REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, July 17, 2012

After closed sessions related to Executive Personnel Matters and Collective Bargaining, the open session was called to order by Chair Bill Linschied.

Committee on Collective Bargaining – Open Session: (Go to http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul12/ColBarg.pdf for more detailed information.) Minutes of the May 8, 2012 meeting were approved as submitted.

1. Ratification of the Successor Collective Bargaining Agreement with the State University Police Association (SUPA – Unit 8) Public Safety, Action.

Committee Chair Monville noted that there actually are no agenda items ready for action today. The ratification noted above as #1 has not yet been completed, so this item will appear on a later agenda.

Public Comment:

- Alisandra Brewer, CSUEU Officer: CSUEU had their state elections and the new officers were introduced.
- Mike Geck, VP for Organizing who represents CSUEU out in the field. Wishes to work with the board and the bargaining teams on both sides toward mutual respect. Believes that what we are currently seeing is not mutual respect. “Shared sacrifice” is not shared sacrifice when the union members lag far behind the administrators and MPPs in salary and benefits. Once they catch up then they will feel that there is mutual sacrifice. Administrators and MPPs need to ante up more. CSU has employees who are at poverty level who would be very hard hit by a 2.5 or 4.5 percent salary decrease.
- Tessie Reese: Reinforced Mike Geck’s comments. Believes the parties have been prepared and fair in negotiations, but reminded the board that there has been
significant attrition, and shared sacrifice needs to be truly shared, not on the backs on the lowest paid employees.

- Pam Robinson: The staff cannot bear any further cuts. Many have lost homes, some can’t afford to drive to work. Have been cut as much as can be cut.

- Sharon Cunnier: Urged that presidents talk to plant directors about the proposed salary cuts. Noted high priced consultants who come in to tell them how to run their plants, which then leads to a decrease in the number of employees. Ultimately find that work cannot get done and then contract it out. In many cases the contractors then do not do the work, and the limited number of state employees end up doing it.

- Michael Chavez: Reiterated comments regarding staff taking another hit and that this will galvanize the union in terms of how it will attack their work and their jobs.

- John Orr, Chair of unit 7. Re pay cuts, noted that the last pay raise was in 2007. Cost of living has increased over 9% since that time without any salary increase.Lost close to 10% in earning power over the last 5 years. It is ignorant to say that it affects everyone the same. A 5% salary decrease would drop some of the full-time people that he represents below the federal poverty line. This seems small on paper but would have a huge effect.

- Rich McGee, Unit 9, San Bernardino. Spoke of presidential pay raise which many of his people support, but there are many who are living at poverty level. Asked that they be shown that they matter, and to show them the spirit of the CSU.

- Lois Cuggelheisen: Currently they are trying to bargain a contract for Unit 12. These people serve about 1200 young people up to 12 years old. Some money comes from HeadStart. Asked for help in pulling a contract together for these child care workers.

- Debra Delagadi, Teaching staff, family advocate and coordinators representative. Contract negotiations fell apart. Wants to complete contract and get on with work.

- Andy Merrifield, Chair of CFA Collective Bargaining Team. Wants a fair contract that balances the needs of the CFA, CSU and people of state. They have been invited back to the table and will meet again this afternoon. Still hoping to get a deal, but need people who are willing to deal with us, and who wish to work together to get a settlement. Want to finish bargaining at the table and not go to fact finding, but if go to fact finding, the deal must include working fairly with CSU management.

Chair Monville expressed his hopes that an acceptable solution will be found.
Committee on University and Faculty Personnel: (Go to http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul12/UFP.pdf for more detailed information.) Minutes of the March 20, 2012 meeting were approved as submitted.

1. Executive Compensation, Action. Chancellor Reed presented this item, noting that no salary exceeds the base pay of the predecessor from state funds. Any supplemental funds will be raised separately and will not come from funds intended for student scholarships or services. He then spoke individually regarding each of the candidates, giving specifics that can be accessed at the URL noted above. In brief, three of the presidential compensation packages include raises from that of their predecessors (Dianne Harrison, Northridge, 10%; Tomás Morales, San Bernardino, 10%; Leslie Wong, San Francisco, 9%), one president will receive a salary reduction from that of his predecessor (Thomas Cropper, Maritime), and three interim appointments will be paid the same as their predecessors (Willie Hagan, Dominguez Hills; Joseph Sheley, Stanislaus; Eduardo Ochoa, Monterey Bay).

Trustee Cheyne welcomed the new presidents and acknowledged the concerns that had been shared by union representatives. Referenced the revised policy that the Board had approved in May and that the Board’s role did not include implementing such policies. Noted that certain assertions regarding faculty compensation are incorrect: faculty have received raises when achieving tenure and/or promotion, new hires in certain disciplines often are hired at salaries higher than their predecessors creating a salary compression dilemma, and it is not uncommon for private businesses to augment or even fully fund faculty positions.

Trustee Glazer clarified that foundation money for presidential salaries would not come from student scholarships. Noted that he supported the new policy and that private individuals have the right to offer funds for whatever purpose they choose.

Trustee Ruddell moved to divide the question. Died for lack of second.

Trustee Achtenberg welcomed the talented new presidents and pointed out that currently seated presidents have had their salaries frozen since 2007. This is consistently misstated in the media. Thanked all presidents for their valuable service.

Trustee Mehas reminded the group that $363 million was generated by the presidents over the past years and that this has gone to serving our students and programs.

Chair Fong reiterated comments regarding monies for salary increases coming from foundations.

M/S/P to accept resolutions. One dissenting vote from Trustee Ruddell.
Committee on Governmental Relations: (Go to http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul12/GovRel.pdf for more detailed information). Minutes of the May 8, 2012 meeting were approved as submitted.

1. 2011-2012 Legislative Report No. 10, Information. VC for University Relations and Advancement Garrett Ashley began the presentation, following by a detailed report from AVC for Advocacy & State Relations Karen Y. Zamarripa. She noted the following:
   - When legislature returns they will again take up the pension issues.
   - AB 633 regarding vehicle purchasing continues to have considerable resistance from the Department of General Services.
   - AB 2126 will extend our ability to make regulations for another five years. Believe that this will be signed by the governor without objection.
   - Regarding academic issues: Noted a bill that would prohibit the implementation of Early Start without financing to support it. Has now been amended. There also was a bill that stated we could not offer special sessions at a higher fee than that charged for the regular academic year. This has been amended. Addressed a number of measures that relate to the situation at Penn State. Two of those bills probably will come to fruition. All of the bills restricting the Board’s ability to set executive compensation have been defeated with the exception of one. SB 952 remains active and would prohibit an increase of more than 10% from general fund sources for any employee whose annual salary exceeds $200,000. The CSU is opposing this measure.
   - There are a number of bills regarding fees. Noted SB 960 related to campus-based mandatory fees. Also AB 970, with the core issues having to do with notice and consultation. In its current form, notice must be given 10 days prior, and consultation with students must occur at least 30 days prior. Also, there must be both an information and action item by the board in order to allow time for consultation. Once the board acts, it cannot be implemented for at least 90 days. These factors are off the table if there are budget cuts which would change the protocols.
   - Bills in the area of governance: AB 1723 will require that audio and video web streaming of board meetings be provided and that such recordings be retained and accessible to the public for 12 months. AB 1965 still is in process and would allow the non-voting student trustee to vote if the voting student trustee is absent. AB 1515, which would have changed the structure of the board, was defeated.
   - Something that just came up and is not in report is that certain student assistants and interns have been prohibited from working in certain agencies...
based upon a complaint by SEIU that it is infringing upon their unit’s employees. This is approximately a $2 million loss in terms of student support, most of whom are in the Sacramento area.

Chancellor Reed noted that it would cost approximately $900 million to rewire the auditorium in order to respond to the audio/video requirement of AB 1723. Trustee Hauck asked why we don’t ask the governor to veto the bill if there is no funding offered in order to address this requirement.

Trustee Monville questioned regarding the Penn State issue and whether something might be forthcoming from the NCAA. Chancellor Reed indicated that he has read the Freeh report and it has some good recommendations. NCAA has a procedural problem in that it is a matter of institutional control and not of the individual athletes; they are trying to determine how to focus on the former without penalizing the latter.

2. 2012 Initiatives, Action. AVC Zamarippa noted that there are at least 34 new members of the Assembly, and between 9-12 new members in the Senate. There is a large question as to whether or not a 2/3 majority can be maintained in order for the democrats to garner approval of tax measures. There also could be two special senate elections given individuals who are running for congress. In addition, there will be new leadership in the house after next year which probably will come from some of the new assembly members. She then summarized the report that can be accessed at the URL above and offered special notes regarding:

- Proposition 32 (Paycheck Protection), Proposition 31 (California Forward), Proposition 34 (repeal of death penalty) and Proposition 39 (sales tax with proceeds used for energy and sustainability).
- Proposition 30 is the governor’s tax initiative which directly relates to budget discussions and, if it fails, will set off the $250 million trigger. Although there is not a direct link to more dollars, there is a direct link to less dollars.

Trustee Mehas expressed concern regarding endorsement of this measure and the implications in terms of “having a gun to our head.” Trustee Torlakson strongly urged endorsement in terms of it being a balanced approach with an eye toward the future. Trustee Achtenberg stated her support, but expressed concern that it is a rather tepid response in terms of the challenges that higher education faces. Trustee Mendoza does not recall the board offering endorsements and believes that this could be a slippery slope; should stay out of it and let the voters decide. CSSA President Allison noted that they had come out in unanimous support of this measure in that it is in the best interest of the students. Trustee Hauck stated that he is no fan of this policy given that the state is already too dependent upon income taxes, however will support it because we cannot stand another $250 million cut. Trustee
Morales indicated his support of the initiative given what a tough time it is for the system. M/S/P to endorse proposition. Trustees Mehas and Mendoza voted nay.

- Spoke of Munger initiative and that although it does not have an immediate hit it could, over the years, put us at odds with K-12 in terms of funding.

**Committee on Institutional Advancement:** (Go to [http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul12/IA.pdf](http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul12/IA.pdf) for more detailed information). Minutes of the May 8, 2012 meeting were approved as submitted.

1. Naming at Sonoma, *Action*. VC Ashley presented the item, noting that the naming results from a $15 million donation by MasterCard. The facility would be named the MasterCard Performing Arts Pavilion. M/S/P to accept the recommendation.

**Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds:** (Go to [http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul12/CPBG.pdf](http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul12/CPBG.pdf) for more detailed information). Minutes of the May 8, 2012 meeting were approved as submitted.

**Consent Items:**


Without discussion, these items were approved as presented.

**Discussion Items:**


4. Approval of Schematic Plans, *Action*. AVC San Juan offered a slide show of the schematic plans for CSU Channel Islands – West Hall. Advised that this is a change from what was originally approved, which was a renovation. However the new construction makes more sense given the age of the existing structure and campus needs. M/S/P to approve the project as presented.

**Committee on Audit:** (Go to [http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul12/Audit.pdf](http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul12/Audit.pdf) for more detailed information). Minutes of the May 8, 2012 meeting were approved as presented.

on Current and Follow-Up Internal Audit Assignments (copy attached as Internal Audit Status Report 7-13-12), indicated that excellent progress is being made and identified a number of specific campuses and their efforts.

2. Status Report on Corrective Action for the Findings in the California State University A-133 Single Audit Reports and Auxiliary Organization Audit Reports for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011, Information. AVC/Controller George Ashkar presented this item, summarizing information that can be accessed at the URL above. In short, all Corrective Actions on the A-133 Single Audits have been completed.

Committee on Finance: (Go to http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul12/Finance.pdf for more detailed information.) Minutes of the May 8, 2012 meeting were approved as presented.

1. Approval to Issue Trustees of the California State University, Systemwide Revenue Bonds and Related Debt Instruments for Various Projects, Action. AVC Ashkar presented this item. A revised document was offered (attached to this report as Revenue Bond Approval) which describes projects at Channel Islands, Pomona, and SDSU. Detailed documentation on each of the projects also was provided and can be forwarded upon request. It was noted that the refinancing will save money and revenues will go back to the individual campuses. M/S/P to approve the item as presented.

2. Report on the Support Budget 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Fiscal Years, Information. AVC Robert Turnage offered a report. Noted that the size of the trigger cut increased from $200 to $250 million. Summarized the report available at the URL above. Noted PERS adjustment that helps, although health care costs negotiated by PERS have gone up and there is no adjustment for that, with an estimated $36 million cost increase in the next fiscal year. Another change involves CalGrants, with the proposal revamped such that the savings primarily will be realized through for-profit universities. The only effect is a $78 reduction in the CalGrants Access Award (5%). Referenced “delayed” tuition increase buyout for CSU and UC that would total $132 million conditioned on the proposition passing and retroactively rolling back the tuition increase that began in fall 2012, but appropriation is for 2013-14. So that would create a $132 million revenue hole for this year, plus having to recalculate financial aid.

3. Strategies to Address the Structural Deficit in the California State University Support Budget, the Contingency of a $250 Million Trigger Cut, and a Possible Tuition Fee Roll-Back, Information. Chancellor Reed pointed out that irrespective of a trigger cut, there is a $130 million structural deficit that must be
addressed. Also must have a plan to cover the $250 million trigger cut. If proposition passes, then have to deal with $132 million tuition rollback.

EVC Quillian presented an overview of this item. If the tax initiative fails, we will face a $427 million shortfall; it will be $309 million if tax passes and we refund tuition, the amount will be $177 million if we deal with just the structural deficit and mandatory costs. When all is factored in, we will have lost over $1 billion in state funds. Options are limited, with 50% coming from state and 50% from tuition.

AVC Turnage and EVC Smith discussed a PowerPoint (copy attached as CSU Support Budget Choices) which lays out strategies.

Trustee Cheyne addressed assigned/release time, noting that there already have been severe cuts in these areas and that faculty now are performing essential functions with no compensation. In terms of the payroll/benefit reductions, she urged that other options remain open, including program consolidation and/or discontinuance. Chancellor Reed stated that programmatic changes require time and do not yield immediate savings.

Trustee Glazer noted that too often organizations try to “get by” and that this often does not prove to be the best approach. Felt it wise to look at the worst case scenario and deal with those issues, then take appropriate action in September.

Public Comment:

- Carol Shubin, Northridge faculty: A handout was provided that is attached as Shubin Comments. Professor Shubin thanked the Board, and the Chancellor for his years of service. Re cost reductions, believes we should focus on the graduation initiative and funding that will be required. Is a win-win for everyone, especially when we maintain quality. Wants the largest and best educated workforce, and believes that has been kept in mind. Need to improve labor-management relations. Hope to adopt outlook that problems are solvable. Noted that Plan A seems to work best, and also encouraged progressive cuts rather than across-the-board cuts.

- Nakia Brazier, student: Made a personal appeal re presidents who received raises today, as opposed to faculty/staff who have not received raises in 6 years. Urged new presidents not to accept raises and to give that money over to classes and scholarships.

Committee on Educational Policy: (Go to http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul12/EdPol.pdf for more detailed information.) Minutes of the May 8, 2012 meeting were approved as submitted.
Speaker: David Bradfield (CFA – Dominguez Hills): Re changes in Title 5 which would affect graduation requirements and extended education. Expressed concern that these are serious policy changes. A handout was offered (attached as CFA re Title V Changes). Noted that this change would create a 3-tiered system which will affect access and affordability.

1. Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements, Residence Requirements, and Special Sessions Credit, Action. AVC Christine Mallon offered background on these three items, stating that in all cases the Title V changes are to clarify current practice, not to change current practice. She also noted that the ASCSU and campus administrations have been consulted. M/S/P to accept changes.

2. Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Standard Requirements for Nursing Degree Programs, Action. AVC Mallon again offered background on this item, noting that it is necessary to clarify prerequisites and requirements. M/S/P to accept changes.

3. Career Technical Education (CTE): Systemwide Procedures for Approving High School CTE Courses for California State University Admission; Recommendation to Amend Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Information. AVC Mallon and Carolina Cardenas, Associate Director of Academic Outreach and Early Assessment, presented this item. It proposes formal adoption of a systemwide curriculum review procedure for CTE courses. The Title V amendment would make CTE courses eligible for satisfying area “g” requirements toward CSU admission requirements. In response to a question from Trustee Cheyne, ASCSU Chair Guerin indicated that the ASCSU has been involved in this process for a couple of years with the Academic Affairs Committee providing considerable input. The Title V amendment will be an action item at the September meeting.

4. Update on SB 1440 the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act, Information. EVC Smith and Senior Director Ken O’Donnell reported on what has occurred with SB 1440 since the previous report at May’s plenary. A PowerPoint was offered (copy attached as SB 1440 Update). Referred to the LAO Progress Report which noted that segments have made notable progress, but have fallen short in a couple of areas, including timeliness in creating TMCs in all areas, and alluded to new legislation. The response indicated increased acceptance of TMCs. It appears that there will be no new legislation at this point. O’Donnell noted difficulties in the transfer process with verifying that a student has completed the TMC they identify. This is being addressed via a number of strategies. For Spring 2013 only qualified transfer students will be admitted to 10 CSU campuses. “Messaging” is being developed for students as well as the CSU
conducting ongoing counselor conferences each fall with the CCCs. Noted a June 14 letter from the UC Academic Senate indicated that it will accept an approved TMC from a CCC.

**********

PLENARY: The plenary was called to order by Chair Linschied at 3:01 p.m.

Public Comment:

- John Orr: Chair, Unit 7. Asked to address Presidents Zingg, Welty, Karnig, Armstrong and Ortiz. Spoke of Accounting Clerks who work for those campuses and the Chancellor’s Office. Stated that that classification is outdated and not used at other campuses which have a higher classification. Asked that Presidents speak to their HR departments and eliminate that classification since it does not pay a living wage. This involves a total of 14 people and their upgrading will not overly impact their budgets.

- Susan Green, CFA: Expressed disappointment is passing of Title V changes as they relate to class and racial backgrounds of graduating students. Is pleased that the Board supports the tax revenue initiative and hopes that the Board will offer more than just verbal support. Regarding two webcasts held on the budget, wondered why MPP salaries were not a part of the scenario offered. Noted a number of concerns regarding workload and compensation, including concern regarding administrative salaries.

- Rich Anderson, President UAW 4123: Represents graduate TAs, tutors, etc. Noted that increasing presidential salaries is a crass double standard. We all should be working together to pass Prop 30 (Brown’s tax initiative) and the Chancellor’s Office should put forth significant effort.

- Gabrielle Rigolato, Student: Critical of narrative that the CSU is “broke.” Noted luxurious standard of living of high level executives when students and faculty are struggling. Expressed belief that funds are being mismanaged.

- Eric Dimitrik, graduate student at CSULA: Noted his ineligibility for financial aid as an undergraduate, and worked graveyard shifts in order to make it through school. Believes that increases in tuition have created a situation where students no longer can pay for school through working even a full-time job. Asked that the Board participate in events that are put together to pass Prop 30.

- Yesenia Ramirez: Noted that the system is not broken: it’s mismanagement by the Board and Chancellor. If it was broken, why would we be discussing presidential salary increases and renovating their houses, while tuition is increasing and classes are being cut. The goal appears to be privatization, which
means more expensive classes through extended education. Also noted struggle of faculty for better working conditions, stating that the Board is not sensitive to their needs and concerns. Stated that students will stand with them.

- Hector Escobar, ASI President, CSULA: Refunding the 9%: It’s a great idea, but he sees what his campus is going through. Believes it should be a 4.5% refund to send message that money should not be cut from budget, but that the funds are needed by the campuses. Is concerned about presidential salary increases in that it sends the wrong message and taxpayers may not pass Prop 30 based upon this choice. Asked not to consider cutting teacher salaries, but rather administrators and executives. Would not recommend a 9% increase for non-residents since that will decrease the number of students willing to come.

- Raiza Arriyas: Has experienced poverty, but held on to dream that college would help her and other students like her get out of poverty. Found that the dream is “kind of” alive, but is being taken away by some of the choices being made.

- Seth “Door-Smasher” Newmeyer: (A copy of remarks distributed to trustees is attached as Newmeyer Comments.) Indicated that public comment is really meaningless. Suggested a number of times that the Trustees “kill yourselves” while he watches, noting the individuals who attacked the students late last year. Discussed class wars and deposing of rulers.

**Chair’s Report:** Chair Linschied reported the following:

- Noted retirement of Chancellor Reed and thanked him for his 14 years of service. A special committee has been convened, chaired by Bill Hauck, to seek a new Chancellor. Chancellorsearch.edu and facebook.com/calstate are two options.

- Introduced new Trustees appointed by Governor Brown: Lupe Garcia. She made brief comments as follows: Honored to be here and taking everything in. Appreciated public commentary. Look forward to serving in this important role and is thankful for the opportunity. Then Chair Linschied introduced Hugo Morales who commented: Indicated his sense of honor, as a Mexican-American, to serve in this position. Been living in Fresno and worked with President Welty. Looks forward to getting acquainted with other campuses. Wishes to further student learning and work with Chancellor Reed prior to his retirement.

- Announced approval of operating budget for the State University House (document attached as Linschied Letter re University House [Chancellor’s residence]).

- Chico State won its second CCAA Commissioner’s Cup with 13 points, the lowest ever recorded. Won 7 conference titles and finished in the top half of the standings in every sport.
• Participated at the symposium in Northridge regarding the future of the CSU. Found it a very informative and valuable event.

**Chancellor’s Report:** Chancellor Reed made the following comments:
• Welcomed the two new trustees.
• Reiterated his retirement and that he will continue until a replacement is found.
• Believes that he will be leaving all the campuses in good hands. In the past year, 9 presidents have been hired, 6 new and 3 interim. Welcomed those presidents who are attending their first meeting today: Kropper, Garcia, Hagan, Harrison, Ochoa, Sheley. Offered congratulations to outgoing presidents Karnig and Corrigan and thanked them for their services.
• Re presidents, noted that we hired Hirshman one year ago. He asked Hirshman to raise $50 million for San Diego State. He has surpassed that and raised more than $71 million. Noted how tough the jobs are, that the criticism is unwarranted, and that not just anyone can do these jobs.
• Re budget, in September will offer a set a recommendations to the Board so that we can continue to serve as many students with as much quality as possible.
• This is the first summer of the Early Start program and we are proud of what campuses are doing in serving over 17,000 students in that program.
• It is his duty to report changes in admission practices before they can be enacted. CSULB and SDSU are receiving more applications than there is capacity. Also Sonoma State is receiving more applications in specific academic programs than there is capacity. CSULB and SDSU have been declared fully impacted. Sonoma State has impaction in the Criminology and Criminal Justice programs.

**Report of the CSU Alumni Council: President – Guy Heston:**
• Spoke of the importance of the arts and named a number of CSU alumni who have been very successful in their artistic endeavors, including winning Emmy awards.
• Alumni Council is led by alumni volunteers who are dedicated to the CSU and recognize its value. It believes in the importance in supporting the CSU with time and resources so that today’s students have the same benefits they had. Identified a number of alumni association initiatives at individual campuses which assist students and teaching.
• Expressed appreciation for the support the Alumni Council receives from the Chancellor’s Office and Trustees.

**Report of the CSSA: President – David Allison:**
• As incoming chair, looks forward to building a positive and productive relationship with the Chancellor’s Office and Board.
• Held a meeting at the Chancellor’s Office where their new leadership received training and passed a number of initiatives, including support of Prop 30.
• They have reviewed the budget initiatives and appreciate the struggle to make it work.
• Thanks to Hauck and Linschied for conducting a progressive Chancellor search and including the student trustee as a member of the committee.

**Report of the Academic Senate CSU: Chair – Diana Guerin:**
• Discussed Chancellor search process, including request for increased representation by internal and external constituencies such as an advisory committee. Noted stated commitment of Board to consultation and diversity. Asked that academic experience be required, as well as broad understanding of all aspects of the university.
• Regarding budget strategies, believe that access must be authentic meaning that the campus has the resources to offer a quality experience. Endorses concepts of synergies and shared services. Re discontinuance of programs, recognizes loss of funding places pressures on campuses to look at programs. Each campus should have policies and guidelines in this regard.
• $250 million trigger: need to maintain access with quality. Re reducing payroll, assigned time and sabbaticals, these need to be considered in context of multiple years of stagnant salaries and furloughs, and need to recruit high quality faculty. Re third tier to tuition structure and other fees, makes sense in terms of mounting loss of funds.

**Approval of Minutes of Board of Trustees’ Meeting of May 9, 2012:** Chair Linschied asked for approval of the minutes of the May 9, 2012 meeting. The minutes were approved as presented.

**Committee Reports:** The reports of each committee essentially duplicated the information presented above, with the exception of the Committee on University and Faculty Personnel. Regarding the vote on Executive Compensation, Trustee Fortune indicated that during these budgetary times she is not comfortable with increasing executive compensation and the message it sends. During the vote, there were four “nay” votes from Trustees Fortune, Ruddell, Garcia and Morales.

