

**Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)**

401 Golden Shore, Suite 243  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

**Beth A. Steffel, Chair**

Phone: 909-781-1820  
E-mail: [bsteffel@csusb.edu](mailto:bsteffel@csusb.edu)

[www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate](http://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate)

January 22, 2024

Dr. Mildred García, CSU Chancellor  
The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor  
401 Golden Shore, Room 641  
Long Beach, California 90802-4210

Dear Chancellor García:

Enclosed are the resolutions approved by the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) at the January 18-19, 2024, meeting. The documents are sent to you for response and action.

We would like to especially draw your attention to AS-3666-23/EXEC/AA "Opposition to Changing California State University General Education Breadth at This Time" and AS-3669-24/FA/JEDI "Support for the Unit 3 Bargaining Process and Historic Statewide Strike".

Sincerely,



Beth A. Steffel  
Chair, Academic Senate of the California State University

**Attachments**

**Distribution list:**

CSU Board of Trustees  
CSU Chancellor's Office Representatives  
CSU Presidents  
Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs  
Chairs, Campus Academic Senates

**Executive Summary of Resolutions**  
**Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)**  
**January 18-19, 2024, Meeting**

The ASCSU approved the following resolutions. Copies of these and other resolutions can be found at <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/Pages/Resolutions.aspx>.

**1. [AS-3666-23/EXEC/AA](#) “Opposition to Changing California State University General Education Breadth at This Time”**

The ASCSU urges the Board to only change Title 5 as the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act of 2021 (AB928) requires and not alter CSU GE Breadth at this time. The Cal-GETC GE transfer pathway was not primarily designed for CSU student needs. There is no evidence that our students do not need the education in tolerance and civics, the cultural capital from exposure to the arts, or the courses proven to enhance success in college which they would lose if the Board reduces CSU GE Breadth to match the unit distributions of Cal-GETC. There is no guarantee such changes would reduce complexity, given how deeply GE is interwoven into the curriculum.

**2. [AS-3651-23/AA](#) “A Call for Continuing Collaboration on Title 5 Changes”**

This resolution urges the Chancellor’s Office to continue to collaborate with the ASCSU on mutually agreeable distinctions between first-time first-year students, for whom CSU GE Breadth applies, and transfer students, for whom Cal-GETC applies.

**3. [AS-3654/APEP](#) “Transfer Admission Routes to the CSU Outside of Cal-GETC”**

This resolution seeks to retain open and equitable access to the CSU by recommending the retention of transfer routes other than the completion of Cal-GETC. This is not saying that we should retain something similar to the IGETC for UC vs. IGETC for CSU situation that currently exists. Rather, the intent here is to retain other routes such as lower-division transfer, upper-division transfer, and Golden four transfer, as currently exist outside of IGETC.

**4. [AS-3652-23/APEP](#) “Notation of Subject Matter Waiver Program Completion on Official Student Transcript”**

This resolution calls for the notation on student transcripts of completion of a California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC)-approved Subject Matter Waiver Program. The evaluation of completion of such a program remains with the appropriate faculty and academic advisors. This resolution asks for there to be a mechanism for that evaluation to be communicated with the university and notated on the students' official transcripts.

**5. [AS-3669-24/FA/JEDI](#) “Support for the Unit 3 Bargaining Process and Historic Statewide Strike”**

This resolution indicates ASCSU support for the bargaining process and the historic strike of Unit 3 instructional faculty, coaches, counselors and librarians, which is scheduled to begin on January 22, 2024. It implores the Chancellor to direct the management bargaining team to return to the bargaining table to negotiate a fair and equitable contract with California Faculty Association, the sole bargaining agent for Unit 3 employees. It objects to the CSU administration's actions so far to arrange time reporting for docking pay of striking Unit 3 employees, as many of these employees work on "non-duty" days for which they are not paid. It asks that the CSU Board of Trustees, Chancellor's Office, CFA and ASCSU work together to jointly advocate for a state budget that increases funding for the CSU to equitably support the pay and working conditions of all Unit 3 faculty, which in turn supports student learning conditions.

6. [AS-3647-23/AA](#) **"Call for Task Force on CSU General Education"**

This resolution calls for the creation of a task force to study CSU best practices in CSU General Education and an analysis of implications for student success in making any changes to CSU GE Breadth.

7. [AS-3655-23/FGA](#) **"Resolution to Change Position to Support SB 252 CalPERS Fossil Fuel Divestment"**

The official position of the ASCSU on SB 252 has changed to "Support" and the ASCSU will advocate for passing this legislation asking CalPERS to divest from fossil fuel holdings.

8. [AS-3656-23/FGA](#) **"Change in the Advocacy Positions Taken on ASCSU Monitored Legislative Bills"**

This resolution replaces the "Need More Information" position on legislative bills with "Oppose Unless Amended" in the list of the three typical positions taken by the ASCSU on legislative bills.

### **FIRST READING**

The following resolutions were presented for feedback from Senators and communication to campuses. The sponsoring committee(s) will revise these resolutions and introduce them for action at the March 2024 plenary.

1. [AS-3665-23/AA](#) **"Faculty Choice in Selection of Course Materials"**

This resolution asserts the right of faculty to select traditional or alternative course materials as they are pedagogically most conducive to student learning. Choice in the selection of course materials must extend to the format of the course materials, i.e., the choice between digital and print materials and any attempt to impose a campus or systemwide use of material will be opposed.

2. [AS-3670-23/EXEC](#) **"Exec Apportionment of Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Seats"**

The ASCSU annually reapportions seven seats to seven CSUs based on campus Full Time Equivalent Faculty data. In this cycle, San Francisco State will lose one seat and Cal Poly

San Luis Obispo will gain one seat.

**3. AS-3672-23/FGA “Change in Bylaws to Define the Position of Legislative Specialist for the Academic Senate of the ASCSU”**

In the current form, this resolution proposes ASCSU Bylaws changes that define the role of the Legislative Specialist position to conform with past practice, and previous resolutions about the role of Legislative Specialist.

**4. AS-3668-23/APEP “Funding for Transfer Curriculum Evaluation Work”**

The implementation of Cal-GETC (in response to AB 928) and the common course numbering project (in response to AB 1111) will require even more faculty participation in intersegmental curriculum review activities. Even at current levels, it is difficult to find sufficient CSU faculty representation for this work. The resolution expresses the ASCSU’s belief that a major contributing factor to this is the minimal level (sometimes none) of compensation available for this work.

**Academic Senate  
of the  
California State University**

**Opposition to Changing California State University General Education Breadth at  
This Time**

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University  
  
(ASCSU) endorse revisions of Title 5 which incorporate the Cal-GETC transfer  
  
pathway and sunset the IGETC pathway as required by Assembly Bill 928; and be  
  
it
  
- 2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU oppose at this time changes to Title 5 which affect  
  
CSU General Education Breadth requirements or systemwide graduation  
  
requirements; and be it
  
- 3. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:  
  
CSU Board of Trustees  
CSU Chancellor  
CSU campus Presidents  
CSU campus Senate Chairs  
CSU campus Senate Executive Committees  
CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs  
CSU campus articulation officers  
California Faculty Association (CFA)  
California State Student Association (CSSA)  
CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA)  
Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges  
Academic Senate of the University of California

**Rationale**

**The development of Cal-GETC**

As required by AB928, ICAS, the executive committees of the academic senates of the  
  
University of California, California State University, and California Community Colleges

negotiated a new unified Cal-GETC pathway. This pathway will replace its bifurcated predecessor, IGETC, and help streamline transfer from California Community Colleges to the University of California and the California State University.

These negotiations were constrained in two ways. First, the legislation limits the new pathway to the number of units in IGETC. Second, the University of California's constitutional autonomy gives them effective veto power. ASCSU negotiators advocated vociferously for CSU student needs. But, with a few exceptions, the UC position prevailed. Cal-GETC thus primarily reflects the needs of UC-bound students.

The UC and CSU serve different student populations with some overlap. By design, the Cal-GETC pathway serves those students eligible for both the UC and the CSU. Given success rates for students who transfer to the UC, Cal-GETC will likely well-serve those CSU students who could've gone to the UC. There is no evidence that Cal-GETC will meet the needs of all CSU students, especially those who were underserved in their pre-collegiate education.

CSU GE Breadth is designed to meet the needs of our students. Compared to Cal-GETC, CSU GE Breadth requires one more Arts and Humanities course, one course in Lifelong Learning and Self-Development, and has a different configuration of science lab courses. The learning outcomes in each subject area under Cal-GETC align closely with UC definitions.

**Opposition only to evidence-free GE changes**

The CSU Faculty are not categorically opposed to curricular change. Faculty are constantly reconsidering and updating the curriculum to better suit our students' needs, though most curricular innovation happens outside of public view at the campuses. The faculty are thus open-minded about whether our students would benefit from changes to the CSU GE framework.

The CSU Faculty are categorically opposed to changing the curriculum without evidence that the changes meet our students' educational needs. At no point in the development of Cal-GETC were the needs of CSU students at the forefront. At no point has there been evidence that our students do not need the abilities to think critically, appreciate differing perspectives, and act with tolerance that they learn in humanities courses. At no point has there been evidence that our students do not need the cultural capital that comes from exposure to the arts. At no point has there been evidence that our students do not need the skills they learn from courses in lifelong learning, especially those courses designed and proven to prepare students for success in college.<sup>1</sup>

**Will not changing CSU GE Breadth complicate the curriculum?**

Approving Cal-GETC without changing CSU GE Breadth need not add complexity.

Currently, a CSU student can satisfy their GE requirements in one of three ways:

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, in Fall 2022 at CSU Northridge, first time Black students who did not take the college skills course as part of GE Lifelong Learning had an average GPA of 1.92. Their peers who took either the college skills course or the variant specifically for Black students had average GPAs of 2.39 and 2.67, respectively.

satisfying a UC's GE requirements before transferring to the CSU; IGETC; or CSU GE

Breadth. AB928 only requires replacing IGETC with Cal-GETC. A student who transfers with Cal-GETC completed would be done with GE, just as they were with IGETC. A student who does not complete Cal-GETC before transfer would have their completed coursework articulated to CSU GE and then satisfy the remainder of CSU GE Breadth. A student who takes some GE courses while in high school before enrolling as a first-time CSU student would similarly receive credit for those courses. This can and should be handled behind the scenes through advising and technology. There is no reason students should be burdened with understanding how community college courses articulate.

Indeed, it is not clear that changing CSU GE Breadth to match Cal-GETC's unit distributions would simplify the curriculum or reduce the units students take.<sup>2</sup> This is because GE does not exist apart from the rest of the curriculum. It is deeply intertwined in at least two ways.

First, on each campus, many major and major-preparation requirements are satisfied by double-counting GE courses. This is especially the case in many STEM and high unit majors. For example, many computer science majors satisfy their formal logic requirements through GE critical reasoning courses (which courses meeting the Cal-GETC standards would not satisfy).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Such changes would also limit the admission pathways into the CSU and thereby potentially hurt enrollment.

<sup>3</sup> This point was made in a letter to the Board of Trustees regarding the critical reasoning requirement in Cal-GETC [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Z-GyyZQP2yAxfesMcJrb3b6JjISSIlsXmPr\\_pkTbc](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Z-GyyZQP2yAxfesMcJrb3b6JjISSIlsXmPr_pkTbc)



Second, GE is similarly intermixed with systemwide and campus graduation requirements. These requirements would not change with GE. For example, the systemwide American Institutions graduation requirements which ensure our students have a deep civics education are normally satisfied through GE courses in social sciences and humanities. Other campus graduation requirements are normally satisfied through GE courses in Lifelong Learning, which alignment with Cal-GETC would jettison.

We rightly brag about the world-class education CSU students receive. It is true that our students learn more than graduates from other systems because they take more units of GE. CSU GE Breadth is tailored to the needs of our students and tightly woven into their majors. We urge the Board to stand resolutely on the side of educational quality and make only those changes required by AB928 by sunseting IGETC and adding Cal-GETC.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Campus senates have also weighed in with the same [request](#). The three most recent examples are attached. The Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) has made a similar [recommendation](#).

