May 13, 2010

Dr. Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
The California State University
401 Golden Shore, Room 641
Long Beach, California 90802-4210

Dear Chancellor Reed:

At its meeting on May 6-7, 2010, at CSU headquarters in Long Beach, the Academic Senate of the California State University discussed and acted upon a number of matters.

Enclosed is a copy of the items upon which the Senate took action. These documents are sent to you for consideration and action as appropriate.

Sincerely,

John Tarjan, Chair
Academic Senate of the California State University

Attachments

Distribution list:
Members, Academic Senate CSU
Chancellor’s Office Representatives
Board of Trustees
Presidents
Provosts/Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Chairs, Campus Academic Senates
CSU Alumni Council
California State Student Association
The status of the resolutions that were circulated for Senate consideration at the May 6-7, 2010 meeting in Long Beach are listed below:

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

2) AS-2944-10/EX Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2010-2011 Meetings  Approved Unanimously

3) AS-2945-10/FGA(Rev) Support for the Governor’s Proposed 2010-2011 Higher Education Budget  Approved Unanimously

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

5) AS-2949-10/APEP (Rev) The Early Assessment Program (EAP) and Collaborations to Increase the Academic Readiness of Graduating High School Seniors  Approved Without Dissent

6) AS-2950-10/APEP(Rev) Facilitating Students’ Academic and Career Goals in a Time of Economic Constraints  Approved Without Dissent

7) AS-2951-09/EX (Rev) Addition of a Second Faculty Trustee to the CSU Board: of Trustees  Approved

8) AS-2952-10/FGA Importance of CSU Faculty Consultation in Development of Legislation Related to Curricular Matters  Approved Unanimously

9) AS-2953-10/FGA/AA/APEP Successful Implementation of SB 724 (Scott) for the CSU Independent Ed.D. Degree  Approved Without Dissent

10) AS-2954-10/FA Resolution Condemning Hate Crimes within the CSU  Approved Unanimously

11) AS-2955-10/ FGA Opposition to AB 2401 (Block) and Loss of Statewide Admissions Diversity and Quality  Approved Without Dissent

12) AS-2956-10/FA Resolution on the Failure of the Board of Trustees to Support Publicly the Appointment of a Faculty Trustee  Approved Unanimously

13) AS-2957-10/APEP/AA/FGA Support of AB 2382 (Blumenfield), Legislation to Authorize the Offering of the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Degree in the California State University  Approved Unanimously

14) AS-2958-10/APEP/AA/FGA Appropriate Preparation in Facilitating Efficient Transfer: Approved
15) AS-2959-10/AA/APEP/FGA  A Detailed Response to SB 1440 (Padilla), “Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act”  Approved
16) AS-2960-10/ FA  Objection to Unilateral Decision Making and the Pursuit of a “Culture of Compliance” in the CSU  Approved
17) 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  Approved
18) AS-2962-10/FA  Opposition to Participation in the Zemsky-Finney Re-engineering the Undergraduate Curriculum Proposal  Approved
Use of College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Tests to Meet General Education (GE) Requirements

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) endorse the recommendations of the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee to expand the breadth of CLEP exams authorized for meeting statewide CSU GE requirements (as attached); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU similarly endorse the recommendations of the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee regarding the modifications to the acceptability of some Advanced Placement (AP) courses to meet Statewide CSU GE requirements (as attached); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to Executive Vice Chancellor Echeverria; the Educational Policies Committee of the CSU Board of Trustees, campus provosts, campus senates, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges, and the California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC) listserv.

RATIONALE: In recent years, the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee has undertaken a review of the scope and breadth of the CSU GE requirements (including a review of alignment with the IGETC pattern) and systematically evaluated expanding the GE applicability of AP and IB exams. This later evaluation has, in the 2009-2010 academic year, been expanded to include an evaluation of the potential expansion of the applicability of CLEP exams to meet CSU GE requirements.

The CLEP exam is often used by military personnel, veterans, and others with "life experience" rather than those having achieved formal university credit (although it could be used by those individuals where such credit is non-transferable). As such, the expanded use of CLEP is entirely consistent with the "Troops to College" initiative and, more generally, the movement away from strict "seat time" metrics of academic performance. The Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee — a committee chaired by and predominantly composed of CSU faculty — has received the recommendations of campus faculty who have independently evaluated the rigor and breadth of the CLEP exams. Additionally, GEAC is satisfied (i) with the CLEP development process and security measures, and (ii) that passing the (various) CLEP exams recommended to be approved for CSU GE credit does indicate an acceptable level of university-level knowledge as well as sufficient GE breadth exposure to justify awarding CSU GE credit.

It will be noted that this expansion of CLEP is unique and not entirely non-controversial since CLEP exams, unlike AP and IB exams, are not inherently tied to a course or program of study. CLEP exams are truly stand-alone
examinations. The use of CLEP may best be thought of as meeting the requirements of credit by examination as permitted under EO-1036.

At present, Coded Memorandum AA-2009-11 provides guidance to the community colleges regarding which of the AP, IB, and CLEP exams are recommended for inclusion within CSU Breadth. This list provides the best guidance for Community Colleges regarding which exams are acceptable to meet CSU GE requirements. The expansion of the CLEP exams (presumably via an updated memorandum) will serve to facilitate graduation via reducing redundancy in educational experiences. The modifications to the AP and IB lists reflect some changes in course offerings and the explicit permission to "grandfather" some AP exams that used to be counted for more units of GE under the previous "Jo Service" memo (1997) and which were not addressed by coded memorandum AA-2008-52.

Approved Unanimously - May 6-7, 2010
MEMORANDUM

Date: May 11, 2009

To: California Articulation Officers, CSU Academic Planners

From: Christine Mallon Hanson

Subject: Systemwide Credit for External Examinations

This Coded Memorandum updates and supersedes Coded Memorandum AA-2008-52 AA-2009-11.

As directed in Executive Order 1036, Section 1.2.4, the CSU faculty have determined the following passing scores, minimum units of credit earned, and certification area (for General Education Breadth and/or U.S. History, Constitution, and American Ideals) for the enclosed list of standardized external examinations.

Note that each campus in the California State University system determines how it will apply external examinations toward credit in the major. For students not already certified in GE and/or American Institutions, the campus also determines how to apply credit from such exams toward the local degree requirements.

Questions about this memo may be directed to Ken O'Donnell, State University Associate Dean, Academic Program Planning: Programs and Policy: 562/951-4735, kodonnell@calstate.edu.
### CSU Systemwide Credit for External Examinations

**As of May 11, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Board Advanced Placement Tests</th>
<th>Minimum Passing Score</th>
<th>Semester Credits Earned</th>
<th>American Institutions and/or GE Breadth Area</th>
<th>Removal Date for GE Breadth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP Art History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C1 or C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Biology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B2-B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Calculus AB²</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Calculus BC³</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Calculus BC/ AB Subscore³</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B1+B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B1+B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Chinese Language and Culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Comparative Government &amp; Politics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Computer Science A³</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Computer Science AB³</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP English Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Environmental Science²</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B2-B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Environmental Science³</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B1+B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP European History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2 or D6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP French Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP French Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP French Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP German Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP German Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Human Geography</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Italian Language and Culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Japanese Language and Culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Latin Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Latin: Vergil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Macroeconomics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Microeconomics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Music Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Physics B⁴</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B1+B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Physics B⁵</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B1+B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Physics C (electricity/magnetism)⁶</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B1+B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Physics C (mechanics)⁷</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B1+B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Spanish Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Spanish Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Spanish Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Spanish Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Spanish Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Statistics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Studio Art - 2D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Studio Art - 3D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Studio Art - Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP U.S. History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(C2 or D6) + US-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP World History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2 or D6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)

| CLEP American Government               | 50                    | 3                       | 3                                           | D8                          |
| CLEP American Literature               | 50                    | 3                       | 3                                           | C2                          |
| CLEP Analyzing and Interpreting Literature | 50           | 3                       | 3                                           | C2                          |
| CLEP Biology                            | 50                    | 3                       | 3                                           | B2                          |
## CSU Systemwide Credit for External Examinations

**As of May 11, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLEP Calculus</th>
<th>44 50</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>B4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Chemistry</td>
<td>48 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP College Algebra</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP College Algebra - Trigonometry</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP College Mathematics</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP English Composition (no essay)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP English Composition with Essay</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP English Literature</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP French Level I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP French Level II</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP German Level I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP German Level II</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP History, United States I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D6+US-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP History, United States II</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D6+US-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Human Growth and Development</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Humanities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Information Systems and Computer Applications</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Introduction to Educational Psychology</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Introductory Business Law</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Introductory Psychology</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Introductory Sociology</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Natural Sciences</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B1 or B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Pre-Calculus</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Principles of Accounting</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Principles of Macroeconomics</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Principles of Management</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Principles of Marketing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Principles of Microeconomics</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Social Sciences and History</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Spanish Level I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Spanish Level II</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Trigonometry</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Western Civilization I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2 or D6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP Western Civilization II</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### International Baccalaureate (IB)

| IB Biology HL | 5 | 6 | 3 | B2 |
| IB Chemistry HL | 5 | 6 | 3 | B1 |
| IB Economics HL | 5 | 6 | 3 | D2 |
| IB Geography HL | 5 | 6 | 3 | D5 |
| IB History (any region) HL | 5 | 6 | 3 | C2 or D6 |
| IB Language A1 (any language) HL | 4 | 6 | 3 | C2 |
| IB Language A2 (any language) HL | 4 | 6 | 3 | C2 |
| IB Language B (any language) HL | 4 | 6 | 0 | n/a |
| IB Mathematics HL | 4 | 6 | 3 | B1 |
| IB Physics HL | 5 | 6 | 3 | D9 |
| IB Psychology HL | 5 | 6 | 3 | D6 |
| IB Theatre HL | 4 | 6 | 3 | C1 |
CSU Systemwide Credit for External Examinations

As of May 11, 2009

1. These units count toward eligibility for admission. The units may not all apply toward certification of the corresponding GE Breadth area. See Executive Orders 1033 and 1036 for details.


3. Students seeking certification in GE Breadth prior to transfer must have passed the test before this date.

4. If a student passes more than one AP exam in calculus or computer science, only one examination may be applied to the baccalaureate.

5. Students who pass AP Environmental Science earn 4 units of credit. Tests taken Fall 2009 or earlier may apply to either B1-B3 or B2-B3 of GE Breadth. After Fall, those credits may only apply to B1-B3.

6. If a student passes more than one AP exam in physics, only six units of credit may be applied to the baccalaureate, and only four units of credit may be applied to a certification in GE Breadth.

7. If a student passes more than one CLEP test in the same language other than English (e.g., two exams in French), then only one examination may be applied to the baccalaureate. For each test in a language other than English, a passing score of 50 is considered “Level I” and earns six units of baccalaureate credit; the higher score listed for each test is considered “Level II” and earns additional units of credit and placement in Area C2 of GE Breadth, as noted.

8. The 18 curriculum offers language at various levels for native and non-native speakers. Language B courses are offered at the intermediate level for non-natives. Language A1 and A2 are advanced courses in literature for native and non-native speakers, respectively,

p. 4
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the following schedule for 2010-2011:

**2010**

- September 15-16: Committees/Plenary
- October 15: Interim Committees
- November 3-5: Committees/Plenary
- December 3: Interim Committees

**2011**

- January 19-21: Committees/Plenary
- February 18: Interim Committees
- March 16-18: Committees/Plenary
- April 8: Interim Committees
- May 4-6: Committees/Plenary
- September 15-16: Committees/Plenary
- October 14: Interim Committees
- November 2-4: Committees/Plenary
- December 2: Interim Committees

; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of the CSU be authorized to change the schedule of meetings approved, with adequate notice to the Academic Senate of the CSU, if the Trustees alter their schedule, or if budgetary constraints require a change.

RATIONALE: The California State University Board of Trustees is in the process of determining its meeting dates for 2010-2011, as follows:

**2010**

- March 16-17: Headquarters
- May 11-12: Headquarters
- July 13: Headquarters
- September 21-22: Headquarters
- November 9-10: Headquarters

**2011 Tentative**

- January 25-26, 2011: Headquarters
- March 22-23, 2011: Headquarters
- May 10-11, 2011: Headquarters
- July 12, 2011: Headquarters
- September 20-21, 2011: Headquarters
- November 15-16, 2011: Headquarters

Approved Unanimously - May 6-7, 2010

Note: Long Beach Grand Prix Weekend – April 15-17, 2011
Support for the Governor’s Proposed 2010-2011 Higher Education Budget

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) commend Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger for the proposed funding of California public higher education in his 2010-2011 budget; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU support, in particular, the proposed allocation of $305 million to backfill the previous one-time reduction to the CSU budget, which will be essential to initiate the fiscal recovery of the University; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU acknowledge and support the Governor’s efforts to provide an additional $60 million in funding for new student enrollment growth; and be it further

RESOLVED: That ASCSU urge the Governor and the Legislature to maintain the above allocations in the subsequent 2010-2011 budget development process; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Governor and the Legislature to recognize that, in light of the budget reductions to higher education in recent years, the allocation in the Governor’s proposed budget represents only a first step in the restoration of full funding for California public higher education in general and the California State University in particular; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Governor, leadership of the California State Legislature, the CSU Chancellor and Board of Trustees, campus senate chairs, and leadership of the California State Student Association.

RATIONALE: As a result of California’s on-going fiscal crisis, the California State University experienced a 20 percent cut in state general fund allocation ($600 million) over the past two years. As part of this reduction, in 2009-2010, the system experienced a one-time cut of $305 million in its general fund allocation. This has had a significant impact on student access, requiring the CSU to turn away 10,000 eligible students in 2009-2010 alone.

The Governor’s proposed budget for 2010-2011 recognizes this problem and backfills the $305 million one-type reduction and offers the prospect of additional monies to fund enrollment growth. While this, in and of itself, is not sufficient to completely address the on-going budget shortfall facing the CSU, it is a step in the right direction that should be acknowledged.

Approved Unanimously - May 6-7, 2010
Consultation on Decisions Regarding Academic and Information Technology

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recommend that campus provosts/vice presidents for academic affairs, vice presidents for information technology, in consultation with the Academic Senates, establish processes whereby proposals that would result in the reduction or centralization of specific academic technology and information technology resources, infrastructure or support services could be fully assessed; and be it further.

RESOLVED: The assessment of these proposals should not merely include estimates of potential cost savings, but also include an assessment of the impact on curriculum and instruction and ultimately the teaching and learning of students; and be it further.

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, members of the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC), members of the Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC), campus senate chairs, provosts/vice presidents for academic affairs, and vice presidents for information technology.

RATIONALE: As campuses consider ways in which to make strategic reductions in expenditures, proposals are likely to include the reduction, elimination, and/or centralization of IT resources, infrastructure, or support services currently provided within divisions of Academic Affairs. Beyond estimates of potential cost savings, proposals should also include an assessment of the impacts on curriculum and instruction and ultimately teaching and student learning.

The ASCSU is aware of reports from campuses where reduction, elimination, and/or centralization decisions have been made without assessment of their programmatic impact and without consultation with faculty. While such decisions may be justified and necessary, they should be informed by a full understanding of their impact.

Approved Unanimously - May 6-7, 2010
The Early Assessment Program (EAP) and Collaborations to Increase the Academic Readiness of Graduating High School Seniors

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support and commend the collaborative efforts begun in the fall of 2009 involving the California State University, the University of California, and the California Community Colleges to establish a more effectively aligned P-16 education system that will help all of California’s students graduate from high school ready for non-remedial, credit-bearing, baccalaureate work; and be it further

RESOLVED: That ASCSU encourage continued support and collaboration with P-12 schools to increase the number of students who meet standards and academic proficiency before beginning credit bearing baccalaureate-level coursework; and be it further

RESOLVED: That ASCSU urge the Chancellor to reconvene and, as necessary, reconstitute the EAP Advisory Committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That ASCSU support the findings of the Achieve¹ sponsored assessment of EAP, which state that:

- EAP augmentations provide and contribute authentic college readiness tasks to the assessment of student’s postsecondary preparation;

- Targeted improvements could be made in the Algebra II, Summative Mathematics, and English EAP to increase the balance and rigor of the items used to assess college readiness;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees and the Assistant Vice Chancellor-Student Access and Retention.

RATIONALE: Resolution AS-2923-09/APEP (November 6, 2009) recognized and supported renewed efforts on the part of the Chancellor’s Office to identify and attempt to initiate improvements in the effectiveness of EAP. In so doing, the expectation was that this work would lead to the identification of the preconditions necessary to achieve the goal set in the Board of Trustees’ 1996 resolution to reduce the percentage of regularly admitted new CSU freshmen needing remediation to 10%. The work is well underway.

¹ Achieve (www.achieve.org) is an independent, non-profit education reform organization. In 2005, it launched the American Diploma Project (ADP)
In 2008 the California Diploma Project (CDP) was launched. With assistance from Achieve, an assessment concluded that EAP did provide students with an indicator of their readiness for “essential college-ready content identified by CSU faculty for entering credit-bearing coursework.”

It is expected that a collaborative and comprehensive effort to help students get ready for college will be formalized with a statement to be signed by the leaders of the UC, CSU, and California Community Colleges along with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Governor. In support of the use of EAP, the statement will indicate that the use of EAP does serve as a valid indicator of students' readiness for college-level work.

It is important to note that the EAP was developed with extensive consultation and involvement of the CSU Academic Senate over the past six years. The ASCSU has appointed CSU English and math faculty to represent the faculty in the development of the additional EAP questions and written essay. Those faculty participated on California Department of Education content review panels that were responsible for writing the 11th grade California Standards Test. At all steps, the English and Math Councils were involved in the development of the EAP as were the EPT and ELM Development Committees. As such, EAP assessment represents the CSU indicator of student readiness for baccalaureate-level coursework within the CSU system.

Approved Without Dissent - May 6-7, 2010
Assessing the Effectiveness of the Early Assessment Program (EAP) in Increasing the Academic Readiness of Graduating High School Seniors

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognize and support the analysis of the effectiveness of the EAP that is being conducted by Academic Affairs, Office of the Chancellor and recommend that this analysis include the assessment and the identification of the preconditions necessary to achieve the goal set in the Board of Trustees’ 1996 resolution to reduce the percentage of regularly admitted new CSU freshmen needing remediation to 10%; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Affairs Officer of the CSU provide the Senate with an annual report on the assessment of EAP that includes the data, the analysis, and findings.

RATIONALE: The Early Assessment Program (EAP) provides students with an early indicator of their level of college preparation. However, the percentage of students that utilize this information to make more informed decisions to increase their knowledge and skills while still in high school and thereby avoid the need for remediation in their entry level college experience, is low. Both the importance and the expectations associated with the EAP are significant. Jack O’Connell, the Superintendent of Public Instruction in a presentation to the Board of Trustees on “Closing the Achievement Gap in California” made reference to EAP as an important component in attempts to close this “Gap”. In addition, the California American Diploma Project, established by Achieve, the non-partisan, non-profit education reform organization, has identified EAP as an important tool in ensuring that high school graduates are fully prepared to undertake college-level work.

The ASCSU continues to believe that EAP is one of the most important outreach activities that the CSU has undertaken. Its acceptance as an assessment tool by the California Community Colleges now means that the majority of college constituents in California will benefit from utilizing EAP-based feedback during their senior year in high school.

The EAP has received the favorable interest and comment at the national level, as states struggle to align their K-12 and higher education interests. By utilizing a shared assessment instrument, high school learning expectations in English and mathematics can be directly related to the CSU’s expectations for incoming freshman. The professional development opportunities in English and mathematics, and curriculum modules in English have addressed a long-standing disjunction between high school and college writing and have allowed the CSU to emphasize the role that critical analysis plays in English and mathematics at the university level.

Furthermore, work to be done to ensure that EAP includes (1) the appropriate incentives to greatly increase student participation and (2) the appropriate counseling that will lead to students taking the courses necessary for them to achieve proficiency prior to
graduation. This resolution recognizes and supports the initiatives being implemented by Executive Vice Chancellor Echeverria.

It is important to note that California public schools do not have the resources necessary to refocus efforts on graduating college ready students. CSU will call upon the California Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the variety of K-12 support organizations to direct their efforts towards graduating students better able to fulfill their higher education goals.

Approved Unanimously – January 21-22, 21010
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AS-2950-10/APEP(Rev)
March 10-11, 2010

Facilitating Students’ Academic and Career Goals in a Time of Economic Constraints

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recommend to the Chancellor and campus presidents that policies which impose unit restrictions on matriculated students, such as prohibitions from changing majors or adding second majors or minors, should take students’ individual academic and career goals into account and provide students with adequate access to advising and faculty support; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend to the Chancellor and campus presidents that all such processes include a student appeal process that incorporates input from appropriate discipline faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees, campus presidents, provosts, and campus senate chairs.

RATIONALE: Recent economic constraints have led to directives to all CSU campuses to manage FTES by restricting unit loads. As a consequence, students’ career and academic choices have been limited. Many successful CSU students use their university experience to explore life and career options before deciding on a specific major or program. This resolution asks that such limitations on such students be considered carefully and that each campus develop, with faculty input, a mechanism for special consideration.

Approved Without Dissent - May 6-7, 2010
Addition of a Second Faculty Trustee to the CSU Board of Trustees

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) request that the CSU Board of Trustees recommend to the Governor and California State Legislature the addition of a second faculty trustee to the Board with a term of appointment staggered with that of the current faculty trustee position; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees and campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: The addition of a second faculty trustee with a staggered term would provide for a second perspective on faculty issues, which are numerous and diverse in a system with well in excess of 20,000 faculty. Additionally, it would eliminate situations where a vacancy due to a delay in the appointment of a single faculty trustee, or any other reason, would mean the Board would not benefit from the wisdom and perspectives of any current faculty member.

