The year has gone by so fast. It is hard to believe that summer is upon us. Hopefully, the State will come to a decision on the budget in the next few months, but past experience in this regard does not lead me to be overly optimistic. The ACADEMIC SENATE CSU Executive Committee plans to remain vigilant over the summer on this issue.

During our May Plenary meeting we approved fifteen resolutions (not including resolutions of commendation to Senators who were leaving the Senate). Resolutions can be found at: www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2007-2008/index.shtml. In total, the ACADEMIC SENATE CSU passed over 35 resolutions during the academic year. At the May meeting the resolutions we passed included support for changes to Executive Order 595 dealing with General Education Breadth, support for the Virtual Library proposal from the Council of Library Directors, support for removal of the Loyalty Pledge Requirement for CSU employment and for Senator Lowenthal’s bill, SB 1322, support for the CSU Troops to College Initiative, and recommended guidelines and policies for participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) and the Pre-Reduction in Time Base Program.

I have greatly appreciated the opportunity of serving as the Chair of the Academic Senate, CSU over the past twelve months. I look forward to working with our new Chair, John Tarjan, the new Executive Committee, and the other members of the Senate during the upcoming year. My best wishes to you for a wonderful summer.
On May 13-14, 2008, the Board of Trustees met. My full report is on the Academic Senate’s web page and the Board’s agenda, reports, and resolutions at www.calstate.edu/BOT. In this space, I want to highlight some of the major items considered and actions taken.

*Access to Excellence* was approved with the inclusion of important language regarding workload re-allocation. Unique plans on various campuses are now possible. For example, CSU Long Beach has adopted similar language to allow for innovative workload re-allocation plans. The strategic plan urges the CSU to seek resources needed for the goals of the plan and many of its objectives. The Statewide Academic Senate of the CSU will be involved in the implementation phase of the plan.

While awaiting the revised budget from the governor, the Board noted that approval of Doctorate in Nursing is moving forward in the legislature. The CSU is trying to make sure that any fee waivers and other facilitation of troops and veterans are compensated to the CSU.

The Board reviewed the support budget request and then reluctantly voted to increase student fees by $276, which is much lower than our cohort institutions, which averaged a rise in fees of $600. The fee increase, which does not apply to students on California student aid, will provide $110 million in additional revenue, a third of which will go to student aid. Currently, 170,000 students receive $861 million in Cal and/or State University grants and their fee increase is offset by an increase in their grants. 142,000 students carry an average loan of $6,744. 8,222 students receive $19 million for work study. The CSU also received an additional $30 million in Pell Grant aid due to changes in the federal formula. Cost of attendance for each student breaks down this way: living at home = $11,504; living on campus = $16,783 (it is $24,000 at the UC); living off campus = $17,587. Nationally, 69% of students leave college in debt; only 34% leave the CSU in debt due in part to our low cost.

Our budgeted costs per student, while low in all national comparisons, are still under-funded; the state only pays for half of the $16,000 per student needed to educate them. We’ve actually used economies of scale to reduce our actual cost per student to about $12,800 per year; but the state only gives us $8,356 per student, so the rest has to come from student fees unless the state steps in with additional revenue.

**Executive Committee (EX)**

**John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Vice-Chair**

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) met twice in April. The first meeting was in Sacramento. After an excellent dinner briefing on developments in the Capitol, ICAS met with a number of key people including the Lieutenant Governor, the Secretary of Education, the Undersecretary for Higher Education, a CPEC representative, key legislators and staff. At the second meeting, changes updating IGETC (GE transfer) and a subcommittee to oversee its currency were approved. A transition meeting with outgoing and incoming Executive Committees will be held at LAX on June 3.

The committee will be working closely with Executive Vice Chancellor Reichard through the summer to help finalize the metrics and initiate the research needed to complete the *Access to Excellence* implementation plan.

The committee worked with the Board of Trustees Chair Achtenberg to arrange for the first ever formal Senate report at the May meeting. Chair Pasternack delivered a terse, yet complete, report.

It is anticipated that advocacy for the CSU will continue over the summer and include the committee. The chairs of the respective segments will be jointly authoring editorial pieces.
Executive Committee (EX)  
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The new Executive Committee will meet on June 3 and 4. The members will be joined on the 4 by the new standing committee chairs to make committee appointments. The committee will also meet that day with Executive Vice Chancellor Reichard and Associate Vice Chancellor Boyum to discuss Access to Excellence, new security policies and appropriate campus consultation, and other matters requiring attention during the summer.

