In 2008-2009 FGA members and colleagues confronted and wrestled with a perhaps over-stimulating array of fiscal and legislative issues of a benevolent or not-so-friendly nature. Some new and old items approached at “regular strength” and some others assailed us with vitriolic vengeance. An overview of themes, topics, and activities follows.

Subject bills of note from Sacramento included single and multiple measures presenting various opportunities and/or risks concerning curricular, governance, and other academic programs and policies. Herein please find a sampling of non-budgetary legislation.

The matter of authorization for a CSU Doctorate in Nursing Practice (DNP) program returned from last year in the form of AB867 (Nava), and the newer iteration incorporated language again designed to assure legislators that CSU would not request extra funding for the time. See AS-2885-09 at Reaffirmation of Support for CSU Authority to Offer the Doctorate in Nursing Practice for AA’s resolution on the DNP as co-sponsored by FGA and which passed unanimously in March 2009. Also, we made the DNP one of our key talking points during FGA’s Legislative Day in Sacramento on 14 April. Nonetheless, the proposal went to suspense status in Appropriations as analysts raised questions of eventual costs, of workforce needs, and of the lack of CPEC approval.

Career Technical Education (CTE) once more attracted much attention in the Capitol, where assemblymembers and senators crafted multiple proposed bills of concern to CSU faculty. Primary legislative aims centered around greatly reducing or even removing current CSU and UC authority for approval of high school CTE courses for “A-G” admissions purposes in spite of good progress made in certifying thousands of such courses. We made one particular bill of note, SB147 (De Saulnier), another centerpiece of our April lobby efforts and asserted strongly that the proposed changes would weaken college or workplace readiness and that CSU-bound students should not have different undergrad prep requirements than those going to UC. As the Spring closed out, the Legislature had parked certain of the bills in Appropriations and had inserted revised language in SB147 requesting new standards specifically from ASCSU several years hence; nevertheless, from evidence of bi-partisan support, we judge the CTE problem has not disappeared. A special task force will continue addressing CTE matters, and Tom Krabacher from FGA will move ahead with a leadership role as he did in 2008-09.

Textbook affordability issues re-appeared in Sacramento this year and showed up in especially onerous “families” of bills that, again, if enacted could undercut faculty freedom to select materials best suited to quality teaching and learning. Some observers argue that one core assumption of certain bills actually blames faculty for the expensive nature of the textbook marketplace. Another assumption seems to support the notion that pricing questions should occupy the first and highest place of consideration by faculty. One particular bill, SB386 (Runner), would require CSU faculty to provide written justification when adopting any newer editions within a three-year window. These reports would have to go to campus senates, student governments, and administration. SB386 may rest in a suspense file in uneasy peace for the moment; nevertheless, once more we noted fairly strong bi-partisan support for this and a
number of related items. See our **Opposition to SB 386 (Runner): Faculty Justification for New Textbook Editions** (AS-2900-09), which passed on waiver and unanimously in May.

Another one-reading item emerged from the committee in May, calling for CSU auxiliary organizations to enhance the transparency of their public accounts in a manner similar to requirements within CSU stateside programs. During a meeting with Senator Leland Yee at our 14 April Capitol visit, ASCSU senators heard from Mr. Yee that he would try to ameliorate CSU concerns that the bill not work against appropriate and legal anonymity and thereby discourage certain significant donations by those wishing to keep their names out of the limelight. Amendments through 20 May did clarify this latter issue. See **Support of SB 218 (Yee, D-San Francisco) Amendment to California Public Records Act** (AS-2894-09), which passed ASCSU on 8 May with some division.

As in every year the Committee devoted a large measure of its time and energy upon the “state” of the CSU budget within the overarching budget for the “State” of California. While many of us have surely witnessed other times of fiscal crisis, 2008-09 and some years forward appear unprecedented in red-ink ugliness going back seven or eight decades. Similarly to subject bills, questions on how to prioritize scarce dollars and the programs they represent also attracted regular attention this year from other colleagues in ASCSU. On our own or in allegiance with other committees, FGA labored over a number of budgetary resolutions. We should also point out that, as in other circumstances, much thoughtful and worthwhile discussion occurred over a number of proposals which did not result in the enactment of formal recommendations.