**Resolution in Opposition to the Alignment of CSU General Education Breadth with the  
California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC)**

Whereas: AB 928 requires the California Community Colleges (CCC), the University of California (UC), and the California State University (CSU) to adopt the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) as the “singular lower division general education transfer pathway;” and

Whereas: AB 928 requires no changes to CSU GE Breadth; and

Whereas: Alignment of CSU GE Breadth with the curricular requirements of Cal-GETC would remove three units of lower division Arts and Humanities (Areas C.1/C.2) and three units of Lifelong Learning (Area E); and

Whereas: The existing units in Arts and Humanities deepen students’ exposure to

- the transcultural capital that allows them to connect with, and hold conversations with, people in a variety of languages on history, literature, politics, philosophy, and religion;
- a place and sense of belonging by giving students the skills to understand their own intersecting identities in relation to others;
- creative thinking skills, a vital complement to critical thinking, enabling our graduates to contribute solutions as members of local and global communities;
- the ability to develop and articulate a sense of self, enabling our students to identify their own experience as valuable and rich;
- the toolkit to understand the moral implications of actions and inaction, and to make ethical decisions consistent with their values in a changing world;
- the ability to recognize their roles in an interdependent global community; and

Whereas: The three units in Lifelong Learning develop

- the skills students will need to continue to enrich themselves beyond their careers at the university;
- practices and self-assessment necessary for students to construct and reconstruct the knowledge they will need to engage with social change;
- an understanding of the various obstacles to critical thinking, including one own's conscious and unconscious bias, culturally constructed ignorance, and misinformation;
- the skills to critically evaluate and create information to facilitate strategic envisioning of collaborative solutions for fostering change in the community;
- the self-awareness necessary to develop a responsible civic identity appropriate for life in ever-changing local and global communities;
- the knowledge, strategies, and dispositions necessary to pursue physiological, socio-cultural, and psychological well-being both personally and professionally; and

Whereas: Elimination of these six units will result in less student engagement with the content; therefore, be it

Resolved: The General Education Task Force, the General Education Committee, and the Academic Senate of CSU Fullerton strongly oppose alignment of CSU GE Breadth with the curricular requirements of Cal-GETC resulting in the removal of three units of lower division Arts and Humanities and three units of Lifelong Learning; and be it further

Resolved: Preparation of students for success both within the institution and throughout their lives should be the top priority when crafting CSU General Education requirements; and be it further

Resolved: Removing units from the CSU General Education Breadth requirements will likely force programs to add units to their degree programs since students will not develop and deepen their knowledge and skills associated with courses in these areas; and be it further

Resolved: Decisions on the revision of curricular requirements of CSU GE Breadth should not be based on perceived simplicity of similarities to Cal-GETC requirements; and be it finally

Resolved: That copies of this resolution will be distributed to the CSU Board of Trustees, the CSU Chancellor, the CSU Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic & Student Affairs, the ASCSU Executive Committee, the CSUF President, the CSUF Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the CSU Campus Senate Chairs, and the California State Student Association (CSSA).



## Senate Resolution on the Separation of Cal-GETC and CSU GE Breadth

**WHEREAS:** the California State Legislature passed [Assembly Bill 928](#) (AB928) in 2021, requiring the California Community Colleges (CCC), the California State University (CSU), and the University of California (UC) to create a singular general education (GE) pattern for students transferring from the CCC to either a CSU or a UC; and

**WHEREAS:** California Title V legislative code already stipulates separate general education pathways for first-time students ([CSU GE breadth](#)) and transfer students (the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum, or [IGETC](#), to be replaced for students entering the CCC starting Fall 2025 by the California General Education Transfer Curriculum, or Cal-GETC);

**WHEREAS:** Cal State LA and [the Academic Senate of the CSU](#) (ASCSU) have endorsed Cal-GETC as the replacement transfer GE curriculum recognized by the CSU; and

**WHEREAS:** the ASCSU [has explicitly](#) stated [in their interpretation of the law](#) that AB928 refers to the transfer GE pathway, now known as Cal-GETC, and no other GE pathways; and

**WHEREAS:** “[When the Academic Senate of the California State University](#) (ASCSU) committed to working with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) to create a pathway that ensured transfer student admissions to the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (U.C.), the goal was to further transfer student success. That goal has been achieved. Cal-GETC ensures the success of transfer students. The success of transfer students should not occur at the expense of first-time, first-year student success under CSU GE Breadth,” and

**WHEREAS:** Cal State LA has also [explicitly stated their position](#) that AB928 has no bearing whatsoever on the CSU GE pathway; therefore be it

**RESOLVED:** That Cal State LA continues its position that Cal-GETC has no bearing whatsoever on CSU GE breadth; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That any discussions to change CSU GE breadth are within the purview of the faculty, per Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act ([HEERA](#)); and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That no changes to CSU GE breadth can legally be made without adhering to HEERA or without explicit legislation stipulating otherwise; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That this resolution be distributed to the ASCSU Executive Committee on or before the close of business Friday, October 13, 2023 in preparation for the November ASCSU plenary.

**APPROVED: OCTOBER 10, 2023**

Academic Senate Office | SSB 5302 | [AcademicSenate@calstatela.edu](mailto:AcademicSenate@calstatela.edu) | (323) 343-3750



## Faculty Senate of California State University Maritime Academy

Resolution 22-23/02

October 20, 2022

First Reading Waiver

Vote (For/Against/Abstain): 17/0/0

### **Response to the ASCSU Call for Feedback on the Cal-GETC Proposal to Remove 6 Units of General Education for Transfer Students**

WHEREAS: The California State Legislature approved AB 928, which requires a reduction in the General Education Transfer pathway; and

WHEREAS: Assembly Bill 928 (AB 928) was signed into law on October 6, 2021, and requires that: "On or before May 31, 2023, the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges shall establish a singular lower division general education pathway that meets the academic requirements necessary for transfer admission to both the California State University and University of California. If the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges is unable to come to agreement on or before May 31, 2023, the respective administrative bodies of those segments shall establish a singular lower division general education pathway that meets the academic requirements necessary for transfer admission to the California State University and the University of California by December 31, 2023;" and

WHEREAS: In June 2022, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) recommended the Cal-GETC package - a "singular lower division general education pathway" that includes oral communication and excludes the existing IGETC requirement of a language other than English; and

WHEREAS: In September 2022, the ASCSU Resolution, AS-3562-22/APEP, clarified that:  
"The essence of the proposal relative to CSU GE is:  
i. a reduction of 5 units (mandated by AB 928),  
ii. loss of 3 of the 9 units of area C (Humanities and Arts),  
iii. loss of 3 of the 3 units of Area E (lifelong learning),  
iv. the 1-unit science laboratory (Area B3) is required (instead of 0/1 unit),  
v. defining critical thinking to be writing intensive, and  
vi. defining oral communication in a manner that focuses on content (vs. Skill development);" and

WHEREAS: The strict timeline of the law and process by which it was implemented has forced CSU campus academic senates to either approve the Cal-GETC proposal or relinquish entirely faculty control over modifications to the General Education Transfer pathway; and

WHEREAS: Curriculum is the purview of the faculty; and

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY MARITIME ACADEMY

200 Maritime Academy Drive, Vallejo, CA 94590-8181 • PHONE (707) 654-1000 • FAX (707) 654-1001 • [www.csum.edu](http://www.csum.edu)

- WHEREAS: On October 4, 2022, ASCSU Chair Beth Steffel assured our campus General Education Committee that the Cal-GETC proposal applies *only* to transfer students, and that a statement made in a March 8, 2022 ASCSU Webinar, in which AVC Alison Wrynn indicated that “first time [CSU] freshmen will be required to take the new GE pattern” starting in 2025, was erroneous; and
- WHEREAS: EVC Sylvia Alva, in an email to the ASCSU Chair Steffel on October 17, 2022, wrote, “I would like to take this opportunity to reassure you – and all senate leaders and faculty – that this question has by no means been decided by the Chancellor’s Office, and instead it will be the topic of important discussions to come. We share a strong commitment to shared governance, so we must work together to consider the pros and cons of adopting a singular lower-division GE pattern, and discuss and develop ways to ensure that all students have clear and streamlined ways to navigate GE requirements and the support they need to succeed;” and
- WHEREAS: The ASCSU has asked campuses to indicate whether they “a) Support the ICAS Cal-GETC proposal (June 2022), b) Recommend specific changes that satisfy the requirements of AB 928, with rationale, or c) [are] unable to come to a consensus;” and
- WHEREAS: In principle the Faculty Senate of Cal Maritime supports simplifying transfer pathways for community college students, but objects to the removal of Humanities units; be it
- RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate of California State University Maritime Academy (Cal Maritime) chooses Option B: “recommend the following specific changes to Cal-GETC, which still satisfies the requirements of AB 928, with rationale,” and
- RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate of Cal Maritime recommend the following specific changes to Cal-GETC: cut the 3 units of Area A1 (speech communication) and maintain the existing 9 units of lower division Area C (Arts and Humanities); and
- RESOLVED: That our rationale is as follows:
- Oral Communication and Lifelong Learning outcomes **can** be met in other required courses outside of the GE pathway; and
  - Humanities outcomes *cannot* be integrated into courses in other disciplines while preserving the integrity of said outcomes; and
  - Removing units from the Arts and Humanities area runs counter to the goals of general education and contradicts the stated premises of EO1100 (“to provide the knowledge, skills, experiences, and perspectives that will enable CSU students to expand their capacities to take part in a wide range of human interests and activities; to confront personal, cultural, moral, and social problems that are an inevitable part of human life; and to cultivate both the requisite skills and enthusiasm for lifelong learning”) since Arts and Humanities courses promote exactly the wide education envisioned by EO1100; and
  - Cutting one Lower Division C2 Humanities may discourage community college students from pursuing the study of Languages Other than English (LOTE). Mandating [English] Speech at the expense of LOTE devalues diversity and effectively encourages monolingualism across the state college systems; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this recommendation is conditional: We are only accepting the reduction of 5 units **for transfer-bound community college students** and in no way is this to be interpreted as applying to the CSU GE pathway; and finally, be it

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate of Cal Maritime distribute this resolution to:

- the Academic Senate of the CSU (ACSCU)
- the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS)
- CSU Campus Academic Senate Chairs
- CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs

**Academic Senate  
of the  
California State University**

**A Call for Continuing Collaboration on Title 5 Changes**

1. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) appreciate the engagement with the ASCSU by the Chancellor's Office to consult on the implementation of AB928; and be it
2. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor's Office to continue to collaborate with the ASCSU on mutually agreeable distinctions between first-time first-year students, for whom CSU GE Breadth applies, and transfer students, for whom Cal-GETC applies; and be it

3. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

CSU Board of Trustees

CSU Chancellor

CSU campus Presidents

CSU campus Senate Chairs

CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs

CSU campus articulation officers

California Faculty Association (CFA)

California State Student Association (CSSA)

CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA)

Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges

California Community Colleges' Board of Governors

Assemblymember Marc Berman



## **Rationale**

AB 928 calls for the replacement of the two variants Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), IGETC for the UC and IGETC for the CSU with a singular general education transfer pathway. The intent of AB928 is to rationalize the choices students faced by who intend to transfer to one or other of California's segments of higher education. The hope is that by simplifying curriculum for intersegmental transfer more students will earn bachelor's degrees at the CSU of the UC.

The ASCSU appreciates the effort at operationalizing shared governance in a meaningful way, as evidenced by the recent and upcoming consultative meetings organized by DVC Evans and Chair Steffel.

As these conversations move forward, the ASCSU is requesting that the Chancellor's Office work with the ASCSU in establishing a clear taxonomy of which kinds of students are categorized as "transfer students".

From AVC Massa's presentation to the ASCSU's Academic Affairs Committee the ASCSU understands that changes to Title 5 undergo four steps before being presented to the Board of Trustees:

1. Content development by experts to develop an initial draft

2. Initial review by the Office of General Counsel
3. Review by a technical/editorial team for numbering consistency and coherence
4. A final review by the Office of General Counsel

To operationalize consultation with respect to Title 5 changes, the ASCSU considers it a required element of shared governance that the initial draft of Title 5 changes be shared with the ASCSU for deliberation and consultative discussion after step 1 above is completed and before step 2 is initiated. This will assist in reaching a clear mutual understanding of what changes to general education may or may not be under consideration for the CSU's non-transfer or "native" students.