Academic Affairs (AA)

Academic Preparation & Education Programs (APEP)

Education Advisory Committee, the campus Senates and advisory committees as well as a significant number of the faculty and administrators who are involved in general education, a revision of EO 595 has emerged. Academic Affairs and the Senate have endorsed the proposed changes which leave the basic structure of GE intact but clarify and modernize the policy description.

Academic Affairs (AA)  
James Postma (Chico), Chair

The Academic Affairs Committee ended its deliberations with three significant topics: libraries, general education, and efforts to transition Troops to College. I discussed Troops to College in the last newsletter, but I’ll mention the highlights of the other two issues here.

The CSU librarians and library directors have done an amazing job of adjusting to the new world of electronic resources and the adjustments are even more admirable in that they have occurred in a time of budget cuts and staff losses, while needing to maintain traditional print resources and serve a growing student body. The recent report of the Council of Library Directors (COLD) (www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2007-2008/documents/2854Attach.pdf) outlines their plans to leverage the capabilities of the CSU to maximize electronic resources and make them available 24/7 from the library, campus offices, homes, and everywhere else with a web presence. These plans deserve recognition, support, and commendation: the message of our resolution.

The CSU General Education Program, established into current policy as Executive Order 595 (www.calstate.edu/oe/EO-595.pdf) is something that faculty care deeply about because it is a significant part of our students’ degrees and is a chief component of transfer relations with the community colleges and other universities. After a nearly two-year effort involving the Senate, the General

Academic Preparation & Education Programs (APEP)

Bob Buckley (Sacramento), Chair

The most recently available date indicated that an average of 55% of entering freshmen in the fall of 2005 needed remediation. At the start of their second year, 97% of these students are fully proficient, having satisfied the entry level requirements for both mathematics and English. This is truly a commendable result of systemwide remediation efforts. At the final plenary meeting of the 2007-08 Academic Senate CSU, a resolution (AS-2847-08) prepared by the Academic Preparation and Education Programs (AEP) Committee was passed commending the faculty, staff and administrators involved in remediation efforts at each of our campuses.

In 1997 Executive Order 665 required students who take the English Placement Test (EPT) and the Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) exam after admission but before enrolling at a CSU campus. Students that did not demonstrate proficiency were to undertake appropriate developmental/remedial work, and were to successfully complete the work during their first academic year. In response, campuses developed the appropriate remedial programs which have resulted in this 97% success
Academic Preparation & Education Programs (APEP) (Continued)

rate. Individual campus rates (reflecting both campus efforts and their different student constituents) are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>Ch. Islds.</th>
<th>Chico</th>
<th>DH</th>
<th>East Bay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>FU</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>SLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To validate these efforts a number of campuses have tracked those students who successfully completed remediation and have found no statistical difference between their success rates and those that required no remediation.

Commendations for work well done are often assumed but rarely conveyed to those responsible. In this case the Senate’s resolution requested that this commendation be conveyed to the campuses and especially to the faculty, staff and administrators who are responsible for these impressive results.

Faculty Affairs (FA)
Bernadette Cheyne (Humboldt), Chair

The Faculty Affairs Committee enjoyed a very productive year and dealt with a number of interesting and important topics, among them issues related to shared governance, academic freedom, international programs, administrative response to votes of no confidence, graduate business fees, Access to Excellence, and patents and technology transfer. In addition, FAC received valuable input and insights from regular attendance by Chancellor’s Office personnel Lorie Roth, Gail Brooks, Margy Merryfield and Elizabeth Ambos, as well as John Travis representing CFA. Topics already on the agenda for next year include systemwide faculty hiring practices, faculty-related issues regarding on-line degree programs, faculty engagement and satisfaction, and the relationship between the union contract and Statewide Senate responsibilities.

Many thanks to all Committee members, Chancellor’s Office personnel and the CFA representative for their excellent work and support over the past year. I hope that everyone enjoys a wonderful and rewarding summer.

Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA)
Fred Hornbeck (San Diego), Chair

We are at the end of our formal academic and Academic Senate CSU years but the major challenge for FGA and the entire Academic Senate CSU—indeed for all of us—lies ahead. I encourage everyone to continue to actively advocate for the CSU budget as urged in AS-2839-08/FGA: ASCSU Outreach Strategies for Protecting the CSU 2008-2009 Budget adopted unanimously in March.

