

**California State University, Chico**  
Academic Senate  
(530) 898-6201, Zip 020  
MEMORANDUM

**UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE MINUTES**

February 27, 2020, 3:30-5:30, K-207/209

Ferrari welcomed everyone to the meeting which is later in the day than usual at 3:31.

**1. Approve Minutes [December 13, 2019](#).** [2:57-03:14]

Minutes were approved.

**2. [Approve Agenda](#).** [3:15-3:27]

Agenda was approved

**3. [20-21 Budget Update \(Sherman\)](#)** [3:27-14:53]

Sherman wanted to describe the Governor's original proposed budget and some of the assumptions behind it.

[Slide 2] We have a strong economy in California with the fifth largest economy in the world and a low unemployment rate and steady growth. For years, we have talked about contraction of the economy, but so far, we are doing fine.

However, there is uncertainty due to global market instability, the Presidential election in the Fall and other challenges like significant income inequality within our regions and across the state.

[Slide 3] The Governor's focus groups for 2020 include building the reserves and promoting effective government in case of emergencies or disasters. The original reserve target was \$15B (currently we have \$21B). This makes us resilient, but we must remain aware of risk. Two persistent problems include:

- Climate change (wildfires, energy shut-offs, etc.)
- Homelessness (exacerbated by availability and behavioral health system issues). Despite the fact that our mortgage rates are the lowest they have been in 12-15 yrs. -people still cannot get into housing.

The majority of the budget surplus is being spent on one-time money -rather than base-budget increases it is one-time money being spent.

[Slide 4] Colleges and universities must continue to evolve and adapt depending on economic needs. This is hard to predict, but innovation and integration to strengthen occupational pathways for students to move through their education will be important:

- Two years of community college
- Access, student supports, closing achievement gaps

[Slide 5] This shows the CSU Proposed budget and contrasts total funds with ongoing expenses and one-time. The 2020-21 budget has no one-time money budgeted at all yet. This is initial budget put forward in January, and the state is waiting to see what income will be later in the year. Our concerns on this campus are the degree of caveats associated with this money either ongoing or one-time. There is more and more intervention from the State level about how CSU spends its cash.

[Slide 6] This slide presents familiar material about the CSU's impacts -student numbers, number of degrees, regional impacts.

[Slide 7] Chico State has the opportunity to capitalize on two State initiatives:

- Broadband for all -this is very important in the North State (the chart shows how low our percentages are Mbps are)
- Reginal and Continuing Education funding  
Our low Mbps rates seems significant for us when compared with the number of people we have in our region with bachelor's degrees (which is really low). We need to address data gaps (which slow online delivery of video and audio) and our billing rates are more than twice those of LA. Thus, even those with access are paying a lot more, which exacerbates the problems. We need to explore this as we enact our strategic plan to serve the North State.

[Slide 8] Details of Budget (\$199M for operational costs and \$6M in one-time general fund support for degree completion and Extended and Continuing Education)

- Extended and Continuing Education for degree completion with a focus on development of online programs and degree and certificate completion
- Summer Financial Aid suspended through June30, 2023, but might be lifted.
- 2020 Bond Act (March 3 ballot)
  - 5-year affordable student housing goals
  - \$2B to the CSU
  - Deferred maintenance (fire safety, seismic, maintenance)
- Other concepts being examined by workgroups
  - Strategies to mitigate non-tuition (ie. affordable textbooks, etc.)
  - Student loans (address confusion about efficacy of loans, repayment, etc.)
  - Camps food pantries
  - Adjustments to Cal Grant program

Underwood asked if there is funding though GI2021 to help students take summer school courses? Jeni Kitchell said that last summer we spent one-time GI2021 money to give grants for people about to complete their degrees. It was not needs based.

[Slide 9] The next steps are advocacy work probably in April as the budget become finalized by the end of June.

#### 4. Enrollment Update (Kitchell/Baumgartner-Lee) [14:53-1:18:49]

[Slide 2] Jeni Kitchell (Associate Vice President for Budget and Operations) began with an overview of where we are now with enrollment in 2019-20. These are the estimated numbers for the coming year and reflect all student types. (resident, non-resident and graduate students)

- The Headcount for Spring 2020 is approximately 16,165.
- Annualized headcount = 16,662 for this academic year
- Annualized FTES = 15, 665
- Census date was Feb 14<sup>th</sup>  
there is a lot of clean-up that occurs after Census and the final numbers won't be known until March 14

For 19-20 Budget planning, we planned our budget around an estimated FTES of 15,615 made up of resident and non-resident targets. On the campus side we budgeted for 15,250 resident, and 365 non-resident. We are coming in really close to our estimates

This translates to actual revenue from tuition and non-resident fees that we budgeted as \$94,330,000 and our Actual right now is about \$261, 290, short of this. This will move a little before the end of the year. This is just tuition and fees. We still receive state-support for our FTES target of 15,560, or \$140M

[Slide 3] Kitchell wanted to show where these numbers came from and explained the 2019-20 Enrollment Cycle, Modelling and Planning. The Budget cycle is tied directly to the Enrollment cycle as illustrated by the chart. The black numbers are solidified and the red are still projections

- In August we landed with an Annualized FTES of 15,832 based on all the indicators we had. We budgeted around 15,615 to give ourselves a cushion.
- In December we checked in and saw that our annualized FTES was trending slightly lower than we had thought. We were almost 200 students low in the headcount for Fall.
- Today our Annualized FTES estimate is 15,665

[Slide 4] This looks forward to 20-21, and Kaitlyn Baumgartner-Lee (Assistant Vice President for University Advancement) gave an overview of the process of making these estimates.

She noted that it is general knowledge that higher education enrollment is starting to shift nationally and within California. We do not know how other critical incidents like the Camp Fire may have impacted Chico. While California has a significant number of residents, other states are digging in with recruitment packages.

Chico is down on our applications 11% and the CSU as a whole is down 7%. Bakersfield was the only campus that saw an increase in first time freshmen. These numbers reference first-time freshmen and transfers. We are still open for enrollment and there may be an extended period into April.

That said, we have had over 18,000 new students apply. This is a result of accelerated activity to reach out electronically and at events.

Kitchell reported that the expectation is that the resident FTES target will remain flat with tuition revenue estimates at \$5,800 per FTES, and non-residents at \$7,750 per FTES.

Ford observed that the last slide estimated revenue per FTES, not headcount. He asked if a student load counter of some kind was being used? Kitchell said it was based on historical averages which are slightly less than 14.1. She said she liked to use FTES because it was comparable to the funded FTES. This is blending of different kinds of fees that folks are paying for simplicity.

[Slide 5] This shows a graphic to visualize all the factors going into enrollment planning to get to the numbers portrayed on the previous slide. It demonstrates that the numbers are continually moving until we get to an enrollment plan.

Baumgartner-Lee noted that GI2021 contributes to the challenges of trying to work on the input output rates as they are not always made up of new students. Kitchell pointed out that gaps marking decline create a ripple effect on the next period of inputs, and it can take time to recover from them.

[Slide 6] This depicts what preliminary planning is looking like for 20-21 with a listing of assumptions:

- 73% fall continuation rate
- 88% spring continuation rate
- 4,040 new student mix
- 14% yield for FTF (first-time freshmen) admits

The way we come up with these numbers is complicated because there are many factors:

- looking forward
- looking back at historical trends that we have experienced.
- Other changing factors (like GI2021)

Here are some of the ways this is calculated:

- The spring to fall continuation rate that we just experienced last year was 73.5%.
- We are also graduating more students, which is a good thing, but we have to account for that here
- the new student mix is based on the current application tool that Baumgartner-Lee described, as well as our prior enrollment trends within admitted students.
- The applicant yield estimated of 14% is based on fall 2019 yield as well as system-wide trends that we just described.

During the last cycle, last year we had been experiencing about 17% yield. (of the first-time freshman we admitted, 17% were coming here). In the fall 2019 cycle, our yield dropped significantly down closer to that 14%. Although the Camp Fire had impact, these were system-wide trends and so it seems reasonable to plan around the 14% yield for now.

We also realized that the typical mix of new students which had been about 60% first-time freshmen with 40% transfers from two-year community colleges, will shift as time goes on. The

community college system feeds into our system, but they are also experiencing declining enrollment. This will require our continued monitoring and also research about new strategies for enrollment outreach.

Of the 18,000 new admits over 16,000 were first-time freshmen and 2,000 were transfers, but the latter are still in review.

Sherman noted that rules have changed, and colleges can continue to recruit students after they have declared including while they are enrolled. This is an example of how historical assumptions may not guide us.

Kitchell added that the graduate credential population is still very difficult to evaluate because enrollment is still open. All these are preliminary numbers on this page.

[Slide 7] This is the estimate for 20-21 for preliminary planning. This is assuming the 73% fall continuation headcount which includes graduating students. The planning model calculates a Spring 2020 Census headcount by combining continuing and new entering students. It concludes with an annualized FTES of 14,527 which is a % 7.0 decline from last year.

[Slide 8] What's Next?

Baumgartner-Lee noted that when we have a collective call for action there is a collective response. Through the intentional development of a strategic enrollment management plan, we will create a robust retention strategy. Enrollment management will work to decrease the mystery behind enrollment so that we can all engage in parts of the process (as for example, how do we work on the intent to enroll to increase student numbers and also decrease “summer melt”?).

We want to create actionable toolkits for specific cycles of the enrollment process that can help people throughout the University to participate. Enrollment management will continue to learn about these trends within each cycle and analyze how we can plan ahead to meet them.

[Slide 9] This effort will include new activities:

- New pre- and post-orientation engagement activities for incoming classes.  
The plan is to engage students earlier on afterwards so that orientation is not just one day and the week before school starts.
- Removing fiscal barriers to increase orientation attendance  
This is building on efforts of the Graduation Initiative team
- Enhanced marketing and communication campaigns (bilingual)  
We need coordinated efforts and the institutional layering of communication -colleges, programs, etc.
- Increased communication across student services units and academic colleges

[Slide 10] Retention and Student Success

The last couple years our continuation rate has been steadily declining. It is less expensive to retain students than to recruit them initially. Here are some of our new activities:

- pilot course for probationary students to support their persistence to the second year
- showcase for multiple academic departments to illustrate how students who start in pre-nursing, still have many other destination majors on our campus. We can create a scaffolding mechanism to help students find the major that is appropriate for them.
- Activities addressing the classroom and support services for Underserved Students. We can try to coordinate movement through a multi-year cycle and invest in key-personnel to support these efforts.

Kitchell returned to [Slide 7] charting projected 20-21 declines. Walking through the preliminary numbers shows a decline of approximately 1,000-1,100 FTES. This is estimated at \$5,800 per FTES, that is a \$6.3 million decline to our operating budget next year.

In the current year, we did reduce our enrollment for 19-20 so, we already experienced this slightly this year, and we made some adjustments. We are operating under a smaller tuition and fee budget this year. This is a significant decrease.

Baumgartner-Lee observed that there is much to the art and science of enrollment management, but census in August will tell us more. We will be continuing collective meetings to identify what we will be doing and what needs urgent attention.

Kitchell noted that because our system-wide allocation responds to the state budget cycle, it does not exactly align with our own enrollment cycle. We will have to make some decisions about our budget well before August and students start to show up. So, we will continue to monitor this data and decide some dates when our budget amounts will need to go forward.

She explained that we had thought that our enrollment was going to be around 15,800. It now seems necessary to budget closer to 15,600. Because we always want to be conservative with a little bit of cushion and budget blow this figure, we will continue to refine this lower number and budget in case other factors come into play that we could not predict. So, right now, we did his TBD and that is what we are going to refine and look at over the next couple of months.

Jeff Bell (Biology) wondered about the 2,200 First-time Freshmen and 1,350 Transfers assumption, because it is based on the fact that we have increased applications in the last few years and raised the bar about who we are taking. What if we lowered the bar down to the 2950 Index, could we then get more transfers?

Baumgartner-Lee said there is ongoing consultation with Cabinet and the Enrollment Management Advisory committee working through our expert guidance in admissions, to know when to lower that index based on understanding the depth of the pool. Barbara Fortin anticipated this six months ago and that may be our reality eventually, but this cycle, at this point in time, we have moved to the 3100 index and will continue to think about this, so that we can be agile,

The index is an assessment of high school 11th grade college prep course work combined with their SAT or ACT test scores. There is a formula that is used for CSU's that takes the academic GPA times eight combined with their SAT or ACT score. This score is considered as we work down the other assessment categories and consider what's happening in grad schools and other information. At this point in time in the cycle, there's still a lot of moving parts, but we are definitely being more aggressive and more proactive since the Camp Fire happened to maximize the pool.

This downturn caught us by surprise as our indicators were all up: housing, orientation, and intent-to-enrolls were up, but we did not get the final bump in May because other campuses panicked and admitted off their wait-lists and things got a little crazy. We have a different eye now, and we will have a better than ever "Choose Chico" event and remain as active as possible in other ways.

Ford wondered if University Advancement could write a check to back-fill our gap? Larson noted that most of the gifts we get are donor gifts to projects that they want to support. The only flexible money we get is in the annual fund that is unrestricted, but she thought all unrestricted funds were already allocated (like to the Math department). Kitchell reiterate this and observed that the amount of funding that was flexible was not on the same scale as our need. Most of the funds are endowed and the interest supports awards and grants, but the principle is not moved.

Ford asked if the larger restricted funds could be used to backfill some of the things we would normally fill with general funds in the way departments manage their funds. Claire said the from money that self-support programs are generating in the colleges, a certain amount goes back to the general fund for cost reimbursement and a certain amount of revenue sharing. Larson emphasized that the funds are being generated through self-support. We can help ourselves by participating more broadly in self-support programs.

Sherman pointed out that some of those restricted funds come from our student numbers and all those fees, so that an enrollment downturn is a double whammy.

Allen asked about the recruitment and admissions strategies and whether the University has thought about linking admission to post-baccalaureate students? She noted that that used to be available, but at some point, it was discontinued. She said she received inquiries from students who want to go into certificate programs and though she know that were not eligible for admission, but they could contribute.

Baumgartner-Lee said that there are many decisions we made in the past about enrollment management that we can rethink now. Ferrari assumed these kinds of questions would be part of the review that Hutchinson has asked for.

Boyd said that many in agriculture are interested in getting something like this or a second degree or a double major, but they are currently being advised not to do this because of the Graduation Initiative. Maybe we could report on these students in a different way that does not hurt us in these measurements.



[Slide 11] future plans include:

- Finalize the search for the AVP of Enrollment Management
- Have an overall review of Enrollment Management (by AACRO)  
This will help us identify what is going well, whether we need growth and ways to improve and strategies to adopt. This will begin in April.

Wyrick thought we should be thinking about what the brand of Chico State is from the perspective of ourselves and students who are looking at us and comparing us with others in the system and the area. Baumgartner said it is the ideal time to develop a strategic enrollment management plan that is tied to the University Strategic plan and will impact cross-divisional efforts. She elaborated on the need to move this way, but also respond to immediate pressures and develop our agility to promote the Chico Experience. This is more critical now and needs to be robust and comprehensive.

Kitchell covered the last bullet

- Develop multi-year enrollment and budget projections

She said this is an attempt to be comprehensive about budget, enrollment, and everything. It is extremely complex because there are many moving parts, but we need to start making plans in advance.

[Slide 12] is a list of enrollment milestones ahead in the year in March and through July. She knew many of us would be participating and there is more detail as well.