Approved - May 6-7, 2010
Importance of CSU Faculty Consultation in Development of Legislation Related to Curricular Matters

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognize the exclusive role of the CSU faculty in the creation and implementation of curriculum as specified in Title V; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm the importance of CSU faculty consultation in creating legislation that relates to CSU curricular matters; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU express its strong concern that the failure to engage in such consultation will further threaten academic quality and erode shared governance; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU understand that decisions involving curricular matters made without CSU faculty consultation may jeopardize accreditation for many academic programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor, Board of Trustees, and California State Legislature to take advantage of the CSU faculty expertise on curricular matters in that faculty—through their education and experience—are most knowledgeable on these matters; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU deplore the CSU administration’s testimony in support of SB 1440, a bill dealing with the CSU curriculum, given that there was no input from the CSU faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED: The ASCSU send this resolution to the CSU Chancellor and Board of Trustees, Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, campus presidents and senate chairs, and members of the California State Legislature.

RATIONALE: The ASCSU acknowledge the importance of the California Community Colleges in the education of California citizens and their role in preparing students for transfer to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution. Although we recognize the need for an inter-segmental approach to many aspects of higher education, we must urgently remind all concerned that the curricular requirements for CSU baccalaureate degrees remain the purview of CSU faculty.

Approved Unanimously - May 6-7, 2010
Successful Implementation of SB 724 (Scott) for the CSU Independent Ed.D. Degree

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) acknowledge the successful implementation of SB 724 (Scott), which authorized the California State University (CSU) to offer an independent Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.) degree; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU commend the Governor, Legislature, CSU Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor, Assistant Vice Chancellor and State University Dean for their leadership in helping to launch an innovative, systemwide effort for the CSU independent Ed.D. degree; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU congratulate the eleven CSU campuses for now serving 576 students and graduating the first CSU independent Ed.D. student cohorts this summer; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU extend special thanks to the CSU faculty and staff for highly effective and interdisciplinary contributions, and the P-12 school and community college partners for collaborative and intersegmental support; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Governor and leadership of the California State Legislature, former senator and current Chancellor of the California Community Colleges Jack Scott, CSU Chancellor and staff, CSU presidents and provosts, CSU campus senate chairs and Ed.D. directors.

RATIONALE: In September of 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger signed into law Senate Bill 724 (Scott), which for the first time allowed the California State University to offer an independent doctoral degree. Prior to SB 724, CSU could only offer joint doctorate programs with the University of California or with a private university.

Recognizing the urgent need for well-prepared administrators to lead public school and community college reform efforts, the state supported CSU’s request to offer graduate level instruction that would lead to the Doctorate of Education degree. The Doctorate of Education degree offered by the California State University is focused on preparing administrative leaders for California public school districts and community colleges, providing the knowledge and skills needed by administrators to be effective leaders for California public schools and community colleges.
It is apparent from the report (http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/may10/edu-policy.pdf) by Dr. Beverly Young, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, that the CSU independent Ed.D. has been a great success. In her report, Dr. Young provides an update on the CSU Education Doctorate (Ed.D.). The program implementation has been very effective, with 11 campus programs now serving 576 students, 333 preparing to be P-12 educational leaders and 243 preparing for community college leadership positions.

The program is serving a diverse group of candidates: more than 20% are Latino, over 15% are African American, 7% are Asian American, and about half are white. In the first offering, in 2007, 150 candidates entered the program. This group is now completing its third year, and just over 100 are projected to earn their Ed.D. degree by this summer.

The program has had unusually low attrition rates--only approximately 5%. The high persistence reflects in part the strength of the cohort model of the program and the study of problems relevant to candidates’ work. In addition, CSU has worked to keep fees at a moderate level; providing greater access to high quality preparation throughout the state.

Approved Without Dissent - May 6-7, 2010
SENATE BILL No. 724

Introduced by Senator Cogdill

February 27, 2009

An act to amend Section 5023.5 of, and to add Section 5023.6 to, the Penal Code, relating to correctional law hospital services, and making an appropriation therefor.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

SB 724, as amended, Cogdill. Prisoners: emergency health care hospital services.

Existing law authorizes the Department of Correction and Rehabilitation, including the Division of Juvenile Facilities, to contract with providers of emergency health care services. Existing law requires hospitals that do not contract with the department for emergency health care services to provide those services on the same basis as they are required to be provided pursuant to specified federal regulations. Existing law prohibits the department from reimbursing a hospital that provides these services without a contract at a rate that exceeds reasonable and allowable costs, as defined by specified federal regulations and publications.

This bill would instead prohibit the department from reimbursing a hospital that provides those services unless the department has contracted with the hospital at a rate equal to 150% of the hospital’s average costs as calculated by using the cost-to-charge ratio developed from the most recent Hospital Annual Financial Disclosure report issued by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development.

Existing law requires the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, including the Division of Juvenile Facilities, to work
with the State Department of Health Care Services in obtaining hospital cost information in order to establish the costs allowable under those provisions.

This bill would instead require the department to work with the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development in obtaining hospital cost information in order to establish the reimbursement required under those provisions.

The bill would also create the Hospital Interim Payment Fund, as a continuously appropriated fund in the State Treasury, for the purpose of making payments to hospitals, for services provided on or after July 1 of the fiscal year for which no budget has been enacted or before November 1 of that year for the purpose of making payments to hospitals, during the period in which the program has a deficiency. The bill would also appropriate from the General Fund, in the form of loans, for each fiscal year in which these payments are necessary, an amount equal to a cumulative total of 33% of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation’s annual payments to all hospitals in any fiscal year.


The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. — Section 5023.5 of the Penal Code is amended to read:

5023.5. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, including the Division of Juvenile Facilities, may contract with providers of emergency health care services. Hospitals that do not contract with the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, including the Division of Juvenile Facilities, for emergency health care services shall provide these services to the department on the same basis as they are required to provide these services pursuant to Section 489.24 of Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, including the Division of Juvenile Facilities, shall not reimburse a hospital that provides these services, unless the department has contracted with the hospital at a rate equal to 150 percent of the hospital’s average costs, as calculated by using the cost to charge ratio developed from the most recent Hospital Annual Financial Disclosure report.
issued by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development.

(b) An entity that provides ambulance or any other emergency or nonemergency response service to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, including the Division of Juvenile Facilities, and that does not contract with the department for that service, shall be reimbursed for the service at the rate established by Medicare. The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, including the Division of Juvenile Facilities, shall not reimburse a provider of any of these services that the department has not contracted with at a rate that exceeds the provider’s reasonable and allowable costs, regardless of whether the provider is located within or outside of California.

(c) The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, including the Division of Juvenile Facilities, shall work with the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development in obtaining hospital cost information in order to establish the reimbursement required under this section. The Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development may provide the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, including the Division of Juvenile Facilities, with hospital cost information that the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development obtains pursuant to Chapter 1 of Part 5 of Division 107 (commencing with Section 128675) of the Health and Safety Code.

SEC. 2.

SECTION 1. Section 5023.6 is added to the Penal Code, to read:

5023.6. Notwithstanding any other provision of law and without regard to fiscal year, if the annual Budget Act is not enacted by June 30 of any fiscal year preceding the fiscal year to which the budget would apply or there is a deficiency in the budget during any fiscal year, the Controller shall annually transfer from the General Fund, in the form of one or more loans, an amount equal to a cumulative total of 33 percent of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation’s annual payments to all hospitals in the immediately preceding fiscal year, to the Hospital Interim Payment Fund, which is hereby created in the State Treasury. Notwithstanding Section 13340 of the Government Code, the Hospital Interim Payment Fund is hereby continuously appropriated for the purpose of making payments to hospitals, on or after July
1 of a fiscal year for which no budget has been enacted and before November 1 of that year for the purpose of making payments to hospitals during the period in which the program has a deficiency. Payments shall be made pursuant to this section if both of the following conditions have been met:

(a) An invoice has been submitted for the services.
(b) Payment for the services is due and payable and the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, including the Division of Juvenile Facilities, determines that payment would be valid.
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AS-2954-10/FA
May 6-7, 2010

Resolution Condemning Hate Crimes within the CSU

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its commitment to providing a learning environment that respects all members of its community and holds central to its mission the values of inclusiveness, cultural diversity, and the welcoming of multiple perspectives: and be it further

RESOLVED: That ASCSU decry any word or deed that is meant to demean, threaten, or injure any individual based on group affiliation or personal characteristics, especially where such actions occur at institutions of higher education; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU condemn in particular as vicious hate crimes recent acts of verbal and physical violence at California State University Chico, California State University Long Beach, and California State University Dominguez Hills; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be forwarded to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU presidents, CSU campus senate chairs, and the California State Student Association, and victims of recent incidents of hate crimes on CSU campuses as described below.

RATIONALE: According to the website of California State University Chico:

In California, you are considered a victim of a hate crime if you have been targeted because of your ‘real’ or ‘perceived’ race, ethnicity national origin, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or physical or mental disability. People belonging to these groups are referred to as ‘protected classes.’ All people are members of a protected class (http://www.csuchico.edu/up/safety/hate crime.html).

In recent months, several incidents that may be classified by statute as hate crimes, as well as other actions that may be classified as hate speech, have occurred on California State University campuses. As cases in point, a transgender student at California State University Long Beach; the Associated Students campus President, a native of Africa, at California State University, Chico; and a gay student at California State University Dominguez Hills were all recently attacked. Although law enforcement authorities can act on legal issues, it is also important for the CSU faculty to decry these actions because they are fundamentally counter to the institution’s stated mission and values.

Approved Unanimously - May 6-7, 2010
ACADEMIC SENATE
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AS-2955-10/ FGA
May 6-7, 2010

Opposition to AB 2401 (Block) and Loss of Statewide Admissions Diversity and Quality

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) oppose AB 2401 (Block), which would require that California State University (CSU) campuses deny admission to all freshman applicants out of the campus local service area (LSA), unless all CSU-eligible LSA students are granted admission; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU assert that AB 2401 would reduce diversity in the student body of CSU campuses by limiting the number of students from disparate areas (e.g., the Central Valley and the North Coast regions) of California outside of their LSAs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That AB 2401

a. would reduce opportunities for students with special talents or interest in areas of the arts, agriculture, engineering, athletics, and other fields not offered by their LSA campus;

b. could incur large financial costs by necessitating an increase in the number of campuses offering particular programs, such as teacher preparation;

c. would deny admission to non-LSA California applicants with higher eligibility scores than those of admitted LSA applicants, thereby denying high achieving students access to their intended campuses;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That ASCSU reaffirm that CSU campuses are supported by and intended to serve all citizens of the State of California and not just those of their LSAs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU send this resolution to the CSU Chancellor and Board of Trustees, California State Legislature, and the Governor of California.

RATIONALE The ASCSU opposes AB 2401 for the following reasons:

- Budget reductions have forced CSU to reduce enrollments by 10% over a 2-year period despite high demand.
- Campuses were given short timelines to develop plans to deal with reduced enrollment.
• AB 2401 was introduced in response to changes in the admission policies at a single campus, but could affect the entire admission process for the CSU.

• The one campus plan that would deny admission to some CSU-eligible LSA applicants this year still exceeded its 11-year average percentage of LSA admissions and percentage of freshman admits from underrepresented groups by providing them additional eligibility score points.

• CSU-eligible LSA students denied admission to local campuses are guaranteed admission upon completion of designated program at community colleges.

• The measure would overturn the mission of the CSU to serve the entire state and not just the local areas of the individual campuses.

Approved Without Dissent - May 6-7, 2010
An act to amend Section 66202 of the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST


Existing law, known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, provides for a public postsecondary education system in this state. This system consists of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges. Among other things, the Donahoe Higher Education Act sets forth legislative intent with respect to enrollment planning and admission priority practice at the undergraduate resident student level for the California State University and the University of California.

This bill would express the intent of the Legislature, subject to existing admission priority practices, that state this legislative intent with respect to enrollment planning and admission, rather than admission priority practice. The bill would require the California State University, within existing enrollment categories, to provide applicants residing in the local service area, as defined, priority admission to the applicant’s local California State University campus over other California residents or out-of-state applicants entering as first-time freshmen or sophomores, provided they meet relevant admissions criteria.
The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 66202 of the Education Code is amended to read:

66202. (a) It is the intent of the Legislature that the following categories be followed, insofar as practicable in the following numerical order, for the purpose of enrollment planning and admission priority practice at the undergraduate resident student level for the California State University and the University of California:

1. Continuing undergraduate students in good standing.
2. California community college transfer students who have successfully concluded a course of study in an approved transfer agreement program.
3. (A) Other California community college students who have met all of the requirements for transfer.
   (B) As stated in legislative findings, the transfer function plays a key role in meeting the state’s goals of educational equity. Therefore, the Board of Regents of the University of California and the Board of Trustees of the California State University shall declare as policy for this subparagraph and paragraph (2) that students who are eligible to transfer and who are from historically underrepresented groups or economically disadvantaged families shall be given preference, to the fullest extent possible under state and federal law, statutes, and regulations, in transfer admissions decisions, and shall design policies in conformity with state and federal statutes and regulations intended to facilitate their success in achieving transfer.
4. Other qualified transfer students.
5. California residents entering at the freshman or sophomore levels.

(b) It is further the intent of the Legislature that within each of the preceding enrollment categories, the following groups of applicants receive priority consideration in admissions practice be granted admission in the following order:

1. Residents of California who are recently released veterans of the armed forces Armed Forces of the United States.
(2) Transfers from California public community colleges.

(3) Applicants who have been previously enrolled at the campus to which they are applying, provided they left this institution in good standing.

(4) Applicants who have a degree or credential objective that is not generally offered at other public institutions of higher learning within California.

(5) Applicants for whom the distance involved in attending another institution would create financial or other hardships.

(c) It is further the intent of the Legislature that those veterans referred to in paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) who were enrolled in good standing at a campus of the University of California or at one of the California State Universities prior to military service receive priority over other veterans recently released from military service.

(d) (1) It is further the intent of the Legislature that, within each of the priority enrollment categories in subdivisions (a) to (c), inclusive, the California State University shall provide applicants who reside in the local service area of a campus with priority admission to the applicant’s local California State University campus over other California residents or out-of-state applicants entering as first-time freshmen or sophomores, provided they meet relevant admissions criteria. An applicant who is provided priority admission pursuant to this subdivision shall be subject to any additional admissions criteria resulting from impaction of a major or campus.

(2) As used in this subdivision, “local service area” means the CSU service area for the campus as set forth in the California State University Coded Memorandum AA-2005-05, dated February 23, 2005.

CORRECTIONS:
Text—Page 2.
Resolution on the Failure of the Board of Trustees to Support Publicly the Appointment of a Faculty Trustee

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its previous resolutions (AS-2941-09/EX, AS-2935-10/FA, AS-2911-09/FGA) on the continued lack of a faculty trustee, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU express its disappointment at the failure of the California State University Board of Trustees to respond publicly to our call to support explicitly the appointment, in accordance with the Education Code, of one of our two faculty trustee nominees, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the 2010-2011 ASCSU Executive Committee be empowered to explore additional legal and other remedies; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be forwarded to the CSU Board of Trustees; the chairs of the Assembly Higher Education and Senate Education committees of the California State Legislature; campus senate chairs; California Faculty Association; California State Student Association; and the editorial boards of the Los Angeles Times, San Francisco Chronicle, San Diego Union-Tribune, Sacramento Bee, San Jose Mercury-News, Fresno Bee, and the Chronicle of Higher Education.

RATIONALE: The California State University Board of Trustees has been without advice from a CSU faculty member since the end of June 2009, an unprecedented length of time without a faculty trustee. Previous resolutions on this matter have failed to prompt action by the Governor nor public support by the CSU Board of Board of Trustees, despite adherence by the ASCSU to the policies and procedures identified in the California Education Code Sections 66600-66609 which govern the nomination of a faculty trustee. The ASCSU continues to stand on the principle that the Governor must abide by the provisions of the Education Code.

Approved Unanimously- May 6-7, 2010
Support for the Appointment of an Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) Nominee as CSU Faculty Trustee

RESOLVED: That ASCSU unequivocally support the two qualified CSU Faculty Trustee nominees and encourage the Governor to fulfill his statutory responsibility to select one as the next faculty trustee for the term ending June 30, 2011; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU is fully cognizant of the importance of diversity in all appointment processes and has taken this into consideration in compiling its list of potential nominees for faculty trustee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That ASCSU leadership be charged to develop and pursue strategies to encourage the appointment of one of the current nominees; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU call upon the CSU Board of Trustees to support the appointment of one of our nominees and to use its influence to encourage the Governor to appoint; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the text of this resolution be forwarded to John G. Cruz, Appointments Secretary, the Office of the Governor; the chairs of the Assembly Higher Education and Senate Education committees of the California State Legislature; the CSU Board of Trustees; campus senates; CFA; CSSA; and the editorial boards of the Los Angeles Times, San Francisco Chronicle, San Diego Union-Tribune, Sacramento Bee, San Jose Mercury-News, and Fresno Bee.

RATIONALE: Section 6606 of the California Education Code reads in part: “In the selection of a faculty member as a member of the board, the Governor shall appoint the faculty member from a list of names of at least two persons furnished by the Academic Senate of the California State University.”

Pursuant to that responsibility, ASCSU considered a diverse pool of nominees for the position. In March 2009, ASCSU submitted two nominees selected on the basis of their experience and qualifications for the position of Faculty Trustee on the Board of Trustees of the California State University. In December 2009, the Governor’s Appointment Secretary sent a letter to the ASCSU requesting that additional nominees be submitted to the governor, including “one or more candidates of diversity”.

Subsequently, ASCSU solicited advice from the Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee and from campuses via a communication to the campus senate chairs. The discussion leading to the passage of this resolution benefited from the input of that committee, from faculty leadership on most of the campuses, and from
three former faculty trustees who were invited to make presentations and answer questions from senators.

Approved Without Dissent
A Call for Board of Trustee Action on Faculty Trustee Appointment

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) express its alarm at the continued lack of faculty representation on the California State University Board of Trustees (BOT); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge all concerned to appreciate that the absence of a faculty trustee to represent the faculty in discussions that inform BOT action, especially with respect to educational policy issues such as time to graduation, transfer, and remediation, calls into question the legitimacy of the BOT and undermines the ASCSU’s confidence in carrying out the policies of a BOT that is not fully constituted as prescribed by law; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU call on the CSU Board of Trustees at its March 2010 meeting to pass a resolution decrying the absence of a faculty trustee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the text of this resolution be forwarded to John G. Cruz, Appointments Secretary, the Office of the Governor; the chairs of the Assembly Higher Education and Senate Education committees of the California State Legislature; the CSU Board of Trustees; campus senates; CFA; CSSA; and the editorial boards of the Los Angeles Times, San Francisco Chronicle, San Diego Union-Tribune, Sacramento Bee, San Jose Mercury-News, Fresno Bee, and the Chronicle of Higher Education.

RATIONALE: In spite of concerted effort on the part of the ASCSU, both formal and informal, the Governor has yet to appoint a faculty member to the Board of Trustees from the list of names furnished by the ASCSU in March 2009 (California Education Code 6606). As a result, there has been no Faculty Trustee for over 8 months (approximately one-third of the Faculty Trustee two-year term) at a time when the CSU is facing serious challenges impacting the access, affordability, and quality of public higher education. The selection process for the Faculty Trustee nominees is lengthy and time consuming for all involved, particularly for the candidates who submit extensive and detailed documentation. The Governor's failure to appoint a Faculty Trustee may undermine this process for nominees to the 2011-2013 Faculty Trustee term, which begins in fall 2010 and concludes in March 2011.

Approved– March 10-11, 2010
Concern over Delay in Governor’s Appointment of CSU Faculty Trustee

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Governor of the State of California to move expeditiously and appoint the new CSU Faculty Trustee to ensure that CSU faculty have representation on the CSU Board of Trustees; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU send copies of this resolution to the Governor of the State of California, the Chancellor and other members of the Board of Trustees, and chairs of the Assembly Higher Education and Senate Education committees of the California State Legislature.

RATIONALE: The ASCSU conducted the posting, review, and interview process described in California Education Code Sections 66600-66609 and approved unanimously by the members of ASCSU on March 4, 1988, as part of, AS-1773-87/EX during the period September, 2008 to March, 2009. Adherence to the prescribed process resulted in a relatively diverse pool of four candidates. After several rounds of secret balloting, two candidates emerged as the clear choices of the members of the ASCSU to send forward to the Governor. The process described in the above referenced California Education Code specifies that a minimum of two candidates be sent forward and the ASCSU did forward, two names to the Governor.

In sum, the ASCSU search committee followed the process required in the appropriate Code and the ASCSU conducted a fair and secret ballot. Therefore, it remains for the Governor to complete the final stage of the process and select one of the two candidates as Faculty Trustee for the 2009-2011 term. Since only one faculty trustee is appointed to the CSU Board of Trustees, it is critical during these difficult times to convey the faculty viewpoint to the Trustees. The duration of this vacancy has left the faculty unrepresented on the board of Trustees for an unprecedented period.

Approved Unanimously – September 10-11, 2009
Support of AB 2382 (Blumenfield), Legislation to Authorize the Offering of the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Degree in the California State University

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support and encourage the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to support “AB 2382 (Blumenfield), as amended. California State University: Doctor of Physical Therapy degrees,” which authorizes the CSU to offer an independent Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) degree; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU support the continuance of successful joint doctoral physical therapy programs such as the partnership between San Francisco State University and the University of California San Francisco, currently ranked 13th in the nation; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU affirm that DPT degree programs offered by campuses of the CSU must be developed and approved by faculty through regular academic program review and approval processes (including individual campus academic senates) at all individual campuses; and be it further

RESOLVED: That all proposed DPT programs be developed in accordance with all appropriate national standards for such applied doctoral programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Chancellor and Board of Trustees; campus presidents; campus senate chairs; Assembly Member Marty Block, Chair of Assembly Committee on Higher Education; Assembly Member Felipe Fuentes, Chair of Assembly Committee on Appropriations; Assembly Member Mary Hayashi, Chair of Assembly Committee on Business, Professions and Consumer Protection; Assembly Members Robert Blumenfield, Anthony Adams, Joan Buchanan, Cathleen Galgiani, Lori Saldana, and Audra Strickland; and State Senators Tony Strickland and Mark Wyland.

RATIONALE: The demand for physical therapists throughout California is strong. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the California Employment Development Department, California exceeds the national growth rate of jobs for physical therapists (30% vs 27%), and it is estimated that California will experience a 30% increase in physical therapy jobs between 2006 and 2018. The demand for physical therapists in the Northern California region is especially significant since, according to the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, 19 areas in the region are designated as medically underserved and/or with underserved populations. Data from the Physical Therapy Central Application Service reveal that applications and enrollments in California physical therapy programs continue to increase.
According to the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education, CSU campuses provide approximately 38% of the new graduate workforce in physical therapy each year.

While the demand for physical therapists grows, state law currently prohibits the CSU from offering an independent Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) degree. This is problematic because the education model for physical therapy is now a 4-year baccalaureate degree followed by a 3-year entry-level professional DPT program. Indeed, for existing physical therapy programs nationwide, the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education has mandated the DPT degree for all accredited programs by December 31, 2015, and this doctoral degree would therefore be necessary for students to achieve professional standing.

As of June 15, 2009, 94% of the 212 accredited physical therapy programs in the United States are approved to confer the DPT degree, and 100% of programs that are in development plan to offer the DPT. Only 11 programs nationwide offer a Master’s of Physical Therapy (MPT) and not the DPT; 5 of them are CSU programs. The DPT has become the national standard.

Partnerships for joint DPT programs with University of California (UC) schools have not materialized in any significant way, with the exception of the UC San Francisco/San Francisco State partnership, which will begin offering the entry-level DPT in Summer 2010. UC San Francisco, despite having the authority to offer an entry-level doctorate, offers a post-professional DPT only. UC has signaled its disinterest in partnering with CSU beyond current arrangements in place with San Francisco State University and CSU Fresno. Moreover, the joint DPT programs in place are not achieving graduation rates that will keep pace with demand. For instance, the CSU Fresno joint DPT program with UC San Francisco graduated only 8 students in 2008 and 2 in 2009, and only 2 students are currently enrolled.

The ASCSU has offered its “Support for the Authority for the CSU to Grant Independent Professional/Clinical Doctorates” in the past (AS-2683-05); allowing CSU campuses to offer independent doctorates specifically in physical therapy will help address the ongoing shortage of physical therapists in California. The cost for such programs would be more affordable than private schools or joint programs with UC. Access to the profession would be increased for students from historically underrepresented groups and those with socioeconomic barriers. Additionally, using the model for the Ed.D., it appears to be possible to offer such programs on a self-sustaining basis within three years.

AB 2382 has received the strong support of the California Physical Therapy Association, the California Hospital Association, the California Association of Health Facilities, California Nursing groups, and both the Northern and Southern California Clinical Education Consortia. The bill was passed.
unanimously out of the Assembly Higher Education Committee, as well as the Assembly Business, Professions and Consumer Protection Committee. It was approved without dissent by the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Approved Unanimously - May 6-7, 2010
An act to add Article 4.7 (commencing with Section 66042) to Chapter 2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 2382, as amended, Blumenfield. California State University: Doctor of Physical Therapy degrees.

Existing law, known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, sets forth, among other things, the missions and functions of California’s public and independent segments of higher education, and their respective institutions of higher education. Provisions of the act do not apply to the University of California unless the regents of the university act, by resolution, to make them applicable.

Among other things, the act provides that the University of California has exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education to award the doctoral degree in all fields of learning, except that it may agree with the California State University to award joint doctoral degrees in selected fields. With respect to doctoral degrees, the act limits the California State University to awarding these degrees jointly with the University of California, as described above, or jointly with independent institutions.
of higher education, provided that the proposed doctoral program is approved by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

This bill would instead authorize the California State University to award the Doctor of Physical Therapy degree. This bill would require the degree to be distinguished from doctoral degree programs at the University of California.

The bill would require that the Doctor of Physical Therapy degree offered by the California State University be focused on preparing physical therapists to provide health care services and shall be consistent with meeting requirements of the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education. The bill would require that each student in the programs authorized by the bill be charged fees no higher than the rate charged for students in state-supported programs in physical therapy at the University of California.

The bill would require the California State University, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst’s Office to jointly conduct a statewide evaluation of the new programs implemented under the bill. The bill would specify topics to be included in this evaluation, and would require that the evaluation be submitted to the Legislature and the Governor on or before January 1, 2015.


The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares both of the following:
2 (a) Since its adoption in 1960, the Master Plan for Higher Education has served the state well, allowing California to create the largest and most distinguished higher education system in the nation.
3 (b) Because of the need to prepare and educate increased numbers of physical therapists, it is the intent of the Legislature to grant the California State University authority to offer the Doctor of Physical Therapy degree as an exception to the Master Plan for Higher Education.

SEC. 2. Article 4.7 (commencing with Section 66042) is added to Chapter 2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code, to read:

98
Article 4.7. Doctoral Programs in Physical Therapy

66042. (a) Notwithstanding Section 66010.4, in order to meet specific physical therapy education needs in California, the California State University may award the Doctor of Physical Therapy (D.P.T.) degree. The authority to award degrees granted by this article is limited to the discipline of physical therapy. The Doctor of Physical Therapy degree offered by the California State University shall be distinguished from doctoral degree programs at the University of California.

(b) Nothing in this article shall be construed to limit or preclude the California Postsecondary Education Commission from exercising its authority under Chapter 11 (commencing with Section 66900) to review, evaluate, and make recommendations relating to any and all programs established under this article.

66042.1. In implementing Section 66042, the California State University shall comply with all of the following requirements:
(a) Funding on a per full-time equivalent student (FTES) basis for each new student in these degree programs shall be from within the California State University’s enrollment growth levels as agreed to in the annual Budget Act. Enrollments in these programs shall not alter the California State University’s ratio of graduate instruction to total enrollment, and shall not diminish enrollment growth in university undergraduate programs. Funding provided from the state for each FTES shall be at the agreed-upon marginal cost calculation that the California State University receives.
(b) The Doctor of Physical Therapy (D.P.T.) degree offered by the California State University shall be focused on preparing physical therapists to provide health care services, and shall be consistent with meeting the requirements of the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE).
(c) Nothing in this article shall be construed to limit or preclude the California Postsecondary Education Commission from exercising its authority under Chapter 11 (commencing with Section 66900) to review, evaluate, and make recommendations relating to any and all programs established under this article.
(d) Each student in the programs authorized by this article shall be charged fees no higher than the rate charged for students in state-supported doctoral degree programs in physical therapy at
the University of California, including joint D.P.T. programs of
the California State University and the University of California.
(e) The California State University shall provide any startup
funding needed for the programs authorized by this article from
within existing budgets for academic programs support, without
diminishing the quality of program support offered to California
State University undergraduate programs. Funding of these
programs shall not result in reduced undergraduate enrollments
at the California State University.
66042.3. The California State University, the Department of
Finance, and the Legislative Analyst’s Office shall jointly conduct
a statewide evaluation of the new programs implemented under
this article. The results of the evaluation shall be reported, in
writing, to the Legislature and the Governor on or before January
1, 2015. The evaluation required by this section shall consider all
of the following:
(a) The number of new doctoral programs in physical therapy
implemented, including information identifying the number of new
programs, applicants, admissions, enrollments, and degree
recipients.
(b) The extent to which the programs established under this
article are fulfilling identified needs for physical therapists,
including statewide supply and demand data that considers
capacity at the University of California and in California’s
independent colleges and universities.
(c) Information on the place of employment of students and the
subsequent job placement of graduates.
(d) Program costs and the fund sources that were used to finance
these programs, including a calculation of cost per degree
awarded.
(e) The costs of the programs to students, the amount of financial
aid offered, and student debt levels of graduates of the programs.
(f) The extent to which the programs established under this
article are in compliance with the requirements of this article.
Appropriate Preparation in Facilitating Efficient Transfer:  
In Response to SB 1440 (Padilla) and AB 2302 (Fong)

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support the intent of SB 1440 and AB 2302 to increase the efficiency of student transfer from the California Community Colleges to the public-supported four-year institutions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm its long-standing support for the efforts to increase preparedness of students to pursue appropriate upper division coursework; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize the inherent conflicts that exist between the requirements for a terminal AA degree with those of a transfer-oriented degree and those of a technical education degree, and therefore affirm the value of separate “transfer degree” focused on facilitating effective transfer independent of other missions of the California Community College System (e.g., remediation, career preparation, terminal AA degrees); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU identify and support the following elements of a “transfer degree” for students within California:

a. For most majors, students planning to transfer should do so with as close to 60 units as practicable.

b. To ensure the possibility of timely graduation, students should complete the lower-division elements of the CSU GE (or IGETC) requirements prior to transfer (this goal may be secondary to appropriate lower division preparation for high unit and/or strongly-sequenced majors such as STEM and nursing, and some other majors requiring strongly sequenced lower division coursework).

c. CSU Title 5 code requirements (e.g., American institutions) should be incorporated into any “transfer degree” offered at the California Community Colleges.

d. In order to avoid unnecessary extra units taken by the students, all major preparation incorporated into any such discipline-specific “transfer degree” should include only the lower-division preparation required for the relevant CSU baccalaureate degree.

e. The California Community Colleges should have the capacity to certify, based on CSU-approved transfer pathways, the appropriate completion of lower division transfer preparation as part of a degree program, a credential, or as a certificate.
; and be it further

RESOLVED: That, in the case of conflicting requirements, the ASCSU hold that discipline, regional, and national accreditation requirements may supersede these transfer degree elements; and be it further,

RESOLVED: The ASCSU stress to all parties that it is the discipline faculty of the CSU, under CSU policy and Title 5, that have the primary responsibility for preserving the integrity and quality of the degrees offered by the CSU. However, the ASCSU also remains committed to our discipline faculty working with our California Community College colleagues to ensure appropriate lower-division preparation for upper-division coursework in the major; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That these elements of a transfer degree should be incorporated into legislation addressing student transfer in California (e.g., SB 1440 and AB 2302).

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to Chancellor Reed, Chancellor Scott, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges, Senator Padilla, Assemblymember Fong, and Executive Vice-Chancellor Echeverria.

RATIONALE: This resolution provides the framework for the ASCSU response to the specific areas of SB 1440 and AB 2302 that we see as problematic. The current resolution argues for splitting the “transfer degree” requirements from other CCC degree requirements (e.g., the 18 units in the major area of study).

Approved Unanimously - May 6-7, 2010
An act to add Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745) to Chapter 9.2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1440, as amended, Padilla. California Community Colleges: student transfer.
Existing law establishes the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in this state. These segments include the California State University, the campuses of which are administered by the Trustees of the California State University, the University of California, which is administered by the Regents of the University of California, and the California Community Colleges, which are administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.
Existing law establishes community college districts throughout the state, and authorizes them to provide instruction to students at community college campuses.
Existing law, known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, authorizes the community colleges to grant associate in arts and associate in science degrees. The act also requires the regents, the trustees, and the board of governors to have as a fundamental policy the maintenance of a
healthy and expanded program to increase the number of transfer students from community colleges.

