

We appreciate the Senate very much for providing an additional venue to collect feedback and questions regarding our admission proposal.

### **Consultation**

We identified the persistent surge in local freshmen after the Fall 2017 admissions cycle. At roughly the same time, the CSU engaged in an eligibility study that demonstrated that the CSU was serving significantly more than the 33% of high school graduates dictated by the master plan. The CSU now serves closer to 40% of the state's college-eligible graduates, and this largely explains the unfunded enrollment on certain campuses. The Legislative Analyst's Office concluded that the CSU should "adjust its admission requirements accordingly." There was discussion about addressing the unfunded enrollment statewide, potentially with a system-wide increase in the Eligibility Index. After the census in Fall 2018, we confirmed that the local freshman surge had continued and that CSU unfunded enrollment would not be addressed by a statewide adjustment to CSU minimum admission requirements.

We immediately began discussions about the unfunded enrollment across the university, beginning with the Senate on October 28, 2018, during our annual budget presentation. The challenge was discussed with the Enrollment Implementation Committee and our high school and community counselor colleagues in October. We also met with senior leadership from the Chancellor's Office to review enrollment demands in LA, to advocate for enrollment funding for Cal State LA, and to explore any options that might mitigate this situation. We explored the limited options provided under CSU policy and reviewed what other CSU campuses have done. The proposal we drafted ultimately reflected these discussions and concerns department chairs, faculty, and students consistently express about the lack of tenure-track faculty and advisors and the alarming impact that the reduction in transfer students is having on many departments.

Shortly thereafter, we commenced meetings with broader audiences: GO Program Office; CLUA Officers; Academic Affairs Leadership Team; Ethnic Studies Faculty, Chicana(o)/Latino(a) University Association (CLUA), Black Faculty and Staff Caucus, and the Asian/Asian-American Studies (AAAS) Advisory Committee. We tried to meet with as many groups as possible between the week after Thanksgiving break and the end of the term. As soon as we returned, we continued to meet with many different groups before the official period of consultation began February 1. In January, we met with Department Chairs; Staff; Senate Executive Committee; Academic Senate; Student Affairs Directors; Advancement Directors, and Administration and Finance Directors; and colleagues from CSUDH and CSUN. President Covino consulted with the Foundation Board of Governors which includes faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community members. We also met with dozens of colleagues from our local community colleges. The president met with the LACCD chancellor, as well as presidents from our local feeder community colleges. The provost hosted a meeting with vice presidents and directors of student services from several of our local community colleges. A meeting with LAUSD was delayed but did take place recently.

During the formal consultation period, we posted a very detailed website with a public comment form. Quarter-page ads were run in local papers the week of February 4. Direct communications were sent to local community colleges and high schools. A link to the website is prominently displayed on the Cal State LA homepage. We held three public meetings at two community colleges and on campus. The president shared the information at Spring Convocation, and the provost focused on it in her February *Provost's Message* with a link to the website. Information about the enrollment proposal and a link to

the website were also published in February in the university's *Insider* newsletter sent to faculty and staff. In addition, the provost met with ASI leadership, explaining details of the proposed admission plan. To further inform students, we published multiple posts on our social media platforms, providing public hearing information and links to the website and public comment webpage. We have continued meetings with campus groups, including the Educational Policy Committee.

The timeline for all this is driven by state law and CSU regulations. The CSU required that the initial proposal be submitted by January 7, 2019, hence why we scheduled as many meetings as we could between Thanksgiving and the beginning of winter break. State law requires an official consultation period in February, and the CSU requires that the final proposal be submitted by March 15, 2019. We are now reviewing all of the comments we received and heard. We have been particularly struck by the comments shared at the Cal State LA public meeting, many of which were echoed at Senate on February 26.

### **Moratorium, Impaction and Implementation**

The financial impact of a one-year moratorium on submitting the proposal would be minimal, but the human impact significant. Even maintaining our current enrollment would require that we reduce the incoming transfer class as the number of local eligible freshman continues to grow (our initial review of Fall 19 local freshman applicants indicates further growth). The only way to preserve access for transfer students is to manage freshman enrollment. It would also mean that we continue to lack the funds to provide students with the services, faculty and staff they deserve. Current faculty and staff concerns about the volume of students and the work required to serve them would grow. Student complaints about access to classes and advisors persist despite the best efforts of department chairs and Associate Deans, and complaints about parking and facilities continue to escalate—all of this would be exacerbated by additional unfunded enrollment growth.

The university simply does not have the recurring general fund dollars to support 28,000 students. We currently have more than 5,000 individual students for whom we do not receive state funding. While the university is not in a deficit, we cannot provide the faculty, staff and services that students require without additional base state funding. Many of the students' stories we heard demonstrated both the value of access to Cal State LA and concerns about lack of services. We heard clearly the need for tenure-line faculty, psychological counselors, academic advisors and support staff, and services to address food and housing insecurities, among other needs. Without state funding for more of our students, we cannot meet these needs well.

Our proposal asks only for permission to use more admission criteria to control enrollment. It does not dictate how or when we would use that authority. We are taking very seriously the concerns about the need for greater consultation. We will work very closely with departments and colleges in exercising this authority, if approved. We also recommend the creation of a shared-governance committee to advise the president on enrollment. This committee, composed of elected faculty, students and administrators, would review admission criteria and enrollment data annually and advise the president on enrollment to ensure transparency and consultation. This would include close review of any admission criteria. While the Eligibility Index does include standardized test scores, it heavily weights the GPA. We are also asking permission to use multiple measures such as high school coursework and grades that could reduce the reliance on test scores, just as our use of coursework reduces the reliance on overall GPA for transfer students.

Our goal is to reduce our enrollment as little as possible. We are working hard to advocate for enrollment funding for Cal State LA, and many across the state are working hard to get 5% enrollment growth for the CSU. We can serve a good number of unfunded students, just not the overwhelming number we currently have. The governor's budget allows for 2% enrollment growth funding—about 360 additional funded students at Cal State LA. The 5% requested by the Chancellor's Office would allow for 900. Two or three years of that kind of funding and increased 2- and 4-year graduation rates would allow us to maintain access or even increase it. As funding allows, this proposal would allow for enrollment growth, too. This would not be a permanent reduction.

Unlike other CSU enrollment proposals, ours gives local students, both freshmen and transfers, a very explicit guarantee. Every June, admission criteria will be published on the web. Local students who meet the minimum published criteria are guaranteed admission. We will work with departments and colleges to ensure that these criteria do not vary widely from year-to-year. This will guarantee that Cal State LA continues to serve local students first and foremost. Non-local students will be ranked and offered admission on a space available basis. We have modeled the impact of an increase in the eligibility index on the Fall 2020 class and have determined that there would be almost no change in the [demographics of the freshman class](#).

### **Budget/Fiscal Queries**

All CSU residential facilities are self-supporting. General fund dollars are never redirected from instruction for residential facilities.

University budget processes and details are posted on the university's [website](#). The provost's office presents the Academic Affairs budget to the Academic Senate annually. Vice President Lisa Chavez presents the university's budget to the Senate annually, as well. Academic Senate presentations can be found [here](#). This year, 85% of our Academic Affairs budget was allocated to the colleges and instruction. We would be very happy to return to Senate to present additional details about the Academic Affairs budget. The provost also meets annually with the Fiscal Policy Committee, and two faculty members serve on the university's Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (RAAC) that meets every spring to make recommendations to the president for the following year's budget.

### **Community College Capacity and Partnerships**

Historically, the CSU and California Community College systems have been models of access, but neither were models of attainment. Much has changed in the last ten years. Colleagues at PCC and ELAC, our two largest feeders, shared some impressive results with us recently. They have received additional funding for enrollment growth and student success and have the capacity to serve additional collegebound students:

- PCC is rated #1 in Southern California for awarding the Associate Degree for Transfer. Forty-one percent of their students transfer to 4-year universities and almost half of them to the CSU. They send their largest number of transfer students to Cal State LA.
- ELAC has seen a dramatic improvement in the awarding of Associate Degree for Transfer. In 2012, they awarded only 26; in 2018, they awarded 873. In 2007, they were rated 27<sup>th</sup> among community colleges for transfer, transferring only 780 students. In 2017, they were ranked 7<sup>th</sup> and transferred over 1200 students.

Like our own community, our CC colleagues are uncomfortable with any restriction in access to higher education. But at a meeting with local vice presidents and transfer center directors, they expressed enthusiasm for welcoming more students and working diligently to ensure their successful transfer to Cal State LA. We will work with them to ensure that students who start at one of our local community colleges get a positive message and the support they need for timely admission to Cal State LA as transfer students (again, these students will have a local guarantee for admission as upper-division students).

### **Timeline**

As noted above, the timeline is driven by state law and CSU policy. It was included in campus presentations.

- January 7, 2019:
  - Notification to CO with preliminary Fall 2020 admission plan
- January – February, 2019 ○ Additional campus and partner consultation
  - Public hearings, press announcements, and community consultation
- March 2019 ○ Public comments posted on enrollment website
  - Review of public comments and all feedback; refine plan ○
- Final admission plan submitted to CO by March 15, 2019 ➤ April – May:
  - Admission Plan response from CSU ○ Provost's Office works with Colleges and Departments to set major specific criteria for Fall 2020 ○ June 1, 2019: Fall 2020 criteria published on website

## Additional Concerns

### Another CSU?

The governor's budget allocates \$2M to study if there is need for another CSU in Stockton. This would not alleviate our unfunded enrollment.

### Local/Service Areas

Our current local/service area is the smallest we are allowed, we can neither shrink it nor expand it. We are urging the CSU to initiate a process to review and redraw these lines.

### Black Student Enrollment

We are all deeply concerned about the enrollment of Black students at Cal State LA. While only 2% of our Fall 18 freshman class identified as Black, the overall numbers while still a cause for concern are healthier than 2%. Institutional Effectiveness data on all Cal State LA Black students, including those who identify as Black and those who identify as Black and another race or ethnicity, yields some interesting information.

Student Level	Term	Total	Black Students	Proportion of Black Students
Undergrad	fall 2014	20668	1247	6.0%
Undergrad	fall 2015	23439	1466	6.3%
Undergrad	fall 2016	24059	1435	6.0%
Undergrad	fall 2017	24629	1354	5.5%
Undergrad	fall 2018	24002	1191	5.0%
Graduate	fall 2014	3820	226	5.9%
Graduate	fall 2015	4242	259	6.1%
Graduate	fall 2016	3768	229	6.1%
Graduate	fall 2017	3624	255	7.0%
Graduate	fall 2018	3683	269	7.3%
Total	fall 2014	24488	1473	6.0%
Total	fall 2015	27681	1725	6.2%
Total	fall 2016	27827	1664	6.0%
Total	fall 2017	28253	1609	5.7%
Total	fall 2018	27685	1460	5.3%

While the proportion of Black students as a percentage of our total enrollment has declined (6% to 5.3%), the decline in headcount has been more modest. And the outlook for Black graduate students is very positive. While our graduate population has declined, our number of Black graduate students has increased, as has their proportion of graduate enrollment (5.9% to 7.3%).

We can and will do a better job of recruiting Black undergraduates. The enrollment proposal includes the creation of an Alternative Admissions Program. The Office of Equity & Diversity is building capacity

to create much stronger pipeline programs for local Black students, and University Outreach is currently launching targeted and customized recruitment activities to increase the yield of local Black admitted students.