**Special Citation:** Prior to adjournment, Alumni Council Chair Guy Heston presented a special citation to Chair Linschied from the Alumni Association, noting his years of service to the CSU, including serving as chair of the Alumni Association.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.
Final Report
2012/2013
State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Board of Trustees
Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds
July 17, 2012

Final State Capital Outlay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands – Classroom/Faculty Office</td>
<td>$1,209,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego – Storm/Nasatir Halls Renovation</td>
<td>$2,583,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus – Science I Renovation (Seismic)</td>
<td>$1,757,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo – Crandall Gym</td>
<td>$1,006,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles – Administration Bldg</td>
<td>$5,799,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt – Van Duzer Theater</td>
<td>$4,190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield – Dore Theater</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt – Library</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012-13 Total $16,544,000
### 2012 ASSIGNMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aux Orgs</th>
<th>Cost Alloc</th>
<th>Title IX</th>
<th>Data Ctr Ops</th>
<th>Facilities Mgmt</th>
<th>Identity Mgmt/Comm Access</th>
<th>Intl Prog</th>
<th>Police Services</th>
<th>CSURMA</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP PAST/CURRENT ASSIGNMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auxiliary Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAK</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td>AI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td></td>
<td>AI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F'RE</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td></td>
<td>AI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- FW = Field Work In Progress
- RW = Report Writing in Progress
- AC = Audit Complete (awaiting formal exit conference or campus response)
- AI = Audit Incomplete (awaiting formal exit conference and/or campus response)
- *No.* = The number of recommendations satisfactorily addressed followed by the number of recommendations in the original report.
- *Recs* = The number of months recommendations have been outstanding (since the formal campus exit conference).
- **Mo.* = The number of auxiliary organizations reviewed.
- # = Represents recommendations that are being held in abeyance pending compliance with new systemwide policies.
- Numbers/letters in green are updates since the agenda mailout.

*Attachment A*  
July 16, 2012  
Page 1 of 3
### Status Report on Current and Follow-Up Internal Audit Assignments
(as of 7/13/2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IT Disaster Recovery</th>
<th>Financial Aid</th>
<th>Delegations of Authority</th>
<th>ADA Compliance</th>
<th>Sensitive Data Security/Protection</th>
<th>Academic Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAK</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>11/11</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of recommendations satisfactorily addressed followed by the number of recommendations in the original report.

**The number of months recommendations have been outstanding (since the formal campus exit conference).

- The number of auxiliary organizations reviewed.

# Represents recommendations that are being held in abeyance pending compliance with new systemwide policies.

Numbers/letters in green are updates since the agenda mailout.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Comp. Date</th>
<th>Managed By</th>
<th>Current *</th>
<th>Campus Follow-Up</th>
<th>CPDC Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE-201</td>
<td>Wildcat Activity Center</td>
<td>Otto Construction</td>
<td>$45,624,250</td>
<td>9/17/2007</td>
<td>Aug-09</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-386</td>
<td>Student Housing, Phase I</td>
<td>Brown Construction</td>
<td>$43,805,902</td>
<td>6/18/2007</td>
<td>Oct-09</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-134</td>
<td>Student Svs. Replace. Bldg.</td>
<td>Lathrop Construction</td>
<td>$34,091,225</td>
<td>8/15/2007</td>
<td>Jul-10</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO-94</td>
<td>Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>CW Driver</td>
<td>$96,786,431</td>
<td>3/10/2008</td>
<td>Apr-11</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM-389</td>
<td>Student Housing, Phase II</td>
<td>WE O'Neal Construction</td>
<td>$60,720,526</td>
<td>6/16/2008</td>
<td>Jul-10</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-707</td>
<td>Std. Recreation/Wellness Ctr.</td>
<td>CW Driver</td>
<td>$40,303,653</td>
<td>12/24/2008</td>
<td>Apr-11</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM-153</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Edge Development</td>
<td>$29,230,398</td>
<td>6/25/2008</td>
<td>Jul-10</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS-201</td>
<td>Student Housing Expansion</td>
<td>Sundt Construction</td>
<td>$42,389,891</td>
<td>7/16/2008</td>
<td>Nov-10</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Al</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ-867</td>
<td>Std. Union Expansion &amp; Ren.</td>
<td>Lathrop Construction</td>
<td>$65,075,000</td>
<td>10/18/2010</td>
<td>Mar-13</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FW = Field Work in Progress; RW = Report Writing in Progress; AI = Audit Incomplete (awaiting formal exit conference and/or response); AC = Audit Complete
**The number of recommendations satisfactorily addressed followed by the number of recommendations in the original report.
***The number of months that recommendations have been outstanding (since the formal exit conference).
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Approval to Issue Trustees of the California State University, Systemwide Revenue Bonds and Related Debt Instruments for Various Projects

Presentation By

George V. Ashkar
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Financial Services

Summary

This item requests the Board of Trustees to authorize the issuance of Systemwide Revenue Bonds and the issuance of Bond Anticipation Notes (BANS) to support interim financing under the commercial paper program of the California State University in an aggregate amount not-to-exceed $106,975,000 to provide financing for two campus projects and refinancing of certain outstanding auxiliary organization bonds. The board is also being asked to approve resolutions relating to these financings/refundings. The long-term bonds will be part of a future Systemwide Revenue Bond sale and are expected to bear the same ratings from Moody’s Investors Service and Standard and Poor’s as the existing Systemwide Revenue Bonds.

The projects are as follows:

1. Channel Islands North Campus Parking Lot Phase 1

During the approval of the 2008-09 Nonstate Capital Outlay program, the north campus parking lot phase 1 project was approved as part of the entrance road project. The current project being considered for financing approval consists of a surface parking lot on acquired land north of the campus involving 4.75 acres. The project will provide approximately 550 parking spaces and will add needed space to meet parking demand for students, faculty, and staff. The project will also include lighting and landscaping.

The not-to-exceed par value of the proposed bonds is $2,040,000 and is based on a total project budget of $2,211,000 with a parking program reserve contribution of $300,000. Additional net financing costs (estimated at $129,000) are to be funded from bond proceeds. The project is being supported by a two-step increase in parking fees approved by the president leading to an increase of $50 per year for 2012-13 (with a total fee of $320) and an increase of $40 for 2013-14. The project is scheduled to start construction in August 2012 with completion in November 2012.
The following table summarizes key information about this financing transaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not-to-exceed amount</th>
<th>$2,040,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>Approximately level over 25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected maximum annual debt service</td>
<td>$146,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected debt service coverage including the new project:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net revenue – Channel Islands pledged revenue programs:</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net revenue – Projected for the campus parking program:</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Combines 2010-11 information for all campus' pledged revenue programs and projected 2013-14 operations of the project with expected full debt service. Does not include any debt, revenues or expenses related to the Channel Islands Site Authority.

The not-to-exceed amount for the project, the maximum annual debt service, and the ratios above are based on an all-in interest cost of 5.33%, reflective of adjusted market conditions plus 100 basis points as a cushion for changing financial market conditions that could occur before the permanent financing bonds are sold. The financial plan includes level amortization of debt service, which is the CSU program standard. The campus financial plan projects a program net revenue debt service coverage of 1.45 in the first full year of operations in 2013-14, which exceeds the CSU benchmark of 1.10. When combining the project with 2010-11 information for all campus pledged revenue programs, the campus’ overall net revenue debt service coverage for the first full year of operations is projected to be 1.40, which exceeds the CSU benchmark of 1.35.

