April 13, 2016

Dr. Steven Filling, Chair
Academic Senate, CSU
The California State University
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

RE: March 3-4, 2016, Senate Resolutions

Dear Dr. Filling:

Thank you for forwarding the packet of resolutions adopted by the Academic Senate of the California State University at its September 3-4, 2015 meeting. We are pleased to provide the responses below.

1) AS-3236-15/FA: Reaffirming the Principle of Shared Governance Within the California State University

Since coming to the CSU, Chancellor White has consistently highlighted the idea of shared leadership as a way of “sharing in the leadership of this university, ensuring that we are consistently learning from each other, and evaluating our failures and successes” (http://www.calstate.edu/executive/speeches/2015/20150428-fitting-the-pieces-remarks.shtml). Shared leadership builds on collegial relationships and is compatible with our understanding of the tradition of shared governance in higher education. Further, it is a way to conceptualize our work together and takes place within existing governance structures, including the Academic Senate of the California State University. The CSU Academic Senate and administration share a common mission on behalf of the CSU and the people of California and we look forward to our working together to shape the future.

Many issues may arise on campuses, and most are resolved through the processes of shared governance at the campus level. There are times when we are confronted with more difficult issues, and each of these has its own history and complexity. By their nature they do not lend themselves to a single approach or solution. Responsible governance requires that we look at each case and its distinguishing characteristics, and our response must take those characteristics into account. In all cases we believe
collegiality, consultation, and trust are essential elements in building and maintaining the relationships necessary for shared governance within the university, and the Chancellor offers advice in varying and nuanced ways with an eye to enabling solutions to be crafted on campus as they maximize ownership and success of the path forward.

2) **AS-3244-16/APEP: Support for Requiring a Fourth Year of High School Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning as a Requirement for Admission to the California State University**

We welcome this attention and support from the senate and agree that requiring students to take a fourth year of math while in high school is in the interest of student success. It should improve student readiness for higher education while addressing two of our system’s pressing challenges; to close achievement gaps and reduce time to degree.

As we consider an admission requirement of four years of mathematics, we will be paying close attention to potential impact on our most vulnerable students. The current one-year gap and possibly two-year gap in high school mathematics development has had a measurable impact on the quantitative readiness of underrepresented students. We also recognize the implications for under-endowed school districts, faculty development, and intellectual resources that facilitate competency in quantitative reasoning for all students, as early as possible.

The resolution appropriately recognizes that such a fourth-year might take different forms, and that practical applications of quantitative reasoning—such as mathematics in computer science, statistical analysis, and financial literacy—could give students a way to maintain their skills throughout high school. Subject-matter experts tell us continued practice is vital, more important even than the particular type of mathematics practiced. In this spirit the ASCSU has called for the use of a course in the college preparatory (“A-G”) high school curriculum, though not necessarily in algebra-based mathematics (Area C).

The CSU is discussing this possibility with several other state-level groups, including the University of California, California Community Colleges, high schools, and school districts. We will keep the senate updated about these discussions, and we note that representatives from these stakeholders are involved in the ASCSU Quantitative Reasoning Task Force. This resolution gives us timely evidence of our faculty’s broad and deep commitment to improving service to our students and the state.

3) **AS-3245-16/AA: Selection of Faculty to Serve on Campus Honorary Degree Committees**

The guidelines for honorary degrees were changed from an advisory document to formal Board of Trustees policy last fall. As the result of consultation with ASCSU, some changes suggested by ASCSU membership were incorporated into the document presented for board action. In moving from the original, advisory guidelines document to the binding policy document proposed to the board in November, no changes were made to the requirement for campus faculty and academic senate involvement in the nomination process for these non-academic
degrees. The board adopted the “Policy for Awarding Honorary Degrees” at the November 2015 meeting.

4) **AS-3246-16/EX: Preventing Workplace Bullying Within the CSU Community**

As the Academic Senate is aware, on March 18, 2015 Vice Chancellor Lamb convened a workgroup on workplace environment in the CSU. The Academic Senate has a representative on that workgroup, as do bargaining units and others. The workgroup is progressing with recommendations and implementing resources to address this important issue. We look forward to continued cooperation from the Academic Senate in these efforts.

5) **AS-3248-16/FGA: 2016 Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the California State University**

The work of the ASCSU in analyzing the hundreds of bills presented in the legislature is very much appreciated. We look forward to working together to tell the story of the CSU to our colleagues in state government in Sacramento.

6) **AS-3249-16/AA/FA/EX: Concerns about Administrative Communications regarding Classroom Discussion of Possible Strike Action**

We had asked that CSU faculty communicate with students about class meeting schedules and assignments during the strike. This was reflected in the FAQ communication posted on the Chancellor’s Office website. It also indicated that faculty may discuss the strike if it is “relevant to the content of the course.” (http://www.aaup.org/file/1940%20Statement.pdf)

Sincerely,

Leo Van Cleve
State University Dean

c: Dr. Timothy P. White, Chancellor
   Dr. Loren J. Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs
   Mr. Steve Relyea, Executive Vice Chancellor & Chief Financial Officer
   Mr. Garrett P. Ashley, Vice Chancellor, University Relations and Advancement
   Ms. Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources