Minutes

Meeting called to order 11:08.

In attendance: Praveen Soni (Chair), Steve Browne (Vice Chair), Tom Krabacher, Eileen Klink, Jay Schwartz, Erick Eschker, Ron Vogel, Cezar Ornatowski, Kate Fawver, Otto Benavides

1. Approval of the agenda – Meeting of May 14, 2014: approved unanimously, as amended.

2. Approval of the minutes – Meeting of April 11, 2014: approved unanimously.

3. Chair’s report
   • Tenured/tenure-track density in the CSU has dropped to 58.2%.
   • Executive Committee met with the Chancellor regarding shared governance. He is working to change the culture. They are optimistic. They will meet with him again in June.
   • The search for EVC Smith’s replacement will commence soon. Two faculty will be on the committee.
   • The Academic Conference will be November 13-14 at the Hilton Long Beach.

4. Other brief reports, if any
   • The committee thanks Praveen and Tom for coordinating the legislative advocacy day. It was very well organized.

5. Changes in positions, if any, on prior legislative bills (SB 850, AB 2153)
   • AB 2153 – No change
   • SB 850 – No change to our position (no position / watch)

6. Possible positions on new legislative bills
   • AB 1548 – No position on this bill.
   • SB 1425 (Block) – No position on this bill.
   • AB 1969 – CSU/CCC/UC would coordinate efforts in educational technology. FGA recommends the ASCSU adopt a position of Watch/No position.

7. The FGA resolution, Formation of a task force to review the role of Student Success fees across California State University Campuses, was passed and sent to the Senate. It is attached.
8. Teleconference with the Department of Finance (Commenced 1:30) – Mollie and Christian

- May Revise:
  - Projected state revenue is up, but costs are up about the same amount.
  - The May revise maintains the previous funding commitment to the CSU. The requested $95 million extra is not likely.

- Question: What is the reason for opposition on student success fees / increased tuition? Answer: The Governor doesn’t want to burden families. Also, raising tuition impacts the state budget due to the need for increased Cal Grants.

- Question: What can we do in the future to have a better influence on the budget process? Answer: We appreciate the CSU’s efforts and understand that the budget doesn’t meet all your needs. We will keep this line of communication open. The Governor needs to get information from the CSU to determine a sustainable budget. What can you do to better serve your students on the current budget? What is an appropriate enrollment for your current funding?

- Comment: Many students don’t want to graduate in 4 years due to part-time employment, family commitments, etc.

- Comment: CSU 4 and 6-year graduation rates are above the national average.

- Question: The May revise included increased funding for the CCC. Philosophically, is the state moving away from the CSU? Answer: The CCC has a different funding model due to Prop 98 so their budget looks different out of necessity. We are still making a significant investment in the CSU.

9. Legislative and Advocacy Update – Nichole from AVC Karen YZ’s office in Sacramento (Commenced 2:30)

- The May budget revision is as expected: no additional funding. We are continuing to work with the legislature.

- We have sent a letter to the legislature. About half of the members of the assembly and senate have signed letters of support.

- e-Advocacy system: updates are sent to 1 million alumni who are asked to contact their representatives.

- Flyers have been sent to representatives.

- We may not get $95 million, but we hope to get something.

- 15 campuses are Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI)

- Bills
  - AB 1989 (Underage drinkers) – progressing well
  - AB 2153 – bill is on suspense file due to costs
  - SB 1200 – passed the Senate, sent to the Assembly. CSU doesn’t have a position.
  - AB 1750 – bill is being watched. It is on the suspense file.
  - AB 2092 – we are working with the representative to address concerns.
• Question: Is there anything else we can do to help your efforts? Answer: Recognize the representatives that have signed on to support the CSU on a local level, in the districts. Visit the district offices.

10. CFA Report – Andy Merrifield (commenced 3:30 pm)
• May revise is essentially unchanged from January. CFA will continue to work for additional funding.
• AB 2153 is in appropriations.
• Question: What is the effect of the May revise on the contract negotiations? Answer: Our position hasn’t changed but it would have been easier if the budget was increased.

11. Executive Committee Liaison – Steve Filling (commenced 3:45)
• The ASCSU calendar for 2014-2015 is in flux due to the BOT schedule.
• Access to Excellence report was released online.
• Senators should complete committee request forms.
• Please advocate for reinvestment in the CSU.
• Question: Why was the CalState Online committee meeting scheduled for June when faculty are not available? Answer: I don’t have a good answer. The Executive Committee had to work to make sure that committee met even once this year.
• Suggestion: First year senators should interface with the standing committees so they can be better informed in their committee choices.

