Members Present:
Praveen Soni, Chair (Long Beach); Jim LoCascio Vice Chair (San Luis Obispo);
Steve Browne, (Maritime); Kate Fawver (Dominguez Hills); Thomas Krabacher (Sacramento);
Martin Linder (San Francisco); and Cezar Ornatowski (San Diego).

Regrets: Eileen Klink (Long Beach); James E. Swartz (Pomona); Otto Benavides (Fresno).

Guests:
Steven Filling, ASCSU Executive Committee, Vice Chair.
Sheila Thomas substituting for Ron Vogel.

1. Welcome and Call to Order: Praveen Soni, Chair 10:03AM.

2. Agenda Approval: An amended order of the agenda was approved.

3. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the FGA meeting of October 12, 2012 were approved without changes.

4. Chair’s Report: Praveen Soni

- The chair reported on the WASC new format and their desire to have CSU faculty input. Committee members could provide WASC feedback directly to Diana Guerin. Cezar liked the changes because there is shared governance throughout the new format. The issue of the cost to the campus for WASC and other visits was discussed. Both Jim LoCascio and Marty Linder gave examples of the cost. Jim reported that it cost the Mechanical Engineering Department at SLO an extra $1000 for their dual master’s degree program with a German university to be reviewed. Marty reported that it cost $200,000 for a one day trustee visit. It was noted that New York State issues accreditation for institutions of higher education in its state. It was discussed that the Federal Government could become the accreditation agent for higher education. It was stated that a Federal accreditation could become too political. Some committee members wondered about the make-up of the WASC Board of Trustees; Cezar suggested that Praveen contact CSULB President Alexander for more information.

- The Chair stated that he is in communication with Judy Heiman of the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) to meet with the FGA in January 2013. It was also suggested that FGA build a bridge with the Governor’s office on their Sacramento Advocacy in Spring 2013.

- The chair will be meeting with Ben Quillian to obtain more information on (1) State University Grants (SUGs) (2) a more transparent budget analysis, in particular revenues and costs and (3) financial information of what it would cost to fund the
5. **Executive Committee Liaison:** Steven Filling:

- Steven reported that the Executive Committee is seeking an audience with Chancellor White and that Ben Quillian will be the interim chancellor.
- Christine Helwick will retire.
- CMS needs a speaker to explain the current status.
- Cal State Online is moving along.
- A task force on MOOC’s will be created to see how they fit with the CSU.
- Questions for Steve: (1) Kate wanted to know why Cal State Online needs an additional $5 million. Steve did not know. (2) What is the status of the 120/180 unit degree limit? Steve noted that it is going ahead and that the BOT has not approved the policy. Marty wanted to know the effect of this policy on students.
- Praveen asked Steve to report back to the Executive Committee that FGA will present a resolution on SUGs because (a) it is negatively affecting campus operating budgets, and (b) instead of the state taking responsibility for eligible low income students for SUGs, 200,000 CSU families are paying tuition for the 100,000 other CSU families (c) if the SUG is important for Californians, then the State should pay for it.

6. **Planning for Spring 2013 Advocacy – In Sacramento and In District**

- Last year it was decided to have senators make in district visits as this is the least expensive plan, but it was not very effective and was hard to coordinate.
- Traditionally the FGA committee went to Sacramento to visit as many legislators as possible. This is the most effective, efficient method, and can be easily coordinated.
- Alternative plans may be: (1) limit a Sacramento visit to senators who live close to Sacramento and maybe a few others. (2) limit the Sacramento visit to the Executive and FGA committee members. Cezar raised the concern about having enough time to be prepared to speak in Sacramento. Tom pointed out that if we go to the capitol we can visit a lot of legislators in a short period of time. The next question is whether April or May is the best month to make the visit. Marty, Kate, Cezar and Steve believe that a smaller well-prepared group would be most effective. It was suggested that we can do both in district and in the capitol if the advocacy is limited to the FGA and perhaps the Executive Committee. It was pointed out that the May revise may be the most important issue for the CSU. That assumes that there will not be any proposed legislation that directly affects curriculum. Whichever plan we adopt it is necessary to produce talking points and brochures. Kate believes that our current advocacy materials are adequate.

7. **Feedback from campuses on resolution regarding SUGs.**
Cezar reported that SDSU is opposed to reducing SUGs and wants Graduate SUGs to remain as is. Their senate has passed a resolution in opposition to eliminating Graduate SUGs.

Tom reported that SAC State offered no concerns.

Steve reported that Cal Maritime in an informal poll had one for and all others against the resolution.

Marty reported that SFSU is on fire over this issue. The graduate students “hate this” and the faculty claims that it will cause the death of some graduate programs. The campus is demanding that this resolution be withdrawn. David Prigge has written a petition on change.org opposing this resolution. Jim reminded the committee that SUGs have caused a $700 million hole in campus operating budgets.

Kate reported that CSUDH is opposed to the resolution.

8. Possible Resolutions:

a. Commendation for Chancellor White on his example of leadership-Voluntary acceptance of 10% salary reduction. There was some discussion on the need for the resolution or a letter to the Chancellor. It was decided that the FGA would make a decision in January after seeing a draft of the resolution.

b. CSU Commitment to Sustainability in Higher Education. The commitment to sustainability is a campus President’s decision. Tom suggested that we craft a resolution and then decide if we want to go forward.

c. Other: FGA discussed a resolution on the 2013-14 CSU budget. The question is how much money does the CSU need to fully fund the “Master Plan” to provide access to California residents. The current CSU plan is for the CSU BOT to ask the state to increase CSU funding by $441 million. We decided that we do not know what the appropriate dollar amount is.

9. Postponed to January FGA Committee meeting:

a. CSU budget data for the last five years showing sources and uses of funds under major headings of revenues and expenditures.

b. FGA charge and responsibility on fiscal and legislative matters and issues, vis-a-vis other committees and specialists.

10. Adjourn 1:00 pm

Meeting minutes submitted by Jim G. LoCascio, FGA vice Chair.