This bill would enact the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act, which would require a community college district, commencing with the fall term of the 2011–12 academic year, to grant an associate degree to a student in his or her field of study that would deem the student eligible for transfer into a California State University baccalaureate program when the student meets prescribed requirements. This bill would prohibit a community college district from imposing any requirements, in addition to these requirements, for a student to be eligible for the associate degree. This bill would prohibit remedial noncollegiate level coursework from being counted towards the units required for the associate degree. This bill would require the California State University to guarantee admission with junior status to any community college student who meets the requirements for the associate degree. This bill would not guarantee a student admission for specified majors or campuses, but would require the California State University to grant a student priority admission to a program or major that is similar to his or her community college major or area of emphasis. This bill would authorize the California State University to require a transferring student to take additional coursework in specified circumstances. This bill would prohibit the California State University from requiring a transferring student to repeat courses that are similar to those taken at the community college that counted towards the units required for the associate degree. This bill would also require the Legislative Analyst’s Office to review and report to the Legislature, within a prescribed time period, on specified outcomes and recommendations related to this act.

By requiring a community college district to grant the associate degree, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement. This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) Since the enactment of the Master Plan for Higher Education in 1960, preparing students to transfer to a four-year university has been a core function of the California Community Colleges.

(b) Successful progression from lower division coursework to degree completion is a basic principle of California higher education and is critical to the future of the state’s economy.

(c) Currently, the coursework necessary to transfer to a campus of the California State University or the University of California differs from the coursework needed to earn an associate degree. As a result, many transfer students leave the community college system having completed transfer requirements, but are unable to participate in community college graduation ceremonies, do not have a degree to show for their work, and are ineligible for some awards and scholarships because they did not fulfill current requirements for an associate degree.

(d) Today, one in every four jobs requires an associate degree or higher. In the near future, one in every three jobs will require an associate degree or higher.

(e) The community college system allows the state to address the serious shortage of educated workers.

(f) To meet workforce demands in a cost-effective way, incentivizing students to earn an associate degree while preparing for transfer to a four-year college or university, and recognizing that they have completed a transfer preparation course pattern, provides students encouragement and support to complete their overall educational pursuits.

SEC. 2. Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745) is added to Chapter 9.2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code, to read:

Article 3. Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act

66745. This article shall be known, and may be cited as the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act.

66746. (a) Commencing with the fall term of the 2011–12 academic year, a community college district shall grant an
associate degree to a student in his or her field of study that shall deem the student eligible for transfer into a California State University baccalaureate program when the student meets both of the following requirements:

(1) Completion of 60 semester units or 90 quarter units that are eligible for transfer to the California State University, including both of the following:

(A) The Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) or the California State University General Education-Breadth Requirements.

(B) A minimum of 18 semester units or 27 quarter units in a major or area of emphasis, as determined by the community college district.

(2) Obtainment of a minimum grade point average of 2.0. A community college district may require a higher grade point average and the completion of specific prerequisite courses for impacted programs or campuses.

(b) A community college district shall not impose any requirements in addition to the requirements of this section, including any local college or district requirements, for a student to be eligible for the associate degree and subsequent admission to the California State University pursuant to Section 66747.

(c) This section shall not preclude students who are assessed at below collegiate level from acquiring remedial noncollegiate level coursework in preparation for obtaining the associate degree. Remedial noncollegiate level coursework shall not be counted as part of the transferable units required pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a).

66747. Notwithstanding Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 66201), the California State University shall guarantee admission with junior status to any community college student who meets all of the requirements of Section 66746. The California State University shall not guarantee admission for specific majors or campuses. Notwithstanding Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 66201), the California State University shall grant a student priority admission to a program or major that is similar to his or her community college major or area of emphasis.

66748. (a) The California State University may require a student transferring pursuant to this article to take additional courses so long as the student is not required to take any more than
60 additional semester units or 90 quarter units at the California State University for majors requiring 120 semester units or 180 quarter units. Specified high unit majors shall be exempt from this subdivision upon agreement by the Chancellors of the California State University and the California Community Colleges and their respective academic senates.

(b) The California State University shall not require students transferring pursuant to this article to repeat courses that are similar to those taken at the community college that counted toward the associate degree granted pursuant to Section 66746.

66749. The Legislative Analyst’s Office shall review and report to the Legislature, within four years of implementation of this article, on both of the following:

(a) The outcomes of implementation of this article, including, but not limited to, all of the following:
   (1) Transfer rates.
   (2) The average amount of time and units it takes a student to earn an associate degree pursuant to this article and a subsequent baccalaureate degree.
   (3) Student progression and completion rates.
   (4) Other relevant indicators of student success.

(b) Recommendations for statutory changes necessary to facilitate the goal of a clear and transparent transfer process.

SEC. 3. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.
An act to amend Section 66720 of, to add Section 66721.4 to, to add Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745) to Chapter 9.2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of, to repeal Sections 66740, 66741, and 66742 of, and to amend, repeal, and add Sections 66721.7 and 66739.5 of, the Education Code, relating to postsecondary education.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 2302, as amended, Fong. Postsecondary education: student transfer.

(1) Existing law, the Donahoe Higher Education Act, establishes the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in this state. These segments include the California State University, administered by the Trustees of the California State University, the University of California, administered by the Regents of the University of California, and the California Community Colleges, administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. A provision of the act applies to the University of California only to the extent that the regents, by resolution, make that provision applicable.

Existing provisions of the act require the governing bodies of the 3 public postsecondary segments, with appropriate consultation with the academic senates of the respective segments, to develop, maintain, and disseminate a common core curriculum in general education courses
for the purposes of transfer. This provision requires that a person who has successfully completed the transfer core curriculum is to be deemed to have completed all lower division general education requirements for the University of California and the California State University.

This bill would additionally require the governing bodies of those segments to develop, maintain, and disseminate a common core curriculum in major preparation courses. The bill would require the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges and the Chancellor of the California State University, and would request the President of the University of California, to jointly develop and implement a transfer degree program for purposes of granting transfer degrees to community college students who meet specified general education and major preparation requirements. The bill would require community colleges, commencing with the fall term of the 2012–13 academic year, to grant a transfer degree to a community college student meeting those requirements, and would guarantee upper division status to certain students who are awarded the transfer degree and admitted as transfer students to the University of California or California State University. The bill would require the California State University, and request the University of California, to guarantee admission to a campus of their respective segments to each student who earns a transfer degree, subject to prescribed requirements.

The bill would require the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges and the Chancellor of the California State University, and would request the President of the University of California, to report to the Legislature on progress toward compliance with the development of the common core curriculum in general education courses and major preparation courses and the transfer degree program by June 30, 2011.

By imposing new requirements on community college districts with respect to granting transfer degrees, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

(2) Existing law requires the governing board of each community college district to direct the appropriate officials at their respective campuses to provide students with a copy of the current transfer core curriculum and to distribute and publish copies of the transfer core curriculum in a specified manner and in specified locations.

This bill would additionally require the governing board of each community college district to ensure that all students desiring to transfer to the California State University or the University of California have appropriate access to a copy of the transfer core curriculum in general
education courses and major preparation courses. By imposing these additional requirements on the governing boards of community college districts, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The bill would require the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to ensure that all California community college students are informed of transfer pathways and transfer degrees.

(3) Existing law requests the University of California, among other things, to address deficiencies in the articulation of major preparation courses between the community colleges and University of California campuses, to identify commonalities and differences in similar majors across University of California campuses, to articulate courses and course sequences at each campus of the California Community Colleges for specified major degree programs for purposes of student transfer, and to conduct a specified review of transcripts of transfer students. Existing law requires the Chancellor of the California State University to establish transfer student admissions requirements to give highest priority to certain transfer students, to specify lower division transfer curriculum for specified major degree programs, and to articulate courses at each campus of the California Community Colleges for specified major degree programs for purposes of student transfer. Existing law requires each campus of the California State University to identify nonelective course requirements beyond systemwide lower division transfer curriculum requirements for each major for purposes of student transfer, in accordance with prescribed requirements.

This bill would make these provisions inoperative on July 1, 2013, and would repeal these provisions on January 1, 2014. The bill also would repeal other provisions of existing law requiring the University of California and the California State University to develop discipline-specific articulation agreements and transfer program agreements.

(4) The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 66720 of the Education Code is amended to read:

66720. (a) The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Regents of the University of California, and the Trustees of the California State University, with appropriate consultation with the Academic Senates of the respective segments, shall jointly develop, maintain, and disseminate a common core curriculum in general education courses and a common core curriculum in major preparation courses for the purposes of transfer.

(b) The common core curriculum in general education courses developed pursuant to subdivision (a) shall be the same for all transfer students, regardless of the public four-year institution, or the campus or location of that institution, to which the student transfers. However, the common core curriculum may allow for minor variations for students declaring majors requiring a high number of units, as determined by the public postsecondary education institutions.

(c) The common core curriculum in major preparation courses developed pursuant to subdivision (a) shall be the same for all transfer students in each respective major that has lower division requirements, regardless of the public four-year institution, or the campus or location of that institution, to which the student transfers.

(d) (1) A person who has successfully completed the transfer core curriculum in general education courses and major preparation courses shall be deemed to have thereby completed all lower division general education requirements for the University of California and the California State University.

(2) Commencing with the fall term of the 2012–13 academic year, a California community college student who has successfully completed the applicable transfer core curriculum in general education courses and major preparation courses shall be eligible for a transfer degree in accordance with Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745).

(e) This section does not limit the authority of the University of California and the California State University to impose post-transfer curriculum requirements on transfer students.
SEC. 2. Section 66721.4 is added to the Education Code, to read:

66721.4. (a) The governing board of each community college district shall ensure that all students desiring to transfer to the California State University or the University of California have appropriate access to a copy of the transfer core curriculum in general education courses and major preparation courses developed pursuant to Section 66720.

(b) The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall ensure that all California community college students are informed of the transfer pathways and transfer degrees established by this chapter.

SEC. 3. Section 66721.7 of the Education Code is amended to read:

66721.7. (a) It is the intent of the Legislature to ensure that community college students who wish to earn the baccalaureate degree at the University of California (UC) are provided with clear and effective directions that specify curricular paths to this degree.

(b) This section shall not be construed to limit in any way the ability of students to gain admission through alternative paths to transfer, such as the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) or any other means.

(c) The University of California is requested to address deficiencies in the articulation of major preparation courses between the California Community Colleges and the various UC campuses to make it easier for prospective transfer students to identify which community college courses meet major preparation requirements across the various campuses of the university.

(d) The University of California is requested to identify commonalities and differences in similar majors across all UC campuses in order to accomplish all of the following:

(1) To provide students with general descriptions of each major.

(2) To identify lower division degree requirements that are common across UC campuses.

(3) To identify additional academic requirements at each UC campus.

(4) To describe additional criteria that students must achieve to be admitted at the various UC campuses.

(e) (1) When four or more UC campuses that award undergraduate degrees have articulated specific courses and course
sequences of the California Community Colleges for common
requirements in similar majors, the remaining UC campuses that
offer undergraduate degrees are requested to also articulate these
specific community college courses and course sequences. The
Legislature recognizes that UC may adopt provisions allowing
individual UC campuses to opt out of this articulation process on
a case-by-case basis; however, these provisions should be
infrequently used. The Academic Senate of the University of
California is requested to notify the California Community Colleges
when an articulation request is denied, and to provide information
that will enable the California Community Colleges to achieve
course comparability with UC.

(2) For at least the 20 most high-demand undergraduate majors,
and with the ultimate goal of including all majors for which it is
feasible, UC is requested to specify lower division transfer paths
clearly identifying commonalities, as well as differences, on a
comparative basis across UC campuses offering specific major
programs. The Academic Senate of the University of California
is requested to review the existing differences in lower division
major preparation in each major across UC campuses, recognizing
that one goal of these requirements should be to achieve similarity
to the greatest degree that is academically appropriate.

(3) The University of California is requested to include all of
the following in the systemwide lower division transfer paths for
the high-demand baccalaureate major degree programs:

(A) Lower division general education requirements for the
university.

(B) Lower division major preparation requirements that are
common across undergraduate campuses.

(C) Additional lower division degree requirements that are
unique to an individual campus.

(D) Elective units, as appropriate.

(E) Additional criteria, such as grade point averages and
minimum grades, to ensure that students are competitive in
selective majors.

(4) The systemwide lower division transfer paths shall be
specified in sufficient manner and detail so that existing and future
community college lower division courses may be articulated,
according to the usual procedures, to the corresponding UC courses
or course descriptions.
(f) (1) The University of California is requested to, and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall, in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges, on or before January 1, 2008, facilitate the articulation of those lower division, baccalaureate-level courses at each campus of the California Community Colleges that meet the lower division transfer path requirements for each major specified by UC in paragraph (1) of subdivision (e).

(2) The University of California is requested to annually review, and update as appropriate, the lower division transfer paths and articulation to ensure that they reflect current UC campus degree requirements and community college curricula, and share the results of that review with the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

(g) As allowed by enrollment demand and available space, UC is requested to develop transfer admission agreement programs for students at each campus of the California Community Colleges who demonstrate the intent to meet the requirements of this section, including the declaration of a major and identification of a choice of a destination campus. The transfer admission agreement shall guarantee admission to the campus and major identified in the agreement and transfer of all units specified in the agreement, subject to the student’s successful completion of the requirements of the agreement. It is the intent of the Legislature that the transfer admission agreements entered into under this section be made available to students early in their academic coursework. However, nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude or limit the development or issuance of transfer admission agreements for students at any appropriate time up to the point of application.

(h) A path to transfer, as specified in this section, shall be available to any community college student who desires to transfer to UC, and shall not be limited to students who secure a transfer admission agreement as specified in subdivision (g). A student who successfully completes a path to transfer, but who does not secure a transfer admission agreement, shall be guaranteed the transferability and degree applicability for all units that the student has earned pursuant to the path to transfer. However, nothing in this section shall be construed to guarantee admission to UC, or to a specific UC campus, for a student who has not secured a transfer admission agreement.
(i) The University of California is requested to, and the California Community Colleges shall, on a three-year periodic cycle, jointly conduct a review of a random representative sample of transcripts of students who have transferred to UC, and of students preparing for transfer, to determine the effectiveness of the transfer preparation pathways referenced in this section.

(j) This section shall become inoperative on July 1, 2013, and, as of January 1, 2014, is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that becomes operative on or before January 1, 2014, deletes or extends the dates on which it becomes inoperative and is repealed.

SEC. 4. Section 66721.7 is added to the Education Code, to read:

66721.7. (a) As allowed by enrollment demand and available space, the University of California is requested to develop transfer admission agreement programs for students at each campus of the California Community Colleges who demonstrate the intent to meet academic requirements for transfer, including declaration of a major and identification of a choice of a destination campus. The transfer admission agreement shall guarantee admission to the campus and major identified in the agreement and transfer of all units specified in the agreement, subject to the student’s successful completion of the requirements of the agreement. It is the intent of the Legislature that the transfer admission agreements entered into under this section be made available to students early in their academic coursework. However, this section shall not be construed to preclude or limit the development or issuance of transfer admission agreements for students at any appropriate time up to the point of application.

(b) This section shall become operative on July 1, 2013.

SEC. 5. Section 66739.5 of the Education Code is amended to read:

66739.5. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(1) The California Master Plan and supporting statutes place utmost importance on the effective transfer of community college students to the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU) as a means of providing access to the baccalaureate degree.

(2) In 2002, CSU enrolled 55,000 transfer students from community colleges.
(3) Two out of three students who earn CSU baccalaureate degrees begin in a community college.

(4) Effective use of state and student time and resources would be maximized by students accruing fewer unrequired units in earning their degrees.

(5) Additional access to community colleges and CSU will be created by higher graduation rates and fewer nonessential units taken.

(6) The state budget situation makes it urgent to streamline the path of the transfer student to the baccalaureate degree.

(b) It is, therefore, the intent of the Legislature to ensure that community college students who wish to earn the baccalaureate degree at CSU are provided with a clear and effective path to this degree.

(c) This section shall not be construed to limit in any way the ability of students to gain admission through alternative paths to transfer, such as the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) or the California State University General Education-Breadth Requirements.

(d) On or before February 1, 2005, the Chancellor of CSU shall establish transfer student admissions requirements that give highest priority to transfer students who are qualified in accordance with subdivision (f) and paragraph (3) of subdivision (g).

(e) (1) CSU campuses admitting students qualified in accordance with subdivision (f) and paragraph (3) of subdivision (g) will make it possible for these students to complete their baccalaureate degree in the minimum number of remaining units required for that degree major.

(2) For purposes of this subdivision, the “minimum number of remaining units” is the minimum number of units required for a degree major after subtracting the number of fully degree-transferable units earned at the community college.

(f) The Chancellor of CSU, in consultation with the Academic Senate of CSU, shall establish the following components necessary for a clear degree path for transfer students:

(1) On or before June 1, 2005, the Chancellor of CSU, in consultation with the Academic Senate of CSU and with the faculty responsible for each high-demand baccalaureate degree major program, shall specify for each high-demand baccalaureate program major a systemwide lower division transfer curriculum composed
of at least 45 semester course units, or the quarter-unit equivalent, that will be common across all CSU campuses offering specific major programs.

(2) (A) The systemwide lower division transfer curriculum for each high-demand baccalaureate degree major program shall be composed of at least 45 semester units, or the quarter-unit equivalent, and shall include all of the following:

(i) General education courses.

(ii) Any other lower division courses required for graduation.

(iii) Lower division components of the student’s declared major.

(iv) Elective units, as appropriate.

(B) The coursework described in subparagraph (A) shall be designated by the CSU faculty responsible for the student’s major degree program.

(3) The systemwide lower division transfer curriculum shall be specified in sufficient manner and detail so that existing and future community college lower division courses may be articulated, according to the usual procedures, to the corresponding CSU courses or course descriptions.

(g) (1) On or before June 1, 2006, the Chancellor of CSU and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges, shall articulate those lower division, baccalaureate-level courses at each campus of the California Community Colleges that meet for each degree major the systemwide lower division transfer curriculum requirements specified in paragraph (1) of subdivision (f).

(2) To the extent that the goals of efficiency and urgency are advanced, existing articulation procedures such as the California Articulation Number (CAN) program shall be employed.

(3) On or before June 1, 2006, each CSU campus shall have identified any additional specific, nonelective course requirements beyond the systemwide lower division transfer curriculum requirements for each major, up to a maximum of 60 semester units or the quarter-unit equivalent, for the systemwide and campus-specific requirements combined. To the extent these additional course requirements are identified, each CSU campus shall provide that information to all community colleges.

(4) The Chancellor of CSU shall amend CSU’s transfer admissions procedures to encourage prospective community college
transfer students to identify and, to the extent possible, commit to, a specific CSU transfer destination campus before earning more than 45 semester units, or the quarter-unit equivalent, of lower division, baccalaureate-level courses, as described in subdivision (f).

(h) As allowed by enrollment demand and available space, each CSU campus shall develop a transfer admission agreement with each student who intends to meet the requirements of this section, including the declaration of a major and identification of a choice of a destination campus, before earning more than 45 systemwide semester units, or the quarter-unit equivalent. The transfer admission agreement shall guarantee admission to the campus and major identified in that agreement and transfer of all 60 semester units, or the quarter-unit equivalent, as creditable to the baccalaureate degree, subject to the student’s meeting the following conditions:

1. Completion of the 60 semester units of college-level coursework, or the quarter-unit equivalent, specified for the student’s major degree program.
2. Declaration of a major.
3. Satisfactory completion of the systemwide lower division transfer curriculum requirements for the student’s declared major.
4. Satisfactory completion of any requirements beyond the systemwide lower division transfer curriculum that are specified by the CSU destination campus.
5. Any impaction criteria for that campus or major.

(i) A CSU campus shall guarantee that the transfer students admitted under this section will be able to complete the baccalaureate degree in the minimum number of course units required for that degree.

(j) This section shall become inoperative on July 1, 2013, and, as of January 1, 2014, is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that becomes operative on or before January 1, 2014, deletes or extends the dates on which it becomes inoperative and is repealed.

SEC. 6. Section 66739.5 is added to the Education Code, to read:

66739.5. (a) As allowed by enrollment demand and available space, each campus of the California State University shall develop a transfer admission agreement with each California community college student who demonstrates the intent to meet academic
requirements for transfer, including declaration of a major and
identification of a choice of a destination campus, before earning
more than 45 systemwide semester units, or the quarter-unit
equivalent, as creditable to the baccalaureate degree. The transfer
admission agreement shall guarantee admission to the campus and
major identified in the agreement and transfer of all units specified
in the agreement, subject to the student’s successful completion
of the requirements of the agreement.

(b) This section shall become operative on July 1, 2013.

SEC. 7. Section 66740 of the Education Code is repealed.
SEC. 8. Section 66741 of the Education Code is repealed.
SEC. 9. Section 66742 of the Education Code is repealed.
SEC. 10. Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745) is added
to Chapter 9.2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education
Code, to read:

Article 3. Transfer Degree Program

66745. (a) Prior to the commencement of the fall term of the
2012–13 academic year, the Board of Governors of the California
Community Colleges, jointly with the California State University
and the University of California, shall develop and implement a
transfer degree program in accordance with this article.

(b) (1) The transfer degree shall be granted by each California
community college commencing with the fall term of the 2012–13
academic year.

(2) A community college student who commences enrollment
in a California community college prior to the fall term of the
2012–13 academic year may elect to prepare for transfer in
compliance with the transfer degree requirements developed
pursuant to this article, and shall be eligible for a transfer degree
and the rights conferred upon transfer degree holders pursuant to
this article.

(c) In developing the transfer degree pursuant to this section,
the Board of Governors shall ensure that the requirements for the
degree provide sufficient unit capacity to allow a student a choice
of electives and allow a student to fulfill local community college
degree requirements.

66746. (a) A transfer degree shall constitute a recognized
educational credential awarded by a community college, equivalent
to satisfactory completion of the requirements of a postsecondary educational program at the associate degree level.

(b) (1) The community college shall grant a transfer degree to a student who completes the common core curriculum in general education courses and major preparation curriculum requirements for his or her major, developed pursuant to Section 66720. The transfer degree shall guarantee a student, if he or she is admitted to a campus of the California State University or the University of California, upper division status upon enrollment in the major for which the student completes the applicable lower division curriculum.

(2) If a student completes a transfer degree, but applies for admission to a campus of the California State University or the University of California without declaring a major, or applies for admission to a major program in a major other than the major for which the student completed the lower division major preparation curriculum, the institution may admit the student at the upper division level, and may require the student to complete lower division major preparation requirements specified by the institution.

