I. Membership and Attendance

Committee:

- Thomas Krabacher (Chair) Sacramento (Geography)
- Praveen Soni (Vice Chair) Long Beach (Marketing)
- Edward Aguado San Diego (Geography)
- Otto Benavides Fresno (Instructional Technology)
- Steven Browne Maritime (Marine Transportation)
- Reyes Fidalgo Fullerton (Spanish Linguistics)
- David Hood Long Beach (History)
- Martin Linder San Francisco (Design and Industry)
- Cezar Ornatowski San Diego (Rhetoric & Writing Studies)
- John Tarjan Bakersfield (Management/Manage.Info.Sys.)

Chancellor’s Office Liaison: Ron Vogel
Executive Committee Liaison: Darlene Yee-Melichar

Guests:

- President King-Alexander (CSU, Long Beach) Higher education funding
- Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi (Chancellor’s Office) Preservation of CPEC data
- Kathy Kaiser (ASCSU) APEP liaison
- Wess Larson (Chancellors Office) Legislative updates
- Rodney Rideau (Chancellor’s Office) CSU budget update
- John Travis (CFA) CFA legislative update
- Robert Turnage (Chancellor’s Office) Calif. higher education budget analysis
- Karen Yelverton-Zamarippa (Chancellor’s Office) Political & legislative updates

II. 2011-2012 Resolutions Recommended by the Committee

During 2011-2012 the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee sent the following resolutions forward to the Academic Senate:

AS-3040-11/FGA
Approved

Restoring Quality in the California State University (CSU)

The resolution calls on members of the Board of Trustees to make the reversal of the erosion of quality in the CSU their highest priority. The resolution specifically calls upon the publicly elected ex-officio members of the Board of Trustees to support the Master Plan.
AS-3042-11/FGA
Approved Unanimously
*Public Access to and Continued Collection of Intersegmental Education Data*
This resolution supports data-based decision making regarding education in California. It additionally commends the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) and the CSU and the UC in preserving the higher education data that has been collected over the past forty years.

AS-3043-11/FGA
Approved
*Public Perception and Presidential Compensation in the California State University (CSU)*
This resolution recognizes the importance of attracting high quality presidential candidates and urges the Board to adopt a policy that will help the public to understand how compensation decisions are made.

AS-3044-11/FGA
Approved Unanimously
*California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees Proposed Support Budget for 2012-2013*
This resolution is in support of the Board of Trustees’ budget request of a $315 million increase to the budget of the CSU.

AS-3053-12/FGA
Approved
*Managing Enrollment During the Current Budget Crisis*
The resolution calls for limiting enrollment in the CSU to a level at which quality can be maintained, while exploring options to increase self-support opportunities, and while considering how smaller campuses might be impacted by enrollment management efforts.

AS-3054-12/FGA/FA
Approved Unanimously
*Implementation of Access to Excellence CSU Strategic Plan Commitment 2: Plan for Faculty Turnover and Invest in Faculty Excellence*
The resolution expresses support for the Board of Trustees’ proposed compensation policy to be considered at its January meeting. The resolution further encourages the Board to reassert its commitment to the 2008 *Access to Excellence* strategic plan, and more specifically references in that plan the commitment to reinvest in the faculty and reduce compensation gaps. The resolution also urges the Chancellor and the Board to develop a plan to elevate faculty salaries so as to recruit and retain high-quality faculty.

AS-3055-12/FGA
Approved
*Opposition to AB 1561 (R. Hernandez), SB 952 (Alquist), and SB 967 (Yee) – Executive and Administrative Compensation*
The resolution expresses opposition to three bills, SB 952, SB 967, and AB 1561, which attempts to restrict the compensation of presidents and executive officers in the CSU, while further noting opposition to any similar legislation relating to personnel matters in the CSU.

AS-3066-12/FGA
Approved
*Opposition to AB 970 (Fong) – System-wide Fees*
Proposed legislation AB 970 (Fong) would establish the “working Families Student Fee Transparency and Accountability Act,” which would, among other things, place restrictions on the timing by which system-wide fee increases could be imposed and require that 1/3 of all fees be set aside for financial aid. The ASCSU opposes the legislation because features of the Act could potentially disadvantage some student groups (esp. veterans) and hamper the CSU’s ability to respond to fiscal challenges imposed by the current state budget environment.

AS-3070-12/FA/AA
Approved without Dissent

Accessible and Affordable Open-Source Digital Textbooks
The ASCSU reaffirms its support for the development of affordable and accessible textbook options and commends the Senators Steinberg and Alquist for taking the initiative on this issue. It also states its appreciation to the Senators for recognizing the importance of the early faculty involvement in the drafting of SB 1052 and 1053 and recommends similar consultation in the future. At the same time the ASCSU reasserts the right of the faculty to ultimate control over the selection of course materials.

AS-3071-12/FGA
Withdrawn

AB1564: Mandatory Child-Abuse Reporting Requirements for State Employees
Proposed legislation AB 1564 (Lara) would expand the mandated reporting requirement of cases of child abuse to include “volunteers of public or private organizations.” It is unclear to what extent this would affect members of the CSU. In addition, it would require training of reporters, which could impose an unfunded mandate on the CSU. This resolution requests the author of the bill to introduce language clarifying these issues. The resolution was deemed moot and withdrawn with the demise of AB 1564 in committee.

AS-3080-12/FGA
Approved Unanimously

Commendation of the “Funding the Future of the CSU” Conference Hosted by California State University (CSU) Northridge
The ASCSU commends CSU, Northridge Academic Senate for hosting the “Funding the Future of the CSU Conference,” thanks the conference participants for the role they played in its success, and urges other CSU campus senates to consider hosting similar forums.

III. ASCSU Advocacy

The Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee has the responsibility for planning and coordinating Academic Senate advocacy activities. During 2011-2012 Senate advocacy efforts took two forms: (1) in-district legislative visits by individual campus senate delegations and (2) late-May Sacramento legislative visits by a senate delegation.

In-District Advocacy:

In 2011-2012, the Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee elected to pursue a strategy of in-district legislative visits in which the statewide academic senators from each campus would visit their local legislators in their district offices. This was a departure from the past practice of holding an April legislative day in Sacramento where members of the ASCSU would call on legislators in their capitol offices.
The change was made for two reasons. The first was budgetary; due to recent reductions it was uncertain whether the ASCSU budget could support the costs of a traditional in-Sacramento advocacy day. The second reason involved effectiveness. Increasingly, in-district advocacy is felt to be more effective that visits in the capitol in that the visits are made by the legislator’s constituents, schedules are less hectic and longer meetings are possible, and the chances of scheduling a meeting with the legislator, not just a staff member, are greater. For these reasons, the CSU Office of Advocacy & State Relations is placing increasing emphasis on in-district lobbying as well.

The plan was announced in general terms to the full senate at the November and January plenaries, and a detailed orientation, including a presentation by Karen Yelverton-Zamarippa was made at the March meeting. In April each campus delegation was sent an advocacy packet that included: a list of the names and addresses of their local legislators, a talking points summary, a hand-out (“leave behind”), and a reporting form for summarizing the outcome of the visit. Talking points focused exclusively on budget-related issues.

The results were not particularly successful. In the end, only five campus delegations reported back to the Committee on the visits, and only three of those actually visited legislators locally. (One reported that, while they did not meet with legislators separately, they did participate in their campus-level advocacy activities; another indicated that they were unable to make any visits at all.)

The Committee discussed these problems at its May meeting, acknowledged its relative lack of success in this first year, but recommends that in-district advocacy be pursued again in 2012-2013. Recommendations for improving the process based on feedback from this year, are given in the “Recommendations” section below.

In-Sacramento Advocacy:

On May 17th four members of the Academic Senate (three members of FGA and the incoming senate chair) carried out a series of legislative visits in Sacramento. The central talking points were the higher education budget and several bills then being heard in committee. Both the offices of the Assembly and Senate leadership were targeted, as well as members of the budget and (higher) education committees in both chambers. Over twenty legislative offices were visited by academic senators, either in pairs or individually. Key ‘take-aways’ from the visits were:

- The legislators and the staff who have responsibility for education-related issues clearly understand the situation that higher education currently faces;
- The ASCSU (unlike the CFA, CSSA, and CSU administration) doesn’t have much recognition in the legislative offices. Greater involvement by the Academic Senate (e.g., testifying a committee hearings, meeting with authors as bill are developed) was urged.

There was agreement among those participating that the day was among the most productive ASCSU Sacramento advocacy days in recent memory.

IV. Legislative Monitoring

The Committee, in accordance with its charge, monitored legislative activity in Sacramento and recommended to senate action on specific bills when deemed appropriate. The Committee was assisted in the task by the use of a legislative matrix prepared by Senator Hood which charted the progress of
individual bills through the legislative process. The Committee also consulted with the CSU Office of Advocacy and State Relations, the CSSA, and the CFA regarding their legislative agendas as part of this process.

The Committee initially intended to develop a legislative reporting process that would regularly update the full senate on legislative developments, along the lines of those currently in place for the CSSA and for the Board of Trustees. A busy agenda, however, prevented progress from being made in this regard. (See Recommendations, below).

The Committee recommended that the 2011-2012 Academic Senate oppose the following bills:

- AB 970 (Fong) – System-wide Fees
- AB 1561 (R. Hernandez) – Presidential & Executive Compensation
- SB 952 (Alquist) – Presidential & Executive Compensation
- SB 967 (Yee) – Presidential & Executive Compensation

The Senate adopted resolutions to this effect (see above).

Although the full Senate did not adopt formal positions on AB 645 (Davis) – Graduation Requirements, SB 1052 and 1053 (Steinberg/Alquist) – Affordable eTextbooks, and AB 1564 (Lara) – Tenure in Postsecondary Education, the Committee, working with the Senate leadership expressed the Academic Senate’s concerns with each of them, through meetings with the authors and/or committee testimony.

The Committee initially recommended that the Academic Senate adopt a resolution expressing its concerns with AB 1564 (Lara) – Mandatory Child-Abuse Reporting but withdrew it, after the bill itself was withdrawn in Sacramento.

V. Recommendations for 2012-2013

At its May 2012 meeting the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee developed the following recommendations for 2012-2013:

1. **Time Management:** Time constraints proved a problem for the Committee on several occasions during the year, in that insufficient time was available to get through the day’s agenda. The Committee should think carefully about the number of reports, and particularly the number Time Certain guests, it schedules. Not all guests may be necessary for every meeting, especially if they will also be speaking at the Senate’s plenary.

2. **Legislative Reporting:** The Committee should work with the Academic Senate’s newly-appointed Legislative Specialist to create a process for regularly updating the full-senate on legislative developments throughout the year. Fall 2012 will be a good time to lay the groundwork for this since, given that it’s an election cycle, no legislative activity will be underway.

3. **Advocacy I:** If possible, schedule some Advocacy activities in Fall 2012 aimed at educating legislative candidates about higher education issues before the election. By nature of the way districts are drawn, the outcomes of most races are known well before the election. This is a good time to meet with key candidates since they will be interested in what voters have to say. Ignorance about higher education in general, and the ASCSU in particular, is a continuing problem in the legislature,
given terms limits. Fall meetings with new members would provide an opportunity for the ASCSU to get a jump on addressing this.

4. **Advocacy II**: For Spring 2013, plan again for an in-district advocacy strategy. However, based on the experiences of the past year the following changes in planning should be made:

- The orientation for senators needs to be held at the January plenary to allow time for individual campus delegations to plan their visits. The March meeting simply proved too late for this.

- The packet of advocacy materials needs to be distributed at the time of the orientation meeting; this means that the materials need to be ready much earlier than was the case this past year; in effect, the materials need to be prepared in the fall.

- Related to the above – preparation and distribution of the packets took more time than expected; this must be allowed for.

- *A big issue*: This past year showed that there was a lack of leadership/coordination within the campus delegations when it came to planning and carrying out the visits; one result was that many campus teams apparently never made an effort to carry out the visits. It is possible that an earlier January orientation will address some of this by allowing more time for campus-level planning, but the problem needs to be taken into account.

4. **Advocacy III**: If the senate budget again permits, hold another streamlined Sacramento advocacy day along the lines of that held in May, 2012. Sacramento visits by a small group of experienced senators proved very effective. The process proved very efficient in contrast to the larger more unwieldy delegations in the past.

V. **Concluding Comments**

The Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee had a productive year, particularly when it came to developing prompt and informed responses to proposed legislation, especially in the cases of AB 645, AB 1564, and AB 1564. Much of the credit for this lies in the effectiveness of AVC Ron Vogel, the Committee’s Chancellor’s Office liaison. Ron provided a wealth of useful information and greatly facilitated the Committee’s ability to work with members of the Chancellor’s Office staff to generate effective responses.

For this the Committee is deeply grateful and hopes that Ron will continue to serve in this capacity in the future.

-- Submitted By Thomas Krabacher

2011-2012 Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee Chair