



Chicanx Latinx University Association

Statement of Clarification Regarding Consultation

Dear CLUAistas, Cal State LA Students, Faculty, and Staff:

We are writing to preempt and/or clarify any potential misunderstanding or interpretation of the CLUA Leadership Collaborative's (CLUA-LC) role in discussions or "consultation" regarding the proposal to declare impaction on our campus.

We are deeply concerned that the wording in the "Consultation" section of the "Admission Proposal Plan" posted by the Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs (<http://www.calstatela.edu/provost/admission-proposal-plan>) may lead CLUAistas, the campus community, and/or community constituencies to believe that the CLUA-LC engaged in discussions that contributed to, or resulted in, the proposal to declare impaction.

The Leadership Collaborative of the Chicanx Latinx University Association explicitly and emphatically communicates that it has neither participated in nor contributed to any discussions that resulted in the Administration's understanding of the need to propose a declaration of impaction. On the contrary, the CLUA-LC explicitly and unequivocally expressed its opposition to a proposal to declare impaction when it formally met with Provost Mahony in the fall of 2018, and CLUA-LC members, speaking on their own behalf as individual members of the campus community, have repeatedly expressed their opposition to a proposal to declare impaction—as well as their concern with what they believe to be the lack of any meaningful consultation with representatives of the constituencies that will be most affected by a declaration of impaction.

In order to effectively preempt and/or clarify potential misunderstandings or interpretations of the CLUA-LC's role and position regarding the Administration's understanding of the need to propose a declaration of impaction, in what follows we will directly respond to the wording in the "Consultation" section of the "Admission Proposal Plan" posted by the Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs.

"Over the Fall semester, campus leadership engaged various groups including President's Cabinet, Deans, Associate Deans and the Academic Senate to better understand our developing enrollment and State funding trends." (<http://www.calstatela.edu/provost/admission-proposal-plan>)

CLUA-LC was not one of the groups that was "engaged to better understand developing enrollment and state funding trends." CLUA-LC formally met with Provost Mahony on December 3, 2018, after requesting a meeting to address concerns about the potential for a declaration of impaction (see attachment of CLUA's Agenda for the meeting on December 3, 2018). At that meeting, CLUA-LC was presented with a PowerPoint presentation that included data said to evidence the need to propose a declaration of impaction. CLUA-LC was not "engaged to better understand" enrollment and state funding, it was presented to—provided data on enrollment and admissions that was said to evidence the already concluded need for impaction, and was informed that impaction was the only option as the Chancellor's Office had mandated a decrease in enrollment. As indexed by the CLUA-

LC's Agenda for said meeting, CLUA-LC communicated its concerns regarding the impact of impactation on specific student demographics and expressed its stance against a declaration of impactation (see attachment of CLUA's Agenda for the meeting on December 3, 2018). In response to CLUA-LC's stated opposition and strongly emphasized concerns, at a given point in the meeting Provost Mahony replied that if CLUA-LC had other solutions she wanted to hear them, to which CLUA-LC responded that it was not in a position to offer alternatives because it had not been invited to any of the discussions in which all the needed variables related to enrollment and the possible alternatives created by said variables had been examined. CLUA-LC stated that only those with full access to all the variables and full participation in the dialogue surrounding those variables could be in a position to offer alternative solutions to impactation, and it requested to play a role in defining alternatives to impactation and supporting or expanding the Administration's strategies to avoid it (see attachment of CLUA's Agenda for the meeting on December 3, 2018). To date, no invitation to participate in discussions that consider alternatives to impactation has been extended to CLUA-LC. Hence, CLUA-LC does not consider that the presentation of data on enrollment and admissions and the informing of the Administration's intent to propose impactation at its meeting on December 3, 2019 establishes it as one of the groups that was "engaged to better understand developing enrollment and state funding trends."

"The campus discussed the challenges created by trying to serve more students than State funding supports. Campus leadership engaged the Chancellor's Office to explore options. Once it became clear that the campus would need to modify our approach to admission impactation in order to manage enrollment to available State funding, this proposal was created and in-person meetings were held with many groups including:

- Senate Executive Committee
- Academic Senate
- Deans, Associate Deans and Center Directors
- Department Chairs
- Black Faculty and Staff Caucus, Chicana Latinx University Association, Asian American Studies Advisory Board
- Student Life Council
- Administration and Finance Directors
- Advancement Leadership Team
- Presidents of Feeder Community Colleges
- LA Community College Superintendent
- Local community college leaders and faculty" (<http://www.calstatela.edu/provost/admission-proposal-plan>)

CLUA-LC has not participated in any event where "the campus discussed" the challenges created by trying to serve more students than state funding supports. As was the case in its meeting on December 3, 2019, members of CLUA-LC have attended campus forums and a Faculty Senate meeting at which data on enrollment and admissions was presented to an audience and the Administration informed that audience of its intent to propose a declaration of impactation because it had no choice, as purportedly evidenced by the data that was presented. These forums and Faculty Senate meeting afforded those in the audience an opportunity to voice their concerns about the effects of the proposed impactation on the most vulnerable working-class students in the surrounding communities, state their opposition or support, and/or outright critique a perceived lack of transparency and consultation. CLUA-LC, however, does not consider these to have constituted a form of meaningful discussion or consultation about the potential need to propose a declaration of impactation or the possible alternatives to impactation because the Administration has explicitly stated at those events that it must move forward with the proposal because there are no alternatives. Moreover, while CLUA-LC agrees that the CSU system as a whole and Cal State LA in specific are severely underfunded by the State, it does not share the purported clarity about the campus' need to modify its approach to admissions via a proposal to declare impactation, raising both the eligibility index and admissions criteria for specific programs. Hence, CLUA-LC strongly opposes the listing of the Chicana Latinx University Association as one of the groups in the bulleted list above and states explicitly that we have not been part of any type of meaningful discussion or consultation regarding the proposal to declare impactation; our participation has been limited to that of a campus and community-representing constituency which has simply been informed of the

fait accompli of the proposal to declare impactation on our campus. If other groups on campus were engaged in meaningful consultation and discussion in which they were afforded the opportunity to brainstorm and propose alternatives before the decision to propose impactation was taken, CLUA was not one of them.

“There was broad understanding of the challenges created by insufficient State funding to serve our enrollment. We would prefer not to further limit admission, but we must reduce our unfunded enrollment. While this proposal would allow us the authority to reduce enrollment, we will only use that authority as dictated by funding.” (<http://www.calstatela.edu/provost/admission-proposal-plan>)

Because CLUA-LC was not engaged in any meaningful consultation or discussion “regarding the challenges created by insufficient State funding to serve our enrollment,” it was unable to meaningfully contribute to the purported “broad understanding” and cannot be said to share it. CLUA-LC does not merely “prefer not to limit admission” to the working-class students from our local communities who will be denied as a result of impactation, **we fully oppose it,** and we are convinced that “allowing the authority to reduce enrollment” to the few individuals leading the rush to propose impactation is ill-advised to say the least—as evidenced by the results of the “impactation” implemented at Cal State Long Beach.

We hope this clarifies the questions and concerns regarding the listing of the Chicana Latinx University Association on the “Consultation” section of the “Admission Proposal Plan” posted by the Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs (<http://www.calstatela.edu/provost/admission-proposal-plan>)

In Solidarity Against Impactation

The Chicana Latinx University Association’s Leadership Collaborative (CLUA-LC)

Dr. Carlos Tejada

Educational Foundations
Charter College of Education

Dr. Anthony Hernandez

Research and Evaluation
Charter College of Education

Dr. Victor Viesca

Liberal Studies
College of Arts & Letters