

Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)
401 Golden Shore, Suite 243
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

www.calstate.edu/csusystem/faculty-staff/academic-senate

Beth A. Steffel, Chair
Phone: 909-781-1820
E-mail: bsteffel@csusb.edu

March 21, 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 March 14-15, 2024, meeting. The documents are sent to you for response and action.

We would like to especially draw your attention to AS-3689-24/FGA “On Estimating the Financial Implications of Adopting Cal-GETC for CSU General Education Breadth”, AS-3668-24/APEP “Funding For Transfer Curriculum Evaluation Work”, and AS-3674-24/FGA “2024 Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)”.

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
California State Student Association
CSU Alumni Council
Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)

Executive Summary of Resolutions
Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)
March 14-15, 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-3676-24/AA](#) On Cal-GETC Alignment and Shared Governance**
The resolution states ASCSU’s objection to and deep concern with the Chancellor’s decision to recommend that CSU GE Breadth unit distribution be aligned with Cal-GETC, and reiterates ASCSU’s request for the Board of Trustees to adopt Cal-GETC for transfer students and not change CSU GE Breadth without faculty support and engagement.
- 2. [AS-3689-24/FGA](#) On Estimating the Financial Implications of Adopting Cal-GETC for CSU General Education Breadth**
The resolution reaffirms the fiduciary role of the Board of Trustees and requests that the Board of Trustees delay action on the question of adopting Cal-GETC for CSU GE Breadth until a robust estimate of the cost of implementation can be provided in a report with input from faculty, staff, and students.
- 3. [AS-3668-24/APEP](#) Funding For Transfer Curriculum Evaluation Work**
The resolution addresses compensation for faculty work pertaining to intersegmental curriculum matters. 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.
- 4. [AS-3692-24/Exec](#) Appreciation to California State Student Association for Support of Student Success [Approved Unanimously]**
The resolution conveys deep appreciation for the passionate opposition to changing CSU General Education (GE) Breadth which California State Student Association (CSSA) Governing Board members expressed at their 2024 February and March plenaries.
- 5. [AS-3674-24/FGA](#) 2024 Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)**
The resolution adopts provisional positions on legislation to guide California legislative advocacy during the 2024 Legislative calendar.
- 6. [AS-3675-24/FGA](#) 2024 Federal Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)**
The resolution adopts provisional positions on legislation to guide Federal legislative advocacy during the current Legislative calendar.
- 7. [AS-3660-24/JEDI/FA](#) Amending the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) to Add Three Designated Temporary Faculty Positions**
This resolution articulates changes to the ASCSU constitution that adds three designated temporary faculty positions.
- 8. [AS-3661-24/JEDI/FA](#) Change in Bylaws of the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) to Accommodate the Addition of Three Designated Temporary Faculty Positions**

This resolution articulates changes to the ASCSU bylaws that add three designated temporary faculty positions.

9. **AS-3665-24/AA/FA Faculty Choice in Selection of Course Materials**

The resolution states ASCSU's opposition to three items regarding faculty selection of course materials: 1) any program at campus or state-wide levels that mandates that faculty use only digital versions of course materials, 2) flat-fee models that do not include opt-out clauses for students and faculty, and 3) flat-fee models that do not address cost differentials between different courses, departments, disciplines, or colleges.

10. **AS-3670-24/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.

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 May 2024 plenary.

1. **AS-3677-24/Exec Academic Senate of the CSU 2024-2025 Meeting Schedule**

The resolution provides the schedule of meetings for 2024-2025 for the Academic Senate of the California State University.

2. **AS-3679-24/AA Support for CSU Institute For Teaching and Learning Artificial (AI) Professional Development**

The resolution applauds Chancellor's Office efforts on providing professional development for teaching and learning tools regarding artificial intelligence and urges funding for future professional development courses in AI to enhance ethical AI tool usage in the college classroom by faculty and students.

3. **AS-3680-24/APEP Review of Standardized Test Use for Undergraduate Admissions**

This resolution does NOT call for a return to the use of the SAT/ACT. In AS-3532-22/APEP, the ASCSU endorsed the recommendation of the Admissions Advisory Council to discontinue the use of the SAT and ACT in first-year admissions decisions. That resolution specifically called on the CO to engage in shared governance processes to assess the consequences of the discontinuation of the use of these exams. Recent articles have highlighted possible inequities that have been created by the elimination of these exams. This resolution calls for the AAC to review the elimination of standardized test use for first-time undergraduate admission.

4. **AS-3681-24/JEDI Promoting Racial Equity in CSU International Program Participation**

The resolution commends the leadership of CSU International Affairs and International Programs (CSUIP) during COVID-19, highlights the underrepresentation of Black and Native American students in study abroad experiences, and requests funding from the Chancellor's Office to support recruitment and advising of these underserved students, along with identifying resources for scholarships and grants to mitigate financial barriers to participation in CSUIP.

5. **AS-3682-24/JEDI Protecting Workload Equity and Shared Governance Considering the**

Systemwide Plan to Target and Reallocate Budget of Low Degree Programs

The resolution highlights the ASCSU's concerns about the systemwide targeting of low-degree programs, course cancellations and resulting budget limitations for campuses and negative impacts on student retention and time to graduation. Concerns about the suspension of temporary faculty and increase workload of permanent faculty violates the Collective Bargaining Agreement are also articulated. The resolution request that the Chancellor's Office follow shared governance principles and work with campus senates, not just administrators to identify ways each cause can meet enrollment targets, increase graduation numbers, and manage budget cuts.

6. AS-3683-24/JEDI ASCSU Support for Reparations Task Force Report and Plan for African Americans

The resolution, in alignment with the CSU Black Student Excellence Initiative, commends the California Reparations Report from the Task Force to Study and Develop Reparations Proposals for African Americans.

7. AS-3684-24/JEDI ASCSU Commends B.A. Program at Pelican Bay State Prison

The resolution commends the partnership between Cal Poly Humboldt, the College of the Redwoods, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation for developing and implementing the B.A. Program at Pelican Bay State Prison, the first program of its kind to be taught in person at a high-security facility in the State of California and encourages other CSU Campuses to develop similar programs.

8. AS-3685-24/JEDI Affirming Commitment to Accessibility in All Course- and Instruction-Related Software

The resolution reaffirms the ASCSU's commitment to accessibility in all course- and instruction-related software because of this growing and under-serviced problem in higher education. The ASCSU urge the Chancellor's Office and local campus decision-makers to consult with campus disability services to implement accessibility requirements for the acquisition of software necessary to complete course assignments in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and other regulations.

9. AS-3686-24/JEDI ASCSU Justice Equity Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan

The resolution demonstrates the ASCSU's commitment to develop and implement a Strategic Plan for Justice Equity and Divinity for the ASCSU, the encouragement of all CSU senates to develop strategic plans, and the development and maintenance of a repository of these plans by the ASCSU. The ASCSU is the representative body for the CSU system and therefore it serves as a model for all campus senates. The importance of developing and implementing a strategic diversity plan will improve the chances that true change will occur in the diversity of senate leadership across the CSU.

10. AS-3687-24/JEDI ASCSU JEDI Committee Bylaw Revisions

The ASCSU JEDI Committee has been in existence for almost two years. These bylaw changes clarify the committee's role and responsibilities in the ASCSU, including the development and implementation of a regularly assessed Strategic Justice Equity and Inclusion Plan that focuses on the recruitment and retention of diverse senators, support for campus senates strategic diversity plans, the development of a leadership pipeline, and addressing justice, equity, diversity and inclusion issues impacting society and CSU campuses.

11. AS-3688-24/FGA/JEDI Resolutions for Equity Data Regarding Student Enrollment, Cost of Instruction, and CSU Equity in Budget Allocation and Reallocation Plans

The resolution asks the Chancellor's Office to develop an equity-based calculation for the per student cost of instruction, an assessment of the impacts on equity, retention, and achievement gaps of any reallocation of enrollment targets and budgets, and exploration of equity-driven funding models to address CSU systemic funding inequities that disadvantage already underserved and non-traditional students.

12. AS-3690-24/FA/JEDI Fortifying and Supporting CSU Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) through Employment by Advancing Their Inclusion and Equity in the CSU

The resolution asks the CSU to support its current employees who have DACA status in a variety of ways, including helping such employees find a pathway to permanent employment and providing training to Human Resources employees and others about how to employ and assist people with DACA status.

13. AS-3691-24/FA Continuing Support of Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA), and Request for Increased RSCA Funding

The resolution expresses continuing support for faculty Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (RSCA). The resolution asks that, given the demonstrated benefit of RSCA to CSU and the system, annual RSCA funding be adjusted for inflation to \$3.3 million from \$2.5 million. The annual RSCA funding level in the CSU budget has been \$2.5 million since 2015-2016 and \$3.3 million represents that level of funding adjusted to account for inflation.

**Academic Senate
of the
California State University**

On Cal-GETC Alignment and Shared Governance

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) object to and be deeply concerned about Chancellor Garcia’s decision to recommend to the CSU Board of Trustees that CSU GE Breadth be aligned with Cal-GETC despite sustained and clear opposition from the CSU faculty; and be it
- 2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU respectfully ask the Board of Trustees to respect the clearly stated position of the faculty that CSU GE Breadth not be changed at the present time and not until the faculty have approved any curricular changes to CSU GE; and be it
- 3. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU condemn the “lack of recognition of established best practices” in CSU General Education as enabled by the CSU faculty to facilitate student achievement and success, and reaffirm that “consultation must allow for the time to consider, debate, develop their responses and work toward consensus while recognizing the need to proceed in a timely manner”¹; and be it
- 4. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU remind the Board of Trustees that the ASCSU has asked that no decision be made to change CSU GE Breadth until any such changes are approved by the ASCSU; and be it

¹ See [Tenets of Shared Governance](https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2018-2019/3348.pdf), AS-3348-18, Nov. 8-9, 2018, p. 6, available at <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2018-2019/3348.pdf>.

- 5. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU ask the Board of Trustees to support “Option 1 (Two General Education Pathways)”², not “Option 2 (Unified General Education Pathway)” as expressed by faculty and students during the board meeting; and be it
- 6. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU ask the Board of Trustees to support the Title 5 changes set out in Option 1 (set out on page 118 of the Agenda) of the Ed. Policy Committee’s January Agenda and reject Option 2 (Unified General Education Pathway); and be it
- 7. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU request a faculty-led rigorous analysis to quantify and assess the potential impacts of the Cal-GETC transfer pathway on student success so that a data-informed decision about lower-division CSU GE Breadth can be made and agreed upon; and be it
- 8. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU request that the twenty-three California State University (CSU) Campus senates, in consultation and conversation with relevant constituencies (e.g., General Education committees, department chairs, chairs of curriculum committees), debate and report the following:
- a. The implications of aligning CSU General Education (GE) Breadth with California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC).

² See Board of Trustees Agenda Packet, January 29-31, 2024, available at <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/past-meetings/2024/Documents/jan-29-31-FULL-BINDER.pdf#page=118>.

- b. The potential use of the 5 units released from CSU GE Breadth to serve the educational interests of our students, should alignment be adopted; and be it

9. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

CSU Board of Trustees
CSU Chancellor
CSU campus Presidents
CSU campus Senate Chairs
CSU campus articulation officers
California Faculty Association (CFA)
California State Student Association (CSSA)
CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA).

Rationale

After the passage of AB 928, the ASCSU, through its representation on ICAS (Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates), negotiated the curriculum of the singular transfer pathway called for in the bill. Because of what amounted to a de facto veto by the University of California, the ASCSU was forced to agree to a smaller GE curriculum than it would have liked, one based on IGETC (Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum) for the CSU rather than on CSU GE Breadth.

Nevertheless, the ASCSU supported the new transfer curriculum, dubbed “Cal-GETC.” This support was based on a careful reading of AB 928 and on assurances from then EVC Sylvia Alva (in e-mail communication to ASCSU Chair Beth Steffel on October 7, 2022 as well as comments to the ASCSU in plenary sessions on January 19, 2023 and March 16, 2023) first that Cal-GETC was a curriculum for transfer only and second that

the question of alignment between Cal-GETC and CSU GE Breadth (for 'native' students, i.e., students who begin their careers in higher education at a CSU) had not been decided by the Chancellor's Office but remained a topic of important discussions to come.

Since then, the ASCSU has been clear in its position that any changes to the CSU GE Breadth curriculum for first-time first-year students should be left to the CSU's faculty to decide, rather than ICAS, the administration in the Chancellor's Office, or the CSU Board of Trustees. Major program changes such as altering the size and content of General Education are clearly curricular matters, and it is a well-established principle that curriculum is the purview of the faculty.

It has been suggested by the CSU Chancellor's Office that legislative intrusion would inevitably follow unless CSU GE Breadth was aligned with Cal-GETC. That mantra has been repeated by the Chancellor's Office for over a year, yet the ASCSU has found no evidence (for instance in the over 2,000 bills in front of the California legislature in this period) for any inclination by the legislature to do more than it has already done. In addition, the Campaign for College Opportunity, a strong lobby group, has indicated that they do not intend to support more legislation in this matter in the near future. For these reasons, the CSU should not self-censor or make any supposedly preemptive changes to General Education.

The absolutely clear message from the CSU faculty through four resolutions (AS-3615-AA(rev), May of 2023;³ AS-3639-AA, September of 2023;⁴ AS-3666-Exec/AA, January of 2024;⁵ and this present resolution) is that while it supports the necessary changes to the transfer curriculum required by AB 928, it is resolutely opposed to changes to CSU GE Breadth until more faculty consultation and rigorous faculty-led analysis of the data has been carried out.

To be clear, the ASCSU has not taken any position regarding the pros and cons of aligning CSU GE Breadth with Cal-GETC, but rather has been unwavering in its assertion that curricular changes are the purview of the faculty and should not be made without faculty endorsement and that they should be data-informed.

This resolution asks the Board of Trustees to respect the position expressed by students and faculty at the last Board meeting, which also happens to be the official position of the ASCSU. This position is an endorsement of a vote to adopt “Option 1,” a change to Title 5 that at this time only concerns transfer, avoiding possible changes to CSU GE Breadth until faculty-led consultation and data analysis have been carried out. In other words, the position calls for a process of faculty consultation and for a rigorous faculty-led data analysis. With the aforementioned consultation and analysis, then, and

³ <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2022-2023/3615.pdf>.

⁴ <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2023-2024/3639.pdf>

⁵ <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2023-2024/3666.pdf>

only then, will the ASCSU be in a position to make a recommendation to the Board of

Trustees regarding changes to CSU GE Breadth.

**Academic Senate
of the
California State University**

**On Estimating the Financial Implications of Adopting Cal-GETC for CSU General
Education Breadth**

1. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm the Tenets of Shared Governance and note the CSU Board of Trustees' fiduciary duty to the California State University system¹; and be it
2. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU oppose adopting Cal-GETC for CSU GE Breadth until such time as:
 - a. A robust estimate of the cost of implementation (both one-time and ongoing costs) is performed with due diligence given to both completeness and accuracy; and
 - b. A report detailing the full fiscal impacts of such adoption on the finances of the CSU system and campus budgets is shared broadly.
 - i. At a minimum, the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor's Office, the ASCSU, the California State Student Association (CSSA), and other key stakeholders should be on the distribution list.
 - ii. The report should have robust faculty, staff, student, and administrative input.

¹ See [Tenets of Shared Governance](https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2018-2019/3348.pdf), AS-3348-18, Nov. 8-9, 2018, p. 5, available at <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2018-2019/3348.pdf>.

- iii. Due diligence should be undertaken to ensure both the accuracy and completeness of the report including, but not limited to, the verification by specialized faculty in the areas of concern.

and be it finally

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)
Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS)
Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
Academic Senate of the University of California
Assemblymember Berman
Chair of the Senate Education Committee Josh Newman
Chair of the Assembly Higher Education Committee Mike Fong

Rationale

During the January 2024 Board of Trustees meeting, it was asserted that alignment of CSU General Education Breadth (CSU GE) with Cal-GETC would save money. This may be the case. But there is also reason to believe it may increase costs to the CSU and to students. The reality can only be discovered by a robust study by a qualified team which takes into account the actual effects on curriculum.

Among the myriad potential financial costs of changing general education are the following:

1. The addition of one unit of laboratory science (area B3) grows classes in an area which is particularly expensive: average enrollments are low; specialized facilities, materials, and technical support staff are required; faculty salaries are higher than in the areas which will be reduced.
2. Reduction of required lower division general education units can result in higher numbers of upper division units being taken by, for example
 - a. Some Transfer Model Curricula (TMC; which are completed at the community colleges) will likely be adjusted to include lower division courses previously included in individual campus majors, thus allowing those programs to increase upper division requirements (completed at the CSU); or
 - b. Students still must take 120 units to graduate. If lower division general education requirements are reduced, many will have more free units which allows additional upper division courses to be taken.

In general, upper division courses have smaller student to faculty ratios (SFRs) and are taught by faculty who, on average, have higher salaries. Thus increasing the number of upper division courses will increase costs.

3. One-time costs of altering CSU GE include:
 - a. Curricular update and approval.
 - b. Degree audit programming updates.

- c. Revision of Transfer Model Curriculum and Associate Degrees for Transfer
4. Courses which meet the American Institutions (AI) graduation requirements are commonly double counted with Area C Arts and Humanities courses. The Chancellor's Office proposes to reduce the number of Arts and Humanities courses. The American Institution graduation requirements will not go away. Thus there will be no net reduction to the overall unit load of first-time, first-year, or transfer students who will be still subject to the graduation requirements. Indeed, campuses may choose to use some of the units returned to them to create local graduation requirements to cover the lost education that will not double count with the American Institution requirements, thus increasing the unit load.
5. Certain Area E lifelong learning courses are designed for student success not just for whole-life learning, but explicitly for success in the immediate future: higher education. Should these be eliminated, student performance in future courses may be reduced (more data needed on this point) and thus time to graduation may suffer. Indeed, data from several campuses indicate that such courses are especially beneficial impacts to our students of color and first generation students who will be disproportionately set back by the changes

While the ASCSU has been assured that \$2 million is set aside for faculty during off-contract times to manage updates from this proposed alignment, across 23 campuses, this comes to about \$87,000 per campus. Given the massive volume of work

likely to be involved, it would seem prudent for the Board to ensure that they have an accurate understanding of whether this is likely to be sufficient.

**Academic Senate
of the
California State University**

Funding For Transfer Curriculum Development And Evaluation

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support the California State University faculty engaged in the increased intersegmental transfer curriculum work generated by [AB 928](#) and [AB 1111](#); and be it
- 2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU recommend the California State University Chancellor's Office work with the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, the ASCSU, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to ensure compensation at a level commensurate with the work required for faculty serving as Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) members, Course Outline of Record (COR) evaluators, et cetera; and be it
- 3. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

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

Rationale

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.¹ Even at current levels, it is difficult to find sufficient CSU faculty representation for this work. The ASCSU believes that one contributing factor to this issue is the minimal level of compensation available for this work. In some cases, participating in a Faculty Discipline Review Group for example, there is no compensation.

The money that is allocated by the state of California for the portion of this work related to SB 1440 is funneled through the budget for the California Community Colleges (CCC). Therefore, it is imperative that the CSU Chancellor advocate to and with the CCC Chancellor for additional compensation for faculty doing the work that these Assembly bills require.

Previous ASCSU resolutions regarding funding for intersegmental transfer curriculum work:

- AS-3542-22/APEP: Increased Support for C-ID Review

<https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2021-2022/3541.pdf>

¹ The full report from the Common Course Numbering Taskforce can be found here: <https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/report/2023-common-course-numbering-task-force-report-2-15-24-a11y.pdf>

- AS-3414-20/APEP: Resources to Support California State University

(CSU) Faculty Participation in the Course-Identification Numbering System

(C-ID) Process

<https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2019-2020/3414.pdf>

- AS-3111-13/APEP/AA Support for the Course Identification Numbering

System (C-ID)

<https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2012-2013/3111.pdf>

**Academic Senate
of the
California State University**

**Appreciation to California State Student Association for Support
of Student Success**

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) deeply appreciate the passionate opposition to changing CSU General Education (GE) Breadth which California State Student Association (CSSA) Governing Board members expressed at the 2024 February and March plenaries; and be it
- 2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU acknowledge the many stories of how courses in Lifelong Learning and Self Development (Area E) helped CSSA Governing Board members persist in their academic pursuits; and be it
- 3. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU recognize the courage of CSSA leaders in articulating students' understanding of CSU GE Breadth's effectiveness; and be it
- 4. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU agree with CSSA leaders' expressed belief that the CSU Board of Trustees must fully examine data on the impacts of curricular change before rendering a decision on the upcoming March 2024 Title 5 change to CSU GE Breadth proposed by the Board of Trustees' Education Policy Committee; and be it
- 5. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU appreciate the CSSA leaders' support of faculty voice; and be it

6. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU thank the CSSA for voting down a proposal to support changes to CSU GE Breadth and the direction of the Governing Board to explain to the Board of Trustees the sentiments expressed at the recent plenaries; and be it

7. 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 campus Associated Students, Inc. organizations
CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA)
Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
Academic Senate of the University of California
Assemblymember Mark Berman

Rationale

The California State Student Association (CSSA) Governing Board met to discuss in [February 2024](#) and act in [March 2024](#) on a proposal titled: *Support of Proposed Title 5 Changes to CSU General Education Requirements*. During discussion at both meetings, the Governing Board members overwhelmingly vocalized concerns over the proposed changes to CSU GE Breadth, specifically the reduction in Area C and the deletion of Area E. Some CSSA leaders who spoke, attributed the student success course they took, which was embedded in Area E, as the course that saved them from dropping out and leaving the CSU. Members also asked for data on implementation and acknowledged the

ASCSU's positions on the Board of Trustees Education Policy Committee's proposed changes to CSU GE Breadth. At the March CSSA plenary, a strong majority of members on the Board of Governors voted down the motion.

**Academic Senate
of the
California State University**

**2024 State Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the
California State University**

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) adopt the provisional positions on bills currently under consideration in the California Legislature as identified in the attached document titled *Academic Senate of the California State University, Positions on Proposed Bills in the California State Legislature – 2024*; and be it
- 2. RESOLVED:** That these adopted provisional positions guide ASCSU advocacy activities during the 2024 legislative calendar; and be it
- 3. RESOLVED:** That if a change in the ASCSU position on a bill is warranted and, due to time or other constraints, consultation with the Academic Senate is not possible, the ASCSU Executive Committee is empowered to act on behalf of the Senate, in accordance with resolution [AS-3656-23/FGA](#), and the [ASCSU Bylaws](#), while exercising due diligence in keeping the ASCSU informed of such actions; and be it
- 4. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

 - Governor of the State of California
 - CSU Board of Trustees
 - CSU Chancellor
 - CSU Advocacy and State Relations
 - CSU campus Presidents
 - CSU campus Senate Chairs
 - CSU campus Senate Executive Committees

CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
CSU Vice Presidents of Student 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 California Community Colleges
California Community Colleges' Board of Governors
University of California Board of Regents
California Senate Pro Tempore Mike McGuire
Speaker of the California Assembly Anthony Rendon
Chair of the Senate Education Committee Josh Newman
Chair of the Senate Budget Committee Scott Wiener
Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee Anthony Portantino
Chair of the Assembly Higher Education Committee Mike Fong
Chair of the Assembly Budget Committee Jesse Gabriel
Chair of the Assembly Appropriations Committee Buffy Wicks

Rationale

This resolution is part of the ASCSU Legislative advocacy strategy for 2024, based on the guidelines approved by the Senate in January 2024. Its purpose is to assist the Academic Senate and its members to be effective and respond quickly to proposed legislation during the key period of the legislative calendar (January-May). It is during suchtime that Legislative bills are heard in committee in their House of origin. Advocacy efforts to shape and influence bill development are likely to be most effective at that time. The positions adopted in this resolution are understood as provisional since bills often change between January and May; adopting provisional positions allows flexibility in advocacy efforts while still ensuring that - at any one point in time - the positions have the

backing of the entire ASCSU body, or of the ASCSU Executive Committee acting
on behalf of the ASCSU.

Attachment: Recommended Bill Position Spreadsheet**High Priority**

Category	Leginfo Link	Title or Description	Author	Suggested Position
Budget	Leginfo AB 252	Public postsecondary education: University of California and California State University: admissions	Holden	Oppose Unless Amended
Budget	Leginfo SB 28	Education finance: school facilities: Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2024	Glazer	Oppose Unless Amended
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 2305	Public postsecondary education: community colleges: statewide baccalaureate degree program.	Fong	Support
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 2044	Requires pay survey before CCC BA recommended	Chen	Support
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 2193	Vetoed 2023 back re: CSU liability for hazing	Holden	Oppose Unless Amended
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 2395	California State University: extension programs, special session, and self-supporting instructional programs: revenues	Quirk-Silva	Oppose Unless Amended
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 2447	California State University: extension programs, special session, and self-supporting instructional programs: revenues	Valencia	Oppose Unless Amended

CSU-CO	Leginfo SB 895	Community colleges: Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program	Roth	Oppose
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 2104	Community colleges: Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program	Soria	Oppose
Faculty	Leginfo AB 2005	Faculty and Student Housing	Ward	Support
Faculty	Leginfo AB 2070	Trustees of the California State University: faculty appointees.	Cervantes	Support
Legislature	Leginfo SB 1411	Instructional Quality Commission: membership: appointments by the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates.	Ochoa Bogh	Support
Legislature	Leginfo SB 1200	Post secondary Edu: Finish in 4 and Through in 2	Glazer	Oppose
Students	Leginfo AB 1160	Protecting students from Credit Act	Pacheco	Support
Students	Leginfo AB 610	AB-610 Fast food restaurant industry: Fast Food Council: health, safety, employment, and minimum wage.	Holden	Oppose Unless Amended
Students	Leginfo AB 2152	Service learning pilot program in '33 for 3 campuses	McCarty	Oppose
Students	Leginfo AB 1887	Student financial aid: application deadlines: extension. (emergency response to FAFSA)	Cervantes	Support
Students	Leginfo AB 1818	Public postsecondary education: homeless students: parking	Jackson	Support

Spot Bills (an ASCSU position seems likely if amended)

Category	Leginfo Link	Title or Description	Author	Suggested Position
Legislature	Leginfo AB 1142	Postsecondary education: Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education in California	Fong	Watch
Legislature	Leginfo AB 1780	Postsecondary education: legacy admissions	Ting	Watch
Legislature	Leginfo AB 1942	Non-substantive changes in def of higher ED	Cervantes	Watch
Legislature	Leginfo AB 1991	Health Professions Career Opportunity Program	Bonta	Watch
Legislature	Leginfo AB 2479	Definition of Higher Ed Segments	Haney	Watch
Legislature	Leginfo AB 2573	Empty bill re Higher ed and careers	Fong	Watch
Legislature	Leginfo AB 2633	Non-substantive changes in def of higher ED	Alvarez	Watch
Legislature	Leginfo AB 2953	Spot Bill on Admissions for 1st Gen Students	Alvarez	Watch
Legislature	Leginfo AB 3081	Definition of Higher Ed Segments	Arambula	Watch
Legislature	Leginfo AB 3167	Non-substantive changes in def of higher ED	Chen	Watch
Legislature	Leginfo SB 1166	Intent to enact anti-discrim reporting req. for CSU	Dodd	Watch
Legislature	Leginfo SB 1483	Cal Grant Spot Bill	Wilk	Watch

Budget Bills (for reference)

Category	Leginfo Link	Title or Description	Author	Suggested Position
----------	--------------	----------------------	--------	--------------------

Budget	Leginfo AB 1812	Budget Bill	Gabriel	Watch
Budget	Leginfo SB 917	Budget Bill	Skinner	Watch

Medium Priority

Category	Leginfo Link	Title or Description	Author	Suggested Position
Budget	Leginfo AB 3015	non-resident tuition waiver for Fed recog indian tribes	Ramos	Support
Budget	Leginfo AB 3112	Postsecondary education: tuition increases: Consumer Price Index.	Essayli	Support
Budget	Leginfo SB 906	Disclose all NIL or payments for athletes at CSU	Skinner	Support
Budget	Leginfo AB 2398	California State University: audits	Kalra	Support
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 1790	California State University: sexual harassment: implementing California State Auditor recommendations.	Connolly	Support
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 1905	CSU: Terms of Employment	Addis	Support
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 2275	Trustees of the California State University: appointees.	Fong	Support
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 2326	Public postsecondary education: sex discrimination policies	Alvarez	Support
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 2349	Create CA Bridge intersegmental Comm on STEM	Wilson	Support

CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 2047	Postsecondary education: discrimination prevention: systemwide offices	Fong	Support
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 2048	Postsecondary education: discrimination prevention: campus-based offices	Fong	Support
CSU-CO	Leginfo SB 916	Public postsecondary education: waiver of tuition and fees: veterans: extended education courses.	Seyarto	Support
CSU-CO	Leginfo AB 810	Postsecondary education: hiring practices: academic, athletic, and administrative appointments	Friedman	Oppose Unless Amended
Legislature	Leginfo AB 2586	Public postsecondary education: student employment	Alvarez	Support
Legislature	Leginfo AB 2936	Higher Education Reconciliation Master Plan	Jackson	Support
Legislature	Leginfo AB 1885	CCC Grant for part time students	Addis	Support
Legislature	Leginfo AB 1986	State Prisons: banned books	Bryan	Support
Legislature	Leginfo AB 2096	Restraining orders: educational institutions	Petrie-Norris	Support
Legislature	Leginfo AB 2184	Student financial aid: Cal Grant C and Cal Grant 2	Davies/Chen	Support
Legislature	Leginfo AB 2357	University of California: school of medicine: University of California San Joaquin Valley Regional Campus Medical Education	Bains	Support
Legislature	Leginfo AB 2821	Post secondary Edu: Students with Disabilities	Grayson	Support

Legislature	Leginfo AB 3089	Chattel slavery: formal apology	Jones-Sawyer, et. al.	Support
Legislature	Leginfo SB 984	Public Agencies: Project Labor Agreement	Wahab	Support
Legislature	Leginfo SB 995	CSU: High-Quality Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act	Padilla	Support
Legislature	Leginfo SB 1412	Instructional Quality Commission: membership: appointments by the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates.	Ochoa Bogh	Oppose Unless Amended
Legislature	Leginfo SB 1023	California State University: Antelope Valley or Victor Valley campus.	Wilk	Oppose
Student	Leginfo SB 26	SB-26 Mental health professions: CARE Scholarship Program	Umberg	Support
Students	Leginfo AB 2093	Community colleges: California College Promise: fee waiver eligibility and funding formula.	Santiago	Support
Students	Leginfo AB 1793	Student financial aid: Cal Grants: Middle Class Scholarship Program: eligibility: dependents of members of the armed services stationed outside of California.	Ta	Support
Students	Leginfo AB 456	Campus mental health hotlines	Maienschein	Support
Students	Leginfo AB 1976	Naloxone spray in workplaces	Haney	Support
Students	Leginfo AB 2588	College Acceleration Programs: Study	Chen	Support

ATTACHMENT

Summary and Position Statements

AB 252 The College Athlete Protection Act.

Chris R. Holden

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 06/19/23 - Amended Senate

Legislative Counsel's Digest

The Student Athlete Bill of Rights requires intercollegiate athletic programs at 4-year private universities or campuses of the University of California or the California State University that receive, as an average, \$10,000,000 or more in annual income derived from media rights for intercollegiate athletics to comply with prescribed requirements relating to student athlete rights. Existing law authorizes an institution of higher education, as defined, to establish a degree completion fund, in accordance with applicable rules and bylaws. Existing law requires an institution of higher education to post in a conspicuous location in its athletic department that is frequented by student athletes a notice detailing certain student athlete rights. Existing law prohibits an institution of higher education from intentionally retaliating against a student athlete for making or filing a complaint about, testifying or otherwise assisting in any investigation into, or opposing any practice that the student athlete believes is, a violation of student athlete rights. This bill would establish the College Athlete Protection (CAP) Act for purposes of providing various rights, benefits, and protections to college athletes. The bill instead would require certain institutions of higher education to establish a degree completion fund for its college athletes, as provided. The bill instead would require an institution of higher education to distribute to each college athlete a notice containing college athlete rights and would require the institution to post this notice in a conspicuous location frequented by college athletes, as specified. The bill instead would prohibit an institution of higher education, and its employees, coaches, and affiliated medical personnel, as defined, from retaliating against a college athlete for filing a complaint or reporting a violation of a college athlete's rights under the CAP Act. By imposing new duties on community college districts, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill would establish the College Athlete Protection (CAP) Program as a program in the Office of Planning and Research for purposes of the CAP Act. The bill would establish a 21-member CAP Panel comprised of appointed individuals to serve on 4 CAP Subpanels, as specified, for the administration of the CAP Act, as provided. The bill would establish the California Athlete Protection Fund under the administration of the CAP Panel, with moneys in the fund appropriated to the CAP Panel, upon appropriation of the Legislature, for purposes of the CAP Act, as provided.

This bill would make its provisions severable. 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 the statutory provisions noted above.

AB 1160 Protecting Students from Creditor Colleges Act.

Blanca Pacheco

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 01/22/24 - Amended Assembly

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law establishes the California Community Colleges, under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, under the administration of the Trustees of the California State University, the University of California, under the administration of the Regents of the University of California, independent institutions of higher education, and private postsecondary educational institutions as the segments of postsecondary education in the state. The Donahoe Higher Education Act requires public higher education entities to adopt regulations to withhold institutional services, including withholding grades and diplomas, upon notice to a student that they are in default on a loan made pursuant to specified federal law. Notwithstanding any other law, the Educational Debt Collection Practices Act prohibits a school, as defined, from refusing to provide a transcript for a current or former student on the grounds that the student owes a debt, conditioning the provision of a transcript on the payment of a debt, charging a higher fee for obtaining a transcript, providing less favorable treatment of a transcript request because a student owes a debt, or using a transcript issuance as a tool for debt collection, as specified. This bill would expand the provisions described above to also prohibit a school from refusing to provide a diploma, as defined, for a current or former student on the grounds that the student owes a debt, conditioning the provision of a diploma on the payment of a debt, charging a higher fee for obtaining a diploma, providing less favorable treatment of a diploma request because a student owes a debt, or using a diploma issuance as a tool for debt collection. The bill would make other conforming changes. This bill would prohibit an institution of higher education, as defined, from taking specified actions, including, among other things, charging a higher tuition or fee on the grounds that the student owes an institutional debt, as defined. The bill would require an institution of higher education to grant a one-time exemption from an enrollment or registration hold on a current or former student on the grounds that the student owes an institutional debt, as provided. The bill would require an institution of higher education to establish a written policy defining standards and practices for the collection of institutional debt, as provided. The bill would prohibit an institution of higher education from taking specified actions when collecting an institutional debt. The bill would require the Board of

Governors of the California Community Colleges and the Trustees of the California State University, and request the office of the President of the University of California, to require each public institution to report, beginning on or before July 1, 2025, using a specified uniform format, and on a biennial basis, specified information regarding the number and dollar amount of institutional debts at each institution. By imposing new duties on community college districts, the bill would constitute a state-mandated local program. Existing law authorizes the Controller, in their discretion, to offset any amount due to a state agency from a person or entity, against any amount owing to that person or entity, including any tax refund, by any state agency, except as specified. This bill would prohibit the Controller, for taxable years beginning on and after January 1, 2025, from offsetting any amount due to a public or private postsecondary educational institution, as defined, from a current or former student, that was incurred in their capacity as a student, against any amount owing to that current or former student by a state agency. The bill would make its provisions severable. 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 the statutory provisions noted above.

SB 1411 Instructional Quality Commission: membership: appointments by the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates.

Rosilicie Ochoa Bogh

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 02/16/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law establishes the Instructional Quality Commission and requires the commission to, among other things, recommend curriculum frameworks and instructional materials to the State Board of Education for adoption. Existing law requires the membership of the commission to consist of one Member of the Assembly and one public member appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, one Member of the Senate and one public member appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, one public member appointed by the Governor, and 13 public members appointed by the state board upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of Public Instruction or the members of the state board, and prescribes their qualifications and terms. This bill would add to the commission 6 public members appointed by the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates and would require the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates to ensure that its appointments consist of 2 faculty subject matter experts from the California Community Colleges, 2 faculty subject matter experts from the California State University, and 2 faculty subject matter experts from the University of California.

AB 2005 California State University: faculty and employee housing.

Christopher M. Ward

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 01/31/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law, the Teacher Housing Act of 2016, authorizes a school district to establish and implement programs that address the housing needs of teachers and school district employees who face challenges in securing affordable housing, as specified. The act provides that the purpose of the act is to facilitate the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation and preservation of affordable rental housing for teachers and school district employees to allow teachers or school district employees to access and maintain housing stability. The act provides that it specifically creates a state policy supporting housing for teachers and school district employees as described by specified federal law and permits school districts and developers in receipt of local or state funds or tax credits designated for affordable rental housing to restrict occupancy to teachers and school district employees on land owned by school districts, so long as that housing does not violate any other applicable laws. The act defines various terms for these purposes. This bill would authorize the California State University to establish and implement programs that address the housing needs of faculty or California State University employees who face challenges in securing affordable housing, as specified. The bill would provide that the purpose of its provisions are to facilitate the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation and preservation of affordable rental housing for faculty or California State University employees to allow them to access and maintain housing stability. The bill would provide that it specifically creates a state policy supporting housing for faculty or California State University campus employees as described by specified federal law and permits the California State University developers in receipt of local or state funds or tax credits designated for affordable rental housing to restrict occupancy to faculty or California State University employees on land owned by the California State University, so long as that housing does not violate any other applicable laws. The bill would define various terms for these purposes.

AB 2044 Public postsecondary education: community colleges: statewide baccalaureate degree program.

Phillip Chen

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 02/01/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law authorizes the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, in consultation with the California State University and the University of California, to authorize the establishment of community college district baccalaureate degree programs, as provided. Existing law requires a community college district to continue to

offer an associate degree program in the same academic subject for which a baccalaureate degree program has been approved, unless that community college district has received approval from the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to eliminate the associate degree program. When conducting a review to approve the elimination of an associate degree program, existing law requires the chancellor to evaluate changes to the labor market viability of the associate degree and changes to the minimum education required to maintain program accreditation. This bill would require the chancellor to additionally evaluate whether baccalaureate degree holders are paid more than associate degree holders in the same field when conducting a review to approve the elimination of an associate degree program.

AB 2070 Trustees of the California State University: faculty appointees.

Sabrina Cervantes

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 02/05/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law establishes the California State University, under the administration of the Board of Trustees of the California State University, as one of the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in the state. Existing law provides for the membership of the board of trustees to include 5 specified ex officio members, 16 appointive members appointed by the Governor and subject to confirmation by the Senate, one representative of the alumni associations, 2 student members appointed by the Governor, and a faculty member appointed by the Governor from a list of names of at least 2 persons furnished by the Academic Senate of the California State University. This bill would require the board of trustees to include an additional faculty member appointed by the Governor. The bill would also require each faculty member appointee to be appointed from a list of names of at least 4 persons, instead of at least 2 persons, furnished by the Academic Senate of the California State University.

AB 2104 Community colleges: Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program.

Esmeralda Soria

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 02/05/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law establishes the California Community Colleges, under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Existing law establishes community college districts throughout the state, under the administration of community college district governing boards, and authorizes these districts to provide instruction at the community college campuses they operate. Existing law establishes a statewide baccalaureate degree program that authorizes up to a total of 30 baccalaureate degree programs at community college districts to be approved per academic year, as

provided. This bill would require the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to develop a Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program that authorizes select community college districts to offer a Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree. The bill would limit the pilot program to 15 community college districts statewide and would require the chancellor to identify eligible community college districts based on specified criteria. The bill would require the Legislative Analyst's Office to conduct an evaluation of the pilot program to determine the effectiveness of the program and the need to continue or expand the program. The bill would repeal these provisions as of January 1, 2031.

AB 2152 California State University: University of California: graduation requirements: service learning pilot program.

Kevin McCarty

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 02/06/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

The Donahoe Higher Education Act sets forth the missions and functions of California's public segments of higher education and their respective institutions of higher education. The California State University, under the administration of the Trustees of the California State University, and the University of California, under the administration of the Regents of the University of California, are 2 of the segments. Provisions of the act apply to the University of California only to the extent that the Regents of the University of California act, by appropriate resolution, to make them applicable. This bill, which would be applicable to the University of California only if the Regents of the University of California adopt an appropriate resolution, commencing with the 2026-27 academic year, would require each California State University and University of California campus to provide on its internet website information on service learning programs and opportunities for undergraduate students. The bill, commencing with students graduating in the 2033-34 academic year, would require the California State University and the University of California, for at least 3 campuses each, as specified, to adopt a pilot program making the completion of a service learning program a graduation requirement. This bill would require, by February 1, 2036, the Legislative Analyst's Office to review and submit a report to the Assembly Committee on Higher Education, the Senate Committee on Education, and the respective education finance budget subcommittees of the Assembly and the Senate on the pilot program, as specified. The bill would require the Legislative Analyst's Office to make the report publicly available and require the California State University and the University of California to consider the report.

AB 2193 Hazing: educational institutions: civil liability: resources.

Chris R. Holden

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 02/07/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law makes it unlawful to engage in hazing, which is defined as a method of initiation or preinitiation into a student organization or student body, whether or not the organization or body is officially recognized by an educational institution, that is likely to cause serious bodily injury to a former, current, or prospective student of a school, community college, college, university, or other educational institution in the state.

Existing law establishes civil liability for hazing participants or the organization if it is involved in the hazing. This bill would, beginning January 1, 2025, additionally establish civil liability for an educational institution, which the bill would define as a public or private institution of higher education in the state, if (1) the institution has direct involvement in the hazing practices of the organization, knew or should have known of the hazing practices and failed to take reasonable steps to stop the hazing practices, or unreasonably failed to prevent or discover the hazing practices of the organization, and (2) the organization involved in the hazing is affiliated with the educational institution at the time of the alleged hazing incident. For purposes of determining whether an educational institution “knew or should have known of the hazing practices and failed to take reasonable steps to stop the hazing practices, or unreasonably failed to prevent or discover the hazing practices of the organization,” the bill would require consideration to be given to the extent that the institution had specific antihazing measures in place at the time of the alleged hazing incident. This bill would also require the State Department of Education to make available on the department’s internet website, on or before July 1, 2025, a model antihazing policy for local educational agencies and resources on hazing prevention for professional development purposes and to increase awareness among pupils, school staff, and community members of the dangers of hazing.

AB 2305 Public postsecondary education: community colleges: statewide baccalaureate degree program.

Mike Fong

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 02/12/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law authorizes the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, in consultation with the California State University and the University of California, to authorize the establishment of district baccalaureate degree programs, as provided. Existing law requires, as part of the application and review process, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to ensure that a community college district is provided with 2 timelines in which to apply for a baccalaureate degree program and receive notice of approval or rejection, as specified, that only 15 baccalaureate degree programs are approved during each application period allowing for a total of 30 baccalaureate

degree programs per academic year, and that a minimum of 30 working days is taken to validate the submitted information and assess the workforce value of the proposed baccalaureate degree program, as specified. This bill would instead require that a community college district is provided with one timeline in which to apply for a baccalaureate degree program, with a total of 30 baccalaureate degree programs approved per academic year, and that a minimum of 45 working days is taken to validate the submitted information and assess the workforce value of the proposed baccalaureate degree program. Existing law requires the chancellor to consult with and seek feedback from the Chancellor of the California State University, the President of the University of California, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities on proposed baccalaureate degree programs, as specified. Under existing law the California State University and the University of California may assess whether proposed baccalaureate degree programs are duplicative of existing baccalaureate programs offered by state universities. If the California State University or the University of California believes there is program duplication they are required to submit written objections with supporting evidence to the chancellor within 30 working days of receipt of the proposal, and the chancellor has 30 working days after receipt of written objections to convene with the applicant and the segment or segments that raised an objection to collaborate and establish a written agreement before the program is approved. This bill would instead provide that the California State University and the University of California have 45 working days after receipt of the proposal to submit written objections with supporting evidence and the chancellor has 45 working days after receipt of written objections to convene with the applicant and the segment or segments that raised an objection to collaborate and establish a written agreement before the program is approved.

AB 2395 California State University: extension programs, special session, and self-supporting instructional programs: revenues.

Sharon Quirk-Silva

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 02/12/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law establishes the California State University, under the administration of the Trustees of the California State University, as one of the segments of public postsecondary education in the state. Existing law authorizes the Trustees of the California State University to transmit any revenues, including fees and charges required by the trustees, received by the trustees from extension programs, special session, and other self-supporting instructional programs to the Treasurer and if transmitted, requires the revenues to be deposited in the State University Continuing Education Revenue Fund, a continuously appropriated fund. Existing law appropriates all revenues from that fund to the trustees for the support and development of self-supporting instructional programs of the California State University. The bill would instead appropriate all

revenues from the State University Continuing Education Revenue Fund to the trustees for the support and development of instructional programs of the California State University. By expanding the scope of an existing appropriation, the bill would make an appropriation. Existing law requires the chief fiscal officer of each campus of the California State University to deposit and maintain in specified trust accounts, or in the continuously appropriated California State University Trust Fund, specified moneys received in connection with certain sources or purposes, including fees for extension programs, special sessions, and other self-supporting instructional programs. This bill would authorize the trustees to transmit the revenues received by the trustees from extension programs, special session, or self-supporting instructional programs to the chief fiscal officer of a university campus, and would require those transmitted moneys to be deposited in specified trust accounts or in the continuously appropriated California State University Trust Fund. By adding a potential source of revenue to a continuously appropriated fund, the bill would make an appropriation.

AB 2447 California State University: extension programs, special session, and self-supporting instructional programs: revenues.

Avelino Valencia

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 02/13/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law establishes the California State University, under the administration of the Trustees of the California State University, as one of the segments of public postsecondary education in the state. Existing law authorizes the Trustees of the California State University to transmit any revenues, including fees and charges required by the trustees, received by the trustees from extension programs, special session, and other self-supporting instructional programs to the Treasurer and if transmitted, requires the revenues to be deposited in the State University Continuing Education Revenue Fund, a continuously appropriated fund. Existing law appropriates all revenues from that fund to the trustees for the support and development of self-supporting instructional programs of the California State University. The bill would instead appropriate all revenues from the State University Continuing Education Revenue Fund to the trustees for the support and development of instructional programs of the California State University. By expanding the scope of an existing appropriation, the bill would make an appropriation. Existing law requires the chief fiscal officer of each campus of the California State University to deposit and maintain in specified trust accounts, or in the continuously appropriated California State University Trust Fund, specified moneys received in connection with certain sources or purposes, including fees for extension programs, special sessions, and other self-supporting instructional programs. This bill would authorize the trustees to transmit the revenues received by the trustees from extension programs, special session, or self-supporting instructional programs to the chief fiscal officer of a university campus, and would require those

transmitted moneys to be deposited in specified trust accounts or in the continuously appropriated California State University Trust Fund. By adding a potential source of revenue to a continuously appropriated fund, the bill would make an appropriation.

SB 28 Education finance: school facilities: Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2024.

Steven M. Glazer

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 12/05/22 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

(1) Existing law authorizes the governing board of any school district or community college district to order an election and submit to the electors of the district the question of whether the bonds of the district shall be issued and sold to raise money for specified purposes. Existing law generally requires, to pass a school bond measure, that either at least 2/3 of the votes cast on the proposition of issuing bonds be in favor of issuing the bonds to pass the measure, or, if certain conditions are met, at least 55% of the votes cast on the proposition of issuing bonds be in favor of issuing the bonds. Existing law prohibits the total amount of bonds issued by a school district or community college district from exceeding 1.25% of the taxable property of the district, as provided. This bill would raise that limit to 2%. (2) Existing law also authorizes a unified school district to issue bonds receiving at least 55% of the votes cast on the proposition of issuing the bonds that, in aggregation with bonds issued with a 2/3 favorable vote, do not exceed 2.5% of the taxable property of the district, as provided. This bill would raise that limit to 4%. The bill would make a similar percentage increase for community college districts. (3) The Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 provides for the adoption of rules, regulations, and procedures, under the administration of the Director of General Services, for the allocation of state funds by the State Allocation Board for the construction and modernization of public school facilities. This bill would, among other things, require a school district to submit to the Department of General Services a 5-year school facilities master plan or updated 5-year school facilities master plan, as provided, as a condition of participating in the school facilities program under the act, would require the school district to submit specified information in the school district's application for an apportionment of state funds, and would make other changes to requirements a school district is required to comply with before participating in programs under the act. The bill would require the department to process applications to participate in the program, as specified, and would make other changes to the method by which the board makes apportionments of moneys under the act. This bill would establish the 2024 State School Facilities Fund, and authorize the board to apportion, and make disbursements of, moneys in the fund, as provided. The bill would require, for bonds approved by voters in 2024 or thereafter, the board to adjust a school district's required local and state contribution, as specified. The bill would authorize new

construction and modernization grants to be used for seismic mitigation purposes and, among other things, to establish schoolsite-based infrastructure to provide broadband internet access. The bill would also authorize modernization grants to be used, among other things, for the control, management, or abatement of lead and for the demolition and construction of a building on an existing schoolsite that meets specified conditions. The bill would prohibit the use of new construction and modernization grants for the purchase of portable electronic devices with a useful life of less than 3 years. This bill would authorize funding for health and safety projects by a school district, as provided. This bill would authorize the board to provide a grant to test for lead in water outlets used for drinking or preparing food on schoolsites serving kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive, as provided. The bill would specify procedures that small school districts, as defined, may use to obtain project and construction management, new construction grants, and modernization grants. The bill would also make conforming changes in, and remove inoperative provisions from, the act. (4) The act also requires the board to adopt regulations for determining the amount of funding and the eligibility and prioritization of funding that school districts with a financial hardship may receive from bond acts for construction, modernization, or relocation assistance. The act requires those regulations to include consideration of various factors, including whether the school district's total bonding capacity is \$5,000,000 or less, in which case the school district shall be deemed eligible for financial hardship. This bill, for purposes of the regulations related to financial hardship eligibility, would increase the total bonding capacity cap to \$15,000,000, to be adjusted as specified. (5) The California Constitution prohibits the Legislature from creating a debt or liability that singly or in the aggregate with any previous debts or liabilities exceeds the sum of \$300,000, except by an act that (A) authorizes the debt for a single object or work specified in the act, (B) has been passed by a 2/3 vote of all the Members elected to each house of the Legislature, (C) has been submitted to the people at a statewide general or primary election, and (D) has received a majority of all the votes cast for and against it at that election. This bill would set forth the Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2024 as a state general obligation bond act that would provide \$15,500,000,000 to construct and modernize education facilities, as specified. This bond act would become operative only if approved by the voters at the March 5, 2024, statewide primary election. The bill would also provide for the submission of the bond act to the voters at that election. (6) Existing law establishes the California State University, which is administered by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, and the University of California, under the administration of the Regents of the University of California, as segments of public postsecondary education in this state. This bill would require the Board of Trustees and the Regents to comply with certain conditions, as provided, before receiving funds from the 2024 University Capital Outlay Bond Fund established pursuant to the Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2024. (7) This bill would become effective upon the adoption of the Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2024 by the voters at the March 5, 2024, statewide primary election.

SB 895 Community colleges: Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program.

Richard D. Roth

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 02/21/24 - Amended Senate

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law establishes the California Community Colleges, under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Existing law establishes community college districts throughout the state, under the administration of community college district governing boards, and authorizes these districts to provide instruction at the community college campuses they operate. Existing law establishes a statewide baccalaureate degree program that authorizes up to a total of 30 baccalaureate degree programs at community college districts to be approved per academic year, as provided. This bill would require the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to develop a Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program that authorizes select community college districts to offer a Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree. The bill would limit the pilot program to 15 community college districts statewide and would require the chancellor to identify eligible community college districts based on specified criteria. The bill would require the Legislative Analyst's Office to conduct an evaluation of the pilot program to determine the effectiveness of the program and the need to continue or expand the program. The bill would repeal these provisions as of January 1, 2031.

SB 1200 California State University students: California Promise: Finish in Four and Through in Two.

Steven M. Glazer

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 02/15/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law establishes the California Promise, which requires at least 20 campuses of the California State University to establish a California Promise program by which the campus enters into a pledge with a qualifying transfer student to support the student in earning a baccalaureate degree within 2 academic years of the student's first year of enrollment to the campus, as provided. Existing law repeals these provisions on January 1, 2026. This bill would rename the California Promise program the Finish in Four and Through in Two program, as provided. The bill would require the Trustees of the California State University, on or before July 1, 2025, and annually thereafter, to submit a report to the Legislature that includes specified program participation information. The bill would delete an obsolete reporting requirement. The bill would delete the January 1, 2026, program repeal date, thereby extending the program indefinitely.

AB 1887 Student financial aid: application deadlines: extension

Sabrina Cervantes

2023-2024 Regular Session

Bill Text 01/22/24 - Introduced

Legislative Counsel's Digest

Existing law establishes the Student Aid Commission as the primary state agency for the administration of state-authorized student financial aid programs available to students attending all segments of postsecondary education. If the federal Free Application for Federal Student Aid is not available on or before October 1, 2023, existing law extends the application deadline for financial aid programs administered by the commission to April 2, 2024, for the 2024-25 award year only. This bill would extend the April 2, 2024, application deadline for financial aid programs administered by the commission by one month. This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

**Academic Senate
of the
California State University**

**2024 Federal Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the
California State University**

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) adopt the provisional positions on bills currently under consideration in the United States Congress as identified in the attached document titled Academic Senate of the California State University, Positions on Proposed Bills in the United States Congress – 2024; and be it
- 2. RESOLVED:** That these adopted provisional positions guide ASCSU advocacy activities for the bills listed in the attached document during the 2024 legislative calendar; and be it
- 3. RESOLVED:** That if a change in the ASCSU position on a bill is warranted and, due to time or other constraints, consultation with the Academic Senate is not possible, the ASCSU Executive Committee is empowered to act on behalf of the Senate, in accordance with resolution [AS-3656-23/FGA](#) and the [ASCSU Bylaws](#), while exercising due diligence in keeping the ASCSU informed of such actions; and be it
- 4. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution and document to:

 - CSU Board of Trustees
 - CSU Chancellor
 - CSU Federal 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)
Academic Senate for 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
U.S. Senators representing the State of California
Members of the House of Representatives representing the State of California

Rationale

This resolution is part of the ASCSU Legislative advocacy strategy for 2024, based on the guidelines approved by the Academic Senate in Fall 2023. Its purpose is to assist the Academic Senate and its members to be effective and to respond to proposed legislation. Advocacy efforts to shape and influence bill development are likely to be most effective when communicated to the California Congressional Delegation. The positions adopted in this resolution are understood as provisional since bills often change until passed by both chambers; adopting provisional positions allows flexibility in advocacy efforts while still ensuring that - at any one point in time -the positions have the backing of the entire ASCSU body, or the ASCSU Executive Committee acting on behalf of the ASCSU.

ATTACHMENT**Academic Senate of the California State University,
Positions on Proposed Bills in the United States Congress - 2024**

(Bill number links to text on Congress.gov)

Bill	Title/Talking Points	Sponsor	Position	Category
H.R. 3000	Tax Free Pell Grant Act excludes Pell Grants from gross income calculations for income tax purposes	Lloyd Doggett	Support	Financial Aid
H.R. 3451 and S. 1665	Higher Education Mental Health Act of 2023 Advisory Commission on serving and supporting students with mental health disabilities	David Trone Robert Casey	Support	Health
H.R. 3941 and S. 2983	Schools Not Shelters Act prohibits using the facilities of certain schools that receive federal financial assistance to provide shelter or housing for any non-U.S. national (alien under federal law) who has not been admitted for lawful entry.	Marcus Molinaro Ted Cruz	Oppose	Student Housing

H.R. 5489	Pell Grant Plus Act some Pell Grant recipients would be awarded additional Pell Grant funding that does not exceed the cost of attendance	David Joyce	Oppose unless amended	Financial Aid
H.R. 5685 and S. 2902	Tyler Clementi Higher Education Anti-Harassment Act of 2023 institutions must include in their security report a statement of policy regarding harassment	Mark Pocan Patty Murray	Support	Anti-Harassment
H.R. 6792	PSLF Administrative Improvements Act to require an on-line portal with a database of public service employers	Brendan Boyle	Support	Financial Aid
S. 1092	Making Education Affordable and Accessible Act of 2023 Reauthorizes and revises the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) program	Gary Peters	Support	Institutional Grants

Bills Reference Sheet Summaries, Congress.gov
Limited Committee Comments and Analysis

[H.R. 3000](#)

Tax Free Pell Grant Act

This bill excludes from gross income, for income tax purposes, any amount received as a federal Pell Grant. It also expands the definition of qualified tuition and related expenses under the American Opportunity and Lifetime Learning tax credit to include computer or peripheral equipment (up to a maximum of \$1,000), child and dependent care expenses, and course materials.

This bill amends Paragraph Section [117\(b\)\(1\)](#) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include the exclusion of Pell Grants from gross income.

This bill amends [Section 25A](#) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the American Opportunity and Lifetime Earning Credits to include tuition and fees, computer or peripheral equipment, child and dependent care expenses, and course materials. Existing law includes tuition and fees.

[H.R. 3451](#) and [S. 1665](#) (Related Bills)

Higher Education Mental Health Act of 2023

This bill requires the Department of Education to establish an Advisory Commission on Serving and Supporting Students with Mental Health Disabilities in Institutions of Higher Education.

The commission must conduct a study and report on

- services available to students with mental health disabilities in institutions of higher education (IHEs) and the effectiveness of such services in supporting these students;
- the impact of policies and procedures, such as reasonable accommodation and disciplinary policies, that help or hinder the goal of providing equal opportunity to these students;
- the use of protected health information of these students by IHEs;
- the impact of providing mental health services on a student's academic performance, well-being, and ability to complete postsecondary education;
- conclusions on the major challenges facing these students; and

- recommendations to improve the overall education, retention, and graduation of these students.

The purpose of this act is

- to ensure states and institutions of higher education are provided with accurate information on the mental health concerns facing students.
- to provide detailed recommendations that institutions of higher education, states, and the federal government can take to improve the mental health services available to students and properly treat the rising number of students with mental health issues.

[H.R 3941](#) and [S. 2983](#) (Related Bills)

Schools Not Shelters Act

This bill prohibits using the facilities of certain schools that receive federal financial assistance to provide shelter or housing for any non-U.S. national (alien under federal law) who has not been admitted for lawful entry. Specifically, this bill shall apply to the facilities of (1) public elementary or secondary schools, and (2) institutions of higher education. This prohibition shall not apply to shelter or housing provided in response to certain disasters such as a fire, flood, explosion, or tornado for which there has been a disaster declaration.

As a condition on receipt of federal financial assistance under any applicable program by a public elementary school, a public secondary school, or an institution of higher education, the facilities of the school or institution may not be used to provide shelter or housing for specified aliens.

The term “Federal financial assistance” has the meaning given such term in section [7501\(a\)\(5\) of title 31, United States Code](#).

The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 ([20 U.S.C. 1002](#)).

[Congressional Budget Office Analysis](#): The bill would primarily affect title I programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which provide funds for school districts with a high percentage of students from low-income households;

programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, which provide funding for special education; federal student loans; and Pell Grants.

CBO expects that those schools and institutions would comply with the requirements of the bill to remain eligible for federal aid. If schools or institutions choose not to comply with the requirement in the bill, spending on the affected programs would decline, but CBO has no basis to estimate the magnitude of that reduction.

FGA Comment: This bill would prevent CSU campuses from allowing undocumented students to access campus housing if students on the CSU campus receive federal financial aid (Pell Grants and student loans).

[H.R. 5489](#)

Pell Plus Act of 2023

This bill would amend Section 401 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 ([20 U.S.C. 1070a](#)), as amended by section 703 of the FAFSA Simplification Act (title VII of division FF of Public Law [116-260](#)).

Pell Grant recipients who attend a Pell Plus institution and have completed at least 4 semesters of their first undergraduate degree while maintaining progress toward degree completion will be awarded an additional Pell Grant known as Federal Pell Plus Grant; the total amount cannot exceed the cost of attendance. A Pell Plus institution is one that notifies the Secretary that the institution desires to participate in the program under this subsection and agrees to provide, to each student receiving a Federal Pell Plus Grant an amount of fund equal to the amount of such Federal Pell Plus Grant received by the student for such award year.

FGA Comment: If a CSU campus wanted to participate in this program as a “Pell Plus Institution,” it would need to provide a dollar-for-dollar match to every student receiving the additional Federal Pell Plus Grant. It is recommended to oppose this bill unless it is amended to remove language from Sect. 2 regarding the dollar-for-dollar match for Pell Plus funding.

[H.R. 5685](#) and [S. 2902](#)

Tyler Clementi Higher Education Anti-Harassment Act of 2023

This bill addresses harassment at institutions of higher education (IHEs).

Specifically, the bill requires each IHE to include in its annual security report a statement of policy regarding harassment on the basis of a student's actual or perceived race, color, national origin, sex (including sexual orientation, gender identity, pregnancy, childbirth, a medical condition related to pregnancy or childbirth, a sex stereotype, and sex characteristics, including intersex traits), disability, or religion.

In addition, the Department of Education may award grants to IHEs to initiate, expand, or improve programs to (1) prevent the harassment of students; (2) provide counseling or redress services to students who have been harassed or accused of subjecting other students to harassment; or (3) educate and train students, faculty, or staff to prevent harassment or address harassment if it occurs.

[H.R. 6792](#)

PSLF Administrative Improvements Act

This bill would require an online database of public service employers and integrating it with the Federal Student Aid dashboard. The policy could improve the use of [public service loan forgiveness](#) by listing eligible employers, and notifying employers if they are in danger of losing eligibility. Employers would be encouraged to provide information to new employees about the employer's eligibility and status. Institution of higher education participating in any program under this title, the Secretary shall, on an annual basis, provide each such institution with standardized information on the program under this subsection, including eligibility requirements.

FGA Comment: This policy would improve transparency for the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program, and it would ease the burden of borrowers by proactively certifying employer eligibility for qualified employees. The Public Service Loan Forgiveness program allows borrowers to erase the balance of their student debt after working for a nonprofit or government employer for 10 years and making 120 qualifying loan payments. Current deficiencies existing at the administrative level in the PSLF program have resulted in borrowers being denied loan forgiveness under the program after applying.

[S. 1092](#)

Making Education Affordable and Accessible Act of 2023

This bill reauthorizes through FY2029 and revises the [Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education \(FIPSE\)](#) program.

The bill also authorizes new grants under the FIPSE program. Specifically, the Department of Education may award grants to institutions of higher education for dual or concurrent enrollment programs or early college high school programs that allow high school students to earn postsecondary credits.

FGA Comment: FIPSE provides institutional grants through several programs. The new funding stream is intended to strengthen the high school-to-college pipeline.

**Academic Senate
of the
California State University**

**Amending the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State
University to Add Three Designated Lecturer Faculty Positions**

1. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) endorse the following amendments to Article II of the [Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University](#) (proposed amendments underlined)

I. Amend Section 1 (b):

(b) The Academic Senate shall also include:

- 1) the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member (who shall not be counted as a campus representative if not an elected member);
- 2) the Chancellor or representative as an ex-officio non-voting member;
- 3) one emerita/emeritus selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association;
- 4) three lecturer senators (who shall not be counted as campus representatives) elected pursuant to Article II, Section 6.

II. Add new Section 6:

Section 6. Lecturer Senators

The lecturer senator electorate shall consist of one lecturer faculty member elected by and from the lecturer faculty on each campus, according to rules established on each campus. Three lecturer senators shall be elected by and from the lecturer senator electorate. Lecturer senators shall serve staggered three-year terms beginning June 1. Terms of members of the lecturer senator electorate, procedures for electing lecturer senators and alternates, procedures for the recall of lecturer senators and alternates by the electorate, and responsibilities of alternates shall be specified in the Bylaws. The Bylaws shall provide for the temporary replacement of a lecturer senator whenever the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate is both from the same campus as the lecturer senator and a member of the senate solely by virtue of being the immediate past chair. Lecturer senators and alternates replacing lecturer senators must hold a one-year (or longer) appointment and be full-time or part-time with a time base entitlement of at least 0.6. The use of the term 'lecturer senator' in this article is for convenience and does not exclude non-lecturer non-tenure track faculty.

III. Renumber existing Sections 6-8 and amend renumbered Section 7:

Section ~~6~~7. Terms of Office

Campus representatives and lecturer senators shall serve a term of three years. The immediate past chair of the Academic Senate shall serve for one year.

; and be it

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU, in accordance with Article VII of the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) forward these amendments to the individual campuses for a vote and initiate a systemwide referendum for its ratification; and be it

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request sufficient funding from the Chancellor's Office to provide assigned time to the ASCSU lecturer senators serving our system in that role; and be it

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

CSU Board of Trustees

CSU Chancellor

CSU DeputyVice Chancellors

CSU campus Presidents

CSU campus Senate Chairs

CSU campus Senate Executive Committees

CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs

California Faculty Association (CFA)

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

Rationale

Senates on 18 of the 23 CSU campuses have seats dedicated to lecturer faculty.¹

Ensuring that lecturer faculty are present to discuss, debate, and decide resolutions and recommendations, is important since they comprise more than half of all faculty in the CSU including the majority of faculty who identify as black or Latinx/Chicanx², and since they often bring experiences and perspectives that permanent faculty do not. In the absence of dedicated seats, there is no assurance that a campus senate will include lecturer faculty, even if the campus permits lecturer faculty to run for seats not dedicated to lecturer faculty.³ Likewise, in the absence of dedicated seats on the ASCSU, there is no assurance that the ASCSU will include lecturer faculty, even though a majority of campuses permit at least some lecturer faculty to run for ASCSU campus

¹ See the table “CSU Campuses with Academic Senate seats dedicated or open to Lecturers as of Spring 2023” posted at

<https://www.calfac.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/2-21-23-Campus-Lecturer-Senators.pdf>. The term ‘lecturer faculty’, as used in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, refers to instructional faculty holding non-tenure track appointments.

² In Fall 2021, of 28,010 instructional faculty, 16,857 (60.2%) were Lecturers; of 1,306 black instructional faculty, 828 (63.4%) were Lecturers; and of 3,405 Latinx/Chicanx instructional faculty, 2,336 (68.6%) were Lecturers. (Instructional faculty are Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Full Professors, and Lecturers). There were 1269 non-instructional faculty (631 coaches, 283 counselors, and 355 librarians) in Fall 2021. All coaches are temporary, and while the exact numbers of temporary counselors and librarians are not readily available, it is generally accepted that the majority of CSU counselors are temporary, and that the majority of CSU librarians are not. See Table 7 on Page 16 of “Boldly Forward: Changing Faces of CSU Faculty and Students Vol. IX” posted at

<https://www.calfac.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Equity-Report-2022-web.pdf>

³ Again, see the table “CSU Campuses with Academic Senate seats dedicated or open to Lecturers as of Spring 2023” posted at

<https://www.calfac.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/2-21-23-Campus-Lecturer-Senators.pdf>

representative.⁴ Amending the ASCSU Constitution to add dedicated lecturer faculty seats will ensure the inclusion of lecturer faculty on the ASCSU.⁵

Wherever possible, the new provisions in the proposed amendments build on and mirror existing provisions in the ASCSU Constitution. As an example, the amendment to Section 1 (b), adding subsection 4, provides that lecturer senators not be counted as campus representatives. This parallels the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate (if not an elected member) not being counted as a campus representative (in subsection 1). Both positions are elected not by a single campus, but by a broader constituency, the past chair by the Senate and lecturer senators by the lecturer senator electorate. The first sentence of new Section 6 provides that elections for the lecturer senator electorate shall be according to rules established on each campus. This allows each campus to determine which lecturer faculty are eligible to serve as and vote for the campus member of the electorate, in line with Article II, Sections 3 and 4 of the Constitution, which provide that campuses determine which faculty are eligible to serve as and vote for campus representatives.

⁴ See the table “CSU Campuses with Lecturers who can run for ASCSU as of Spring 2023” posted at <https://www.calfac.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/2-21-23-ASCSU.pdf> . Article II, Sections 3 and 4 of the ASCSU Constitution provide that campuses determine which faculty are eligible to serve as and vote for campus representatives.

⁵ The proposed amendments fit within the scope of the Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee making recommendations on “alterations to ASCSU documents, procedures, and practices to promote equity and inclusion.” See Bylaw 4, Section d (5) (a) in the ASCSU Bylaws.

The first two sentences of new Section 6 state, “The lecturer senator electorate shall consist of one lecturer faculty member elected by and from the lecturer faculty on each campus, according to rules established on each campus. Three lecturer senators shall be elected by and from the lecturer senator electorate.” Lecturer senators thus indirectly represent every lecturer faculty member on each campus eligible to vote for the electorate.

The fourth and fifth sentences of the proposed new Section 6 states, “Terms of members of the lecturer senator electorate, procedures for electing lecturer senators and alternates, procedures for the recall of lecturer senators and alternates by the electorate, and responsibilities of alternates shall be specified in the Bylaws. The Bylaws shall provide for the temporary replacement of a lecturer senator whenever the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate is both from the same campus as the lecturer senator and a member of the senate solely by virtue of being immediate past chair.” If the ASCSU, prior to forwarding the amendments in this document to the individual campuses for a vote (pursuant to the second Resolved above), passes a resolution to change the Bylaws in order to implement the fourth and fifth sentences of new Section 6, that resolution will be linked [here](#), not for approval, but for information purposes.

The provision in the fifth sentence of new Section 6 for a temporary replacement of a lecturer senator whenever the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate is both

from the same campus as the lecturer senator and a member of the senate solely by virtue of being immediate past chair, will prevent the seven largest campuses from having more than four members on the senate and other campuses from having more than three members on the senate.