**Academic Senate  
of the  
California State University**

**Transfer Admission Routes to the CSU Outside of Cal-GETC**

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm the continuation of multiple routes for transfer admission to the California State University (CSU), such as Cal-GETC and admission based on the [Golden Four](#)<sup>1</sup>, to preserve open and equitable access to the CSU for students from diverse backgrounds; and be it

- 2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

CSU Board of Trustees  
CSU Chancellor  
CSU campus Presidents  
CSU campus Senate Chairs  
CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs  
CSU campus articulation officers  
California State Student Association (CSSA)  
CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA)  
Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges  
Academic Senate of the University of California  
California Community Colleges' Board of Governors  
University of California Board of Regents

**Rationale**

AB928 in requiring a singular "lower division general education pathway used to determine academic eligibility and sufficient academic preparation for transfer admission to the California State University and the University of California", requires SB 1440 to replace CSU GE and IGETC pathways as part of the

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.calstate.edu/attend/student-services/casper/Pages/golden-four.aspx>

Associate Degree for Transfer curricula with what is now Cal-GETC. This resolution does not call for the reintroduction of multiple GE pathways. Rather, it calls for us to continue to allow for other routes, not based on GE, to the CSU. These routes include, but are not limited to Golden Four completion and upper-division transfer. Note that the Golden Four includes the following areas of Cal-GETC

- Area 1A: Written Communication,
- Area 1B: Critical Thinking and Composition,
- Area 1C: Oral Communication, and
- Area 2: Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning.

Furthermore, the elimination of other routes for transfer admission would limit access to the CSU due to the University of California's requirement of a grade of "C" (2.0) or better in all coursework used for certification of Cal-GETC completion under ICAS Cal-GETC Standards 1.0. The ASCSU does not see this higher standard (2.0) as an appropriate requirement for all incoming CSU transfer students. The purpose of this resolution is to highlight the option for the CSU to use basic admission standards for upper division transfer students (Golden Four with a grade of "C-" (1.7) or better in each course and a grade of "C" (2.0) or better in the golden four coursework) and to evaluate general education and other requirements after admission. This would provide the opportunity to use a broader GE package (CSU GE) that may use more student

friendly standards which are less likely to lead to an increase in

Underrepresented Minority (URM) gaps based on pre-collegiate preparation.

In a manner analogous to how the UC generally holds all students who graduated in California exempt for American Institutions if they graduated high school in California (the idea being the work was covered in high school), but that the CSU currently requires almost all CSU graduates to explicitly meet American Institutions requirements with university-level coursework -- differences in expected student preparation can be relied upon to allow a difference in GE expectations for UC and CSU-bound students. This will provide a 'second chance' for those potential CSU-bound students who are not deemed to be UC-eligible at the point of transfer.

This resolution and the results of any information gathering related to it should be shared directly with California Community College counselors so that they recognize that the CSUs doors are still open to students who don't satisfy the UC standard.

**Academic Senate  
of the  
California State University**

**Notation of Subject Matter Waiver Program Completion on Official Student  
Transcripts**

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support efforts to increase the supply and diversity of qualified candidates applying to enter a California Teaching Credential (CTC) program provided for in [Assembly Bill 130](#) passed in 2021, as evidenced in [AS-3548-22](#) and [AS-3596-23](#); and be it
- 2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU request that the Chancellor's Office direct that University Registrars include notation on official student transcripts that a CTC-designated Subject Matter Program (also known as a Subject Matter Waiver Program) has been completed; and be it
- 3. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

  - CSU Board of Trustees
  - CSU Chancellor
  - CSU campus Presidents
  - CSU campus Senate Chairs
  - CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
  - CSU Deans of Colleges of Education
  - CSU campus Registrars

**Rationale**

In recent years the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) has expanded the time allowed for credential programs and reduced credential requirements. The legislature, by passing AB 130, has recently created expanded

opportunities for meeting basic skills and subject matter competency

requirements. In addition to students having the ability to meet subject matter competency through completion of a California CTC-approved subject matter waiver (SMV) program, or through successfully passing the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET), AB 130 permits students to meet subject matter competency through a mixture of coursework in specific subject matter domains and CSET subtests. These pathways are described by the California CTC:

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/subject-matter-requirements>. A complete list of definitions is provided by the California CTC glossary:

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/reports/data/files/data-terms-glossary.pdf>

The ASCSU recognizes that the completion of a California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) – approved SMW Program represents the benchmark in demonstrating subject matter competency. The California CTC has stated that the completion of the SMW Program is the highest standard for demonstrating subject matter competency. Campus faculty have incorporated these standards into coursework and program curriculum. They are engaged in continuous review and revision of coursework to meet these standards. While campus subject matter faculty have oversight of the curriculum of SMW programs, they do not have oversight over the other methods of verifying competency in AB 130.

This resolution seeks to achieve the following:

(i) Continuation of the current practice of requiring approval by both the department chairperson and a teaching credential analyst to verify completion of a Subject Matter Waiver (SMW) Program.

(ii) Requiring that University Registrar's include an official notation of completion of the SMV Program on a student's transcript as follows:

Subject Matter Program Completed (Name of CTC-approved Subject Matter Program)

For example:

Subject Matter Program Completed (Mathematics)

Subject Matter Program Completed (Multiple Subject)

This would notate on the student's transcript completion of the major, minor, and SMW program. For example, a history major completing the SMW Program in Social Science:

BA History

Subject Matter Program Completed (Social Science)

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) requires that CTC-approved SMW Program be evaluated by (i) the department chairpersons (or



discipline-based faculty designee) who coordinate SMV programs and (ii) a teaching credential analyst, as is the current practice. In the case that there are multiple pathways to completion of the SMV Program, the University Registrar may wish to require approval by the department chairpersons (or discipline-based faculty designee) representing each of the multiple pathways is required, in addition to approval by a teaching credential analyst. The implementation process should match existing campus processes used to verify completion of a SMW Program to minimize workload.

