Academic Senate CSU

May 3-5, 2006
Thursday, 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Social hour, 5:00-6:00 p.m.
Friday, 8:30 a.m.-noon (est. time)

Organizational Meeting of 2006-07 Senate
Friday, 1:00 p.m. - 3 p.m. (est. time)

Dumke Auditorium, CSU Headquarters
401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA

Agenda

1. Call to order 10:00 a.m.

2. Roll call

3. Approval of agenda

4. Approval of minutes

5. Announcements/Communications

6. Presentations/Introductions

7. Reports:
   7.1. Chair
   7.2. Standing committees
   7.3. Other committees and committee liaisons
   7.4. Chancellor Reed (Time certain 11:00 a.m., Thursday)
   7.5. Trustee Herbert Carter (Time certain 4:00 p.m., Thursday)
   7.6. Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
   7.7. John Travis, President, CFA
   7.8. Craig Smith, Faculty Trustee
   7.9. Hironao Okahana, CSSA Liaison

8. Committee Recommendations:
   8.1 Reinstating the CSU Academic Conference AS-2732-06/FA
       Second Reading
   8.2 Providing Lecturers With Timely Academic Support AS-2733-06/FA
       Second Reading
   8.3 Academic Senate CSU Calendar of 2006-2007 Meetings AS-2734-06/EX
       Second Reading
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Concern About Faculty Salary Inversion and Compression</td>
<td>AS-2737-06/FGA/FA</td>
<td>Second Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Availability of Paper Copy of CSU Catalog</td>
<td>AS-2739-06/AA</td>
<td>Second Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Creation of a Statewide Database of CSU Extension Enrollees</td>
<td>AS-2740-06/AA</td>
<td>Second Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Opposition to Morrow’s Purported “Student Bill of Rights” (current iteration SB1412) and a Reaffirmation of Academic Freedom</td>
<td>AS-2741-06/AA/FA/FGA</td>
<td>Second Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Timely Notification about Private Security Personnel on CSU Campuses</td>
<td>AS-2742-06/FA</td>
<td>Second Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Support for Subject Matter-Teacher Education Faculty Collaboration</td>
<td>AS-2743-06/TEKR</td>
<td>Second Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Opposition to AB 2168 (Liu): A Single, Common General Education Curriculum</td>
<td>AS-2744-06/AA/FA</td>
<td>Second Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>Title 5 Language to Accommodate the Independent Doctorate of Education Within the CSU</td>
<td>AS-2746-06/AA/TEKR</td>
<td>Second Reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Adjournment
REINSTITUTING THE CSU ACADEMIC CONFERENCE

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge that the CSU reinstitute the Annual CSU Academic Conference; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU communicate the will of the Academic Senate CSU to Chancellor Charles B. Reed, and the Board of Trustees of the CSU.

RATIONALE: For 26 years, the California State University hosted an annual conference dedicated wholly to academic matters. The 26th Annual CSU Academic Conference, Quality Education through Diversity, in February/March 2001, was the last one held.

It would be timely to resume the Academic Conference.

This annual conference provides a unique opportunity for representatives from the CSU community to meet and discuss issues facing the CSU in a conference setting away from many of the distractions of daily university life. With all of the campuses involved, well-recognized leaders in the subject matter are invited to provide lectures, lead discussions and offer workshops on issues important to the CSU.
In the past, academic conferences have explored a variety of topics, including diversity, shared governance, service to the region, and high quality education. The academic conference provides the rare but very important opportunity for members of the Board of Trustees to meet with representatives of the academic community from all campuses -- administrators, faculty, staff and students -- to talk about ways of improving the CSU. At one conference, a prominent legislator, Dede Alpert, joined in the discussions and at another the chairs of both the UC and CCC senates attended. Many of the newer members of the BOT have not had the opportunity to attend a CSU Academic Conference nor to interact with members of the campus communities, on topics vital to the future of the university.

An important and continuing focus of the CSU for several years has been facilitating graduation. In addition to facilitating graduation is the equally important obligation of providing high quality education to an ever-increasing number of students. Exploring how best to serve more students and still maintain academic rigor and excellence would be a good theme or focus for such a conference.

SECOND READING – May 4-5, 2006
Providing Lecturers With Timely Academic Support

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) re-affirm its commitment to ensuring that students are provided high quality education and that all lecturers, as well as other faculty, are afforded the necessary facilities and resources to enable that high quality education; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recognize that to offer high quality education, all lecturers should be provided, whenever possible, timely notice of the course(s) they will teach to allow sufficient time to design the course(s); to review and select appropriate course materials; to prepare course syllabi and course outlines for the first day of class; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge CSU to ensure that every lecturer is provided with a suitable office and office furniture to meet with students and to prepare for class; an appropriate computer and printer, and internet access, including access to the campus e-mail and electronic library resources; a telephone; a campus mail box; access to rooms/buildings where s/he will teach and hold office hours; and sufficient staff support to duplicate/distribute course syllabi and other course materials; and be it further
4. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the campuses to provide all lecturers with the necessary technical training and support and other resources to provide accessible information and other technologies to students in a timely manner.

RATIONALE: Given current scheduling time-lines on the campuses, academic units generally know months before the beginning of a semester/quarter what courses will be scheduled, the number of sections for each course that will be offered, and who will staff these classes--and to make timely hiring decisions of lecturers, thus giving instructors adequate time to prepare. With early "real time" online registration, they also know the number of students enrolling in a particular course or course section.

These facts are particularly important in the context of recent lawsuits and legal settlement agreements concerning the rights of disabled students to timely access to course materials and requiring that textbooks and course materials be available to all students on the first day of classes: all faculty need enough time to review course materials and prepare their courses--to select materials well-suited to the needs of all of the students and make them available in a timely manner.

However, the California State University, 2005 Facts says that 47.5% of the faculty in the CSU are part-time; many are hired at the last minute. While CSU is fortunate to have a work force willing and able to accommodate the teaching needs of the CSU, these faculty (and some of their students) suffer from their lack of time to select materials and prepare classes. They are often asked to do
ancillary work (e.g., confer with students) in inadequate spaces--when multiple faculty share the same office and are present at the same time, they have difficulty talking with their students.

These faculty must be provided with the necessary resources to be effective and professional instructors. A functioning office space with a computer, e-mail, phone, and access to the Internet is essential so faculty can meet with their students in an appropriate setting: faculty are required to hold office hours and interact with students, and need a professional setting in which to do so. Timely hiring of and appropriate support for temporary as well as permanent faculty contribute to the quality of education in the CSU.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the following schedule for the 2006-2007 academic year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>September 14-15</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 19</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 8-10</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 8</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>January 17-19</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 9</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 7-9</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 13</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 9-11</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

; and be it further

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

RATIONALE: The California State University Board of Trustees is in the process of determining its meeting dates for 2006-2007, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>September 19-20</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 26</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 14-15</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>January 23-24*</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 13-14*</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 15-16*</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To be confirmed

SECOND READING – May 4-5, 2006
Concern About Faculty Salary Inversion And Compression

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) strongly urge the Chancellor’s Office and the California Faculty Association to address problems of faculty salary inversion and compression.

RATIONALE: The current faculty salary structure in the California State University system remains essentially unchanged since its last major revision in the mid-1990s. On numerous occasions problems with the salary structure have been noted, most notably those of salary compression for faculty at the upper levels of their ranks and—more recently—salary inversion for many of the junior faculty hired in recent years. The inversion issue, tied to the lack of salary increases in recent years as a result of the state’s budget constraints, has generated faculty protests on several CSU campuses, inducing a number of them to address this issue on the local level. The issue, however, is one that needs to be resolved on system wide basis.

Given that the Chancellor has recently made addressing faculty compensation issues a priority, as evidenced by his five-year plan to significantly raise faculty salaries announced in Fall 2005, it seems appropriate that a review of the existing faculty salary structure be undertaken at this time as well..

SECOND READING – May 4-5, 2006
Availability of Paper Copy of CSU Catalog

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) fully support the attached resolution presented by the California Intersegmental Articulation Council.

SECOND READING – May 4-5, 2006
2004-2006 Officers

Chair, North: Michael Dang  UC Davis
(530) 752-3711 fax: (530) 752-1280 mrdang@ucdavis.edu

Vice Chair, North: Liz Linton  Mendocino College
(707) 468-3226 fax (707) 468-3120 lizlinton@mendocino.edu

Chair, South: Janet Rizzioli  CSU Channel Islands
(805) 437-8427 (805) 437-8857 janet.rizzioli@csucis.edu

Vice Chair, South: Maggie Van Riper  Chapman College
(949) 941-2126 941-2178 maggie.vanriper@chapman.edu

March 1, 2006

TO:  Marshelle Thobaben, Chair Academic Senate CSU
FR:  CIAC and TCDA
RE:  Paper Copy Catalog Resolution
CC:  Ann Peacock, Executive Director, Academic Senate CSU

An issue that has been of concern to both Articulation Officers and Transfer Center Directors for some time is the diminishing number of colleges and universities who publish and/or distribute paper catalogs. Our effort to communicate to individual campuses the need for catalogs for Articulation Officers to do their jobs and for Transfer Centers to serve students, however, has not been successful.

Consequently, the professional organizations of the two respective groups—CIAC (California Intersegmental Articulation Council) and CCC-TCUDA (California Community Colleges Transfer Center Directors Association)—have prepared a joint resolution requesting support from the administrations of the three segments of public higher education in California. Included here is that resolution. We are asking that the statewide Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges; the Academic Senate of the California State University; the Academic Senate of the University of California; and the Academic Senates of the various community college districts and university campuses introduce and pass resolutions expressing support for the CIAC/TCUDA statement. We are prepared to assist in that process however we can.

Respectfully,

Michael Dang  UC Davis
Northern CIAC Chair

Janet Rizzoli  CSU Channel Islands
Southern CIAC Chair

Roberta Delgado  Santa Rosa Junior College
Northern TCDA Chair

Heidi Lockhart  Fullerton College
Southern TCDA Chair
RESOLUTION
REQUEST FOR PAPER COPY UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE CATALOGS

Whereas, There is a continuing legislative focus on improving the transfer process through clarity of intersegmental articulation and improved coordination of transfer services; and

Whereas, An increasing number of universities and colleges have in recent years reduced the availability of paper copy catalogs in lieu of less costly CD or online versions; and

Whereas, The Articulation Officers of all segments and the Transfer Center Directors at the California Community Colleges refer to university and college catalogs on a daily basis and often must compare more than one institution at a time, find it difficult and time consuming to work with CD or online versions of university or college catalogs, especially when consulting between the index and the body of multiple catalogs; and

Whereas, Paper copies of university and college catalogs are required tools for Articulation Officers and Transfer Center Directors to effectively and efficiently perform their jobs and meet their goal of making the transfer process more efficient; and

Whereas, Many of the CSU and UC campuses, as well as the University of California Office of the President, require paper copy community college catalogs to complete their articulation agreements; therefore

Be It Resolved, that the California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC) and the Transfer Center Directors Association (TCDA) request the California State University Chancellor and the University of California President to urge their respective campuses to send at least two paper copies of their university catalogs to each of the 109 community colleges (one to the Articulation Officer and one to the Transfer Center Director) and the California Community College Chancellor to urge the community college campuses to send at least two paper copies of their college catalog to each of the 23 California State University and 9 University of California campuses; and

Be It Resolved, that the California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC) and the Transfer Center Directors Association (TCDA) request the California Community College Chancellor and Presidents of Independent Institutions to encourage the exchange of at least one paper copy of their college and university catalogs where applicable admissions agreements or student transfer interest are evident.
Creation of a Statewide Database of CSU Extension Enrollees

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge the Chancellor’s Office to create a database of enrollees in non-credit extension classes offered by all CSU campuses. The database should capture all future enrollees in non-credit extension programs as well as enrollees during the past three years in such programs; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the intent of this list is for the marketing of credit degree programs offered by CSU campuses and that the Statewide Division of Extended Education shall control over access to this list.