The sixth sentence of new Section 6 states, "Lecturer senators and alternates replacing lecturer senators must hold a one-year (or longer) appointment and be full-time or part-time with a time base entitlement of at least 0.6." A time base entitlement of 0.6 ensures that a part-time lecturer faculty member will have sufficient time base entitlement to take advantage of the assigned time historically provided to ASCSU senators. As an example, a part-time lecturer faculty member on a semester campus holding an academic year appointment with a time base entitlement of 0.6 (or 18 WTU for the academic year) would have 3 WTU of entitlement remaining in Spring semester even if they had been assigned 15 WTU in Fall semester. Article 20.37 of the [Collective Bargaining Agreement](#), which deals with Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students, clarifies that all faculty, including part-time lecturer faculty, may receive assigned time.

Once the amendments to the Constitution adding designated lecturer faculty positions have been adopted and changes have been made to the Bylaws to accommodate those amendments, campuses will likely need to adapt existing policies and procedures (or

develop new ones) to elect the campus member of the Lecturer Senator Electorate. If the campus member of the Lecturer Senator Electorate is elected ASCSU Lecturer Senator, campuses may want to ensure that the ASCSU Lecturer Senator becomes a member of the campus senate and campus senate executive committee. To do this will likely require amending the campus constitution and/or bylaws. In addition, to promote communication between ASCSU lecturer senators and the lecturer faculty they indirectly represent (those eligible to vote for the lecturer senator electorate according to rules established on each campus), campuses may want to adopt procedures or practices that permit ASCSU lecturer senators to contact lecturer faculty on the campus directly or via the campus senate chair or ASCSU campus representatives.

**Academic Senate
of the
California State University**

**Change in Bylaws of the Academic Senate of the California State University to
Accommodate the Addition of Three Designated Lecturer Faculty Positions**

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University
(ASCSU) add the following new Bylaw:

Bylaw 10. Lecturer Senators

a. Use of the term 'Lecturer Senator'

The use of the term 'lecturer senator' in this bylaw is for
convenience and includes non-lecturer temporary faculty:

b. Lecturer Senator Electorate

- (1) The ASCSU lecturer senator electorate shall consist of
one temporary faculty member elected by and from the
temporary faculty on each campus.
- (2) Members of the electorate shall serve a term of one
year beginning April 1, however, a member of the
electorate serving as lecturer senator shall remain a
member of the electorate until March 31 of the last year
of their term as lecturer senator.
- (3) Campus elections to serve on the electorate shall be
held according to rules established on each campus. In
any year in which a campus election is held, the

election result shall be certified to a designated officer of the Academic Senate by the principal elected officer of the faculty of that campus on or before April 1.

- (4) Rules on each campus may include a provision for electing a campus member of the lecturer senator electorate by and from the temporary faculty on the campus to fill a vacancy in the position. Rules on each campus may also include a provision for the recall of the campus member of the electorate by the temporary faculty on the campus.

c. Election of Lecturer Senators

- (1) Three lecturer senators and three alternates shall be elected by and from the lecturer senator electorate. Lecturer senators shall serve staggered three-year terms beginning June 1. Alternates shall serve one-year terms beginning June 1.
- (2) Positions shall be filled annually, at a meeting to be held no later than April 15, starting with lecturer senator and continuing with first alternate, second alternate, and third alternate, in successive order with nominations and election by secret ballot. Each

member of the electorate shall have the opportunity to make nominations. All nominees shall be listed on the first and subsequent ballots alphabetically. Those having the highest number of votes, and whose votes, when added together, constitute a majority of the votes cast, shall appear on the next ballot. Voting shall continue in this manner until one candidate receives a majority of votes cast.

- (3) Lecturer senators must hold a one-year (or longer) appointment and be full-time or part-time with a time base entitlement of at least 0.6.

d. Responsibilities of Alternates

- (1) In the event that a lecturer senator will be absent for one or more semesters or quarters, they shall be replaced by the first alternate, who shall finish out their term. If the first alternate is unavailable, the lecturer senator shall be replaced by the second alternate, who shall finish out their term. If both the first and second alternates are unavailable, the lecturer senator shall be replaced by the third alternate, who shall finish out their term.

- (2) In the event that a lecturer senator is unable to attend a meeting of the Academic Senate, the first alternate shall have the right to attend and vote at that meeting. If the first alternate is unavailable, the second alternate shall have the right to attend and vote at that meeting. If both the first and second alternates are unavailable, the third alternate shall have the right to attend and vote at that meeting.
- (3) If a lecturer senator is from the same campus as the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate, and the immediate past chair is a member of the senate solely by virtue of being immediate past chair, then until the immediate past chair is no longer serving as immediate past chair, the lecturer senator shall be temporarily replaced by the first alternate. If the first alternate is unavailable, the lecturer senator shall be temporarily replaced by the second alternate. If both the first and second alternates are unavailable, the lecturer senator shall be temporarily replaced by the third alternate. Once the immediate past chair is no longer serving as immediate past chair, the lecturer senator shall resume their position as lecturer senator,

assuming they still have time remaining in their term as lecturer senator.

(4) If an alternate is from the same campus as the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate, and the immediate past chair is a member of the senate solely by virtue of being immediate past chair, then until the immediate past chair is no longer serving as immediate past chair, the alternate may not replace a lecturer senator.

(5) Alternates replacing lecturer senators must hold a one-year (or longer) appointment and be full-time or part-time with a time base entitlement of at least 0.6.

e. Recall of Lecturer Senators and Alternates

A lecturer senator or alternate shall be recalled by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the lecturer electorate. A recall vote by the electorate shall be initiated by a vote of the majority of the members of the ASCSU. A lecturer senator or alternate shall also be recalled if they are recalled as a member of the lecturer senator electorate by the lecturer faculty on their campus according to rules established on their campus.

f. Special Elections

If vacancies occur in all three alternate positions, the ASCSU may call for a special election for three new alternates. The three new alternates shall be elected by and from the lecturer senator electorate, with terms ending May 31. Special election procedures shall be consistent with Bylaw 10 c (2).

g. Interim Election Procedures

In the first year that elections for lecturer senators are held, three lecturer senators and three alternates shall be elected. Positions shall be filled in successive order, starting with a lecturer senator who shall serve a three-year term; followed by a second lecturer senator who shall serve a two-year term; and continuing with a third lecturer senator, first alternate, second alternate, and third alternate, who shall serve one-year terms. Bylaw 10 g shall govern the terms of lecturer senators elected under these interim procedures. Bylaw 10 g shall expire and be deleted from the Bylaws three years after the lecturer senators elected under these interim procedures begin their terms.

- 2. RESOLVED:** That the addition of the new Bylaw occur upon adoption of amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate to add three designated lecturer faculty positions (in accordance with Article VII of the Constitution); and be it finally

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

CSU Board of Trustees
CSU Chancellor
CSU Executive Vice Chancellors
CSU campus Presidents
CSU campus Senate Chairs
CSU campus Senate Executive Committees
CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
California Faculty Association (CFA)
CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA)

Rationale

Wherever possible, provisions in the proposed new Bylaw build on and mirror existing provisions in the ASCSU Constitution and Bylaws. As an example, the second sentence of Section b (3) states, “In any year in which a campus election is held, the election result shall be certified to a designated officer of the Academic Senate by the principal elected officer of the faculty of that campus on or before April 1.” This sentence is taken almost verbatim from Article II, Section 5 of the Constitution. Section c (2) of the proposed new Bylaw states that positions will be filled “in successive order with nominations and election by secret ballot. Each member of the electorate shall have the opportunity to make nominations. All nominees shall be listed on the first and subsequent ballots alphabetically. Those having the highest number of votes, and whose votes, when added together, constitute a majority of the votes cast, shall appear on the next ballot. Voting shall continue in this manner until one candidate receives a majority of votes cast.” This language is taken almost verbatim from Bylaw 2 d, where it applies to the election of ASCSU officers. Section d (1) and (2) of the proposed new Bylaw (dealing with alternates) make separate provisions for when a lecturer senator will be

absent for one or more semesters or quarters or is unable to attend a meeting. This matches the provisions for substitute members for campus representatives in Article II, Section 7 of the Constitution. Terms of members of the lecturer electorate begin April 1 and elections for lecturer senators are held no later than April 15 so that lecturer senators may be identified prior to the ASCSU May plenary, when ASCSU officers for the following year are elected.

**Academic Senate
of the
California State University**

On Faculty Choice in Selection of Course Materials

1. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) contend that choice in selection of course materials extends to the format of course materials, i.e., choice between digital and print materials (or both); and be it
2. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU oppose any program at campus or statewide levels which mandates that faculty use only digital versions of course materials (where those are available); and be it
3. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU oppose flat-fee models that do not include opt-out clauses for students *and* faculty and that do not address cost differentials between different courses, departments, disciplines, or colleges; and be it
4. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU request that faculty be involved in robust consultation *before* flat-fee models are instituted on any campus; and be it finally
5. **RESOLVED:** That this resolution be distributed to the

CSU Board of Trustees
CSU Chancellor
CSU Provosts and Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
CSU Vice Presidents for Student Affairs
CSU campus Senate Chairs
CSU bookstore Directors
California State Student Association

Rationale

It is our hope that the ASCSU and the Chancellor's Office of the CSU agree on two fundamental principles:

1. We should provide course materials to students at as low a cost as possible—without violating principle #2.
2. We should provide course materials to students that are most effective for student learning—while of course considering the cost to students as articulated in principle #1.

Flat-Fee Models

The ASCSU strongly supports initiatives to mitigate and lower the costs of course materials such as the Affordable Learning Solutions program (<https://als.calstate.edu/>) prompted by AB 798, The California College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015 and the Zero Cost Course Materials program (<https://als.calstate.edu/zccm>) prompted by SB 1359, Public Postsecondary Education: Course Materials of 2017. This support is expressed in ASCSU resolutions such as [AS-2730-06/AA, Provision of Accessible Electronic Material by Publishers](#), [AS-2747-06/FA, Faculty Role in Mitigating the Costs of Textbooks](#), [AS-2813-07/AA/FA/FGA, Textbook Affordability](#), and [AS-3070-12/FGA/AA, Accessible and Affordable Open-Source Digital Textbooks](#).

In other words, the ASCSU strongly promotes the provision of affordable and accessible course materials. For instance, the ASCSU supports using already existing open access

course materials, creating programs to deposit textbooks, and using course reserves in cooperation with faculty and campus libraries. This support extends to accessibility accommodations and accommodations for veterans.

In a supposed attempt to lower the costs of course materials further—and following a small national trend—some CSU campuses and their campus bookstores (regardless of the ownership structure of those bookstores) are imposing flat-fee models where they sell all course materials a student might need to each student for a set flat fee per semester (usually around \$250). The bookstores claim that these flat fees make course materials cheaper for students. In some cases, these programs are labeled ‘equitable’ textbook access programs (or designated ‘inclusive access’ programs). Some flat-fee programs allow for opt-outs for students (and, very rarely, faculty). Some flat-fee programs focus on specific courses rather than on all course materials purchased by students.

Unfortunately, the argument that flat-fee models save students money is not true, or at least not very precise. Bookstores have not provided information on the actual cost of course materials for students, especially disaggregated by college, department, discipline, and program, nor distinguish between the sticker price of books and what students actually spend. Actually, as the Electronic Frontier Foundation has reported in [“Inequitable Access: An Anti-Competitive Scheme by Textbook Publishers,”](#) the main beneficiaries of flat-fee models are publishers.

As a matter of fact, flat-fee models are based on a faulty economic assumption: that all students who can purchase course materials for less than the flat fee opt out of the program. If this was true, the bookstore program is stuck only with students who pay less for their course materials than they would without a flat fee, which creates a price differential between what students pay the bookstore and what bookstores have to pay the publishers. That leaves the bookstore program with a deficit that has to be made up somehow. Alternatively, and more likely, flat-fee models are based on the assumption that students who would pay less for their course material than the amount of the flat fee are unaware of that fact or find it too onerous to opt out or are unaware of that possibility. This raises the specter of some colleges cross-subsidizing others, i.e., students in some colleges actually paying more through the flat-fee model, while students in other colleges pay less. Furthermore, campuses and their campus bookstores do not consider that students purchase their course materials through a variety of avenues, e.g., buying second-hand or older editions, renting, sharing, or borrowing from the library—or don't purchase them at all. For these reasons, as Inside Higher Education has reported, the [Biden administration is currently investigating](#) these programs. The American Library Association makes similar arguments in a recent blog post "[Keeping Up With... Automatic Textbook Billing](#)."

In addition, the opt-out will probably only be exercised by students who are well-informed and have the time to do research on the cost of their course materials,

while especially first-time, first-year, and transfer students learning their way around campus are prone to miss the opportunity to opt out. In other words, the flat-fee model would potentially increase inequity rather than reduce it. Flat-fee models also often do not take device inequity into account: many students may have laptops or tablets, but others might have to read their course materials on their phones. The campuses that already use flat-fee models have to our knowledge not supplied information on opt-out rates or assessed that information.

For the same reason, flat-fee models will potentially increase the number of students who don't purchase any course materials at all since flat-fee models only allow for one price, which may be beyond the purses of some students. Flat-fee models are often supported by financial aid, but that aid usually takes the form of loans, so even those models are simply adding to student debt. It probably comes as no surprise that most flat-fee models have been developed without robust faculty input or consultation.

For these reasons, the ASCSU concludes that flat-fee models could be harmful to student learning and to the academic mission of the California State University and therefore opposes such models.

Format of Course Materials

As the ASCSU has documented in various resolutions such as [AS-2747-06/FA, Faculty Role in Mitigating the Costs of Textbooks](#), and [AS-3070-12/FGA/AA, Accessible and](#)

[Affordable Open-Source Digital Textbooks](#), the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) and many policies on individual campuses place the ultimate responsibility for the selection of textbooks and other course materials in the hands of the faculty. Faculty have the disciplinary knowledge as well as the right to select traditional or alternative course materials depending on which are pedagogically most conducive and effective for student learning.

Some CSU campus bookstores, however, have recently asserted that the choice of course materials does not extend to the format of the materials. In instances where course materials are available in print format and digital format, these bookstores are moving towards ordering only digital materials and in doing so are infringing on academic freedom.

The question, then, becomes whether print and digital versions of course materials are actually the same or different.

If they are the same, it makes no difference whether faculty can select print or digital versions.

If they are different, faculty should be able to make the choice in format.

There is a large body of research demonstrating that there are significant differences in student learning outcomes depending on which format course materials are in (see Select Bibliography)—regardless of the specific discipline, age, background, etc. of the students. Most research shows that student learning is more successful when students

study with print material, while some research demonstrates the opposite (see Select Bibliography)—but both positions clearly indicate that there is a difference between digital and print versions of the ‘same’ course materials.

In addition, any bookstore program that imposes one format does not take into consideration the differences between colleges, departments, disciplines, and programs in terms of how course materials are employed and used. For instance, a Chemistry textbook might require a very different engagement from a Victorian novel in an English seminar.

There is also a claim that providing course materials in digital format only makes those course materials cheaper and therefore more accessible for students. Unfortunately, there is no evidence for that claim. Any data provided so far refer to students in the aggregate, but not about students as individuals purchasing books.

In practice, however, the main financial beneficiaries of digital editions of course materials are publishers—so students are not really saving any money. In addition, digital materials are often only available to students in the semester they are taking a course, with the consequence that those course materials cannot be consulted later in the students’ careers at and beyond the university. Faculty experience across disciplines clearly indicates that there is a benefit to perpetual access to course materials, particularly for life-long learning.

For these reasons, the ASCSU reasserts that the choice to use print materials, digital materials, or both should not be imposed by bookstores, but made by faculty based on their assessment of which will best contribute to student learning in any given course.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baron, Naomi. "Know What? How Digital Technologies Undermine Learning and Remembering." *Journal of Pragmatics* 175 (April 2021): 27-37.

Digital devices and the internet lead us to depend on them to remember for us. Digital screens foster shallower reading than do print texts. Digital technologies potentially undermine educational goals.

Baron, Naomi. "Reading in a Digital Age." *Phi Delta Kappan: Connecting Education Research, Policy, and Practice* 99.2 (October 9, 2017): 15-20.

When students have a choice, they spend less time on digital reading and have lower comprehension scores.

Clinton, Virginia. "Reading from Paper Compared to Screens: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Research in Reading* 42.2 (May 2019): 288-325.

Based on random effects models, reading from screens had a negative effect on reading performance relative to paper ($g = -.25$). Readers had better calibrated (more accurate) judgment of their performance from paper compared to screens ($g = .20$). Readers may be more efficient and aware of their performance when reading from paper compared to screens.

Colvard, Nicholas, Edward Watson, and Hyojin Park. "The Impact of Open Educational Resources on Various Student Success Metrics." *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 30.2 (2018): 262-276.

Study found that open educational resources [not 'equitable' textbook programs] positively influence grades and decrease withdrawal rates for all students and do so at higher rates for low-income students, part-time students, and racial/ethnic minorities.

Delgado, Pablo and Ladislao Salmerón. "The Inattentive On-Screen Reading: Reading Medium Affects Attention and Reading Comprehension under Time Pressure." *Learning and Instruction* 71, February 2021.

On-print (but not on-screen) readers increased on-task attention when required by the task. On-screen (as compared to on-print) readers comprehended less when reading under time pressure.

Delgado Pablo, Cristina Vargas et al. "Don't Throw away Your Printed Books: A Meta-Analysis on the Effects of Reading Media on Reading Comprehension." *Educational Research Review* 25 (November 2018): 23-38.

Paper-based reading yields better comprehension outcomes than digital-based reading.

Furenes, May, Natalia Kucirkova et al. "A Comparison of Children's Reading on Paper Versus Screen: A Meta-Analysis." *Review of Educational Research* 91.4 (August 2021): 483-517.

The comparison of digital versus paper books that only differed by digitization showed lower comprehension scores for digital books.

Hurley, Tracy and Amir Fekrazad. "E-Textbooks, Inclusive Access, and Academic Performance." *Inclusive Access and Open Educational Resources E-Text Programs in Higher Education*. Ed. T.A. Hurley. Springer, 2020: 177-84.

Success rates increase when digital vs. print resources are compared across 112 courses. Some sections used digital resources [though not necessarily in 'equitable' textbook access programs] and other sections used print within the same course.

Jeong, You and Gahgene Gweon. "Advantages of Print Reading over Screen Reading: A Comparison of Visual Patterns, Reading Performance, and Reading Attitudes across Paper, Computers, and Tablets." *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 37.17, 2021.

In terms of reading attitude, readers reported higher levels of perceived understanding, perceived confidence, and perceived immersion and lower levels of perceived fatigue for reading printed text than reading from a device screen.

Kong, Yiren, Young Sik Seo, and Ling Zhai. "Comparison of Reading Performance on Screen and on Paper: A Meta-Analysis." *Computers & Education* 123 (August 2018): 138-49.

The meta-analysis showed that reading on paper was better than reading on screen in terms of reading comprehension, and there were no significant differences between reading on paper and reading on screen in terms of reading speed.

Mueller, Pam and Daniel Oppenheimer. "The Pen Is Mightier than the Keyboard: Advantages of Longhand over Laptop Note Taking." *Psychological Science*, 2014, 1-10.

Even when laptops are used solely to take notes, they may still be impairing learning because their use results in shallower processing.

Sidi, Yael, Maya Shpigelman et al. "Understanding Metacognitive Inferiority on Screen by Exposing Cues for Depth of Processing." *Learning and Instruction* 51 (October 2017): 61-73.

Cognitive and metacognitive researchers find screen inferiority compared to paper in effort regulation, test performance, and extent of overconfidence.

Singer, Lauren and Patricia Alexander. "Reading Across Mediums: Effects of Reading Digital and Print Texts on Comprehension and Calibration." *The Journal of Experimental Education* 85.1, 2017.

While there were no differences across mediums when students identified the main idea of the text, students recalled key points linked to the main idea and other relevant information better when engaged with print.

**Academic Senate
of the
California State University**

Apportionment of Academic Senate CSU Seats

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU), as required by [ASCSU Bylaw 9](#), approve the results of the ASCSU Executive Committee's CSU campus census of Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) from Fall 2023 data for the purpose of apportionment/reapportionment of Senate seats among the campuses; and be it

- 2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU approve the distribution of a third seat to the seven campuses with the highest FTEF based on the 2023 data as described in Attachment 1; and be it

- 3. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:
 - CSU Board of Trustees
 - CSU Chancellor
 - CSU Deputy Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs & Chief Student Affairs Officer, Dilcie Perez
 - CSU Deputy Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs & Chief Academic Officer, Nathan Evans
 - CSU Associate Vice Chancellor and Chancellor's Designee to the ASCSU, Jennifer Baszile
 - CSU campus Presidents
 - CSU campus Senate Chairs, Executive Committees, and Senates
 - CSU campus Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
 - California Faculty Association (CFA)
 - California State Student Association (CSSA)
 - CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA)

Rationale

Article II, Section 1 of the ASCSU Constitution provides that the membership of the ASCSU will consist of "...two senators per campus plus an additional senator from each of the seven largest campuses apportioned on the basis of FTEF." To implement this provision, ASCSU [Bylaw 9](#) requires that each year the Executive Committee "...conduct a "census" using the most recent and reliable Fall FTEF data to determine whether reapportionment of seats among campuses is necessary. The results shall be presented to the Senate for approval at its first meeting in the calendar year."

Fall 2023 FTEF data by campus is included in Attachment 1. In order from highest to lowest, the seven largest FTEF campuses are CSU Long Beach, CSU Fullerton, San Diego State University, CSU Northridge, San José State University, CSU Sacramento, and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. All campuses are the same apart from reapportionment of one senator from CSU San Francisco to Cal Poly San Luis Obispo.

Campuses which remain the same and that currently have a third senator, no re-apportionment is necessary. Cal Poly San Luis Obispo is entitled to elect a third senator, with a first term of 3 years, per Bylaw 9.d. For CSU San Francisco, per Bylaw 9.c. "...the seat lost shall be the first seat to complete its three-year term following the announcement of the reapportionment, and the seat shall not be lost until the three-year term expires."

This resolution approves the results of the 2023 census and re-affirms the assignment of a third senator to those seven campuses with the largest FTEF.

Attachment 1

Fall 2023 Instructional Faculty FTEF

Campus	Tenure-Track FTEF	Lecturer FTEF	Total Faculty FTEF	7 Highest FTEF	# of Senators 2023	Projected # of Senators 2024
Bakersfield	243.3	206.4	449.7		2	2
Channel Islands	166.1	141.4	307.5		2	2
Chico	404	252	656		2	2
Dominguez Hills	307.7	314.5	622.2		2	2
East Bay	337	206.4	543.4		2	2
Fresno	580.8	540.9	1121.7		2	2
Fullerton	800.9	740.4	1541.2	2 nd	3	3
Humboldt	227.5	155	382.4		2	2
Long Beach	833.4	833.2	1666.6	1 st	3	3
Los Angeles	555.3	549.3	1104.6		2	2
Maritime	48	21.6	69.6		2	2
Monterey Bay	184.8	154.6	339.4		2	2

Northridge	760.2	644.6	1404.8	4 th	3	3
Pomona	568.3	457	1025.3		2	2
Sacramento	706.1	505.5	1211.6	6 th	3	3
San Bernardino	441.3	359.2	800.5		2	2
San Diego	799.7	635.4	1435.1	3 rd	3	3
San Francisco	674.4	440	1114.3		3	2
San Jose	713.5	647.7	1361.3	5 th	3	3
San Luis Obispo	693.7	428.1	1121.9	7 th	2	3
San Marcos	298.5	314.2	612.7		2	2
Sonoma	212.8	101.6	314.4		2	2
Stanislaus	301.5	191.7	493.1		2	2

Notes: Data as of 11/6/2023; includes active instructional faculty based on primary classification code.

Excludes faculty on leave.