Selected key fiscal measures debated and forwarded by FGA and partner committees included AS-2863-08, which addressed **CSU Budget Priorities for 2009-2010** (FGA) and passed unanimously in September 2008. Considering how much the economy and revenues later worsened, this last represented something of a forlorn but honorable charge in calling for renewed Compact funding. AS-2868-08 (Nov. 08) from FGA and APEP covered **Systemwide Impaction, Enrollment Management and the 2009-2010 Budget Environment**. In January 2009 the Senate amongst other items passed AS-2872-08 (FA/FGA: **Protecting Instruction During Times of Budget Crisis**), AS-2874-09 (FGA: **Support for the Proposed Higher Education Investment Act**), and AS-2876-09 (FGA: **Reaffirmation of Campus Faculty Consultation in Budget Decisions**) in efforts to address the building crisis at our 23 campuses. In May ASCSU passed AS-2886-09 (FA/FGA: **Concerns Related to the Migration of State-Supported Courses to Self-Supporting Special Sessions during Times of Budget Constraints**). Many other states impose severance taxes on the extraction of certain natural resources, and higher education has accordingly benefited with a reliable revenue stream in some of these places as part of the pertinent statutes. Even recognizing short-term pessimism about the Legislature adding any such tax at the moment, FGA considered that California should at least begin a discussion on the matter. Therefore, we sent waiver item AS-2899-09 (FGA) to the entire body in May for review: **In Support of AB 656 (Torrico) California Higher Education Endowment Corporation: oil and gas severance tax**. The item passed unanimously.

Our semi-regular, annual Legislative Day in Sacramento occurred on 14 April 2009. FGA and ExCom sent seven teams of one to three academic senators to 45 different Capitol offices to speak with state Assembly and Senate staffers and legislators. We set most of the appointments with legislative leadership offices and with members of budgetary and education committees. In visiting the 15 Assembly and 30 Senate offices, each team spoke to three main systemwide topics centering on the budget, DNP authorization, and CTE legislation. Wherever possible and as in past lobby days, we matched up team members with legislators from their service areas. Our faculty as always provided significant “down-to-earth” stories and examples from their own campuses and provided policymakers an opportunity to communicate a bit with our “everyday” frontline advocates. Additionally, the trip
allowed us to hear concerns directly from our Legislature so that we might better comprehend their outlook.

Full and due recognition of the creative and thoughtful contributions by FGA members and colleagues could go on for much longer than space herein allows.

Several regular guests assisted with immeasurable support and advice. Robert Turnage (AVC/Budget) visited with us extensively by teleconference or in person at every meeting in giving us considerable insight on fiscal matters for the CSU and California, and he also spoke frequently to the Chair in between committee gatherings. Karen Zamarripa (AVC/Advocacy & Institutional Relations) likewise communicated with us on subject legislation and on the political process and players in Sacramento. Further, the Chair thanks her for invaluable aid for our lobby day in both tactical and strategic ways. AVC Allison Jones (Academic Affairs) attended FGA meetings frequently and interacted most helpfully with difficult CTE issues. John Travis from CFA also gave generously of his time in coming to most of our confabs or sending a representative and in conversing with us on a span of union-senate concerns from different perspectives. With all of these visitors, FGA benefited from a wide and useful range of opinions whether in final concordance with ours or in respectful divergence.

Within ASCSU the Chair wishes to thank all members of FGA, ExCom, and other committees who contributed so much to our common cause. In further partial but inadequate appreciation, I particularly acknowledge and underscore the efforts of FGA Chair Emeritus Hornbeck and Vice Chair Krabacher and senators Hood, Nelson, Guerin, Montanari, Soni, McNamara, Postma, Stepaneck, Tarjan, and Pasternack. Similarly, I must express my gratefulness to Senate staffers Tracy Butler and Sharon Van Steenwyk for their countless acts of practical first aid. I am honored to have served as Chair for 08-09 and thank everyone for their patience and wisdom.

From my view after nine such campaigns, we have traversed yet another “typically unusual” year during 2008-09 with a mix of wins, other outcomes, frustration, and fulfillment. New and ongoing challenges will face us in 2009-10, but our collaborative energy and critical acumen will surely return in FGA’s next guise.
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