RATIONALE: Several CSU campuses have begun offering degree programs through distance education. The creation of a database of enrollees in non-credit extension programs would assist in the marketing such programs.
Opposition to Morrow’s purported “Student Bill of Rights” (current iteration SB 1412) and a reaffirmation of Academic Freedom

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) strongly reaffirm its commitment to upholding and preserving the principles of academic freedom as stated in AS-2675-05/FA and AS-2649-04/FA and as contained in the 1940 Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure with the 1970 Interpretive Comments; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU oppose any attempt, especially those made in the name of academic freedom, to quell open discussion of controversial material in the classroom; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm the AAUP March 4, 2004, statement on “Controversy in the Classroom” including the statement “that instructors should avoid the persistent intrusion of matter, controversial or not, that has no bearing on the subject of instruction.” These principles reflect the University’s fundamental mission to discover knowledge and to disseminate knowledge to its students and the society at large; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU oppose SB 1335 (2004), SB 5 (2005), and its latest instantiation, SB 1412, presented as a “Student Bill of Rights” (the Morrow bill), because
this legislation erodes the role of faculty in determining curriculum (Papers and Policies of the CSU, and HEERA); and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm that it is the faculty who have primary responsibility for and jurisdiction over establishing hiring criteria for faculty positions. Such criteria must derive exclusively from the professional standards set forth by scholarly/professional organizations and by campus faculty (according to the shared governance processes of the University); and be it further

6. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the university and its campuses to foster and honor the free speech rights embedded in the United States Constitution, California Constitution and contractual agreements between university employees and the CSU, and ensure that guests on any campus have full opportunity to appropriate exercise of these rights; and be it further

7. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU finds that there is no need for this draconian unnecessarily invasive measure as existing campus policies protect the freedom of inquiry, research, expression and teaching both inside and beyond the classroom; and be it further

8. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU send this resolution to the Chancellor, the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Presidents, CFA Board, and chairs of the Senate Education Committee and Assembly Higher Education Committee in the California Legislature.
RATIONALE: Academic freedom is essential to the search for truth, knowledge and understanding — the pillar of a university’s fundamental mission of discovery and advancement of knowledge and its dissemination to students and the public. Recent events, including the renewal of the USA PATRIOT Act authorizing the tracking of certain public library books and the monitoring of electronic communications, has greatly chilled the extent to which members of the academic community are willing to freely and openly express their thoughts, opinions, writings or research, fearful of repercussions.

The 2004 controversy concerning the resistance to the appearance of a prominent filmmaker at CSU San Marcos clearly demonstrates the need to clearly articulate and reaffirm the academy’s commitment to academic freedom. The quelling of discussions that are contentious under the guise of a “balanced” approach to controversial issues is antithetical to the function of the university; any such restrictions on freedom to teach, conduct research, publish, and express points of view create obstacles to fulfilling the mission of the university.

Only when universities protect academic freedom and foster the free exchange of ideas can they effectively fulfill their mission of providing high quality educations to the students and to the public.

The suggestion that all retention, tenure, and promotion decisions should be made available via audiotape and/or court reporter is particularly troublesome.
Potentially unintended consequences of the bill are to codify attendance as an acceptable criteria for grading (an example of removal of faculty control of the curriculum) and to leave (student) scholars with the ability to be “free to reach their own conclusions about whether research has validated a particular method or theory” (contrary to accepted methodologies in the disciplines and, interestingly, a de facto endorsement of “intelligent design” or other such non-scientific approaches for those students who elect not to believe in the scientific approach) This provision is in addition to the requested acknowledgement of the state that courses in the social sciences and humanities reflect “the uncertain and unsettled character of all human knowledge in these areas.” Perhaps obviously, there are, in fact, many known facts in the Social Sciences and Humanities. The Holocaust is one such “social science” topic in which many solid facts are known and for which spending time “considering and making students aware of other viewpoints” would be inappropriate.

The hiring constraints suggested within the “student bill of rights” are already addressed by existing federal law.

SECOND READING – May 4-5, 2006
SENATE BILL No. 1412

Introduced by Senator Morrow

February 22, 2006

An act to add Section 66015.8 to the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

SB 1412, as introduced, Morrow. Public postsecondary education: Student Bill of Rights.

(1) Existing law establishes the various segments of the public higher education system in the state. These segments include the University of California, which is administered by the Regents of the University of California, the California State University, which is administered by the Trustees of the California State University, and the California Community Colleges, which is administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

This bill would request the Regents of the University of California, and direct the Trustees of the California State University and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, to develop guidelines and implement specified principles, relating to academic freedom, of a Student Bill of Rights. Among other things, the bill would require the audiotaping of all meetings pertaining to faculty hiring, promotion, and tenure. Because this provision would create new duties for community college districts, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

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

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


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

SECTION 1. Section 66015.8 is added to the Education Code, to read:

66015.8. (a) The Legislature finds and declares, with respect to public institutions of higher education, as follows:

1. The central purposes of the university are the pursuit of truth, the discovery of new knowledge through scholarship and research, the study and reasoned criticism of intellectual and cultural traditions, the teaching and general development of students to help them become creative individuals and productive citizens of a pluralistic democracy, and the transmission of knowledge and learning to a society at large.

2. Free inquiry and free speech within the academic community are indispensable to the achievement of these goals, the freedoms to teach and to learn depend upon the creation of appropriate conditions and opportunities on the campus as a whole as well as in the classrooms and lecture halls, and these purposes reflect the values of pluralism, diversity, opportunity, critical intelligence, openness, and fairness that are the cornerstones of American society.

3. From its first formulation in the 1910 General Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors, the concept of academic freedom has been premised on the idea that human knowledge is the pursuit of truth, that there is no humanly accessible truth that is not, in principle, open to challenge.

4. Academic freedom is most likely to thrive in an environment of intellectual diversity that protects and fosters independence of thought and speech, and that academic freedom protects the intellectual independence of professors, researchers, and students in the pursuit of knowledge and the expression of ideas from interference by legislators or authorities within the institution itself.
(5) Intellectual independence means the protection of students from the imposition of any orthodoxy of a political, religious, or ideological nature. To achieve the intellectual independence of students, teachers should not take unfair advantage of their position of power over a student by indoctrinating him or her with the teacher’s own opinions before a student has had an opportunity fairly to examine other opinions upon the matters in question, and before a student has sufficient knowledge and life experience to be entitled to form any definitive opinion of his or her own, and students should be free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion.

(b) To secure the intellectual independence of students, and to protect the principles of intellectual diversity, the Regents of the University of California are requested to, and the Trustees of the California State University and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges are directed to, develop guidelines and implement the following principles of the Student Bill of Rights:

(1) Students shall be graded solely on the basis of their reasoned answers and appropriate knowledge of the subjects and disciplines they study, attendance, class participation, and other generally accepted grading criteria, not on the basis of their political or religious beliefs. Furthermore, each college and university should have well-known and publicly accessible policies and procedures available to students who believe that they have been penalized for their social, political, or ideological beliefs.

(2) Curricula and reading lists in the humanities and social sciences shall respect the uncertainty and unsettled character of all human knowledge in these areas, and provide students with dissenting sources and viewpoints. While teachers are and should be free to pursue their own findings and perspectives in presenting their views, they should consider and make their students aware of other viewpoints. Academic disciplines should welcome a diversity of approaches to unsettled questions.

(3) Exposing students to the spectrum of significant scholarly viewpoints on the subjects examined in their courses is a major responsibility of faculty. Faculty shall not use their courses or
their positions for the purpose of political, ideological, religious, or antireligious indoctrination.

(4) The selection of speakers, allocation of funds for speakers’ programs, and other student activities shall observe the principles of academic freedom and promote intellectual pluralism.

(5) An environment conducive to the civil exchange of ideas being an essential component of a free university, the obstruction of invited campus speakers, the destruction of campus literature, or any other effort to obstruct this exchange shall not be tolerated.

(6) Knowledge advances when individual scholars are free to reach their own conclusions about whether research has validated a particular method or theory.

(7) Formal or informal quota systems shall not be used in making decisions regarding faculty hiring, promotions, and tenure.

(8) All faculty shall be hired, fired, promoted, and granted tenure on the basis of their competence and appropriate knowledge in the fields of their expertise, and, in the humanities, the social sciences, and the arts, with a view toward fostering a plurality of methodologies and perspectives. No faculty member shall be hired or fired or denied promotion or tenure solely on the basis of his or her political or religious beliefs.

(9) No faculty member shall be excluded from tenure, search, or hiring committees on the basis of his or her political or religious beliefs.

(10) (A) All meetings pertaining to faculty hiring, promotion, and tenure must be audiotaped. The audiotapes shall be maintained and made available for review by appropriate authorities for compliance with state and federal laws and systemwide or campus policies. The audiotapes shall be maintained in a manner that affords the same privacy protections as other personnel-related materials.

(B) At his or her own expense, any person under consideration for faculty hiring, promotion, or tenure may arrange for transcription of that portion of the meeting by a certified court reporter. The court reporter shall be instructed to refer to all participants in the meeting as “Speaker A,” “Speaker B,” et cetera, rather than by their actual names or titles. The campus or academic department conducting the meeting shall inform the
person under consideration of this right at least seven days prior
to the meeting so as to allow sufficient time for that person to
arrange for the certified court reporter. The services of the
certified court reporter shall be paid for by the person under
consideration.

SEC. 2. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that
this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to
local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made
pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division
4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.
Timely Notification about Private Security Personnel on CSU Campuses

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) express concern about the use of private security personnel on CSU campuses; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly urge campus senates, in conjunction with other appropriate bodies in the campus community, to participate in the development and/or review of local guidelines or recommendations with respect to the use of any private security personnel on their campuses; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly recommend that these guidelines or recommendations include language about notifying the campus community, when possible, when private security personnel are hired; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly recommend that these guidelines or recommendations also include language which ensures that any private security personnel that might be retained by a CSU campus be clearly informed regarding the diverse nature of the campus community and the types of communications and interactions that they may encounter, in order to promote safe and appropriate interactions between these security personnel and the campus community.
RATIONALE: Each of the CSU campuses has internal security personnel supported by public funding via the CSU budget and trained for the complexities of working in a university context. In addition, some campuses seek supplementary help from private security personnel. This practice is even more common during times of reduced funding when campus security units have difficulty maintaining an adequate level of staffing.

Often the faculty, staff and students are not aware of the presence on campus of private security personnel. Because universities operate according to a collegial ethos whose nature may be unfamiliar to people outside the university, campuses cannot ensure that private security personnel will be adequately prepared for the unique challenges of working in a diverse and multicultural university setting.

This resolution proposes a means of taking preventive measures to minimize or avoid the problems that may arise when private security personnel are hired on the campuses.
Support for *Subject Matter-Teacher Education* Faculty Collaboration

1. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) recognize that one of the primary missions of the California State University System is the preparation of high quality teachers for the public schools of California; and be it further

2. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU affirm its support for strong collaborative process between faculty members with specific *subject matter* expertise and faculty members with *teacher preparation* expertise, in the development and implementation of high quality teacher preparation programs; and be it further

3. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU commend those campuses that have established meaningful faculty incentives and rewards within their retention, tenure and promotion policies intended to encourage faculty collaboration in support of the development and implementation of high quality teacher preparation programs; and be it further

4. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge those campuses that presently do not have meaningful faculty incentives and rewards incorporated within their retention tenure and promotion policies, intended to encourage *teacher preparation-subject matter* faculty collaboration in support of the development and implementation of high quality teacher preparation programs, to address this deficiency.
RATIONALE: Ample data exist that support the notion that the State’s highest quality K-12 teachers possess both strong subject matter foundations and preparation and strong pedagogical training. Both to encourage and support faculty collaboration between colleagues from a broad spectrum of subject matter disciplines, and colleagues from colleges, schools and departments of education, it is important to provide both incentives and rewards for those faculty who are working in support of one of the primary missions of the CSU System. Because these collaborative efforts occur in conjunction with faculty member’s academic assignments, acknowledging and rewarding those efforts through a campus’s retention, tenure and promotion policies and procedures is particularly appropriate. Clearly the CSU Mathematics and Science Teacher Initiative represents one of several system-wide enterprises that will benefit from the strongest possible subject matter-teacher preparation faculty collaboration.

