



Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA) Committee

MINUTES

Wednesday, September 15, 2010
10:00 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.; Coronado Room

Present: Darlene Yee-Melichar (Chair), Buckley Barrett (Vice-Chair), Edward Aguado, Michael Ault, Jim Meriwether, Dick Montanari, Catherine Nelson, Cezar Ornatowski, Praveen Soni, William Wagner, III.

Guests: Eric Forbes (Chancellor's Office Liaison), Elizabeth Hoffman (CFA Liaison), David Hood (ASCSU Budget Specialist), Thomas Krabacher (ASCSU Executive Committee Liaison), Karen Zamarripa (AVC Advocacy and State Relations), APEP (all members) and AA (Barry Pasternak and Jim LoCascio) joined FGA for Eric Forbes' report.

I. Call to Order:

- Chair Darlene Yee-Melichar called the meeting to order at 10:03am.

II. Announcements and Updates

- Plenary begins at 2:45 p.m.
- \$30 request for all socials.

III. Campus Reports: Liaison Reports, Member Items

- Senator Yee-Melichar reported about cost-cutting procedures on her campus, especially work of the University Planning Advisory Committee on proposals for reorganization of colleges and other academic units.
- CSU/UC Joint Graduate Board. Senator Yee-Melichar participated in meetings over the summer regarding plans for 3 new joint Ph.D. programs (all between SDSU and UCSD).

IV. Consent Calendar

- Unanimous approval of the minutes from the May 2010 meeting with special thanks to Senator Michael Ault.

- Unanimous approval of the 2009/2010 Year-End FGA Report with special thanks to Senator Buckley Barrett.
- Unanimous approval of the September 15, 2010 FGA Meeting Agenda.

V. Consultations and Reports

1. Eric Forbes (Chancellor's Office Liaison Report)

- **Budget and Enrollments:** Federal stimulus will allow an increase in enrollments for the Spring term. Plans are being made to carry this out.
- **SB 1440 (Padilla), CCC Student Transfer:** Update on the implementation and interpretation of the bill. The "intent" of the bill is that students must "meet all application requirements." There was a discussion about impacted programs. Senator Kaiser raised the issue of coordination between the Community Colleges and the CSU; she also cautioned the Academic Senate in its response to this bill. Leaders from the three segments claim this bill will produce "significant savings" for higher education in California. Senator Pasternak raised the issue of community colleges offering upper-division courses and the CSU being required to accept courses that may not be considered appropriate to the degree. Senator Nelson raised the issue of the course CID process. Senator Ornatowski raised the issue that qualifications of the Community College faculty are not addressed by the bill. Senator Yee-Melichar asked how the bill might affect demand for lower division and upper division GE course offerings for the CSU. Senator Van Selst raised the issue that there was no input from the "academic side of the house" on this bill.
- **Early Start Program:** Chancellor's Office Committee recently met to discuss the implementation of the program. Chancellor's Office Liaison Forbes claimed "the issue pivots around what we do with the student who cannot make it to the destination campus during the Summer term." He reported the committee made "progress moving that side of the process forward." It was decided that software development is needed. Senator Kaiser called this "the most offensive linking of alternative realities." She mentioned that it's not true that all students will receive financial aid for the Summer. Several other issues were raised regarding campus and student requirements. Senator Buckley raised the issue of software development and PeopleSoft. Chancellor's Office Liaison Forbes mentioned that the guidelines to campuses are "coming quickly." Senator Van Selst asked when students are required to begin and end their remediation.
- **Budget (revisited):** All campuses will receive part of the \$106 million federal stimulus money. On Sept. 27, the Chancellor will speak about admitting students for the Spring quarter. Some campuses are already admitting students to graduate programs for Spring. Senator Yee-Melichar asked about the one-time stimulus funds for Spring and noted that these funds are not permanent. The concern is that it will be used as an "off-set" to the \$305 million in the Governor's current budget instead of a supplement. Concern was raised that the increase in campus FTE is permanent and yet the funding is only one-time.

2. David Hood (ASCSU Budget Specialist)

- **Budget:** There is a \$4 billion difference between the two budget proposals; also, there is \$305 million in “restoration” funds. On September 27, the Chancellor will make an announcement concerning the budget. Again, concern over the \$106 million is that it might just be a “swap-out.” One lingering problem remains: several years ago, during that year’s budget crisis, voters approved temporary tax increases. Unfortunately, these increases are set to expire next year (2011/2012 budget), which will result in 10 percent less state revenue. Also, during the meeting of the Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee, there were discussions about the “principles” governing future budget requests. ASCSU Budget Specialist Hood summarized the principles.

Principles expressed by Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee:

- i. The outlook is bad. Fears of a double dip recession seem a little overstated but, nevertheless, next year is going to be worse than this year. Problem: temp taxes are set to expire – which means the state will take a \$9 billion hit in revenues. ASCSU Budget Specialist Hood said, “Just wait until next year, it’s going to get worse.”
- ii. While bad times, the CSU should devise a request that addresses what “we really need.”
- iii. Coordinate the UC and CSU budget requests so there is a higher education united front.
- iv. Preserve base funding. \$106 million of stimulus money to “fill in” the \$306 million and NOT supplement it.
- v. Because of the economic realities, student fee increases need to be part of the mix.
- vi. Mandatory cost increases (e.g., health and utilities) must be absorbed by the state and not cut into instruction budgets.
- vii. Money must be requested for compensation (i.e., there have been no salary increases for some time).
- viii. Ask for increased academic services (e.g., Advising, graduation initiative).
- ix. Educate the legislature about deferred maintenance costs and reduced library resources. The CSU needs to make the case to the public and the State government.

3. **Karen Zamarripa (AVC Advocacy and State Relations)**

- **Legislative Front:** “Overall the CSU should be proud of the things we’ve prevented from happening, and we have been able to get some things added (e.g., extension of doctoral degrees).” Systemwide, there is emphasis on the collective

interests between CSU and UC. AVC Zamarripa commented on the fact that the last three days of the legislative session were the “worst” she has ever seen. She does not expect a budget until after the November election. “Next year’s budget is going to be worse than this year’s,” she argued. A lot of the CSU work in Sacramento is “deflecting.” She continued, “next year is going to be a huge unknown.” There’s been a 21 percent cut in the base of the budget over the past 2 years. The CSU message to the Legislature is that the \$305 million is nice, but it’s still not the amount that we have been cut over the past two years.

- **SB 969 (Liu), Fee Stabilization Act:** There was a discussion of the student fee issue and notification to students.
- The CSU is trying to get a bond passed for capital outlay projects.
- Letters to the Governor in support of AB 867 (Nava), CSU DNP would be helpful. AVC Zamarripa will send sample letters for our reference.
- Senator Wagner asked about faculty input on SB 1440 – her response was simply, they didn’t seek faculty input for the drafting of the bill. She argued, there is a “strong view” in the Legislature and the general public that the CSU does not work for students and makes it difficult for transfer students. “There was a strong view that the issue needed to be pressed and addressed in a timely manner.”

4. Thomas Krabacher (ASCSU Executive Committee Liaison)

- Discussion of ASCSU/Administration relations: There is an effort to have better relations between the two. SB 1440 and Early Start will require better relations.

5. Elizabeth Hoffman (CFA Liaison).

- **Budget:** CFA is still confident that the Democrats will hold to the \$305 million.
- **SB330 (Yee), Transparency Bill.** CFA has been encouraging letters to editors as well as the Governor. It passed in the Assembly and is waiting for the Governor’s signature.
- CFA and the Academic Senate worked together on SB1440 to ensure that community colleges cannot provide upper-division courses.
- Yes on Prop 24 and 25 and voter registration. CFA is working on all of these issues.
- CFA has commit cards that they’re collecting.

VI. Discussion and Work on Resolutions

- Affordable Learning Solutions Initiative
- Adequate Financial Support for the Academic Senate CSU
- Call for Adequate and Sustainable Support for the California State University (CSU)

VII. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Submitted by *Michael Ault*