Consistent with our last report, the California and CSU budgets are very nearly our only concern. Student fees for the coming year were set by our Board of Trustees earlier this week so that is pretty much settled. The probability of a legislative buy-out of the 10% increase seems infinitesimally small. The Governor’s May Revise has been published and generated some degree of optimism in some quarters. FGA member and Academic Senate CSU Budget Specialist David Hood describes a budget that is better than it was but by no means perfect, and a process that is fraught with perils and uncertainty. The budget debate is far from over. In fact, it has just started.
If you have not yet done so, please enroll in the Alliance for the CSU www.allianceforthecsu.org and work with your own university or campus senates, administrators, students, alumni, and collective bargaining chapters to continue our conversations with legislators in their local offices emphasizing the message that the CSU is the Solution—or at least a substantial contributor to a solution—for California’s dire fiscal situation.

And, if you haven’t yet done so, please send to me fhornbeck@psychology.sdsu.edu a brief report of those advocacy visits that you have made on your own or with other representatives from your campus or university.

As the current year ends, I thank all members of our FGA Committee for their effort and contributions. Each member has helped to make ours an effective, productive group while maintaining an atmosphere of mutual respect and camaraderie.

Successful, collegial shared governance depends upon the constructive contributions of administrators as well as the willing participation of members of the faculty. As observed here last month, we have enjoyed very helpful and collegial support from Karen Yelverton-Zamarippa and her CSU Office of Advocacy and Institutional Relations (AIR), particularly Wess Larson and Kathy Radtkey-Gaither. Since Patrick Lenz’s departure [see Commendation of Patrick Lenz], Rodney Rideau has kept us informed of developments in the CSU Budget Office and we appreciate his assistance. Allison Jones is our committee’s liaison with Academic Affairs and we appreciate his thorough briefings and willing responses to questions. Jim Blackburn briefed FGA when Allison’s responsibilities took him to Washington or elsewhere and we appreciate Jim’s helpful remarks and cordial demeanor.

FGA has also enjoyed the close cooperation of CFA’s John Travis and Chris Garland in our battle of the budget as well as other legislative matters. We appreciate very much the positive rapport between the voice of the CSU faculty in collective bargaining and the voice of the CSU faculty in shared governance that their contributions represent.

In closing, let me note that on May 22 the California Senate passed Senate Bill 1322 authored by Sen. Alan Lowenthal, D-Long Beach, that is intended to protect "the Constitutional freedoms that we have fought so valiantly for," including freedom of political affiliation www.sacbee.com/102/story/942850.html. Last week, the Academic Senate CSU approved unanimously FGA’s resolution AS-2856-08/FGA/FA in support of that bill. Removal of the Requirement of Loyalty Pledges from State Employees and Support for SB 1322 (Lowenthal. Communism.) The bill now goes to the Assembly.

Please enjoy a productive, restorative, and pleasurable summer.

Lower-Division Transfer Patterns (LDTP)
Barbara Swerkes (Northridge), Chair

The LDTP Advisory Committee has met once and the LDTP Steering Committee has met three times since the March Academic Senate CSU Plenary. The work of the committees these past two months has been a continuation of the major projects for the past year with a primary focus on implementation details, facilitating the course review process, and seeking ways to improve communication and collaboration with our Community College colleagues. Major recent LDTP developments:

Transfer AA Pilot Project:
The CSU Chancellor’s Office following consultation with LDTP Committees and with Community College Administrators, initiated a pilot project at two CSU campuses, East Bay and Northridge. The purpose of the project is to explore the potential for enfolding LDTP program courses from limited, selected disciplines into local Community College AA degrees with the intent to further facilitate transfer. This project encourages the discipline faculty to interact across the segments to explore this possibility.

Development of LDTP Admissions Agreements:
On March 18, 2008, Executive Vice Chancellor, Gary Reichard distributed a memo to CSU campus presidents, directors of admissions and others announcing that LDTP Admissions Agreements and Planning Guides will be available to CCC students applying for admission to the
Lower-Division Transfer Patterns (LDTP)
Barbara Swerkes (Northridge), Chair (continued)

CSU for 2009-10. Thus much of the materials and technology to support this process must be in place by this coming summer 2008.

Committee items:
Joan Bisell, Director in the Office of Teacher Education and Public School Programs of the CSU Chancellor’s Office, reported to the Advisory Committee that faculty working on the Math Science Initiative are utilizing LDTP patterns to facilitate the transfer and the acquisition of a teaching credential by CCC students with an interest in obtaining a Math or Science teaching credential. This project is designed to meet the urgent need in California for teachers in Math and Science.

Discipline Pilot Project.
The Steering Committee has recommended and the Chancellor’s Office approved special summer funding for two discipline projects. Two current LDTP discipline coordinators (Business and Chemistry) have been asked to submit a request for funding proposal for a project that will permit further development/refinement of the LDTP programs in those disciplines. This project could include the reconvening of CSU faculty system wide with articulation officer and Community College representation in each of these disciplines.

Discussion of possible approaches to the streamlining of the of the course review process. A proposal was forwarded for consultation to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate CSU and then referred to the Academic Affairs (AA) and the Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committees. The result of this consultation was expression of a strong commitment to maintaining the decision-making authority regarding course approvals that lead to articulation, in the hands of the CSU discipline faculty.

There are a number of summer projects on the Steering Committee agenda:
  Assessment of the project to date
  Setting priorities for the summer and the coming year
  Continue meeting/discussing improvements to LDTP with our CCC colleagues.

Develop better communication/public relations: respond to the CCC recommendation that we still need “to sell” LDTP to them! respond to questions raised by CSU Articulation Officers
  Refine implementation – recommend procedures as questions/issues arise
  Review courses included in local programs to identify where significant common elements exist with potential for descriptor development.

Finally a sincere note of thanks to the hard working and dedicated members of both committees. We are a group representing faculty (F), articulation officers (AO), and Chancellors’ Office staff (CO) from both systems plus a CCC Student Services Officer (CSSO). We are diverse but representative of the variety of perspectives regarding transfer. What we all share is our dedication to the students of California who come to our respective systems. There has not been a meeting where we failed to openly express our thoughts and concerns in a collegial and intersegmental effort that has major potential significance for our state and our students. We do not always agree but we will move forward as long as we continue to talk and listen. Thank you!!

Advisory Committee:
  CCC: Jane Patton (F), Bonnie Schmiege(F), Ken Matsuura (AO & F), Deanna Abma (AO & F), Jeanie Nishime (CSSO), and Jeff Spano (CO).
  CSU: John Tarjan (F), Mark Van Selst (F), Barbara Swerkes (F), David Hood (F), James Postma (F – Ex-officio, non-voting), Michelle LaCentra (AO), Cathy Beane (AO), Christine Hanson (CO), Allison Jones (CO), and Keith Boyum (CO – Ex-officio, non-voting).

Steering Committee
  CSU: John Tarjan            Michelle La Centra
         Mark Van Selst           Christine Hanson
         Barbara Swerkes          Allison Jones

Special thanks also to the staff who do all of the behind the scenes work (there is much of it!!):
  Marshall Cates (Faculty Director), Rachel Hendrickson (CO) and Mark McKellip (CO)
May Revised Budget & Implications for the CSU
David Hood, FGA Member and ASCSU Budget Specialist

The Governor’s May Revision proposes a General Fund increase of $97.6 million to maintain funding for CSU level from year to year and to limit fee increases to the levels agreed to in the Compact. This funding is also intended to preserve enrollment levels in high-state-need instructional programs and provide resources for implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment standards for teacher preparation programs required to be implemented in 2008-09 pursuant to Chapter 517, Statutes of 2006 that would otherwise have to be absorbed. Thus, the unallocated portion of the reduction to the workload budget level for CSU is reduced to $172.1 million for a revised total reduction of $215.3 million. That is very good.

More details may be found on the following URL’s:

Higher Education Summary:
http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/Revised/
StateAgencyBudgets/6013/agency.html

CSU:
http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/Revised/
StateAgencyBudgets/6013/6610/department.html

The Democrats’ analysis of the budget:
http://democrats.assembly.ca.gov/members/a27/pdf/
MayReviseHighlights2008.pdf

There are several serious problems even with the Governor’s proposed $97.5 million augmentation. The CSU must still pay for increased energy costs, increased space, and increased compensation. Our mandatory costs are increasing while our budget remains the same. The result is that we must cut back on some programs to fund these mandatory costs.

Another worry: the Governor is proposing to sell revenue anticipation bonds based on future lottery performance and will borrow greatly from specialized funds, which are supposed to be repaid after he leaves office. This worries me. The details of the borrowings may be found here:
http://www.sacbee.com/static/weblogs/capitolalertlatest/012587.html

In other words, we are postponing the reckoning that is facing us today.

He is also proposing a one percent increase in sales tax, but only as a last-ditch measure.

It is interesting to consider the sectors of the budget that were augmented and those which were reduced. The Governor is proposing adding funds to parks, prisons and education probably because the public wants to visit its parks, does not want prisoners released early, and has a soft spot for education. The Governor proposes reducing funds for the general area of health and welfare.

In the arena of public planning, a proposal that is criticized by all sides is probably a good proposal because nobody got everything they wanted. In this case, the Republicans oppose the sales tax increase and the Democrats oppose drastic cuts to services to children, the elderly, and the poor. When the Academic Senate CSU Executive Committee and Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee visited Sacramento in early April, we heard almost everywhere the comment that this year was the time to completely design the budget process. The combination of a general desire to revamp the budget process with both party’s dislike of the proposed budget, it doesn’t require a prophet to predict a very long and hot summer.

The Governor’s Revised Budget is a stop-gap solution with no permanent remedy for the state’s structural budget problem. There are no overarching revenue enhancements in the State’s revenue base: no new taxes that amount to much, and no mention of the VLF loophole that costs several billion a year. Although, for this year, through borrowing on our future we are making do and getting by, these temporary solutions will not work for tomorrow. Further, cost-cutting and temporary borrowing merely postpone, but do not solve, the structural problem.

As Dr. F. King Alexander (President, California State University, Long Beach) said:

“In addition to not being a comprehensive solution, the Governor’s proposal is simply a recommendation and is subject to the actions of the Legislature, which is likely to make changes in the revised budget. The Legislature may reduce the restored funding or it could choose to target some or all of any restored funding to a specific purpose.”

I urge everyone in the CSU family to unite behind the CSU Alliance and to work for legislative action not just to add to the CSU budget but also to correct both the budgetary process and the need for revenue enhancements. Instead of celebrating this temporary budgetary increase, we should instead be preparing for the long struggle ahead.

That struggle has just begun…
学术委员会的决议可以在以下URL找到。
www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions

**RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE MAY 8-9, 2008 MEETING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-2837-08/EX (Rev)</td>
<td>Priorities for Budget-Driven Reductions in Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) Functionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2838-08/EX (Rev)</td>
<td>Academic Senate CSU Calendar of 2008/2009 Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2840-08/EX (Rev)</td>
<td>Response to <em>Access to Excellence</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2841-08/FA (Rev)</td>
<td>Guidelines and Policies for Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program or in the Pre-Retirement Reduction in Time Base Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2842-08/FA (Rev)</td>
<td>Ensuring Consistent and Full Representation on the Academic Senate California State University (CSU) by Every Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2843-08/AA (Rev)</td>
<td>Approval of Recommended Revisions to Executive Order 595: “CSU General Education Breadth Requirements”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2844-08/AA (Rev)</td>
<td>Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) Support of the <em>Troops to College</em> Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2845-08/FA (Rev)</td>
<td>Shared Governance, Academic Freedom and Principles Governing Systemwide Initiatives with Curricular Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2847-08/APEP (Rev)</td>
<td>Commendations for the Success of Campus-Based Student Remediation Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2848-08/FA (Rev)</td>
<td>Faculty Participation in the Creation of Policies and Implementation Strategies for Patents and Technology Transfer Services in the California State University (CSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2849-08/APEP (Rev)</td>
<td>Assessment of Early Assessment Program (EAP) Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2851-08/EX (Rev)</td>
<td>Change to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, including Section 4d.(4) Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2854-08/AA (Rev)</td>
<td>Support for the Proposal for a Virtual Library from the Council of Library Directors (COLD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2855-08/EX (Rev)</td>
<td>Consultation on CSU Systemwide Information Security Drafts on Standards, Policy and Acceptable Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2856-08/FGA/FA (Rev)</td>
<td>Removal of the Requirement of Loyalty Pledges from State Employees and Support for SB 1322 (Lowenthal,Communism)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FAILED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-2853-08/FGA (Rev)</td>
<td>Opposition to a Permanent Cap on Future Student Fee Increases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENDATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-2857-08/SJSU Del</td>
<td>Commendation for Dr. Michael Gorman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2858-08/CSUB Del</td>
<td>Commendation for Dr. Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2859-08/SDSU Del</td>
<td>Commendation for Dr. Michael J. Perkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2860-08/MAR Del</td>
<td>Commendation for Captain Tuuli Messer-Bookman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2861-08/CSUCI Del</td>
<td>Commendation for Dr. Lillian Vega-Cantaneda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>