Baumgartner-Lee clarified some of the context of the move toward writing the Enrollment Strategic Plan. She said while the University Strategic Plan is being written before the new VP of Enrollment Management arrives and AACRO does their evaluation, this unit will work on retention planning and other activities.

Wyrick thought Enrollment Management would do a fine job as usual, he wanted to address larger questions like what students are thinking of Chico State, and what we think it should be. Baumgartner-Lee said that surveys were being done and other activity -Enrollment Management needs to work on creating roles for faculty and others to participate.

Ferrari said that the conversations were moving out of EMAC and Enrollment management to become general conversations about our mission and everybody's part in it. Diana Dwyre, Chair of EMAC said we need to market ourselves, and have a campaign for Chico State. Instead of putting out fires, we need to get ahead of things, (ie. social media misinformation about the expenses of living here, or the lack of safety). Baumgartner-Lee thought we should communicate more internally so that we can move together. Sistrunk believed that describing the challenges of modern living lie racism did not need to be negative, because we can identify how we are meeting these to solve problems.

Kate McCarthy (Dean of Undergraduate Education) thought a reframing of the Graduation Initiative would be useful. It is not about pushing students out, it is a retention program. If



student want to compete a double major, they should do it. We can solve our graduation initiative problems by retention activities.

Sharon Barrios (Dean of Graduate Education) thought it would be important to encourage our undergraduates to go on to graduate school to extend their education and possibilities.

Ford noted that we have more room on this campus than what we are currently projecting. We also have room in our index because we are currently accepting 85% of students who come from outside our service area (at 3100 index) where the minimum allowed is 2950. We have room and need, why are we not going down to the 2950 now? He said that can impact retention as students leave more, but we can serve the state of California.

Baumgartner-Lee said that we are still going through the applicant pools and may adjust the index number if the leadership on this campus decides to. It is an active ongoing discussion.

Ford noted that all these projections are based on a 14% yield, but just a few years ago it was 17+%.

Since this seems to be a discussion that many have questions about and want to participate in because it is addressing one of our number-one concerns, Ferrari thought maybe we can have a larger EMAC meeting in a larger room to make this an institutional conversation and bring everyone together.

##### **5. Budget Oversight (Kitchell/Larson) [1:18:49-1:45:31]**

- **Planning and Reporting**
- **Academic Affairs Mid-year Budget Review**

Kitchell passed out three paper copies of the Quarterly Budget Summer of Academic Affairs (G1006: Unit Detail; and 485: Other Funds; and IRA) with more detail than the power-point.

##### [Slide 2] Budget Oversight: Planning and Reporting

Kitchell noted that she shared at the last UBC meeting the efforts to shift the way we are doing budget planning and overseeing the budget. A plan was made and milestones listed to implement it.

##### Milestones

A University-wide position review was completed in Nov 2019. All of the colleges, departments and support units in Academic Affairs evaluated their budget and spread their budgets based on category (as we discussed in Dec 2019). This effort continued until January and February and the focus today will be the work of developing standard reporting template to prepare for preliminary 20/21 budget development.

She pointed out that the quarterly reports shared show how the units are leveraging this work. Having consistent budgets across the system will powerfully augment our planning.

Strategies we are following to make this happen include:

- Utilize Technology

- Consistent reports not only in divisions but throughout the University
- Leverage Plans and Reports to make Informed Decisions  
She said probably everyone in this room is faced with making decisions about expending funds, what should be invested in, and to what degree. This allows more evaluation before decisions are made.

Kitchell referred to handout number 1 the Unit Detail -Academic Affairs. It has all the units in the division by category. This report is through December 31 -50% of the year. This represents a lot of work.

A CSU system-wide Budget Oversight Policy has been promulgated and requires the VP of every division to meet four times a year and go over their budget with the CFO. The spending to date is assessed and projections through the end of the year are made. The intention of this is to identify errors early and take action, if needed. It creates more awareness for the CFO and the divisions.