12. Teleconference with Judy Heiman, Legislative Analyst’s Office (call commenced 4:26):
• The Governor is sticking with his plan for the CSU budget. The subcommittee hearings will occur during the next two weeks. The Assembly will likely add funding for higher ed. The Senate probably won’t. If money is added, the Governor can use his line-item veto power.
• The Governor is committed to finding ways to educate more students for less money and will provide $50 million for awards for innovation.
• Student success fees are a political problem. Legislators have touted the tuition freeze, but the CSU has circumvented it. The LAO considers that a long-term tuition freeze is not workable.
• State University Grants
  - LAO does not count SUGs when determining net revenue for CSU.
  - If SUGs were funded by the state, the state, not the CSU, would likely be in control of who got them.
  - Although tuition increased, 50% of students don’t pay anything due to SUGs.
  - Without SUGs, tuition would not have increased as much.

Meeting adjourned: 4:58.
Formation of a task force to review the role of Student Success Fees across California State University Campuses

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognize the fiscal exigencies that have prompted the introduction of Student Success Fees on CSU campuses; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU nonetheless recognize that questions have been raised regarding these fees, such as: impact on overall cost to the students, affect on access, possible inequities among campuses, lack of clear guidelines on their usage and effectiveness of the consultation process; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor’s Office to undertake a system-wide assessment of the role of Student Success Fees that will:

- review the current E.O. 1054 to determine if changes to CSU student fee policies are advisable, and
- to evaluate and to clarify the role of Student Success Fees within the broader context of the fiscal needs and anticipated state funding levels the CSU can expect in the future; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be distributed to:

- Chancellor Timothy White,
- CSU Board of Trustees,
- Assemblymember Das Williams, Chair, Assembly Higher Education Committee,
- Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi, Chair, Assembly Budget Subcommittee 2 (Education Finance),
- Senator Carol Liu, Chair, Senate Education Committee,
- CSU campus Presidents,
- CSU campus Senate Chairs,
California State Student Association (CSSA), and the
California Faculty Association (CFA).

RATIONALE: Since 2008 individual campuses in the CSU have introduced Student Success Fees on top of regular tuition and other campus-based fees as a way of augmenting the state’s general fund support for instructional programs and other basic higher education needs. Currently, eleven campuses have such fees and a proposal for a twelfth is currently under review. The size of the fees varies from campus to campus and currently ranges from $162 to $630 (3%-12% of tuition). While, traditionally, campus-based student fees have been used to cover incidental classroom costs (such as lab fees) or to support things not covered by state funding or regular tuition (a student union expansion or a child day-care center), the Student Success Fee is primarily intended to support basic classroom instruction.

The fees are proposed and approved by the students themselves under the process outlined in E.O. 1054. The California State Student Association (CSSA) is scheduled to plans to take up a resolution in support of Student Success Fees, given that students no longer believe the State is willing to support higher education at the level necessary to ensure student access to a quality education. The ASCSU recognizes the fiscal pressures that have prompted campuses to establish Student Success Fees and applauds the willingness of students to look for ways to help solve the underlying problem of the underfunding of public higher education even if it means taxing themselves in order to receive the education they desire.

Nonetheless, the ASCSU remains sensitive to questions that have been raised about the way Student Success Fees are being implemented in the CSU. First, and most fundamentally, the fees are being used to make up for the failure of the state of California to adequately support higher education. Guidelines as to the purposes to which the fees are to be used are unclear, yet, for the most part, they are exactly those things that state support (supplemented by regular tuition) should be funding. As such, they amount to de facto tuition hikes under a different name. Questions have also been raised about the
consultation process by which students are asked to approve (or disapprove of) any such fee proposals; there appears to be a lack of consistency as to how this takes place among campuses and it is not clear whether the “alternate consultation” system, which calls for approval by a student fee advisory committee, is sufficient to allow for genuine student consultation. Furthermore, the fees seem to run the risk of exacerbating quality and opportunity differences among campuses within the CSU as student groups on some campuses may be better able than others to support these fee increases.

The introduction of Student Success Fees also offers the potential for unintended political consequences; such fees run the risk of being seen as an effort by the CSU to side-step the freeze on tuition increases that are part of the multi-year funding proposal for higher education proposed by the governor. Several newspaper editorial boards have commented on this and, more importantly, it has been noted in the Legislature. The Chair of Assembly Budget Subcommittee 2 (Education Finance) recently observed that Student Success Fees were little more than a tuition hike by another name and that it was imperative that the existing tuition freeze be honored. He then went on to stress that the introduction of further such fees would undercut the Assembly’s willingness to support a budget augmentation such as that which the CSU is currently requesting.

Currently, Student Success Fees are implemented on a campus-by-campus basis according to the guidelines established in E.O. 1054. In light of the questions raised above, a system-wide assessment of Student Success Fees is now warranted. Any assessment should be carried out in the broader context of an examination of the anticipated fiscal needs of the CSU, the anticipated levels of state funding it can expect in the future, and the appropriate role of tuition and fees in meeting the costs of a quality education within the CSU.