Minutes
Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee
Academic Senate of the California State University
March 9-10, 2005

Present: David Hood, Myron Hood, Thomas Krabacher, Susan McKillop, Ann Morgan, Dennis Muraoka, Barry Pasternack, Hank Reichman (chair)

Guests: Cristy Jensen (Executive Committee), David Ernst (Chancellor’s Office), Jackie Kegley (Faculty Affairs Committee liaison), Marshelle Thobaben (Executive Committee), John Tarjan (Executive Committee), Susan Meisenholder (CFA), Wess Larson, via video conference (Office of Governmental Affairs)

Wednesday March 9th
1. Chair Reichman called the meeting to order at 10:10 AM and provided a brief overview of the agenda.

2. Agenda was approved.

3. Minutes from 1/19/05 approved with minor emendations.

4. Reports
   A. David Hood reported on the recent Budget Advisory Committee meeting. The major topic at the meeting was the LAO analysis of the higher education budget, which was seen as extremely negative. It concludes that:
      - the undergraduate marginal cost should be lowered;
      - higher education currently greater enrollment capacity than needed;
      - enrollment demand will be lower than expected.
   It also argues that fee increases should not be captured by the system but go to the general fund. Patrick Lenz was extremely upset over it. David Hood sees it as an effort by the LAO to increase its influence among new legislators.

   B. Susan McKillop reported on the Assembly Higher Ed. Committee Master Plan hearings. She provided the Committee with written summaries of two meetings. Susan also felt that CSU may have alienated CPEC for the near future because of CSU support for the aborted plan to reorganize CPEC. Susan was complimented and thanked for the thoroughness of her reports.

5. Lobbying:
   A. February’s “Meet and Greet”: The legislative visits in Sacramento were reviewed. Attending committee members met with 17 of 20 new Assembly members or their staff. Specifics of selected meetings were discussed.

   B. April 4-5th Leg Day: In planning for the event, the following was decided upon:
      - The dates would remain Monday April 4th and Tuesday April 5th as originally planned. As many senators as possible would be requested to make one day or another; if attending the Sacramento event was not practical, senators would be asked to visit legislators in their home districts.
      - Visits would target the following: Membership of the Senate Education Committee, the Assembly Higher Education committee, the two education budget subcommittees, and the leadership of both houses. Senators will be urged to visit the offices of their local representatives, if possible. Tom Krabacher agreed to generate a potential list of visits.
      - Chair Reichman will circulate a sign-up sheet during the plenary session;
• The Committee agreed to prepare a one-sheet for distribution during the visits; Tom Krabacher agreed to provide Chair Reichman copies of one-sheets from prior Leg Day visits.
• The theme will be: There won’t be room for their constituents at the CSU in the future unless the system’s needs are addressed today. Other issues to stress include: the CSU budget, the professional doctorate, and refutation of the LAO budget analysis, if it is brought up.
• It was agreed to prepare background information sheets with which to brief senators before their legislative visits;
• Depending upon the number of senators planning to attend (and for which days), the committee will plan breakfast and evening events. Possibilities include: Monday AM breakfast w. briefing by someone from Governmental Affairs Office, Monday PM dinner, and Tuesday AM breakfast.

6. Times Certain:
   A. 11:30AM: Susan Meisenhelder (CFA): Meisenhelder updated the committee about CFA positions on a number of issues, including:
      • Budget: The CFA position is that the Compact agreement is not adequate and needs to be augmented; it must be seen in the context of cuts in recent years. The access argument seems to be the one that resonates most with legislators.
      • Initiatives: CFA feels we need to think of current initiative efforts as set of “initiative wars,” a well-organized, well-funded attack on the public sector. Recent quotes by the governor to this effect were offered. Initiatives of major concern include:
        -- the “auto pilot” budget writing initiative;
        -- use of the CPI to determine spending growth
        -- universal contracting out of state services
        --CalPers/retirement changes
   The petitions need to be filed by April 22nd;

   B. 12:30 PM: Wess Larson (Governmental Affairs): Larson provided a brief overview of the status of things in the capitol. He then gave a brief timeline of key dates:
      Early May: bills with a fiscal impact must be complete
      Late May: fiscal deadline
      June 1: all bills out of house of origin
      Mid-July to Mid-August: summer recess
      Early Fall: back in session for three weeks
      End of September: sessions end for year; time then used for studies, etc.

   Top legislative priorities for the CSU this session include:
      • SB 569: Use of the affinity card—to be heard on 4/13
      • SB 724: The professional doctorate (Scott)
      • AB 706: Whistleblower Protection (Parva)—to be heard on 4/12
      • AB 961 or AB1646: Omnibus education code clean-up.
      • AB 992 Law Enforcement Surveillance Bill (Spitzer)

   Regarding other legislation:
      • SB 5: Feels it isn’t going anywhere
      • Outside employment bill: CSU has not found author for it; will pursue it again in ’06
      • AB 196 (Liu) Higher Education Accountability Act—CSU will work to make reporting requirements more acceptable.

   C. David Ernst (Chief Implementation Officer, CMS) spoke to the Committee on CMS implementation. Several members of the Executive Committee were also present.

   Numerous points were raised and Ernst responded to them with the Chancellor’s Office position; topics included: Need for implementing CMS on current schedule, concern that the necessity for campuses to borrow to implement the Student module would negatively affect the instructional budget (CMS costs vs. academic need), and the need for a formal cost-benefit analysis.
David Ernst agreed to follow up with John Tarjan, Jackie Kegley, and others to develop a cost-benefit analysis to demonstrate the advantages of proceeding with CMS implementation.

7. **Legislation:**
   The following legislation was of interest to FGA:
   - SB 5: The “Morrow Bill”—(See Wess Larson’s comments above.)
   - SB 196: FGA decided not to take position on it.
   - AB 992: Law Enforcement Surveillance Bill—FGA had some concerns over the implications of the bill and the way in which it was introduced. It was agreed that Chair Reichman should carry these concerns to Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa.

8. **Resolutions**
   FGA decided to forward no resolutions at this meeting. Specifically:
   - It decided to wait until the May meeting, when it will be known whether the changes will be proposed in the form of initiative or legislation, before decided whether to join Faculty Affairs in co-sponsoring a resolution on proposed changes to the public employees retirement system
   - FGA decided that, in light of its January resolution on the subject, it was not necessary to support Eric Guerra’s proposed resolution encouraging voter registration.

-- submitted by Tom Krabacher