It is important to note that a student's graduation does not require completion of a SMW Program, assuming the baccalaureate requirements are otherwise met. It is also important to note that while some degree programs meet subject matter competency defined in AB 130, others do not. This resolution would allow students who complete a SMW Program to have this program officially notated on their transcript, regardless of whether the SMW Program is part of an official degree program. A list of degrees that meet subject matter competency are defined by the CTC. Currently, students request a Subject Matter Waiver Program Verification from the subject matter program chair/program coordinator, but no official notation is included on the student's official transcript.

The ASCSU recommends that when multiple pathways are possible to achieve completion of a Subject Matter Program, the pathways have a shared understanding of what is required for completion on each campus. This will ensure that the CTC-approved Subject Matter Waiver (SMW) Program will not be jeopardized by waiving of requirements by one program, and not another. Also, this will ensure equitable treatment of students. If there are common courses that are used to satisfy Subject Matter Waiver Program requirements, there should be shared understanding across the multiple pathways to ensure the SMP requirements are satisfied.

**Academic Senate  
of the  
California State University**

**Support for the Unit 3 Bargaining Process and Historic Statewide Strike**

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support the right of all Unit 3 faculty to a process of fair collective bargaining, which includes the right to strike if the CSU administration and the California Faculty Association (CFA) do not come to a settlement within a formal process for bargaining; and be it
- 2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU recognize that withholding labor during a strike by Unit 3 faculty may be necessary to facilitate a fair collective bargaining agreement and to support Unit 3 faculty who choose to participate in the historic strike scheduled to take place January 22, 2024 to January 26, 2024; and be it
- 3. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU implore the Chancellor to direct the management bargaining team to return to the table and negotiate a fair contract with CFA; and be it
- 4. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU work with the Board of Trustees, the CSU administration, and CFA to jointly advocate for a state budget that increases funding for the CSU to equitably support the pay and working conditions of all Unit 3 faculty, which in turn supports student learning conditions; and be it
- 5. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU strongly object to the Chancellor's Office's decision to require faculty time-reporting given the amount of time many faculty members

work outside of regular "duty days" which are unreported and uncompensated;

and be it

**6. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to

CSU Board of Trustees

CSU Chancellor

Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Leora Freedman

CSU campus Presidents

CSU campus Senate Chairs

CSU campus Senate Executive Committees

CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs

California Faculty Association (CFA)

California State Student Association (CSSA)

CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA)

Assemblymember Mike Fong, Chair of California State Assembly  
Committee on Higher Education

Assemblymember Jesse Gabriel, Chair of California State Assembly  
Committee on Budget

Senator Nancy Skinner, Chair, California State Senate Standing Committee  
on Budget and Fiscal Review

Assemblymember Robert Rivas, Speaker, California State Assembly

Senator Toni G. Atkins, President Pro Tempore, California Senate

**Rationale**

The CSU Unit 3 Bargaining unit includes 29,000 tenure-track and lecturer instructional faculty, coaches, counselors, and librarians. These employees work tirelessly to support and educate the diverse range of CSU students numbering

almost 460,000 across 23 CSU campuses.<sup>1</sup> The high-quality education that Unit 3 employees deliver provides benefits to Californians, including documented very high social mobility for CSU students.<sup>2</sup> However, state investment in per-student funding for the CSU has continued to drop relative to University of California funding; the 2022-2023 CA Spending Plan on Higher Education compared the CSU per student funding (\$20,385) to the 69% larger UC per student funding (\$34,485).<sup>3</sup> The state budget allocation for the CSU must increase to maintain California's commitment to a high value 4-year education for all California students, which includes funding dedicated to fair and equitable CSU Unit 3 faculty salaries and benefits.

From May 2023 to January 2024, the CSU and the California Faculty Association (the sole bargaining agent for Unit 3 CSU Faculty) engaged in bargaining on a contract "reopener" that focused on four articles of the Unit 3 collective bargaining agreement with the CSU: Article 20-Workload, Article 23-Leaves of Absence with Pay, Article 31-Salary; and Article 37-Health and Safety. As the Associated Student Inc. at California State University Sacramento (ASCSUS) has affirmed: "CFA is bargaining for better pay and working conditions for all CSU faculty, particularly to lift up our most vulnerable

---

<sup>1</sup> The CSU 2023 Fact Book

<https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/about-the-csu/facts-about-the-csu/Documents/facts2023.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> "CSU Scores High for Social Mobility in 2023 College Rankings,"

<https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/news/Pages/CSU-Scores-High-for-Social-Mobility-in-College-Rankings.aspx>, 1/3/2024 (originally published 9/27/2023).

<sup>3</sup> The 2022-2023 CA Spending Plan on Higher Education, <https://www.lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/4632>

faculty and address long-standing racial, gender, and social inequities by negotiating for community well-being, safety on campus, adequate mental health resources for students, adequate and humane paid parental leave, and wages that keep pace with the cost of living and set a livable minimum standard for our lowest paid faculty.”<sup>4</sup> The CFA declared an impasse in August 2023, which led to mediation and fact finding phases of bargaining.<sup>5</sup> Subsequently, CFA held a strike vote, which was successful, and CFA organized four one-day strikes at different campuses (Cal Poly Pomona on December 4, San Francisco State on December 5 Sacramento State on December 6 and Cal State LA on December 7). Finding that the CSU bargaining team did not make sufficient movement towards an acceptable settlement, on December 18, 2023, CFA notified Unit 3 employees and the CSU that if the two sides could not come to an agreement during four days of bargaining in the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of January, 2024, Unit 3 faculty from the across the state would strike January 22-January 26.<sup>6</sup> On January 9, 2024, the bargaining team for the CSU Chancellor’s Office refused to continue bargaining and imposed its proposal for a 5% pay increase for faculty, beginning January 31, 2024.<sup>7</sup> Consequently, Unit 3 faculty will

---

<sup>4</sup> Associated Student Inc. at California State University Sacramento (ASCSUS), “Resolution in Support of Improved Faculty Pay and Working Conditions”, Legislation No.: 2023/24-11-65, 11/01/2023.

<sup>5</sup> For a full description of the two parties’ bargaining proposals see Najeeb N. Khoury, Esq., “[Factfinding Report and Recommendations for Settlement, California Faculty Association and California State University](#)”, Case No. LA-IM-4143-H, November 21, 2023.

<sup>6</sup> California Faculty Association, letter to Unit 3 employees, December 18, 2023: <https://editor.des05.com/vo/?FileID=e866ea1b-3930-418c-a21c-b5217234d733&m=c3bad5fe-a034-441e-adc4-f72c9544fabb&MailID=45618214&listid=47801&RecipientID=23637526394>

<sup>7</sup> “CSU to Provide Faculty with 5% Pay Increase Effective January 31, 2024.” The California State University, January 9, 2024.

<https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/news/Pages/labor-relations-announcement-january-2024.aspx>

conduct the first ever statewide strike January 22-26, which will have an impact on campus operations and student learning. The ASCSU supports these faculty as they fight for a fair settlement reflective of the real value of Unit 3 employees to the CSU system and the state of California.

**Academic Senate  
of the  
California State University**

**Call for Task Force on CSU General Education**

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) appreciate the recent collaboration with Academic Affairs (AA), the Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee, and the Chancellor's Office on California State University (CSU) General Education (GE); and be it
- 2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU request that the CSU Chancellor's Office, in conjunction with the ASCSU, constitute a task force to study CSU best practices in GE; and be it
- 3. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU suggest that the task force review best practices that promote student success and student achievement as informed global citizens, career identity, exploration and self-discovery, and student engagement with social and racial justice; and be it
- 4. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU request that an academically rigorous data-informed analysis be undertaken to understand the implications for student success (in various definitions, see page 1 of [White Paper on Student Success](#)) in making changes in CSU GE Breadth at the lower division; and be it
- 5. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge the task force to assess whether changes to CSU GE Breadth are necessary and what changes to general education could result in improved student learning without sacrificing academic integrity or campus autonomy; and be it



**6. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

CSU Board of Trustees  
CSU Chancellor  
CSU campus Presidents  
CSU campus Senate Chairs  
CSU campus Senate Executive Committees  
CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs  
CSU campus articulation officers  
California Faculty Association (CFA)  
California State Student Association (CSSA)  
CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA)  
Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges  
Academic Senate of the University of California  
California Community Colleges' Board of Governors  
University of California Board of Regents

**Rationale**

In current discourse on CSU General Education there is no clear relationship between the barriers to degree completion in general education asserted by stakeholders and the ways in which CSU faculty have lent to the creation of an informed citizenry through General Education (GE) and associated liberal arts pedagogies and research in the State of California. Current data provided during discussions of CSU faculty expectations of AB 928 transfer students and CSU 2030 best practices reveal that general education enables students to understand the world around them, develop a voice within it, cultivate the soft skills of meeting deadlines, organizing thoughts analytically, using diverse data source to support their views, and learn the importance of listening to and learning from a diversity of disciplines and perspectives desired by employers.

Discourse on CSU General Education should be consistent with, and informed by, the indefatigable efforts of faculty to enable student achievement and success, student skill acquisition and outcomes in general education courses, and the values their readiness provides to the State of California.

**Academic Senate  
of the  
California State University**

**Resolution to Change Position to Support SB 252 CalPERS Fossil Fuel Divestment**

**1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of California State University (ASCSU)  
  
change its position from Need More Information to Support for SB 252 CalPERS  
  
Fossil Fuel Divestment; and be it

**2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution and document to:

Governor of the State of California  
Senator Lena Gonzalez  
California Senate Pro Tempore Toni G. Atkins  
Speaker of the California Assembly Robert Rivas  
Chair of the Assembly Higher Education Committee  
Chair of the Assembly Budget Committee  
Chair of the Assembly Banking and Finance Committee  
CSU Board of Trustees  
CSU Chancellor  
CSU Advocacy and State Relations  
CSU campus Presidents  
CSU campus Senate Chairs  
CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs  
California Faculty Association (CFA)  
California State Student Association (CSSA)  
CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU ERFSA)  
Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS)  
Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges (CCC)  
Academic Senate of the University of California (UC)  
President of the California Community Colleges  
CCC Board of Governors  
Chair of the UC Board of Regents

**Rationale**

SB 252 was withdrawn by the author due to lack of support and difficulty moving the bill forward with lack of support. However, it will be re-introduced in the 2023-24 legislative cycle, and to secure its potential for passing and because we are in agreement in concept, we are changing our position from need more information to support.

The ASCSU passed AS-3485-21/FGA (Rev) in March 2021 and has already shown its support for fossil fuel divestment by the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) and to develop and implement a strategic plan to divest from corporations which do not commit to carbon neutrality consistent with Governor Brown's Executive Order B-55-18.

As the AS-3485-21/FGA (Rev) noted that "the ASCSU tends not to be directive in terms of the investment policies of state governed bodies. For the purpose of this resolution, we make an exception, given the urgency of global climate change, and the relatively effective track record of divestment policies.... With the explosion of investment and development in carbon-free technologies, consumer pressure, and governmental regulation forcing a move away from fossil fuels, it has become clear that the fossil fuel industry may be a risky and myopic financial investment. In fact, data from the last four decades shows that in 1980, the fossil fuel industry claimed 29% of the S&P 500, whereas today, it only occupies 5.3%, the lowest level in more than 40 years."<sup>1</sup> Senator

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2021-2022/3529.pdf>

Lena Gonzalez author and sponsor of SB 252 emphasizes that “CalPERS has taken on divestments that has resulted in positive returns for the funds. CalPERS’s active divestment from Thermal Coal has resulted in \$598 million in gains.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See [sb\\_252\\_the\\_fossil\\_fuel\\_divestment\\_act\\_fact\\_sheet.pdf \(ca.gov\)](#).

**Academic Senate  
of the  
California State University**

**Change in the Advocacy Positions Taken on ASCSU Monitored Legislative Bills**

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) acknowledge the Legislative Advocacy Guidelines & Priorities per [AS-3148-13/FGA \(Rev\)](#), and [AS-3513-21/FGA \(Rev\)](#); and be it
- 2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU recognize that formal ASCSU positions on legislative bills other than Oppose or Support are not recognized in the passage of state legislation and that an initial position of “Need More Information” has proven to be of lesser value in the formative stages of advocacy for state legislation; and be it
- 3. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU adopt updated ASCSU Legislative Advocacy Guidelines & Priorities (below) to guide its legislative advocacy:  
  
ASCSU Legislative Advocacy Guidelines & Priorities
  - I. Legislative advocacy of the California State University (ASCSU) shall give priority to legislation that:
    - A. Has the potential to affect access, affordability, and quality in California higher education, as broadly defined.
    - B. Affects faculty purview over the curriculum and modes of instruction.
    - C. Affects the academic freedom of faculty, students, and institutions of higher education.

- D. Affects the financial and budgetary health of higher education, including, but not limited to unfunded mandates.
  - E. Affects faculty influence over governance of higher education per the Higher Education Employer/Employee Relations Act (HEERA) [Section 3561](#).
  - F. In these areas, highest priority shall be given to addressing legislation that is specifically directed toward the California State University (CSU).
- II. Advocacy efforts should be a year-round activity and not confined to any single point in the legislative process.
- III. Advocacy efforts should be carried out not only for the purpose of influencing specific bills, but also for the purposes of:
- A. Raising legislative awareness of the ASCSU as the voice of the CSU faculty in academic and curricular matters.
  - B. Developing on-going working relationships with individual legislators and their staffs.
  - C. Encouraging early consultation with CSU faculty through the Academic Senate in the drafting of bills affecting academic matters within the CSU.
- IV. To maximize the effectiveness of ASCSU advocacy efforts, the Academic Senate should:

- A. Establish positions on proposed legislation as early as possible in the legislative process (ideally no later than mid-March) so that these positions can serve to guide both individual and collective advocacy efforts.
- B. Initial positions adopted on legislation that are considered High priority should *typically* be one of the following:
- Support – the ASCSU is in favor of the bill as currently written or finds that what minor objections may exist are not sufficient to prevent the ASCSU from supporting it.
  - Oppose Unless Amended – once amended as appropriate the ASCSU position will change to Support.
  - Oppose – the ASCSU is in opposition to the bill in its entirety and sees no way in which it could be amended to make it acceptable.
- C. The full Senate shall be consulted when developing positions on legislation, but there will be times when this may not be practical, such as during the summer, or in the rapidly evolving committee process in the spring. On such occasions, as per the Academic Senate of the California State University Bylaws, the ASCSU Executive Committee is empowered and expected to act on behalf of the Senate upon request by Legislative Specialist(s) to allow the Legislative Specialist(s) to fulfill their advocacy functions. In such



cases, however, the Executive Committee must exercise appropriate due diligence in keeping the Senate informed of its actions.

D. The Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee and the Legislative Specialist shall have the responsibility for regularly reporting to the Senate on the status of legislation in which it has an interest.

V. The ASCSU shall coordinate its advocacy efforts, where possible, with other stakeholders in California higher education in order to maximize effectiveness. Such groups may include but are not limited to: the California State University, Academic Senates of the University of California and the California Community Colleges, the California Faculty Association, the Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association and the California State Student Association.

VI. The ASCSU may consider developing its own legislative proposals and seeking a legislative sponsor to carry them. This should be done carefully, however, and only after consultation with other interested parties.

; and be it

**4. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

Governor of the State of California

California Senate Pro Tempore Toni G. Atkins

Speaker of the California Assembly Anthony Rendon

Chair of the Assembly Higher Education Committee

Chair of the Assembly Budget Committee

Chair of the Assembly Banking and Finance Committee

CSU Board of Trustees  
CSU Chancellor  
CSU Advocacy and State Relations  
CSU campus Presidents  
CSU campus Senate Chairs  
CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs  
California Faculty Association (CFA)  
California State Student Association (CSSA)  
CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU ERFSA)  
Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS)  
Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges (CCC)  
Academic Senate of the University of California (UC)  
President of the California Community Colleges  
CCC Board of Governors  
Chair of the UC Board of Regents

### **Rationale**

Over the past several years, legislative advocacy efforts by the ASCSU have become more extensive as (1) state legislative activity affecting California higher education continues to increase, both in terms of the number of bills and in the willingness of the legislature to involve itself directly with matters of access, curriculum, and modes of instruction, and (2) the ASCSU itself has become more active in responding to and helping shape proposed legislation. One result of this has been recognition of a need for a set of generally agreed-upon guidelines that will allow the ASCSU to prioritize and direct its advocacy activities, whether carried out individually or collectively, in an

ongoing and strategic manner. The document “ASCSU Legislative Advocacy Guidelines & Priorities” is intended to provide this guidance.

Prior to the current positions used to advocate for legislative bills, AS-3148-2/FGA, dated September 20, 2013, prescribed the following positions: “Support”, “Support in concept”, “No position, watch”, “Oppose unless amended”, and “Oppose”. These many positions proved to be unwieldy and so, those categories were altered to the current use of three through resolution AS-3513-2/FGA, dated November 4, 2021, encompassing “Support”, “Need more information”, and “Oppose”,

What we have found during these last two years while using this revision of our advocacy positions is that consensus on what constitutes “need more information” varied by the bill’s substance and attention of the author. Some, like AB 506, needed a revision to drop one of the named parties. Another, AB 252, needed a redefinition of the word “income”. Yet another, AB 640, needed to be more specific, relating only to food workers. Still another, SB 252, did not go far enough.

The “no position/watch” is not advocated, and the “support in concept” is superfluous. Yet it has been our experience that “oppose unless amended” gives context to our

position and raises the question of what should be changed, whereas “need more information” has proven to confuse lawmakers causing nonresponse.

When a “Oppose unless amended” position is chosen, we expect that examples or an enumeration of the sorts of amendments which are needed for the body to support the bill will be included in discussion of that bill. If the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee advocates for such a position, they will be providing such a list either in the rationale for legislative positions adopted in a one-off resolution (such as was done for AB 506 in [AS-3603-23/FGA/JEDI](#)) or included in a bill summary reference sheet (in the style of [AS-3605-23/FGA](#)).