(c) Subject to a competitive application process, the California State University shall, and the University of California is requested to, guarantee admission to a campus of their respective segments to each student who earns a transfer degree pursuant to this article and completes the applicable lower division major preparation curriculum, if the student meets academic standards developed and published by the respective institution.

(d) This section does not limit the authority of the University of California and the California State University to impose posttransfer academic requirements on transfer students.

SEC. 11. (a) On or before June 30, 2011, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges and the Chancellor of the California State University shall, and the President of the University of California is requested to, in consultation with the Academic Senate of each respective segment, jointly develop and implement academic requirements for purposes of this article.

SEC. 11. (a) On or before June 30, 2011, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the Chancellor of the California State University, and the President of the University of California shall report to the Legislature on progress toward compliance with Sections 1 and 11 to 10, inclusive, of this act.
(b) (1) A report to be submitted pursuant to subdivision (a) shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.

(2) Pursuant to Section 10231.5 of the Government Code, this section is repealed on June 30, 2015.

SEC. 12. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) supports the intent of SB 1440 (Padilla) to increase the efficiency of transfer from the California Community Colleges to state-supported four year institutions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That because the ASCSU has the following specific concerns about elements of SB 1440, the ASCSU cannot support the bill at this time:

a. Requirements for the transfer degree should differ from the requirements for the standard associates degree.

b. There is a need for flexibility in the number of units (currently specified as 18 semesters/ 27 quarter units) in the major or area of emphasis that may be specified for transfer by the community college district;

c. Proposed transfer guarantees for students attaining junior status need to allow the California State University (CSU) flexibility in accommodating transfers into impacted majors;

d. In Article 3, Section 66748 (a) the term “high unit majors” should be replaced with the more inclusive “high-unit or strongly-sequenced majors such as STEM or nursing”;

e. In specifying those courses that students should not be required to complete upon transfer to the CSU, language should be changed from “courses that are similar” to “courses that are articulated (e.g., as comparable to a statewide descriptor as defined by LDTP and/or C-ID)”;

f. There is need to acknowledge that, pursuant to Title 5, although the California Community Colleges have the right to establish the requirements for the AA degree, the CSU maintains the right to establish the requirements, including specific coursework, for the baccalaureate degree.

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge that joint consultation take place between discipline faculty of the California Community Colleges and the CSU to determine the appropriate coursework for major preparation; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU acknowledge the groundwork laid for the implementation of the provisions of SB 1440 by the Academic Senate for the California
Community Colleges in their resolution ASCCC resolution on SB 1440 adopted April 17, 2020 (4.03 S10), which calls for the California Community Colleges to work with the California State University and University of California in establishing common major preparation requirements for the development of the transfer degree; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to Chancellor Charles Reed and the Board of Trustees, Chancellor Jack Scott (California Community Colleges), Senator Alex Padilla, Assembly Member Paul Fong, and the chair of the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges.

RATIONALE: The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognizes the need for more efficient student transfer between California’s community colleges and the state’s public four-year universities. To this end, the ASCSU in the past has supported the establishment of a community college AA transfer degree. SB 1440 is a step toward this end. The ASCSU, however, does have serious concerns about aspects of the proposed legislation that prevent it from supporting the bill at this time. These involve (1) the need for flexibility in the implementation of certain requirements contained in the proposed legislation and (2) the recognition that while community college districts have the right to set the requirements for the transfer degree, the requirements for the baccalaureate degree are ultimately set by faculty of the CSU.

Approved Unanimously - May 6-7, 2010
Objection to Unilateral Decision Making and the Pursuit of a “Culture of Compliance” in the CSU

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) note the relentless move, over the past several years, toward unilateral administrative decision making and the pursuit of a “culture of compliance” within the CSU, as evidenced by the recent “deliverology”-based graduation initiatives, alternative policy-making venues (delivery teams, administratively appointed non-representative advisory committees, and others), and other non-representative forms of decision making; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU acknowledge that such non-collaborative decision making obscures transparency, stifles public discourse, reduces opportunities for input from relevant groups and consensus building, and circumvents accountability; it also violates existing shared governance policies and procedures and institutionalizes a culture of compliance that is contrary to the mission of the CSU as a public university and threatens academic excellence in the CSU system; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm its role as “the official voice of the faculty in matters of systemwide concern” within the “collegial form of governance . . . based on historic traditions as recognized by California law,” as affirmed in the Constitution of the ASCSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the CSU Chancellor’s Office honor its obligation to maintain shared governance principles and standards as established in “Collegiality in The California State University System,” declared in the 1985 Board of Trustees’ *Report of the Board of Trustees’ Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, Collegiality in the California State University*, and confirmed in the 2001 ASCSU report *Shared Governance Reconsidered: Improving Decision-making in the California State University*; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be forwarded to the CSU Board of Trustees, campus presidents, and the campus senates.

RATIONALE: The history of the CSU and Academic Senates (both at the system and campus level) is one of commitment to shared governance. Recent decisions related to educational policy and faculty rights by the CSU and campus administrations contravene the principles of a culture of collegiality and suggest a powerful and strategic bypassing of truly collaborative shared governance as defined by statute and the BOT’s policies. The result, we believe, is a preferred “culture of compliance,” where decisions are made and announced to faculty under the guise of consultation rather than regularly engaging faculty in decision making at the formative stages. “Compliance” is a
term common to regulatory industries, and efforts to instill a “culture of compliance” within these industries is seen as essential to developing within the rank and file conformity of behavior. Yet, such an approach is contrary to the way decisions have historically been made within the Academy.

Illustrative of what appears to be a systematic disengagement with faculty are:

a. The frequent absence of Trustees and the Chancellor from ASCSU meetings; the identification of the faculty in general and the Academic Senate in particular by Presidents and Provosts at an October 2009 meeting as obstacles to reform;

b. The failure to make public several task force reports, including the report on Early Start, the introduction of initiatives without prior review by the ASCSU in accordance with previously standard practice; and

c. The formation without faculty participation of a special President’s ad hoc group to discuss reforms to General Education.

Although the ASCSU does not necessarily challenge the merit of these endeavors, it abhors the abrogation of the principles of shared governance and hopes that the Administration returns to normal collaborative shared governance.

Approved - May 6-7, 2010
AYDACEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
AS-2961-10/EX
May 6-7, 2010

Regarding Board of Trustees and Chancellor’s Office Response to Faculty Vote of No Confidence in President Shirvani of CSU Stanislaus

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its support for AS-2305-96/FA “Investigation of a Vote of No Confidence,” and AS-2819-07/FA “Board of Trustees and Chancellor Office Attention and Response to Faculty Votes of No Confidence;” and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Board of Trustees and Chancellor to investigate further the circumstances surrounding the faculty vote of no confidence in the president at California State University Stanislaus using the processes, and in the spirit of, the two above-referenced resolutions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Board of Trustees and Chancellor to share the results of that investigation with the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate and notify the ASCSU upon completion of the investigation; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage the Board of Trustees and Chancellor to work actively, and on an ongoing basis, with campus constituencies to resolve the problems giving rise to the faculty vote of no confidence in President Shirvani at CSU Stanislaus; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the 2010-2011 ASCSU Executive Committee to provide whatever support possible to our faculty colleagues at CSU Stanislaus during the Summer 2010; and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be sent to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor of the CSU, the President of CSU Stanislaus, the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate, and campus senate chairs.

RATIONALE: The ASCSU has consistently urged the Board of Trustees and Chancellor to investigate faculty votes of no confidence in campus presidents. This resolution continues that tradition and reaffirms the principles and processes in its previous resolutions on the subject. Actions in this instance may be particularly appropriate and urgent given the following finding from the recent WASC review at CSU, Stanislaus.

“With full appreciation for the fact that the state’s current financial crisis has intensified at a time of increased demand and higher expectations, CSU Stanislaus can fulfill its mission and ensure a sustainable, high-quality university only if it engages in collaborative and inclusive, faculty-engaged planning processes that are fact-based, values-oriented, and aligned in all aspects with the primacy of the academic mission. Accountable, responsible, high-performing, and effective administrative and faculty leadership alike require nothing less. An organization committed to learning and improvement
demands a well-understood process for making hard, immediate decisions in the context of long-term (strategic) improvement, sustainability, and fulfillment of mission.

Accordingly, CSU Stanislaus should:

a. Clarify the respective responsibilities of the administration and the faculty in decision-making with a reciprocal appreciation for the necessary role of each;

b. Commit to open, direct, and timely communication of essential information and data relevant to decision-making to deans, chairs, and faculty leadership;

c. Ensure fulfillment of educational effectiveness and institutional integrity by truthful representations of consequences of decision-making to students and the public; and

d. Fill senior administrative positions as quickly and effectively as possible with qualified persons who share the University’s academic values through consultative processes appropriate to institutional integrity and educational effectiveness, with a recognition of the delegated authority of defined roles, including but not limited to the provost.

The importance of acting on this recommendation in a timely and open manner cannot be overstated. In taking concrete steps to address these specific concerns, CSU Stanislaus should also be mindful of the importance of trust among the constituents who clearly share a commitment to the success of the University in serving its students and community. An atmosphere of trust enables different perspectives to be considered and final actions to be taken without rending the character, values and purpose of CSU Stanislaus, which have been built deliberately, carefully, and patiently for over half a century.”

Approved Unanimously - May 6-7, 2010
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2962-10/FA
May 6-7, 2010

Opposition to Participation in the Zemsky-Finney Re-engineering the Undergraduate Curriculum Proposal

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) appreciate the opportunity to meet with Dr. Joni Finney, co-author of the Zemsky-Finney report “Changing the Subject: Costs, Graduation Rates, and the Importance of Reengineering the Undergraduate Curriculum”; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU state its opposition at this time to participation at the systemwide or individual campus levels in the Zemsky-Finney “Re-engineering the Undergraduate Curriculum” proposal as outlined in their programmatic statement; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU support CSU faculty’s continuing efforts to design, review, and adjust curricula appropriately to the mission and character of the CSU, the needs of CSU students and communities, the broader context of public needs, and available resources; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU welcome and support appropriate research from within the CSU that helps CSU campuses make appropriate curricular changes in keeping with the needs and conditions mentioned above: and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be forwarded to the CSU Board of Trustees, campus presidents, provosts and deans of undergraduate studies, and campus senates.

RATIONALE: We are concerned that the proposed study frames the research questions in terms of impediments and barriers to graduation and fails to recognize current systemwide academic endeavors like the Give Students a Compass Project through which these efforts are already being undertaken. Although we appreciate Dr. Finney’s clarification and expanded characterization of her work as presented before the ASCSU on 5/6/2010, the written text co-authored by Finney and Zemsky outlines the framework to which we would be agreeing to participate. The Zemsky-Finney paper enumerates many issues and challenges that face higher education; however, from an academic standpoint, the proposal shared with the ASCSU fails to provide any original evidence or a literature review justifying the research or supporting the assertions upon which it is based. In addition, the methodology suggested, though lacking in rigor and detail, exhibited methodological bias by suggesting potential changes to the CSU curriculum prior to the gathering of data. Such flaws make it impossible for the Senate to support participation at this time.

Approved - May 6-7, 2010