2. Pomona Recreation Center

In September 2010, the board approved the amendment of the non-state capital outlay program and in March 2011 it approved the schematics for the Pomona recreation center project. The project will construct a three-story (approximately 120,000 gross square foot) facility that will include a gymnasium, a multi-activity court gymnasium, an elevated jogging track, weight/fitness room, rock climbing wall, recreation and lap pools, sports club spaces, multipurpose rooms, wellness center, social lounge, juice bar, locker rooms, and Associated Students, Inc., administrative offices.

The not-to-exceed par value of the proposed bonds is $65,890,000 and is based on a total project cost of $56,950,000 with a student union program reserve contribution of $350,000. Additional net financing costs (estimated at $9,290,000) are to be funded from bond proceeds. The campus anticipates a construction start of July 2012 with construction completion in July 2014. A fee increase was approved by the campus based on an alternative consultative process and modified referendum. The student body center fee will increase by $420 per year, thereby increasing the fee to $717 effective 2014-15.
REVISED

The following table summarizes key information about this financing transaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not-to-exceed amount</th>
<th>$65,890,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>Approximately level over 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected maximum annual debt service</td>
<td>$4,430,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected debt service coverage including the new project:
- Net revenue – All Pomona pledged revenue programs: \(^1\) 2.04
- Net revenue – Projected for the campus student union program: \(^1\) 1.25

1. Combines 2010-11 information for all campus’ pledged revenue programs and projected 2015-16 operations of the project with expected full debt service.

The not-to-exceed amount for the project, the maximum annual debt service, and the ratios above are based on an all-in interest cost of 5.56%, reflective of adjusted market conditions plus 100 basis points as a cushion for changing financial market conditions that could occur before the permanent financing bonds are sold. The financial plan includes level amortization of debt service, which is the CSU program standard. The campus financial plan projects a program net revenue debt service coverage of 1.25 in the first full year of debt service in 2015-16, which exceeds the CSU benchmark of 1.10. When combining the project with 2010-11 information for all campus pledged revenue programs, the campus’ overall net revenue debt service coverage for the first full year of operations is projected to be 2.04, which is exceeds the CSU benchmark of 1.35.

3. San Diego State University Research Foundation – Student Housing Refunding

San Diego State University Research Foundation (the “Foundation”), a recognized auxiliary organization in good standing at San Diego State University, seeks Board of Trustees approval for the refunding of an existing stand-alone auxiliary organization bond issue. At the time of this write-up, the Foundation’s board of directors is expected to adopt a resolution authorizing the bond refunding at a special meeting on or about July 6, 2012.

The project will be the current refunding of $9,035,000 in outstanding principal on the Foundation’s Auxiliary Organization Student Residence Revenue Bonds, Series 2001, which were originally issued at a par amount of $11,000,000 to fund the acquisition and improvement of a student apartment complex. The size of the proposed refunding is at a not-to-exceed par amount of $8,500,000, and is estimated to generate a net present value savings of approximately $908,673, or 10% of the refunded bonds. The not-to-exceed amount and the net present value
savings are based on a current all-in true interest cost of 3.75%, which is reflective of market conditions as of June 2012, and an average remaining bond maturity of approximately 11 years.

Assuming both refunding discussed herein proceed, for #3 Student Housing Refunding and #4 Office Building Refunding, the loan agreement for the refunding of the stand-alone 2001 bonds will be secured by a general obligation pledge of the Foundation’s unrestricted revenues. In the event the Office Building Refunding described below does not proceed or proceeds only in part, the loan agreement for the refunding of the stand-alone 2001 bonds will be secured by a pledge of the Foundation’s unrestricted revenues from the Student Housing Refunding and the Pied:a del Sol Student Housing Project. This refunding will have a minimal impact on systemwide debt capacity, as this auxiliary debt is already included in overall CSU debt capacity calculations.

4. San Diego State University Research Foundation – Office Building Refunding

San Diego State University Research Foundation (the “Foundation”), a recognized auxiliary organization in good standing at San Diego State University, seeks Board of Trustees approval for the refunding of an existing stand-alone auxiliary organization bond issue. At the time of this write-up, the Foundation’s board of directors is expected to adopt a resolution authorizing the bond refunding at a special meeting on or about July 6, 2012.

The project will be the current refundings of $32,080,000 in total outstanding principal on the Foundation’s Auxiliary Organization Revenue Bonds, Series 2002A (tax-exempt) and 2002B (taxable), which were originally issued at total par amount of $34,660,000 to refund certain outstanding obligations of the Foundation, and fund the construction of certain facilities, including a parking garage and research facility. The total size of the proposed refundings is at a not-to-exceed par amount of $30,545,000, and is estimated to generate a net present value savings of approximately $1,021,527, or 3.18% of the refunded bonds. The not-to-exceed amount and the net present value savings are based on a current all-in true interest cost of 5.19%, which is reflective of market conditions as of June 2012, and an average remaining bond maturity of approximately 16 years. The savings also assume that Series 2002A are refunded with tax-exempt and taxable refunding bonds in order to preserve flexibility to sell certain properties in the future. (Series 2002B are to be refunded with taxable refunding bonds.) In the event circumstances regarding the possible future sale of assets changes before the time of the bond sale and all Series 2002A bonds are fully refunded with tax-exempt bonds, savings would be increased.

Assuming both refunding discussed herein proceed, the loan agreement for the refunding of the stand-alone 2002 A&B bonds will be secured by a general obligation pledge of the Foundation’s unrestricted revenues. In the event the Student Housing Refunding described above does not proceed, or this Office Building Refunding proceeds only in part, the loan agreement for the refunding of the refunded portion of the stand-alone 2002 bonds will be secured by a pledge of
the Foundation’s revenues received as indirect cost recovery payments relating to research contracts. This refunding will have a minimal impact on systemwide debt capacity, as this auxiliary debt is already included in overall CSU debt capacity calculations.

**Trustee Resolutions and Recommended Action**

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, as bond counsel, is preparing resolutions to be presented at this meeting that authorize interim and permanent financing for the projects described in this agenda. The proposed resolutions will be distributed at the meeting and will achieve the following:

1. Authorize the sale and issuance of Systemwide Revenue Bond Anticipation Notes and the related or stand-alone sale and issuance of the Trustees of the California State University Systemwide Revenue Bonds in an aggregate amount not-to-exceed $106,975,000 and certain actions relating thereto.

2. Provide a delegation to the Chancellor; the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer; the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Financial Services; and the Senior Director, Financing and Treasury; and their designees to take any and all necessary actions to execute documents for the sale and issuance of the bond anticipation notes and the revenue bonds.

Approval of the financing resolutions for the project as described in this Agenda Item 1 of the Committee on Finance at the July 17, 2012, meeting of the CSU Board of Trustees is recommended for:

**Channel Islands North Campus Parking Lot Phase 1**

**Pomona Recreation Center**

**San Diego State University Research Foundation – Student Housing Refunding**

**San Diego State University Research Foundation – Office Building Refunding**
CSU Support Budget: 
Addressing the Challenges and Choices 

Benjamin F. Quillian, EVC and CFO
Ephraim P. Smith, EVC and CAO
Robert Turnage, AVC for Budget

July 17, 2012
Board of Trustees Information Item

Structural Budget Deficit
• Tuition, efficiencies and cost reductions do not fill the massive budget hole created by state cuts

Over $130 million structural deficit remains

• Ongoing solutions needed to close the deficit, even if the tax measure passes
2012-13 Budget Implications

With Tax Approval
- $130 M
- $47 M
- $132 M

Without Tax Approval
- $130 M
- $47 M
- $250 M

$300 million loss
$427 million loss

Alternative Trigger Strategies

Two options, one goal:

Protect Quality and Access

- Shared components of both plans:
  - Reducing employee salary and benefit costs
  - Reducing faculty assigned/release time
  - Improving access to courses
  - Increasing nonresident tuition
  - Using one-time funds, including Continuing Ed
### Preserving Access – Trigger on Trigger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$150/semester tuition increase</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5% reduction in payroll and benefits</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce faculty assigned/release time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Third tier&quot; on tuition structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident tuition increase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time balance from Continuing Ed</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other one-time resources</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dollars in millions

### Preserving Price – No Tuition Trigger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce enrollment 1.5% and reduce associated faculty and staff positions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25% reduction in payroll and benefits</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce faculty assigned/release time</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Third tier&quot; on tuition structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident tuition increase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time balance from Continuing Ed</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other one-time resources</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dollars in millions
Hi Leticia Hernández,

Please put my name on the CSU Board of Trustees Finance Committee public speakers list for July 17.
I request 1 - 2 minutes (see below). Thanks, Carol

Carol Shubin, Professor of Mathematics, CSUN

Priorities

1. Graduation Initiative
All parties can support the Graduation Initiative
http://graduate.csuprojects.org/
The initiative is comes down from the federal government.

This initiative can be a win-win for everyone. Why is it good for labor? Higher graduation rates can be used to justify hiring and keep the workload reasonable. It can be used to justify research projects over presidential legacy projects. It is good for students. It makes management look good. It is good for the state.

Now the part that faulty needs to get across -- it is not only a graduation initiative -- it is, more importantly, an educational initiative. The state needs more than degrees: we need a larger, better educated work force. We faculty need to keep hammering on QUALITY, but we do also need to improve QUANTITY too. It does seem possible to improve our graduation rate over the next 5-10 years without any reduction in quality or inflation in grades.

2. Better Alignment of Budget & Resource with our Primary Mission
We need to find the will and the way to get more funding to instruction. This is necessary to support the Graduation Initiative.

3. Improve Labor-Management Relations

Civil behavior is a sign of education. We must have the perspective and attitude that our problems are solvable, or, at least, that things can be improved.

Lastly, let's all dedicate ourselves to jointly improving the CSU, while retaining some perspective of our state's overall social funding. We must not fund higher education at the expense of the weak and the vulnerable - those who have no lobbies or unions and can not vote.
July 13, 2012

Dr. Christine Mallon
State University Dean, Academic Programs and Policy
Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4210
Fax 562-951-4982

Dear Dr. Mallon:

Attached please find the California Faculty Association's statement regarding proposed changes to Title 5 in CSU regulations relative to the use of extended education and special session credits for graduation.

We look forward to discussing this further with the CSU.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Lillian Taiz
President

:tmg
Attachment (two pages)

cc: CSU Board of Trustees (by mail)
Proposed Changes in CSU Regulations Regarding Use of Extended Education and Special Session Credits for Graduation Affect Affordability and Access while Altering Decision Making Process

Overview
Proposed modifications to CSU graduation requirements (as codified in Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations) will profoundly affect the affordability of, as well as equity of access to, a CSU education. The changes\(^1\) the CSU administration is proposing concern the use of extended education and special sessions courses to meet graduation requirements. Rather than being minor issues, as the administration suggests, these changes and the increased costs for a CSU degree they facilitate undermine the CSU’s mission to provide equal access to an affordable higher education to all who qualify for admission.

Like the recent Santa Monica College attempt to move toward a two-tiered pricing structure for courses (with access assured for the higher-priced courses), the changes under consideration at the July 2012 Board of Trustees’ meeting will further solidify a two-tiered tuition system that ensures CSU students with the resources to pay more get better access to courses they need.

While a proposal by the Santa Monica College Board of Trustees for two-tiered pricing of courses sparked much internal debate and public controversy (the proposal was ultimately withdrawn as a result), the move by the CSU Board of Trustees is being taken with virtually no discussion among the Trustees and none outside the University itself. Because of the authority vested in the CSU Board of Trustees to make changes to Title 5 without external oversight, these changes will have the force of law for the foreseeable future with no further opportunities after the July Board of Trustees meeting for members of the public or for elected officials to weigh in on the wisdom of these changes.

Implications of Proposed Changes
For many years, the CSU has offered courses through so-called “self-support” in addition to its regularly scheduled, “state-supported” courses. Students took more expensive “self-support” courses for a variety of reasons—some because they did not reside close enough to a CSU campus to take regularly offered courses there, some because they wanted to accelerate their progress to degree by attending summer session, and others because their employers were prepared to pay extra for courses offered at times and locations convenient for their employees.

What has changed now is that regularly admitted students, students who should have a reasonable expectation of graduating on time through state-supported regular course offerings, are being urged (or effectively forced) to take higher-priced “self-support” courses if they want reasonable access to courses and reasonable progress towards their degrees.

\(^1\) Our concerns noted here are with amendments proposed for Sections 40407.1 and 40403 of Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 2, Article 5, “General Requirements for Graduation.”

Statement from California Faculty Association to the California State University, July 13, 2012
The proposed changes to allow unlimited numbers of extended education credits or special sessions credits to count toward degrees for regularly admitted students will move the CSU yet one more step toward a “privatized” model of higher education where “the haves” can easily get courses and degrees and where “the have-nots” must either take on extra debt (since only state-supported courses are eligible for the full range of financial aid) or dramatically increase their time to degree.

In addition to decreasing equity in access, expanding the CSU’s two-tiered tuition system in the ways proposed will also decrease transparency and accountability in setting the price of attending the CSU. Tuition for regular, state-supported courses will continue to be set by Trustees (who are appointed by elected officials) in open meetings that are duly noticed to the public and intensively covered by the media. But tuition for “self-support” courses is set on each campus without similar transparency or public accountability.

Because of the effects these changes to Title 5 will have on students and on the core values of equity, access, and affordability of the CSU’s mission as a public university, we strongly urge that more time be allowed for a thorough discussion of the long-range implications of these changes. If, however, the Trustees believe these proposed changes are necessary ones to make now, then we urge the Board to also adopt new regulations that will ensure transparency and accountability for the tuition charged for these special sessions and extended education courses. Rather than abdicate responsibility for setting student tuition and fees, the Board should act to ensure that all tuition rates for CSU courses are noticed to the public, deliberated over by the CSU Board of Trustees, and voted on by that body in public. Such a regulation would ensure that the cost of a CSU is not determined behind closed doors on campuses with no public accountability or oversight but in an open and transparent way.
SB 1440: the STAR Act
Update

Board of Trustees, Committee on Educational Policy
July 17, 2012

Ephraim P. Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

Ken O'Donnell, Senior Director, Student Engagement and Academic Initiatives & Partnerships

Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support
Goals of the legislation:
- clear and efficient path to the degree
- associate degree along the way
- broad participation and improved capacity
Goals of the legislation:
- clear and efficient path to the degree
- associate degree along the way
- broad participation and improved capacity
For California Community College Students Only

If you are presently enrolled in a special 60 units Associate of Arts or Associate of Science Transfer degree (AA-T or AS-T) at your California community college, please answer the following:

Degree program pursuing: AA-T

From which California community college will you receive this AA-T or AS-T degree? Long Beach City College

Dates attended: 08/2009 to 05/2012

Units completed: 40

Term type: Semester

Degree date: 05/2012

What is your major for this AA-T or AS-T degree? Sociology

* full automation remains the long-term goal
* restrictions meanwhile on Mentor application screens

2,500 with AA-T not offered at CCC

2,500 potentially legitimate AA-T degrees

CSU sent e-mail invitation to petition for CCC degree

* only ten campuses open, all exclusively SB 1440
* campuses advised to “roll” all others to fall
SAVE THE DATE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE COUNSELOR CONFERENCES
COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2012
PASADENA CONVENTION CENTER
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2012

marketing group in June:
- user-friendly disclaimer
- student interviews
- roll out 8/15/2012
June 14, 2012

LAURENCE PITTS, PROVOST AND EVP
JUDY SAKAKI, VICE PRESIDENT, STUDENT AFFAIRS

Re: Amendment to Senate Regulation 476.C on transfer pathways

Dear Larry and Judy:

At its meeting on June 6, the Academic Assembly approved amendments to SR 476.C that add the following two pathways to transfer admission in addition to the existing one: (1) Completion of a UC Transfer Curriculum (in the relevant major), and (2) completion of an approved Associate Degree for Transfer (in the relevant major) from a California Community College. The revised regulation, as well as a version showing the changes, is attached for your information.

BOARS will finalize changes to the implementation guidelines, over which it has authority, in consultation with the admissions directors at its meeting in early July. After the meeting, we will circulate the amended regulation and implementation guidelines, along with a document explaining the changes, which should be distributed widely. In the meantime, we wish to inform you that the regulation, as amended, is in effect.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert M. Anderson, Chair
Hernandez, Leticia

Subject: FW: public comment

From: Seth Newmeyer [mailto:sethnewmeyer@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 1:39 PM
To: Hernandez, Leticia
Subject: Re: public comment

Dear plutocratic oligarch,

The purpose of my public comment is to inject some semblance of democracy into your autocratic and inept proceedings. The fact that someone without voting power in the meeting but with a stake in its outcome wants to speak—even if they wish to speak on nothing "important" or "relevant" to your all-powerful mind—should be reason enough to warrant my speaking time; the silenced should never need an excuse, much less one provided by oppressors, to speak.
Regardless, I would like to speak on the fundamental nature of anti-democracy embodied in the Board of Trustees—from outlining how the intent behind all of your proposals is disgusting to suggesting syndicalism as a model for meeting spaces un antagonistic to liberation and progress—so, especially with this email documentation to back it up, if you deny me speaking time, you are in violation of the Brown Act, and in negligence of your duties, and I will seek your much-deserved removal.
The Trustees make decisions much worse to the CSU than they would be if they were merely "irrelevant"; however, I notice you do not need them to prove, in advance, that their comments fit the mission of these meetings in order to allow them to speak. Thus, you expose yourself as a terrible person facilitating the removal of students' participation in these events, and therefore facilitating the destruction of the CSU system.
Go fuck yourself,
-Seth
PS Way to go with putting increasingly unnecessary restrictions on speaking! From having to email in to an unadvertised email days before the meeting, to now getting those requests themselves sorted through and censored by some unreachable administrative asshole, you remind me of the enactors of the poll tax in the South during segregation. The differences here are that you are explicitly against all non-bosses, rather than just one segment of the working class, and we don't even have the ability to vote, just to speak, which you are interfering with.
Put me on your god damn list.

On Mon, Jul 16, 2012 at 11:49 AM, Hernandez, Leticia <lherandez@calstate.edu> wrote:

Mr. Newmeyer,

The purpose of the public comment at the plenary session is to raise public policy issues for the Board to consider that are not already on the agenda. If you are not able to summarize reasonable and responsible intended remarks, your name will not appear on the public comment list.

Leticia Hernández

Trustee Secretariat

401 Golden Shore, Suite 620
July 16, 2012

Dear Fellow Trustees:

In July 1991, the Board of Trustees approved a set of operating policies and procedures governing the State University House Trust. The State University House Trust was established to receive the proceeds from the sale of the previous State University House located in Bel Air. Under the terms of the gift of the Bel Air residence, the proceeds from its sale are restricted to the purchase of a residence for the Chancellor and for maintenance, furnishings, and associated expenses. Let me underscore that the terms of the gift restrict use of the Trust to expenses related to the State University House; any other use would cause the Trust to revert to the donor.

The operating policy and procedures specify that the Chair of the Board has the authority to approve the annual operating budget for the State University House. I will announce my action approving the 2012-2013 operating budget in the amount of $73,830 (with the provision for supplies, services, and utilities) in the Chair’s Report at the July 17 Board meeting.

Please let me know if you have questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bob Linscheid
Chair, Board of Trustees

Attachment