ASSOCIATED STUDENTS, INC.
5154 STATE UNIVERSITY DRIVE. ROOM 203
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032

Fall 2026 TOWN HALL

October 13th, 2026 | 4:00 p.m. - 6:30 p.m. | Shared Governance Council

Executive Summary

The Fall 2026 ASI Town Hall organized student conversation around five different areas of campus life. The available notes outline specific questions ASI can carry forward: How can advising be easier to navigate? What can prevent unexpected financial aid problems? How can students find safer, clearer routes around campus? How might the University address course access, academic fees, culturally affirming programs, as well as graduate support? This report will be used as a public account to follow up with at the Spring 2027 ASI Town Hall on what action has been taken to address these questions and what is still open.

Findings to Prioritize

1. **Navigation itself is a barrier.** Students do not always know where to book tutoring or advising, which financial aid office to contact, how to find transit options, or how to communicate a concern to ASI.
2. **Affordability involves both price and uncertainty.** Students described unexpected academic platform fees, confusion or repeated changes in aid eligibility, perceived parking and transit expenses, and graduate funding gaps.
3. **Belonging depends on access and intentional design.** Campus housing creates connection for some students, while others feel disconnected by late event times, weak outreach to Black student communities, limited graduate gathering spaces, or difficult transit and campus routes.
4. **Student voices need a feedback loop**. Students asked what ASI does beyond events and how to reach people who can respond.

Introduction: Purpose, Structure, and Interpretation

1.1 Purpose of the Town Hall

The Fall 2026 ASI Town Hall gave students a structured opportunity to describe their experience at Cal State LA, identify barriers, recommend changes, and make their priorities visible to student representatives. This feedback will inform ASI student leaders, University administration, the Academic Senate, and shared governance committees. This student-facing report aims to translate student accounts into traceable action agenda while remaining transparent about what has and has not been confirmed or resolved.

1.2 Town Hall Structure

The supplied records contain facilitator/note-taker handwritten notes and online summaries of the five discussion zones. The prompts contained 4 main questions: What challenges, barriers, concerns, or personal experiences did students share? What changes, improvements, or solutions did students recommend? What were the most important points or recurring concerns raised during the discussion? Were there any specific requests, questions, or concerns that ASI should follow up on?

1.3 Town Hall Discussion Zones

Zone	Why This Information is Useful?	Actional Information Sought
Academic, Enrollment & Professional Experience	Academic barriers affect degree progress and career preparation.	Course scheduling, advising quality, tutoring, instructional tools, internships, and graduate-aware resources.
ASI, Shared Governance & Institutional Accountability	Students evaluate representation and campus decisions.	Visibility of ASI, service accountability, and facilities priorities.
Student Life, Belong & Wellness	Belonging and identity affirmation influence student success.	Campus climate, event accessibility, culturally responsive program, mental health, and communication channels.
Parking, Transportation & Campus Access	Travel, affordability, and safety shape attendance.	Transit information, parking costs, accessibility routes, lighting, shittles, and signage.
Graduate Student Experience	Graduate pathways create distinct time, financial, and program demands.	Graduate advising, scholarships, required courses, professional support, community, and study space.

2. Zone 1: Academic, Enrollment & Professional Experience

2.1 What Students Experienced

Feedback in this zone was not uniformly negative. The notes record gratitude for parts of students' academic experience and appreciation for professors described as caring and aware of the student population. Another account similarly says participants had not generally felt unsupported and that tutoring had been useful. Students were asking for more consistent service and preparation, not dismissing all existing support.

Course access was a major concern. Students wanted more summer sections, especially where limited offerings make it difficult to take needed courses. Some favored late afternoon or evening classes and longer once-weekly formats because those patterns fit work, family, and education-student schedules. Another participant described repetitive instruction, including repeated professors across courses and repetitive projects. The notes also record that continued contact with the same professor can improve mentorship.

The advising problem had two components: visibility and substance. Some students did not know about NavigateLA or drop-in advising hours. Others reported meeting advisors who summarized their records rather than helping them understand degree requirements or why a course counted toward their plans. Students wanted more time for open-ended conversations, clearer graduation mapping in GET, and stronger guidance before enrollment. Zone 1 handwritten notes specifically called for advising meetings longer than 30 minutes in situations requiring more individualized guidance.

Academic support and professional preparation also surfaced. Participants described under-advertised tutoring, confusing access to library materials through OneSearch, demand for practical simulation workshops

in marketing and similar majors, limited professional exposure in laboratory-based science programs, and insufficiently visible resume and internship help. Graduate students participating in Zone 1 said the Writing Center, Career Center, and thesis-faculty access did not consistently reflect their needs.

Artificial intelligence prompted disagreement rather than consensus. Some students questioned whether institutionally supported ChatGPT access is relevant or educationally appropriate across majors, particularly when the tool may conflict with disciplinary learning objectives. Others described useful accessibility functions, such as read-aloud support. Participants asked for faculty guidance in syllabi about permitted use and questioned the allocation or value of related spending.

2.2 Changes Students Recommended

- ❑ Make summer and required-course planning more responsive to actual demand; study flexible evening and once-weekly schedules where educationally appropriate.
- ❑ Publish a consistent, searchable guide to NavigateLA/drop-ins, tutoring bookings and locations, and degree-planning information; have instructors point students to relevant academic support in syllabi.
- ❑ Make advising conversations more individualized and provide time to discuss degree audit details, goals, and course eligibility rather than only processing forms.
- ❑ Offer applied workshops, alumni and workplace connections, resume reviews, internships, and clearer guidance on professional experience and laboratory entry.
- ❑ Clarify institution-wide expectations for permitted AI use and whether any purchased tools serve different majors and accessibility needs equitably.
- ❑ Make course evaluations easier and more compelling to complete, with transparency about anonymity and how feedback informs teaching improvement.

2.3 Interpretation and ASI Response

The strongest recurring Zone 1 thread is a gap between services that technically exist and students' ability to find or use them effectively. A second is the tension between getting through a degree and receiving a well-rounded, career-relevant education. ASI can test solutions without promising new courses by requesting advising-process walkthroughs, collecting examples of unavailable required courses, and convening student representatives with Academic Affairs, tutoring/library, and career services.

3. Zone 2: ASI, Shared Governance & Institutional Accountability

3.1 What Students Experienced

In Zone 2, the most developed story concerned a student who reportedly received Pell Grant support, and then later was flagged as ineligible. This turnaround incident lacked sufficient advance warning for the student to plan their coursework and finances. Other comments described long waits at Financial Aid/One Stop, uncertainty about which office had responsibility, insufficient empathy, and communications that made class enrollment feel precarious.

Students also expressed uncertainty about ASI's governing role. Some recognized ASI chiefly through tabling, logos, events, and practical benefits such as free Scantrons and bluebooks, but did not know the extent of its advocacy or how to influence decisions. A participant wanted transfer-students more involved. Others questioned whether departments and older facilities receive equitable investment, citing King Hall conditions,

and scholarship availability.

A concrete instructional-cost concern involved a physics student who reportedly had to pay approximately $15 after an iClicker free trial to record classroom attendance. The concern was not that technology should never be used, but that students may have to buy access to participation or homework tracking. The notes also document discussion of a possible technology-enabled advising model: a chatbot might answer routine questions after hours, with live advisors available when needed. Students stressed opt-out choice and preserving a real human advisor.

3.2 Changes Students Recommended

- ❑ Give students early, intelligible financial-aid status alerts and escalation paths; explain One Stop versus Financial Aid roles and consider coaching on how course loads interact with aid.
- ❑ Reduce time spent completing repetitive forms in advising by using tutorials or workshops; preserve meaningful one-on-one advising for student-specific questions.
- ❑ Clarify the rationale for fees and financial decisions, distinguish ASI-controlled funds from University budgets, and give students an understandable path to ask questions.
- ❑ Investigate whether required attendance/homework platforms create avoidable direct costs and what alternatives may be available to instructors.
- ❑ Increase ASI and event outreach in high-traffic places and platforms students already use, with dedicated attention to transfer students.
- ❑ Seek written facilities updates on King Hall air conditioning and older-building improvements, with specificity about what can and cannot change. [S2]

3.3 Interpretation and ASI Response

Zone 2 is fundamentally an accountability conversation. Students want a clear explanation of a decision, a person able to address an error, and evidence that concerns travel beyond the discussion table. ASI should separate high-risk individual cases from general process feedback. An individual aid case requires the student's consent and private handling. Public reporting can focus on response times, notification workflows, and available appeal or support channels without revealing identity. For facilities and fees, the first step should be a request for documented policies, spending categories, and relevant campus contacts.

