

ASCSU Report to the CPP Academic Senate

Key Issues discussed-

Credit by Examination- The ASCSU Task Force on Credit by External Examination was established in October 2025. In November 2025, Chancellor Garcia asked GEAC “to review and develop clear, actionable recommendations” on several topics including GE credit through external examinations (See #2 in Garcia Memo to GEAC, 2025-11-10). As GEAC is a Chancellor’s Office committee and does not formulate policy and related formal positions for the ASCSU, it is incumbent on ASCSU to consider and engage in shared governance on this process. The task force seeks broader deliberation and direction from all ASCSU Committees and Senators whose campuses and (prospective) students will be significantly impacted by this work.

ASCSU Broad Action Position Options Task Force has Deliberated

- Position 1: Do not expand credit by examination: no process pathway. (This position would put ASCSU in a reactive position to a process that may be developed through GEAC/CO.)
- Position 2: Develop a process for evaluation for college-level elective credit only: do not expand lower-division GE and American Institutions articulation. (Similar to Position 1: This position would put ASCSU in a reactive position to a process that may be developed through GEAC/CO.)
- Position 3: Develop a process for evaluating exams for college-level elective credit, GE, and American Institutions credit.

First Readings Resolutions:

AS 3772-26- Supporting the Establishment of a Systemwide Staff Representative Body- The ASCSU is committed to furthering democratic governance of the CSU. Therefore, the ASCSU supports the creation of a systemwide staff representative body whose mission is to ensure meaningful staff participation in system-level decision-making, consultation, and governance.

AS 3774-26- Academic Senate of the California State University Academic Senate of the California State University 2026-2027 Meetings- Meeting schedule for the following year. There will be alternating zoom and in person due to budget cuts.

AS 3775-26 Academic Senate of the California State University Amending the Academic Senate of the California State University Bylaws to Address Campus Closure and Integration- as with the merger of Maritime and SLO how to consolidate senate seats.

AS 3776-26- Academic Senate of the California State University Consultation Regarding CSU Chancellor's Office Policies -the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) request that, when Policies of the California State University (CSU) come up for regular review, the Owners of the Policies (where appropriate and when possible) consult with the ASCSU to find out if there is any feedback on the Policy; and be it

AS 3777-26- Academic Senate of the California State University Update to Academic Senate of the California State University Bylaws: Responsibilities of the Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee

AS 3778-26- Academic Senate of the California State University Process for Appointment of Area 6 Ethnic Studies Disciplinary Faculty Reviewers -That Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) endorse the following process for articulation of Ethnic Studies courses and reviewers: Reviewer shall be appointed from the ranks of the CSU Ethnic Studies discipline expert review faculty with experience in articulation/curriculum development.

AS 3779-26- Academic Senate of the California State University Restoration of Sane and Efficient Plenary Session Hours to Boost Academic Senate of the California State University Senate Health and Wellness

Second Readings (Approved)

AS 3773-26 - Academic Senate of the California State University Apportionment of Academic Senate of the California State University Seats- Designation of Senators based on full time enrolled faculty

NAGPRA Issue-

Many fields that do not include studying humans may be impacted. The approval process is time consuming and costly. Right now it is left to faculty and departments. This creates excess costs and workload. This should be done systemically to reduce workloads and costs to individual departments and faculty and to ensure compliance.

What is the approval process? There are three steps, all of which are coordinated via your campus NAGPRA office.

1. Archeological Records Check. The policy enumerates 6 specific databases (3 of them specific to work in CA), such as the California Register of Historical Resources. I have been

told that there are record search fees to be paid by the requesting department that may be in the \$40–200 range per site.

2. Tribal Consultation. Your campus NAGPRA office contacts the California Native American Heritage Commission (or similar, for out-of-state work) to obtain a list of all Tribes with an interest in the proposed field site. Next, a letter must be sent to each tribe inviting them to meet for consultation. In this case, CPP NAGPRA Director Martinez offered to help me draft a letter to each of the tribes (the actual lists of tribes have not been shared with me at this time, so I'm not sure yet how many tribes we might typically be talking about). Following consultation, campuses defer to the wishes of the Tribes, which may include no ground disturbance allowed, or ground disturbance allowed only if chaperoned by an archaeologist and/or Tribal representative, to be paid for by the department. This process has been estimated to take 2-6 months.

There also does not appear to be any sort of appeal process built into the Tribal consultation. As an example of why that might be relevant, in 2023, a nonprofit I was working with on the Chuckwalla NM designation did Tribal consultation for a public-outreach geology trip. We were asked to cancel the whole 4-stop trip without being provided an explanation—other than, months later, one of the Tribal elders mentioned that they had "a problem with geologists". Even if only a small subset of tribes feel similarly, the current process could effectively shut out certain types of field education from broad swaths of the state.

3. Consultation with Other State and/or Federal Agencies. This last step does not actually seem to be mandated by the new CSU policy. Nevertheless, I was told that, in regards to the records lists in step 1, "not all site data resides there," and for this reason, BLM would need to be consulted. (I thought that was the reason for Tribal consultation??) The BLM contact then suggested that field schools should abide by the same permitting requirements as collection of samples for research purposes, and that "It is possible that the BLM California State Office might be needed to be involved, especially in determining how/ when to pursue an ARPA permit from the BLM". Which then potentially opens up a whole new can of worms related to ARPA (the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979), which might require a professional archaeological survey of the entire site, and would also trigger (to my understanding) a NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) review. Here is where we might enter the same regulatory hellscape that the construction or mining industry might face—I haven't vetted the following numbers, but AI estimates \$15,000 - \$60,000 to clear ARPA/NEPA review, for small projects in areas lacking actual archaeological resources. Onerous for private industry, but GAME OVER for CSU field budgets. CSU representatives are meeting with the BLM this week to discuss this further.

In addition, JEDI committee is working on a presidential training for shared governance. Please send any suggestions you may have to Dr. Lloro or Dr. Wachs.