[Slide 3] shows Academic Affairs Mid-Year Budget Review.

Larson made some higher-level comments. This is the data as of December 31. A lot has happened in the two months since this. The data helps us identify where we are at now, but the final word will be June 30. The data gives us the capacity to think about what we can do to buy time and create strategy and tactics to manage the implications of a downward drop in enrollment.

[Slide 4] is a hard to read roll-up of the division. Larson reminded everyone that our division has had a habit of deficit spending. This report shows us that we have been managing within our allocation in a responsible and deliberate way. We are living within our budget. At half-way through the academic year we had spent a little less than half of our allocation. This is exactly what we should be doing. Congratulations to everyone!

Not only are we living within our allocation, but our units are creating carry-forward that in some cases are pretty substantial. In December 31, we were projecting for the division about \$4.4M in carry forward. This gives us breathing room to start to address these strategic challenges.

[Slide 5] Kitchell swiftly gave an overview. The division report is broken into a hierarchy like the division structure. The past years spending actuals are noted in the first column. The next three columns are the budget -starting with the base, the adjustments are one-time issues that come in (carry-over, CO grants, little buckets and funds that can be transferred within among ourselves and then the total budget: \$69,906,518. The next column are the actual things we are spending, encumbrances are purchase orders that are out there that we have committed to, and then the available budget funds left: \$89,982,222. We have spent 44% of the annual budget.

The Budget Office then makes projected estimates for the rest of the year. We also estimate what percentage of the budget will be used and whether there should be adjustments. As the

Provost mentioned, we foresee a surplus. This process has been developing over the last few years, and she anticipates that we will get better at this.

Larson noted that the carry-over column will allow us to mitigate the impacts of the deficit. This is the yellow column showing different colleges with different balances. Larson said as it became clear that enrollment was declining, she told the deans not to spend any more of their money on important and interesting projects in their colleges. If the funds had not been encumbered, the projects stopped.

Boyd wondered how this would influence enrollment expectations in courses -would this be left to the colleges and departments. Doesn't this impact scheduling down the road? Larson answered that we are working with a fairly gross understanding. We know the gap is coming, but we don't know how big it is. A 7% budget hit and the 1000 reduction in FTES will directly impact the percentages in your college. She hoped that all chairs and their Deans would begin to start thinking about financial impacts.

Boyd asked how we are managing the faculty searches currently underway. Larson said these are moving forward now because we have some carry-over. Next year she cannot make predictions. We will have to do some hard work about curriculum.

Sherman thought we had 18 months to get ready. We will have the summer. We have time to get ready, but we will need to move when it is time.

[Slide 6] Kitchell said this information shows that spending in Academic Affairs is flat. Larson noted that if nothing changes the division will have to absorb a \$4.5M deficit. Though our spending has been stable, the loss of Enrollment income will be significant.

Kitchell said that benefits are managed centrally and they are not shown in this academic Affairs budget. It is interesting to see how these continue to change things because they are increasing.

[Slide 7] shows the varied fees and funds that make of the budget of Academic Affairs. They are from the CO or student fees, but they have a definite purpose. The finer details are found on the handout #2 (485 Other Funds)

Details are also found in handout #3 (IRA funds) and on the back (Lottery funds).

Ford noted that 47% of the budget has been spent. In the Fall enrollment planning, we have more enrollment and more FTES offered, there is more teaching in the Fall than in the Spring. The expectation is that the cost of instruction will be less in the Spring. If spending continues in a linear fashion, he estimates that we will be in even better shape at the end of the fiscal year.

Larson said we have overestimated the benefits cost and she knew some lecturers are being given more entitlement. There might be close to \$2M from benefits savings to help as well. She said the division has a plan to mitigate some expenses, but we will really need to hunker down because we can not recover overnight.

- 6. Ethnic Studies Requirement Implementation (Boyd/Ford/Grassian) [1:45:32-2:00:38]**
- [Draft Campus Response \(2/25\)](#)
  - [AB 1460 \(third reading\): California State University: graduation requirement: Ethnic Studies](#)

Ferrari explained that this was a consideration of the Ethnic Studies Requirement especially about its financial ramifications. This has been discussed in the Standing committees and in the Senate. The bill AB 1460 is being considered by the legislature. The ASCSU has written a resolution in response and the CO has asked campus Presidents to respond to their resolution.

The draft of the joint ASCSU and CO feedback form is enclosed. The students are not sending a separate draft, so the response from our campus will be from the academic senate and our administrators. The state-wide senators requested that this be considered by UBC as the measure may have significant financial ramifications.

Boyd hoped members had looked at the draft response as it is due tomorrow. She invited comments and also drew attention to the last section of the response form which is an estimation of our campus' ability to meet this requirement. This bill has also been analyzed for its potential fiscal impacts. It was believed that the expense would be \$16.5M each year for this requirement. They assume 53% of students have not taken the course and that there will be administrative costs of as well as one-time costs of \$1.5M to review the associate degree for transfer pathways. The total costs would be about \$18M per year. If this results in a lower division requirement that the CO posited, this would add some \$4.5M which includes the costs to the community colleges to develop curriculum and hire faculty.

The ASCSU created a separate resolution that would become part of a different process from a recommendation of the ASCSU to the CO who would take it to the Board of Trustees who could try to change the education code. This response is not about the bill, but the ASCSU suggestions of a requirement to the CO.

Boyd thought this was an attempt to have a faculty led process and not a top down legislative one. She invited Ford and Grassian to add comments.

Grassian note that the form provided three alternative ways to approach the question of an Ethnic Studies requirement. We wanted to frontload the determination that our campus would make the decision about how to implement this. If this option was chosen, it would have moderate financial impacts here. If we chose the ASCSU approach with a number of SLOs required, this would have a medium impact and if we chose the alternative proposed by the legislations that 4 specific ethnic groups be studied, this would have the largest financial impact.

Boyd did not believe there would be an \$8M impact with the current ASCSU resolution because it is designed as an overlay (or what we call a double-count) course to augment our current GE. We still think there is potential financial impact regardless.

Kitchell asked what Boyd thought the potential costs were. Boyd thought course development to match the learning outcomes defined in the ASCSU resolution. It would impact workflow to incorporate both the lower and upper division SLO's. It may have impact on the community

colleges, though they already have this requirement to offer a course in Ethnic Studies. There would have to be some kind of articulation agreement about it.

Sistrunk thought the form response about financial impacts was sort of dreamy. We have not passed anything ourselves, there is no definition of what we would do, nor even roughing out what we already have. He knew it was political that we don't want legislators stating the obvious about certain kinds of history that has been neglected for decades in the United States. He did not know what kind of clarification he could offer about the response form today.

Ford said this is a heads up for everyone. We don't know exactly what the decision will be but will be made soon. If AB1460 is passed, that will be the way we are going. But this is a heads up that this will be a fairly major expense for the campus.

Baumgartner couldn't remember when we had an Ethnic Studies Non-Western requirement. It might have been before the Global Cultures requirement. Was there analysis about what happened when we did that?

**7. Other** [2:00:39-2:00:44]

None.

**8. Announcements** (2:00:44-2:01:19)

- Ford reported that he had just received news that the Graduation Initiative requirement for the CSUs to graduate 1M student on time is going well since we are ahead of schedule,

**9. Adjourn** [2:01:19]

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary

**General Resources for Background:**

**State of California, Department of Finance:**

[http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/BUD\\_DOCS/Bud\\_link.htm](http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/BUD_DOCS/Bud_link.htm)

**State of California, Legislative Analyst's Office:** <http://www.lao.ca.gov/>

**CSU System:** <http://www.calstate.edu/budget/>

**CSU, Chico:** <http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/planning/resourceallocation/index.shtml>

**CSU, Chico:** <http://www.csuchico.edu/bud/budgetplans/index.shtml>

**OpenGov:** <https://csuchicoca.opengov.com>