4. Zone 3: Student Life, Belonging & Wellness

4.1 What Students Experienced

The Zone 3 notes students living in residence halls described opportunities to make connections, while others recalled having difficulty finding peers with similar interests during their first semester. Participants tended to socialize in or near their academic buildings, while some mentioned events took place too late in the evening. These comments suggest campus life is unevenly accessible rather than absent to everyone. One student stated "there's no student life," while others emphasized positive experiences with existing communities.

Identity and recognition mattered. Students wanted more visible racial and ethnic representation and said communications about Black fraternities/sororities and events for Black students did not always reach the intended community. They proposed more frequent cultural pride, music, and art events. Several also linked a well-maintained, attractive campus to emotional well-being and morale. Another requested improvements in

older facilities such as King Hall.

Wellness feedback contained both needs and successful examples. Students requested more support for burnout and stress and a more empathetic approach to grading. One participant reported finding help from a CAPS counselor through GSP during a mental health crisis. Students separately praised EOP and GSP peer mentorship. Other participants said they were encouraged to contact ASI or administrators but did not know the correct channel. This suggests ASI should make existing supports visible while advocating for improvements where students report gaps.

4.2 Changes Students Recommended

- ❑ Offer recurring, culturally affirming events developed with the students they are meant to serve; better distribute information about Black Greek-letter organizations and related programming.
- ❑ Design social opportunities across academic programs and for students unable to stay late; coordinate events near where students attend classes or spend time.
- ❑ Make the route from a concern to ASI or a University office visible, including examples of which issues each can handle.
- ❑ Promote supportive resources already recognized by students, including EOP/GSP mentorship and CAPS access, while gathering more information about burnout needs.
- ❑ Continue bringing campus upkeep, King Hall conditions, student spirit, and more visible mascot participation into campus programming and facilities conversations.

4.3 Interpretation and ASI Response

Belonging is not one program. This zone offers at least three practical tracks: outreach that reaches intended student communities, programming at varied times and locations, and an accessible support/referral map. ASI can pilot events, assess participation, and listen to Black student organizations and campus centers without presuming to speak for them.

5. Zone 4: Parking, Transportation & Campus Access

5.1 What Students Experienced

Zone 4 raised the difficulty of navigating campus transit and drop-off points, insufficient signage, high perceived parking or transit-pass costs, and physical distance between bus stops, housing, and academic buildings. Students specifically mentioned a bus stop being far from King Hall and confusion about which entrance or stop to use.

There were also many environmental and safety concerns. Students described moved residence parking as inconvenient, Lot 5 as needing stronger security, poorly lit approaches near LAFC Street, long waits or lack of shade at transit stops, and late-hour safety anxiety. A participant cited approximately $100 for a public transit pass and others described daily parking prices and parking access as burdensome. Students also reported elevators in King Hall and an engineering/technology building not working reliably.

The central lesson is that access involves an entire trip, not merely the availability of a parking space or bus route. A student can have a transit option but lack clear signs to reach it, sufficient shade to wait comfortably, a safe return path, or a functioning elevator along the route. These problems may affect students with disabilities,

commuters, student residents, and those attending evening classes differently.

5.2 Changes Students Recommended

- ❑ Audit and simplify wayfinding signs for parking, bus stops, entrances, drop-off locations, and accessible routes; consolidate transit information in one easy-to-find guide.
- ❑ Explore affordability options - payment plans, student transit passes, eligibility rules, parking permit structures, and resident-specific arrangements - after verifying current fees and authority.
- ❑ Review shuttle feasibility and whether service or routing would help students travel from residence halls, distant bus stops, and academic areas.
- ❑ Request a campus safety walk-through of Lot 5 and late-night routes, including lighting, patrol presence, and pedestrian safety.
- ❑ Review transit-stop shade/seating, evaluate accessible routes and elevators, and publish maintenance contacts and work-order status when available.
- ❑ Advertise future parking/transit listening or resource events more visibly.

5.3 Interpretation and ASI Response

The strongest near-term action is a joint student walk-through and documentation exercise, followed by a written, itemized request to Parking/Transportation, facilities staff, and campus safety or accessibility personnel. ASI can publish verified existing pass and permit options immediately, as well as any change in rates, shuttle service, lighting, or building hardware must be considered by the campus authority responsible for those systems.

6. Zone 5: Graduate Student Experience

6.1 What Students Experienced

In Zone 5, students described difficulty securing advisor appointments because they do not have direct graduate advisors, and those who do advise carry other departmental duties, leaving students to repeatedly seek guidance. Some required courses were reportedly offered only once per year or at inconvenient times, creating risk for students balancing employment, caregiving, commuting, and degree timelines.

Funding emerged as a distinct equity concern. Students said scholarship deadlines may precede admission or first-year eligibility, and that GPA thresholds can be difficult to satisfy immediately. A participant cited an MBA introductory course reportedly carrying nine units at more than $300 per unit, without an available wavier. A note-taker described a broader perception that graduate students pay heavily yet receive limited academic, financial, and professional support.

Students wanted more internships, employers, networking, alumni panels, and career preparation designed for their post-degree path. They also requested a stronger sense of graduate community, including interdisciplinary mixers and quieter dedicated study areas than the lower library floor. A student also explicitly recommends changes for future Town Halls, including a room closer to the main walkway, an earlier discussion time, and stronger promotion to reach graduate participants.

6.2 Changes Students Recommended

- ❑ Review advisor availability and graduate-degree mapping, with a clear contact and escalation procedure

for students whose advisor is unavailable.

- ❑ Audit admission timing against scholarship eligibility rules and deadlines, including what options exist for newly admitted students.
- ❑ Collect required graduate-course scheduling bottlenecks by program before proposing revised frequencies or time blocks.
- ❑ Create graduate-specific career networking, alumni panels, application and thesis support, and employer relationships.
- ❑ Explore a quiet graduate study area or designated hours and co-create lower-barrier social opportunities for graduate students.
- ❑ Review placement, timing, and promotion of the graduate discussion zone at future Town Halls.

6.3 Interpretation and ASI Response

Graduate feedback offers several distinct, manageable work products. An aid and deadline map, a course-bottleneck inventory, a graduate advising service map, an employer/alumni event pilot, and a study-space feasibility conversation.

7. Themes That Cut Across Zone Boundaries

1. **Navigation and access.** Academic appointments (Zones 1, 2, 5), aid offices (2), transit routes (4), ASI contact information (2, 3), and tutoring (1) all show that access can fail before a service is used.
2. **Affordability and predictability.** Technology charges (1, 2), parking/transit (2, 4), and graduate scholarship and course expenses (5) require both cost transparency and fewer unexpected barriers.
3. **Facilities as a student success issue.** King Hall appears in Zones 2, 3, and 4; Zone 4 adds elevators, lighting, and accessible routes. These observations justify a consolidated request, not separate disconnected complaints.
4. **Graduate-specific access.** Graduate experiences appear in Zone 1 and Zone 5. Course sequencing, thesis advising, specialized career supports, and scholarships deserve a graduate-focused response.
5. **Trust in representation.** Zones 2 and 3 reveal uncertainty about ASI's role and how to raise issues. Credible follow-through requires visible ownership, deadlines for updates, and transparent unresolved items.

8. Proposed Advocacy Initiatives

The following 13 initiatives are proposed avenues for responding to the Fall 2026 Town Hall feedback. They are organized by the kind of result students could see: practical information, institutional decisions or pilots, and longer-term accountability.

Priority A: Begin with inquiries and information students can use.

Financial Aid Notices, Office Coordination, and Escalation

What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Zone 2 participants described long waits, difficulty knowing whether Financial Aid or One Stop could solve a problem, and one serious account of Pell Grant eligibility changing after an apparent correction. The concern is not simply that a response was slow, a status change without clear, timely guidance can affect whether a student can afford to remain enrolled. Zone 5 also documented graduate funding uncertainty.

Specific Objective: Students should be able to understand an aid-status notice, identify the office responsible for the next decision, learn the available correction or review route, and receive useful notice early enough to make informed enrollment decisions.
Decision Path: Vice President for University Affairs, Graduate Academic Senators, Financial Aid, One Stop
Proposed Step 1: Compile an anonymous issue brief separating four questions: initial eligibility decisions, repeat flags after a correction, timing and content of notices, and handoffs between Financial Aid and One Stop.
Proposed Step 2: Request a joint process meeting. Seek written answers on where students can check status, which office owns a disputed notice, how to request case review, what to do if a registration deadline is close, and whether any notice or referral practice can be improved.
What Students Should See: A verified one-page "An aid warning appeared: what now?" guide, with office contacts, escalation steps and applicable deadlines, plus a short public summary of changes requested and answers received.
How Progress Should Be Measured: A written response from each relevant office; confirmed ownership of the guide; a documented route for unresolved cases; date of the next update. Track whether the new guide helps students choose the correct contact.

Advising Clarity and Appointment Usefulness
What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Students in Zones 1 and 2 did not always know how NavigateLA, drop-in advising and GET fit together. Others felt appointments were too short or consumed by routine forms rather than individualized degree planning. Graduate participants described difficulty scheduling with advisors who also hold other duties.
Specific Objective: Create a single, understandable route to advising while advocating for appointments that help students leave with a clear course, deadline or referral plan.
Decision Path: Vice President for University Affairs, All Academic Senators, academic advising units, colleges and departments, campus units maintaining GET and NavigateLA
Proposed Step 1: Inventory official scheduling channels, drop-in eligibility, appointment preparation requirements and the differences between general, college, major and graduate advising. Record gaps or conflicting instructions.
Proposed Step 2: With student input, design a short "before/during/after advising" checklist: required documents, questions about degree maps and course sequencing, and how to obtain a written next step. Ask advising offices about handling complex cases, missed appointments and workshops for routine forms.
What Students Should See: A verified campus advising access map and appointment checklist, together with an ASI summary of campus responses to proposed improvements.
How progress Should Be Measured: Number of distinct pathways verified; student completion of a test booking/lookup task; written response on complex-case appointments and follow-up options.

Parking, Transit, and Accessible Wayfinding
What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Zone 4 students described confusing signs and stop locations, difficult routes between transit, housing and academic buildings, and concerns about permit and transit costs. Zone 2 students also asked about parking charges for residents.
Specific Objective: Make the existing parking and transit system easier to understand while presenting campus decision-makers with a specific list of route and accessibility problems, and asking for a written review of residential parking options and other relevant cost concerns.

Decision Path: Vice President for University Affairs, Diversity & Inclusion Commissioner, Parking and Transportation, facilities, office responsible for accessibility and route compliance
Proposed Step 1: Conduct daytime walkthroughs with students, including students with different mobility and commuting needs. Record unclear stops or entrances, missing directional signs, drop-off locations and connections to King Hall and housing.
Proposed Step 2: Verify official permit prices, current transit options, eligibility and any resident parking policy directly with the responsible office. Prepare clear questions about discounts or alternative options without representing them as available.
Proposed Step 3: Send a location-by-location list to the correct office and ask which items can receive a low-cost signage or information fix, which need an accessibility assessment, and which require a pricing or service decision.
What Students Should See: A student-tested route and parking information guide, an annotated wayfinding issue list, and a public response table identifying the campus office and disposition of each request.
How Progress Should Be Measured: Number of routes and stops checked; number of information errors corrected; written response to each infrastructure or pricing question; re-check of any changes reported as complete.

King Hall and Campus Infrastructure Status
What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Students in several zones raised King Hall conditions, including reported poor air conditioning and aging facilities; Zone 4 added elevator reliability and accessible route concerns in King Hall and another academic building.
Specific Objective: Move from repeated general complaints to separate, verifiable facilities requests. ASI should seek the current status, responsible office and next review point for each reported problem, while pressing for timely attention to barriers with accessibility implications.
Decision Path: Vice President for University Affairs, Executive Vice President, all College Representatives, Diversity & Inclusion Commissioner, Facilities
Proposed Step 1: Create separate entries for King Hall temperature/air conditioning, specific elevator problems, and accessible route obstacles. Ask students to give location, approximate time and type of barrier without collecting unnecessary personal information.
Proposed Step 2: Submit each issue through the official maintenance or accessibility reporting route. Request existing work-order status when that can appropriately be shared, a point of contact, interim access information, and whether the issue requires repair, assessment or a larger capital project.
Proposed Step 3: Confirm responses in writing and periodically revisit the reported locations. Distinguish a completed repair, a scheduled assessment, an unresolved issue, and a longer-term funding request.
What Students Should See: A public facilities issue summary showing the reported location, requested remedy, responsible office, verified response, current status and next check-in.
How Progress Should Be Measured: Written disposition for each separately logged issue; verified changes to access or service; the age of open requests and whether follow-up occurred.

ASI Communication and Student Concern Intake
What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Some students recognized ASI through events, tabling and supplies but did not know what it does in University decision-making or how to raise a concern. Students also recommended advertising where they actually spend time, including outreach that reaches transfers and graduate students.

Specific Objective: Make it straightforward for any student to learn what ASI can influence, submit an issue, understand where it will be referred and later see a non-identifying status update.
Decision Path: Vice President for Community Engagement, Executive Vice President, and ASI Marketing Team.
Proposed Step 1: Draft a short "What ASI does/where your concern goes" page distinguishing ASI services, student representatives, academic-governance issues and University operational complaints.
Proposed Step 2: Design a lightweight intake process that explains what information is collected, who reviews it, how urgent or confidential concerns are redirected, and when a student can expect acknowledgment.
Proposed Step 3: Promote the channel through tabling, high-traffic locations, class outreach, and existing student platforms. Publish a periodic aggregate "You raised/ASI did/University responded" updates.
What Students Should See: A public advocacy contact guide, accessible intake and routing process, and recurring aggregate status summaries.
How Progress Should Be Measured: Student ability to identify the right channel in a usability test; routed inquiries with an assigned owner; acknowledgment and referral timeliness; feedback on whether the outcome was understandable.

Priority B: Turn issues into institutional responses and pilots.

Required Courses, Summer Options, and Degree Timelines
What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Students in Zone 1 requested more summer offerings and described schedule formats that better fit jobs and family responsibilities. Graduate students reported required courses offered only once a year or at inconvenient times.
Specific Objective: Identify specific degree-progress bottlenecks by program and obtain a department-level answer about feasible scheduling changes, alternatives or better advance notice (make required pathways more predictable).
Decision Path: Vice President for University Affairs, Graduate Academic Senators, All College Representatives, department chairs, colleges, Academic Senate
Proposed Step 1: Invite students to report the actual required course, program, term attempted, conflict and anticipated effect on completion. Check reported requirements against published degree maps before escalating, and de-identify student examples.
Proposed Step 2: Create a short bottleneck inventory of repeatedly named courses and ask departments about historical frequency, anticipated demand, enrollment rules, timetable conflicts and limits on adding or moving a section.
Proposed Step 3: Seek a concrete departmental response for each viable issue: adjust timing, communicate future rotations earlier, explore a summer/evening option, expand access through an approved alternative, or explain why a change is not possible.
What Students Should See: A program-level scheduling bottleneck and response summary, with validated examples and a follow-up term for any feasible proposal.
How Progress Should Be Measured: Programs and courses reviewed; written departmental responses; updated course-rotation information; changes actually reflected in future published schedules.

Graduate Scholarship Access and Program-Specific Charges
What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Graduate students described scholarship deadlines that may occur before students can apply after admission, eligibility rules that can disadvantage first-term students, and

program costs that are difficult to anticipate. One student cited an MBA introductory course described as nine units at more than $300 per unit without a waiver.
Specific Objective: Give graduate students an accurate picture of available aid and total program-specific costs, while asking University decision-makers whether deadline, eligibility or assistance rules create avoidable barriers.
Decision Path: Vice President for University Affairs, Graduate Academic Senators, graduate studies, Financial Aid
Proposed Step 1: Verify funding sources, application windows, admission timing, first-term GPA eligibility, renewal rules, and available appeals or alternative programs. Separate campus-wide awards from program-specific funding.
Proposed Step 2: Request an explanation of the reported MBA charge, including the actual unit calculation, required status, charge authority, whether the fee is standard tuition or program-specific, and any documented exemptions or assistance.
Proposed Step 3: Present administrators with narrowly framed improvement requests: adjust communication timing, publish a new-admit funding checklist, review first-term eligibility, or clarify fees before students commit to a course.
What Students Should See: A graduate funding and fee fact sheet with verified deadlines, eligibility explanations, program-specific questions, and the written status of any requested rule review.
How Progress Should Be Measured: Official sources cited in the guide; number of ambiguous rules clarified; administrative response to each proposed improvement; updated information made available before the next relevant application cycle.

<u>Graduate Academic, Career, and Study Support</u>
What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Graduate participants said general writing and career supports can feel undergraduate-oriented, that finding thesis faculty or timely advising is difficult, and that quiet study and graduate community are limited. Students proposed networking and alumni connections, interdisciplinary gatherings, and designated study areas.
Specific Objective: Develop a reliable graduate-specific resource map and test at least one feasible improvement in academic writing/thesis support, career engagement, or study and community space (should be shaped by graduate students and designed for working and commuting schedules).
Decision Path: Vice President for Community Engagement, Graduate Academic Senators, College Representative for Business and Economics, graduate studies, departments, library, writing/tutoring services, Career Center
Proposed Step 1: Ask service providers which offerings explicitly serve graduate students, how students book help, and where thesis committee or advisor availability questions should be directed.
Proposed Step 2: Collect a short, opt-in needs assessment about quiet space, preferred event times and the most useful professional supports. Ask library and graduate partners whether reserved time, designated space, or improved directions are feasible.
Proposed step 3: Co-design one manageable pilot, such as a graduate writing/thesis navigation session or alumni-career panel, and request a separate decision on study-space access.
What Students Should See: A verified graduate resource map and a public decision on one pilot program and one study-space request, with student feedback after any event.
How Progress Should Be Measured: Resources confirmed; number of graduate programs represented in feedback; pilot participation and usefulness; written space decision and next step.

Mandatory Instructional Platforms and AI Transparency

What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Zone 2 recorded a student report of an iClicker charge after a trial period for class attendance or homework tracking. Zone 1 students questioned the value and disciplinary fit of institutionally available AI tools, while others recognized accessibility uses such as read-aloud support.
Specific Objective: Ensure students can identify unavoidable course-related technology costs before enrollment when feasible, understand whether lower-cost or accessible alternatives exist, and receive clear course-level guidance on permitted AI use.
Decision Path: Vice President for University Affairs, Vice President for Finance, All Academic Senators, colleges
Proposed Step 1: Verify the reported iClicker price, the course use requirement, availability of a campus license or alternative, and whether students are notified before they incur the cost.
Proposed Step 2: Ask the relevant University office to document the purpose, funding source and scope of any campus AI access program.
Proposed Step 3: Through Academic Senators, ask academic leadership whether syllabi could more consistently explain required technology charges and acceptable AI use, including when use is discouraged, prohibited or permitted for accessibility.
What Students Should See: A verified technology-cost explainer, a plain-language account of who funds and authorizes the relevant tools, and specific proposed syllabus or academic guidance changes.
How Progress Should Be Measured: Official responses on cost and funding; confirmed student alternatives or assistance if any; academic committee consideration or written reasons a proposal is not adopted.

Culturally Affirming Belonging Initiatives

What Students Raised and Why It Matters: In Zone 3, students said information about Black fraternities and sororities and culturally relevant activities did not consistently reach Black students. They sought more frequent cultural pride, music and art events and stronger representation and connection across student communities.
Specific Objective: Work with interested student organizations and campus cultural centers to identify the specific communication and belonging gaps they want ASI to address, then support one community-designed outreach or programming pilot with visible partner leadership and appropriate resources.
Decision Path: Diversity & Inclusion Commissioner, Vice President for Community Engagement, College of Ethnic Studies Representative, interested Black student organizations, CSI, CCC
Proposed Step 1: Invite community representatives to a listening and planning conversation that asks which groups are being missed, which messages or channels fail to reach them, what events they want, and what support or decision-making role they expect.
Proposed Step 2: Offer feasible ASI assistance, such as promotion, venue coordination or eligible programming resources.
What Students Should See: A co-designed outreach or cultural programming pilot, a partner-approved communications plan, and a public reflection on what changed and what support is still needed.
How Progress Should Be Measured: Participation of consenting organizations in planning; outreach channels tested; accessibility and scheduling feedback; partners' own evaluation of the experience.

Stress, Burnout, and Academic Climate

What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Zone 3 students asked for more support with stress and burnout and more empathy around academic expectations. They also named helpful existing resources, including an example of counseling support through GSP and positive experiences with EOP/GSP mentorship.

Specific Objective: Improve how students find existing wellness support now, while separately investigating whether academic scheduling, workload or a proposed wellness-days policy can be addressed through University academic governance.
Decision Path: Vice President for University Affairs, All Academic Senators, Diversity & Inclusion Commissioner, Vice President for Community Engagement, CAPS
Proposed Step 1: Verify available wellness, counseling, crisis-referral and mentorship pathways with the relevant offices. Make contact directions clear for students with different schedules and distinguish routine support from urgent assistance.
Proposed Step 2: Hold a voluntary, non-clinical discussion about academic sources of stress, including workload, deadlines and evening schedules.
Proposed Step 3: Ask Academic Senators to produce a separate feasibility memo on a wellness-days proposal.
What Students should See: A verified wellness-support pathway guide and an academic-governance scoping memo stating what proposal can be reviewed, by whom, and what the barriers are.
How Progress Should Be Measured: Support offices verify guidance; referral materials distributed; Senate or academic office acknowledges the proposal; next governance step or written impediment is documented.

Nighttime Campus Access and Bus-Stop Conditions
What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Zone 4 participants named poorly lit approaches near LAFC Street, security concerns involving Lot 5, distance and wait conditions at bus stops, limited shade or seating, and elevator-related access issues.
Specific Objective: Obtain a location-specific evening review of lighting, safe travel routes and waiting conditions, with a written response indicating what can be repaired quickly, what requires assessment and which requests need larger service or capital decisions.
Decision Path: Vice President for University Affairs, Diversity & Inclusion Commissioner, campus safety, Parking and Transportation, Facilities
Proposed Step 1: With University personnel, arrange an evening access walk at representative hours on the named routes, including Lot 5, LAFC Street, selected bus stops and any reported elevator-dependent connections (invite student observation).
Proposed Step 2: Log each location and condition separately: lighting, visibility, signage, wait time, shelter/seating, reachable alternatives and the reported effect on travel. Submit actionable maintenance or assessment requests to the responsible units.
Proposed Step 3: Request a priority and response category for each item, including an interim route or safety communication if appropriate; revisit items that offices report as addressed.
What Students Should See: An evening access and comfort audit with general location references, University responses, interim guidance where approved, and follow-up status for each item.
How Progress Should Be Measured: Sites reviewed jointly; documented work requests and responses; re-inspection of completed changes; unresolved high-priority items and next check-in.

Priority C: Establish transparency and continuity.

Teaching Feedback and Respectful Faculty-Student Communication
What Students Raised and Why It Matters: Students reported uneven professor communication, concerns about repetitive instruction and limited influence from course evaluations. Some wanted more empathy regarding grading, while others worried surveys receive too few responses to shape teaching.

Specific Objective: Help students understand when and how teaching feedback is collected, what anonymity safeguards actually apply, and how feedback can reach improvement processes. Advance specific, constructive recommendations on faculty-student communication through appropriate academic channels.
Decision Path: All Academic Senators, Academic Senate
Proposed Step 1: Ask the responsible offices to explain evaluation timing, student access, confidentiality or anonymity rules, response thresholds if any, how results are reviewed and which routes exist for concerns that cannot wait for end-of-course surveys.
Proposed Step 2: With student input, identify useful changes such as clearer evaluation reminders, plain-language explanations of how feedback is used, or faculty-development conversations on expectations, respectful communication and assignment feedback.
Proposed Step 3: Submit a memo through the relevant Academic Senate or academic channel. Request a written reply about which suggestions can be implemented, which require a policy change and which fall outside that body's authority.
What Students Should See: A student-friendly teaching feedback process explainer and a documented set of academic-governance recommendations with the campus response.
How Progress Should Be Measured: Process facts confirmed by the owning office; student understanding of the feedback route; written committee/office response; any adopted communications or procedural change.

9. Conclusion

The Fall 2026 ASI Town Hall brought students together for sustained conversation across five areas of University life. The discussions did more than express opinions. Students described concrete obstacles affecting academic progress, affordability, access to campus, belonging, wellness, and graduate education. They also recognized positive experiences, including caring faculty, supportive programs, and communities built through housing and peer networks.

The clearest pattern was not that every service is failing. It was that inconsistent access, uncertainty, and opaque processes can turn existing resources into inaccessible resources. Students are asking for clearer guidance, an identifiable person or office to contact, meaningful opportunities to shape decisions, and visible evidence that concerns lead somewhere.

For students, the report should be the beginning of a visible feedback loop, not the end of a conversation. ASI can select realistic first priorities, seek each proposed leader's agreement, ask the relevant campus partners for documented responses, and publish updates that distinguish progress from unresolved requests. Students should then be able to see not only what concerns were heard, but what was done, what has not changed, and why. The next Town Hall can revisit those results and invite students to help determine what deserves attention next.