June 2, 2010

Dr. James Postma, Chair
Academic Senate
The California State University
401 Golden Shore, Suite 139
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

Dear Dr. Postma:

RE: May 6-7th Senate Resolutions

Thank you for forwarding the packet of eighteen resolutions adopted by the Academic Senate of The California State University at its meetings on May 6-7, 2010. I am pleased to provide the responses below:

**AS-2942-10/AA (Rev.)**
Use of College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Tests to Meet General Education (GE) Requirements

This resolution in support of using the CLEP to meet requirements of the General Education program is a welcome one. We appreciate the work of the General Education Advisory Committee, as well as that of the Academic Affairs Committee, in the preparation of this resolution. In addition, members of the distribution list are likely to find the attached list of placement tests acceptable for CSU system wide Credit for External Examinations useful.

**AS-2944-10/EX**
Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2010-2011 Meetings

We acknowledge receipt of the 2010-2011 Academic Senate Calendar and note the listing of seven plenary/committee sessions and six interim committee dates. While the scheduling of plenary sessions to precede the meetings of the Board of Trustees is widely understood, it should be noted that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate may be obliged to reduce overall number of days for the Senate meetings given the potential of limited funding in 2010-2011.
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AS-2945-10/FGA (Rev.) Support for Governor’s Proposed 2010-2011 Higher Education Budget

We welcome a resolution in support of sustainable funding for higher education in the State of California, and commend our Governor for his stand for increased funding to the California State University.

AS-2947-10/APEP/AA (Rev.) Consultation on Decisions Regarding Academic and Information Technology

We support the idea that campuses should consider ways in which to implement strategic reductions in a manner that includes consideration of impacts on curriculum and instruction. Yet the reason why this resolution focuses solely on matters related to information technology are not clear. We would support broad consideration of the affects of strategic reductions on all aspects of the university.

AS-2949-10/APEP (Rev.) The Early Assessment Program (EAP) and Collaborations To Increase the academic readiness of Graduating High School Seniors

We appreciate the importance of efforts to coordinate P through 16 education in the State of California and accept the recommendation that the EAP Advisory Committee be reconvened. In April 2010, members of the Chancellor's Office staff began identifying potential nominees for vacated positions on the Advisory Board. Once that process has been completed, we anticipate convening the Board to discuss progress to date on EAP, as well as plans for the Early Start Program.

AS-2950-10/APEP (Rev.) Facilitating Students’ Academic and Career Goals in a Time of Economic Constraints

We acknowledge the importance of establishing an appeal process for on campuses which impose unit restrictions on matriculated students and believe that most of our campuses already have such appeal processes in effect.
AS-2951-09/EX (Rev.)  Addition of Second Faculty Trustee to the CSU Board Of Trustees

We regret the absence of a Faculty Trustee on the Board of Trustees. However, adding a second faculty position would not resolve the current log jam. Also, some have observed that the rationale for naming a second student position arises from the more temporary nature of their affiliation with the CSU, while faculty are comparatively more permanent.

AS-2952-10/FGA  Importance of CSU faculty Consultation in Development of Legislation Related to Curricular Matters

We are pleased to reaffirm the importance of faculty consultation, particularly as it relates to curricular matters. The process of creating and developing legislation, however, is often not a matter open to the control of the institutions of higher education in our State. Also, many pieces of legislation take on a life and pace of their own: both factors that do not easily lead to thorough and detailed consultation with all involved. The development of SB 1440 was such a case.

The Senate’s resolution -- to “deplore the CSU administration’s testimony in support of SB 1440” -- appears to have been passed in haste and seems to be absent consideration that multiple bills involving transfer have been circulated in Sacramento this spring. None of these bills originated in consultation with faculty participation.

A well taken point in this resolution is the acknowledgment that the CSU enjoys a great deal of expertise in its faculty and that the utilization of that expertise could be expanded.

AS-2953-10/FGA/AA/APEP  Successful Implementation of SB 724 (Scott) for the CSU Independent Ed.D. Degree

We heartily concur with the acknowledgement of the faculty, students, and administrators who so valiantly fought to institute and develop the CSU Independent Ed.D. Degree. Those approximately one hundred students completing their degrees this year are also to be congratulated.

AS-2954-10/FA  Resolution Condemning Hate Crimes with the CSU

We join you in condemning recent hate crimes on CSU and other university campuses, and we share the values of respect for diversity as outlined in this resolution.
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AS-2955-10/FGA  
Opposition to AB 2401 (Block) and Loss of Statewide Admissions Diversity and Quality

We acknowledge receipt of this resolution opposing AB 2401 regarding the proposed limitation of incoming freshmen to campus local service areas or LSAs.