SECOND READING – May 4-5, 2006
Opposition to AB 2168 (Liu): A Single, Common General Education Curriculum

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) strongly, clearly and unambiguously oppose AB 2168 as an egregious intrusion by the legislature in the faculty right and obligation to control the curriculum.

RATIONALE: This legislation is completely unnecessary. The unintended consequence of this legislation would be to remove from GE Oral communication and Critical Thinking. The CSU has spent thousands of person hours in a variety of forums to deal with transfer. This bill’s wish is to cure a problem in the University of California (UC) by changing the CSU. This is not acceptable.
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Opposition to AB 2168 (Liu): A Single, Common General Education Curriculum

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) strongly, clearly and unambiguously oppose AB 2168 as an egregious intrusion by the legislature in the faculty right and obligation to control the curriculum.

RATIONALE: This legislation is completely unnecessary. The unintended consequence of this legislation would be to remove from GE Oral communication and Critical Thinking. The CSU has spent thousands of person hours in a variety of forums to deal with transfer. This bill’s wish is to cure a problem in the University of California (UC) by changing the CSU. This is not acceptable.
An act to amend Sections 66720 and 66739.5 of the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 2168, as introduced, Liu. Public postsecondary education: common core curriculum.

(1) Existing law establishes the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in this state. These segments include the California State University, the campuses of which are administered by the Trustees of the California State University, the University of California, which is administered by the Regents of the University of California, and the California Community Colleges, which is administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Existing law establishes community college districts, which operate campuses that provide instruction to students throughout the state.

Existing law, known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, sets forth the missions of the segments of postsecondary education. Provisions of the act are applicable to the University of California only to the extent that the regents act, by resolution, to make these provisions applicable. An existing provision of the act requires the governing bodies of the 3 public postsecondary segments, with appropriate consultation with the Academic Senates of the respective segments, to develop, maintain, and disseminate a common core curriculum in general education courses for the purposes of transfer. This provision requires that a person who has successfully completed the transfer core curriculum is to be deemed to have completed all
lower division general education requirements for the University of California and the California State University.

This bill would express findings and declarations of the Legislature with respect to the necessity for a single, common core curriculum of general education requirements between the University of California and the California State University. The bill would express the intent of the Legislature that an integrated single common core curriculum be developed and maintained by the 3 public postsecondary segments in a manner that protects and perpetuates faculty responsibility in determining the contents of that curriculum.

This bill would require the board of governors and the trustees, and request the regents, in consultation with the Academic Senates and with student representatives of the respective segments, to jointly develop, maintain, and disseminate a single common core curriculum for the purposes of transfer on or before June 1, 2008.

(2) Existing law establishes a program with the purpose of ensuring that community college students who wish to earn baccalaureate degrees at a campus of the California State University are able to do so. Existing law requires the Chancellor of the California State University to carry out specified tasks in connection with the establishment of this program.

Existing law requires the Chancellor of the California State University to establish admissions requirements for community college transfer students in accordance with specified criteria. Existing law requires the Chancellor of the California State University, in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University and with the faculty responsible for each high-demand baccalaureate degree major program, to specify for each high-demand baccalaureate program major a systemwide lower division transfer curriculum. This provision declares that it is not to be construed to limit in any way the ability of students to gain admission through alternative paths to transfer, such as the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum or the California State University General Education-Breadth Requirements.

This bill would add the single common core curriculum to be developed, maintained, and disseminated on or before June 1, 2008, pursuant to this bill to the list of alternative paths to transfer in this provision.

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

(1) Students and families who choose the California Community Colleges, as an excellent and affordable lower division path to a high-quality four-year degree, face a tangled maze of degree requirements and general education patterns.

