

LOBBY CORPS MINUTES

Meeting #11

November 9, 2017

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jara called the meeting to order at 12:30pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Voting Members Present

Genesis Jara (Chief Government Relations Officer)
Sofia Musman (ASI Vice President)
Stephanie Argent (Senate Representative)
Danielle Carancho (Senate Representative)
Hilda Jurado (Senate Representative)
Amanda Kilian (Student At-Large)
Nicolas Olenslager-Orton (Student At-Large)
Zak Show (Student At-Large)
Autumn Farmer (AVP Legislative & External Relations Designee)

Voting Members Absent

Non-voting Members Present

Lindsay San Miguel (Asst. Director, Government Affairs & Initiatives)

Non-voting Members Absent

3. APPROVAL /CORRECTIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

(M) Jurado (S) Argent to approve the Lobby Corps Agenda, Meeting #11, November 9, 2017

VOTE ON THE MOTION

PASSES 9-0-0

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE LAST MEETING

A. Lobby Corps Minutes, Meeting #10, November 2, 2017

(M) Argent (S) Carancho to approve Lobby Corps Minutes, Meeting #10, November 2, 2017

VOTE ON THE MOTION

PASSES 9-0-0

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

6. REPORTS

A. Chair/Government Relations Officer

Chair Jara reported the following:

- CHESS applications are due tomorrow, November 10th by 5:00 pm
- An individual from Housing Long Beach will be at the next meeting to get input from student leaders because they are trying to enact rent control measures in Long Beach.

B. Vice Chair

Vice Chair Carancho reported the following:

- Believes that they should start to prepare students for what's to come with increased tuition proposal and suggested throwing an event on campus next semester

C. Students-at-Large

Students-at-Large reported the following:

- Olenslager-Orton:
 - Tuesday they had elections in Long Beach
 - Agrees with Carancho about educating students about potential tuition increase
- Show:
 - CSU Board of Trustees did not have a discussion on mental health or housing issues
 - There was a DACA resolution that proposes that the CSU continues to lead national advocacy efforts with lawmakers to reinstate DACA, or its equivalent, alongside our higher education partners and state leaders
 - There are 23 CSU campuses that have food pantries
 - They also discussed the 2025 Grad Initiative, and asked if anyone knew what this grad initiative was
 - Musman explained that this initiative aims to have students graduate in 4 years. They are focusing on issues and barriers that prevent students from graduating in 4 years for each CSU. For some campuses, they might need more advisors, while other campuses might need more classes.
- Kilian:
 - Rescheduled legislative visit with Assemblymember Travis Allen's district rep for Nov 14th at 4pm in Huntington Beach
 - Regarding legislative visits schedule, they are only going into the 1st week of December, but not past that
 - Has reached out to a student representative regarding the Long Beach housing measures and suggested possibly having them come speak to the board about this issue

D. Senate

Senator Jurado reported the following:

- Senate tabled 2 resolutions for next week, the Football Exploratory Committee and ASI Stands
- They had a presentation from AVP for Student Affairs Jeff Klaus and they went over the CSULB Freedom of Speech website

E. AVP Legislative & External Relations

Farmer reported the following:

- Pointed out an article from the Press Telegram about the racial divide among Californians about the necessity and importance of higher education
- Asked Kilian to send the names of any of the legislators that they plan to visit so that they could put in a request for the district information

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. Discussion Item: Dream Act of 2017 Efforts

Jara said that for next semester, they were considering doing phone banking every week and partnering with a different student organization and they can choose a date/time that works for them. As of right now, phone banking is on hold until next semester.

Musman said that when they table at 11am, not a lot of students show up, and thinks they should just do the afternoon tabling sessions.

San Miguel suggested changing their location to be able to reach out to different students, instead of just the same ones at every tabling session.

B. Action Item: CHESS Interviews

Jara stated that interviews are December 1st from 8 am to 5 pm. Jara asked members of the board to do their best to clear their schedule and make it a priority to be there for the interviews.

There are 12 spots open, and asked the board if they wanted to set any guidelines as to what the breakdown of students would be based on their major, year, student leader status, etc.

Olenlager-Orton suggested saving some slots set aside for specific students, and the rest would be open to the rest of the applicants.

Argent agreed, and suggested having 3-4 people with ASI experience and the rest would be open. Also thinks it depends on what the breakdown of their applicants is once applications close tomorrow.