AS-2956-10/FA  
Resolution on the Failure of the Board of Trustees To Support Publicly the Appointment of a Faculty Trustee

Preceding resolutions AS-2941-10/EX, AS-2935-10/FA, AS-2911-09/FGA regarding the continued absence of a faculty trustee have been noted. The clarity of these previously issued resolutions and the fact that the ASCSU does not have the authority to prescribe the actions or agenda of the Board of Trustees appear to render this resolution unnecessary and somewhat off mark. The title boldly states that the Board has failed but neither the resolution (nor the title) acknowledge that the Board is not obliged to act when the ASCSU passes a resolution.

AS-2957-10/APEP/AA/FGA  
Support of AB 2832 (Blumenfield), Legislation to Authorize the Offering of the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Degree in the California State University

We acknowledge the pressing need to resolve issues surrounding the Doctor of Physical Therapy – either by removing the new requirement for a doctoral degree by accrediting agencies or by permitting our departments of Physical Therapy to develop a DPT for our students.

AS-2958-10/APEP/AA/FGA  
Appropriate Preparation in Facilitating Efficient Transfer: In Response to SB 1440 (Padilla) and AB 2302 (Fong)

We welcome faculty and ASCSU support in the effort to increase the efficiency of student transfer from the California Community Colleges, as well as the ASCSU support for “the intent of SB 1440 and AB 2302.” We concur that further discussion within, between and among CSU and CCC faculty will be useful in creating a stronger bill.
AS-2959-10/AA/APEP/FGA  A Detailed Response to SB 1440 (Padilla), “Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act”

Again, we welcome faculty and ASCSU support for more effective transfer processes. The concerns raised in this resolution should be taken into consideration by faculty of the CSU and CCC, should SB 1440 pass.

AS-2960-10/FA  Objection to Unilateral Decision Making and the Pursuit of a “Culture of Compliance” in the CSU

This strongly-worded resolution regarding a “Culture of Compliance” is founded upon a premise of increasingly “unilateral administrative decision making” in the CSU and asserts or implies that recent moves toward increasing graduation, administratively appointed advisory committees, and “non representative forms of decision making” are inappropriate and expanding. Unfortunately, the assertions in the second, third and fourth resolves – while accusatory and impassioned – do not contain sufficient specificity upon which to respond.

However, the rationale provides more specific commentary regarding “disengagement.” It is not clear whether “unilateral” decision making alluded to above is assumed to be synonymous with disengagement as described in this section. Nonetheless, a few direct responses follow on items a through c of the rationale:

a. There is no requirement that the Chancellor or members of the Board of Trustees attend meetings of the Academic Senate.

b. There is no requirement that the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs make public the recommendations of a task force he/she appointed. Nor is there a requirement that the Academic Senate review the recommendations of said task force before the EVC present recommendations to the Board of Trustees. This is especially the case if the program was originally mandated by the Board of Trustees and given a confined timeline. Further, it should be noted that the task force contained members from the ASCSU and the CSU Math and English Councils. Meetings were held with several constituents regarding the Board resolution during the task force deliberations.

c. The Presidents of the CSU retain the right to meet and confer, as well as offer suggestions to the Chancellor, without a stipulation that faculty join their discussion.
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AS-2961-10/EX  
Regarding Board of Trustees and Chancellor's Office
Response to faculty Vote of No Confidence in President
Shirvani of CSU Stanislaus

It is the practice of the Chancellor to review all personnel matters pertaining to the presidents of the
CSU, and this practice includes votes of no confidence. As the ASCSU will understand, issues related
to presidential performance are confidential.

AS-2962-10/FA  
Opposition to participation in the Zemsky-Finney
Re-engineering the Undergraduate Curriculum Proposal

We regret the ASCSU's opposition to participation in this invitation to engage faculty in a nation-wide
discussion of the efficacy of the undergraduate curriculum. We find the opposition ironic, as it appears
to oppose the very sort of consultation the ASCSU has supported in earlier resolutions. We also find
unusual that the ASCSU has taken it upon itself to oppose any campus in pursuing this national
corversation. We question whether such a resolution is within the charge of the ASCSU.

Sincerely,

Jeri Echeverria
Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

JE/yb

c: Dr. Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Dr. Benjamin F. Quillian, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Mr. Garrett P. Ashley, Vice Chancellor, University Relations and Advancement
Ms. Gail E. Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources