisis when it comes to teacher recruitment, teacher preparation, and ... teacher retention. [...] Our school districts do not have the resources they need to adequately fund teachers in these areas.”

In conclusion of the lengthy debate, Trustee Steinhauser, Superintendent of the Long Beach Unified School District, reported that his low-wealth district (“70% of my students are on free and reduced lunch, a third is on welfare, 87% are minorities, and I have about 5,000 homeless students, and about 800 foster students – so I have all the challenges of urban systems”) succeeded in shifting “from a two-year to a four-year math requirement.” It required a re-direction of funds, but only a surprisingly small amount of new funds (\$150,000). Contrary to fears and expectations, the graduation rates went up, not down, across all student demographics. He acknowledged that “change is hard, change is so hard – this is

adaptive change,” but he pleaded that we “push this across the finish line,” because “this is a huge opportunity for our state to lead the nation.”

- c. A report on *Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities* as an information item was postponed to the next Board meeting due to lack of time.
- d. The committee received an update on the *Graduation Initiative 2025* as an information item. In 2019, the CSU graduated 107,000 students, which is 20,000 more than in 2015, the year before the Graduation Initiative 2025 was implemented.

The 2019 graduation rates compared to 2015 (with the 2025 goals) are as follows:

- 4-year Graduation Rate for First-Time Student: 28% up from 19% (40%)
- 6-year Graduation Rate for First-Time Student: 62% up from 57% (70%)
- 2-year Graduation Rate for Transfer Student: 41% up from 31% (45%)
- 4-year Graduation Rate for Transfer Student: 78% up from 73% (85%)

[The session was interrupted by loud student chants from the gallery. Chair Day adjourned the meeting temporarily and resumed after approximately 10 minutes]

The Pell Equity Gap regrettably increased from 8.6% in 2015 to 10.2% in 2019, and the Underrepresented Students of Color Equity Gap shrank minimally from 11.3% to 11.1% over the same amount of time. [Due to the interruption of the report, this data was not presented during the meeting, but it was part of the printed BoT agenda].

Trustee Khames questioned the lack of improvement in the equity gaps. EVC Blanchard responded that there were “steady increases across the board in graduation rates across ethnic groups” over the past four years. Yet, the campuses need to provide even more support so that the targeted groups cannot only rise equally well, but at a faster rate than the majority student population.

#### 11. The **Committee of the Whole**

- a. conferred the *Title of Trustee Emerita on Thelma Meléndez de Santa Ana*, who is retiring and hence resigned from the Board. In her farewell remarks, Trustee Meléndez de Santa Ana praised the staff at the Chancellor’s Office, the presidents, and the trustees for their passion and dedication in pursuing what is right for our students. After a long career in education at the local, the state, and the national level in the Obama administration, Trustee Meléndez de Santa Ana plans to retire in Albuquerque.

At 11:50 am, the work of the **Committees of the Board** was concluded and Chair Day called the full **Board of Trustees Meeting** to order.

12. The **Board of Trustees Meeting** began with *Public Comments*. Four members of Students for Quality Education (SQE) spoke in opposition to presidential salary increases, in favor of an ethnic studies requirement, and they complained that the trustees (especially the student trustees) left the plenary during their earlier protest from the gallery.

Four CFA members demanded land acknowledgements throughout the CSU system.

Six leaders of the CSUEU pointed out that the Board passed a policy to allow for merit salary increases for campus presidents, but that such increases do not exist for other employees. They hope for a collaborative collective bargaining process and that fair and equitable pay will be provided for all employees and not just for the presidents. They reiterated that other state employees receive salary step increases and that Governor Newsom stated his explicit support for fair wages in the CSU. While they appreciate the CSU's offer to begin a new era of civility and collaboration, they lamented that security technology is being re-purposed to supervise employees.

Seven speakers supported the Teamsters Local 2010, the skilled trades workers union, unit 6. They echoed the request to bring back salary steps, cited the increase in executive pay when the CSU claims that it cannot afford salary steps, and they repeatedly referenced Governor Newsom's letter of support. They criticized the outsourcing of work to non-union laborers and claimed that the CSU built a billion-dollar surplus by over-charging the students and under-paying their workers. They ended their comments with the repeated chant, "CalState, CalState, you're no good, treat your workers like you should."

The last two speakers criticized planned developments on ceremonial land and on the site of an organic garden at Long Beach State.

The Board received the following *Reports*:

- a. The *Chair of the Board of Trustees*, Adam Day, named the trustees who will serve on the search committee for the president at CSU East Bay (McGrory [chair], Eisen, Morales, and Simon). He announced the sale of the state university house, the former residence of the Chancellor, for \$2.5m, which was added to the endowment that fully pays for the Chancellor's housing allowance. Chair Day reported that 35% of California college students are food insecure and 25% of CSU students are eligible for food stamps, but only 5% actually receive it. He pledged that the CSU will continue to develop partnerships with external organizations to make students aware of existing food programs. In this context, he announced the first Intersegmental Basic Needs Summit on Feb. 6 and 7. In conclusion, he thanked Chancellor White for his seven years of extraordinary dedication and service to the CSU and its students.
- b. *Chancellor* Tim White spoke about the raging wild fires in California and related campus closures (Maritime, Humboldt, Sonoma, Channel Islands, and San Bernardino). He talked about the "existential implications of climate change" and about "our responsibility as a state and national leader in teacher preparation ... to provide the educational foundation for the next and future generations of climate literate, environmental champions." Lastly, he commemorated the passing of Heather Cropper, the first lady of the CSU Maritime Academy.
- c. The Chair of the *Academic Senate CSU* (ASCSU), Catherine Nelson, referenced the three resolutions that the senate passed in its meeting during the previous week (support for the 4<sup>th</sup> Year of QR, a call for the development of land acknowledgment

statements, and support for the trustees' budget request with the provision to increase the pool for compensation). Among the first reading resolutions, ASCSU Chair Nelson in particular pointed out the resolution on the implementation of a system-wide ethnic studies graduation requirement.

- d. Michael Wiafe, President of the *California State Student Association* (CSSA), reported on various activities and meetings the CSSA took part in, among them the Young Men of Color Forum, the Graduation Initiative 2025 Symposium, and the Fix-Financial-Aid Campaign. He announced the ratification of a CSSA constitution, explained the association's opposition to the 4<sup>th</sup> year of quantitative reasoning, and announced civic engagement as a priority for the coming year and the organization's quest to increase voter registration and census participation.
- e. Jeremy Addis-Mills, President of the Alumni Association, yielded his speaking time to affect a more timely conclusion of the Board meeting.

The Board moved to approve the resolutions that were previously passed in the various committees. At Trustee Sabalius' request, the *Approval of the 2020-2021 Operating Budget Request* was taken off the consent agenda for further discussion. Trustee Sabalius refrained from making an amendment to increase the request for compensation because it was clear to him that he could not secure a majority of the Board. He did, however, express his disappointment that less money is being requested for compensation than last year, that the requested amount is not on top or above the range of dollars suggested at the Board's September meeting, and that a 3% salary increase is deemed adequate in a booming economy. Accordingly, he voted against the approval.

The Board of Trustees Meeting was officially adjourned on Wednesday, November 20, at 12:55 pm.

The **Board of Trustees** met in **Closed Session** to discuss *Executive Personnel Matters* from 13:00 to 13:30 pm.

*[The Board of Trustees meeting was followed by the third of six listening sessions to gather input on the Chancellor search. The other five sessions took place on CSU campuses across the state (Sacramento, East Bay, Pomona, San Marcos, Fresno). During these open fora, members of the Special Committee (consisting of seven appointed trustees, three ex-officio trustees, and a former trustee as senior advisor) and the Advisory Committee (consisting of seven stakeholder representatives) heard ideas and suggestions from many campus members, but also from the general public]*