Jurado suggested having 2 freshman and 2 ASI leaders.

Musman pointed out that with ASI leaders, they should consider whether they are coming back next year, or if they are graduating.

San Miguel agrees and stated that CHESS has been a great recruitment tool in the past.

Jara believes that at least half of the spots should be freshmen and sophomores.

Carancho suggested having 4 freshmen, 4 sophomores, 2 ASI leaders, and 2 seniors.

Olenlager-Orton asked if they could table this discussion until they know what the breakdown of their applicants is.

Jara agrees and thinks this would give them some insight on what their breakdown could be.

Musman said that based on the applications, most of them are probably freshman or Beach Teamers.

Kilian thinks that they shouldn't forget about transfer students, and thinks it would be great to give them that opportunity.

Argent asked if they would they take overlap into account, such as an ASI leader who is a sophomore. What category would they fall under?

Olenlager-Orton thinks they can use that strategically based on the number and types of applicants that they have.

Carancho brought up other subcategories, like experienced versus non-experienced applicants.

Jara stated that CHESS legislative visits would be scheduled from 8am to 3pm.

Regarding contacting legislators, Kilian will be putting together a list with their contact info, and the board will all be helping Kilian with contacting these legislators.

**(M) Olenlager-Orton (S) Carancho to approve CHESS Interviews questions
VOTE ON THE MOTION**

PASSES 9-0-0

8. NEW BUSINESS

A. Information Item: CSSA Update – Dr. Rob Shorette, Executive Director

Shorette discussed the priorities for CSSA this 2017-18 academic year as well as legislative priorities set out by the public policy agenda.

Jared Giarrusso, Assistant Director of Government Relations, introduced themselves to the board.

Four priorities that were established:

1. Ensure that mental health resources are responsive to the distinct needs of the CSU system's diverse student body.
2. Improve the affordability of higher education at the CSU and ensure students' basic needs are being met.
3. Promote safe and inclusive environments to ensure a positive campus climate for all CSU students.
4. Promote equity in the academic success of CSU students

Shorette wanted to discuss equity and how its purpose is focusing resources on those who need them the most. The idea of equity is embedded within the framework of CSSA and its policy agenda. For example, with mental health, the priority is to make sure that they are not only available, but are also focused on the distinct needs of the students of each CSU within the system.

Another example is that different students are affected differently by the costs of tuition, so they are looking at affordability through an equity lens.

Shorette explained that achievement gaps have not really closed over the past few years, so they are trying to look at how they can advocate in a way that makes sure that resources are distributed based on need.

Giarrusso added that the CSU had their Board of Trustees meeting and approved Budget Request to the state, which included a portion on proposals for alternate revenue streams, which includes tuition.

The entire budget request was for \$282 million, on top of what we already receive from the state. So this would be considered an augmentation. This augmentation is used to cover additional costs to the system, such as compensation increases, mandatory cost increases (healthcare costs, inflation, minimum wage increases), grad initiatives, infrastructure, and enrollment increases.

This \$282 million request is what the system is hoping that they are going to get from the state, but they are usually never fully funded. Last year they received around \$170 million, but they had requested over \$300 million.

The Governor has also proposed to give the CSU system an increase of about \$102 million, which is a decrease over what he had guaranteed over the past 6 years. Last year, what they anticipated getting from the governor was about the same as the absolute critical cost that could not be negotiated in order to run the system. This year they are about \$50 million short from the core costs.

Last year's tuition increase brought in about \$77 million in revenue for the CSU system.

Giarrusso said that a tuition increase proposal is possible within the next few months, and it is hard to imagine that a large tuition increase would be palatable for a lot of the legislators looking at this issue.

Giarrusso explained that last year, they advocated for full funding from the state. Full funding would have meant no tuition increase. They also advocated at the board of trustees meetings so that when this comes through, they don't vote for it to go through.

At their next CSSA Plenary in San Luis Obispo, they are going to be talking about affordability and ways that their organization can implement their policy priority, which is to ensure affordability in an equitable way.

Carancho asked that if they were advocating for full funding from the state, would they be asking them to pull from other areas in the budget.

Giarrusso explained that they are meeting with stakeholders and working with the Department of Finance and looking at revenue projections based on tax revenues. Projections are looking good and negotiations should be a little bit easier this year.

Carancho asked about compensation for the board of trustees and asked if there was any transparency regarding those increases.

Giarrusso answered that management received a 2.5% increase that will be covered by this budget request. The largest portion of compensation increases would actually be going for represented staff and faculty.

Shorette added that if you looked at the executives, it would be a pretty small percentage of those compensation increases.

Giarrusso also added that looking at a recent state commission and audit; proportionally, management personnel only make about 7-8%.

Giarrusso summarized some of the bill in the legislative portfolio:

- 2 year bills – These are bills that were not passed out of their houses and remain as active bills for remainder
- Inactive – These bills were pulled/discontinued by their author. This means they are usually going to revamp them significantly and reintroduce them
- Vetoed – These bills were passed out of the House and then vetoed by the Governor
- Chaptered – These bills were signed by the Governor

Carancho brought up AB 1064 and that it passed and then vetoed and asked if it could be brought back if there is enough support.

Giarrusso explained that this could be brought back if they used current, and accurate numbers in order to really quantify the cost of living for students at each CSU. Right now, they don't have information on the three categories of students: students who live at home, students who live independently, and students who live on campus.

For examples, the information they have for students who rent an apartment off campus are not consistent with what it actually costs to live off campus. Some campuses, the numbers are much higher than what it actually costs to live off campus and others it is much lower. This information and these numbers are used for grants and allocating aid equitably.

These numbers are from 10 years ago and there was no standard methodology for collecting this data. Giarrusso believes that there should be a standardized process.

Carancho asked if they should bring this bill to the attention of legislators during their visits.

Olenslager-Orton if that isn't what equity was, and what they were aiming for.

Shorette explained that equal distribution of debt is equality, not equity because of the net effect of debt from tuition costs affects each person differently.

Olenlager-Orton added that they believe that a student's parents' income should not affect the kind of funding that they receive, because not everyone is receiving assistance from their families.

Shorette agrees, and added that privilege and generational wealth factor into the net effect of debt for the students coming from the higher earning families.

Giarrusso agrees, and does see problems in terms of providing financial aid across the board and believes that methods for allocating funds does need to be improved.

Show asked if they had any tips for dealing with legislators and how a lot of them will tell you what you want to hear and how to avoid that.

Giarrusso suggested having a clearly stated strategy and outcomes. A common tactic that is used is that you will meet with a legislator who will filibuster a meeting so they can get you out of the room without you making a formal request or them committing to anything. Recommends that they be able to walk out of a meeting with a firm commitment from the legislator if that was one of their goals.

Jara added that they have a district visit outline set in place so that they can stay on topic and focus on the issues set out by the Lobby Corps Policy Agenda.

Jara also informed Shorette and Giarrusso that Senator Nguyen was very interested in the opportunity to co-sponsor a bill for mental health resources in higher education.

Giarrusso brought up AB 217, which took prop 63 (incremental tax) and created a statewide fund that would go to county based, mental health resources. AB 217 looked to take some of that revenue and allocate it to colleges. This bill made it through both houses, but then got vetoed by the Governor.

Assemblymember Kevin McCarty's strategy this year was to instead of going the legislative route, they went through the budget process and through different committees. Unsuccessful for the CSU system, but was able to secure 4.5 million for community colleges.

They have been working with McCarty's office and the Steinberg Institute, based in Sacramento. They have identified college mental health as a priority. They are definitely under resourced, but one of the main ways that a mental health professional is looking to solve mental health crises is through early identification and prevention.

Shorette commended the board and reminded them that they are doing really important work. Reminded them to think about what success looks like. Last year, they fought tuition increase pretty hard, and the outcome was a tuition increase. You might not always see the outcome of your advocacy and your hard work, but it is there and Shorette believes that they will see the effects of it this year.

9. VOLUNTARY CLOSING COMMENTS

Jara reminded the board to copy them if they are going to reach out to Rob Shorette or Jared Giarrusso so that they are in the loop as well.

Carancho informed the board of an event tonight on sexual assault awareness and prevention in LH-150 at 7pm.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Without objection Chair Jara adjourned the meeting at 1:48pm.

RECORDED BY:

Diana Duran, Lobby Corps Recording Secretary

Date

APPROVED BY:

Genesis Jara, Lobby Corps Chair

Date