(2) The transfer function is one of the most cost-effective aspects of postsecondary education in California; its effectiveness is a critical matter for the prudent use of resources and for providing a clear path to each person’s educational goals.

(3) Simplicity brings clarity for students and families. Students should be able to keep their options open to compete for the best they can achieve in a fair admissions process or be able to arrange a transfer admission guarantee to a specific campus if preferred.

(4) A single, common core curriculum of general education requirements between the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU) is necessary for an understandable set of requirements, and can be accomplished, as it was in the agreements related to the high school “A-G” pattern, through consultation, accommodation, and professionalism.

(5) Simplicity should not be imposed on academic content. California’s renowned academic excellence and academic freedom are protected only when curriculum is solely within the purview of faculty, who are in a position to determine the skills and bodies of knowledge that should be required in a general education pattern. Additionally, agreement upon curricula is not a one-time project. It is an ongoing regular responsibility of the segments—an evolving process that must reflect the most current content or California will suffer from stagnant education.

(6) While it is important that general education requirements not differ between UC and CSU, it is acceptable and valuable for there to be variations by discipline; for example, for those preparing in the sciences, so that students may maximize the value of their lower-division preparation as it relates to their eventual educational goals.

(b) Thus, it is the intent of the Legislature that an integrated single common core curriculum be developed and maintained by
UC, CSU, and the California Community Colleges in a manner that protects and perpetuates faculty responsibility in determining the contents of that curriculum.

SEC. 2. Section 66720 of the Education Code is amended to read:

66720. The (a) On or before June 1, 2008, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Regents of the University of California, and the Trustees of the California State University shall, and the Regents of the University of California are requested to, with appropriate consultation with the approval of the Academic Senates of the respective segments, shall and appropriate consultation with student representatives of the respective segments, jointly develop, maintain, and disseminate a single common core curriculum in general education courses for the purposes of transfer. The single common core curriculum developed, maintained, and disseminated pursuant to this section may contain variations by academic discipline, but not by segment. Any

(b) Any person who has successfully completed the transfer core curriculum; shall be deemed to have thereby completed all lower division general education requirements for the University of California and the California State University. The single common core curriculum developed pursuant to this section shall be utilized as the general education component in all transfer agreement programs.

SEC. 3. Section 66739.5 of the Education Code is amended to read:

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

1. The California Master Plan and supporting statutes place utmost importance on the effective transfer of community college students to the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU) as a means of providing access to the baccalaureate degree.
2. In 2002, CSU enrolled 55,000 transfer students from community colleges.
3. Two out of three students who earn CSU baccalaureate degrees begin in a community college.
(4) Effective use of state and student time and resources would be maximized by students accruing fewer unrequired units in earning their degrees.

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

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

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

(c) This section shall not be construed to limit in any way the ability of students to gain admission through alternative paths to transfer, such as the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) or, the California State University General Education-Breadth Requirements, or the single common core curriculum, which shall be developed, maintained, and disseminated pursuant to Section 66720 on or before June 1, 2008.

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

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

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

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

(1) On or before June 1, 2005, the Chancellor of CSU, in consultation with the Academic Senate of CSU and with the faculty responsible for each high-demand baccalaureate degree
major program, shall specify for each high-demand baccalaureate
program major a systemwide lower division transfer curriculum
composed of at least 45 semester course units, or the quarter-unit
equivalent, that will be common across all CSU campuses
offering specific major programs.
(2) (A) The systemwide lower division transfer curriculum for
each high-demand baccalaureate degree major program shall be
composed of at least 45 semester units, or the quarter-unit
equivalent, and shall include all of the following:
(i) General education courses.
(ii) Any other lower division courses required for graduation.
(iii) Lower division components of the student’s declared
major.
(iv) Elective units, as appropriate.
(B) The coursework described in subparagraph (A) shall be
designated by the CSU faculty responsible for the student’s
major degree program.
(3) The systemwide lower division transfer curriculum shall be
specified in sufficient manner and detail so that existing and
future community college lower division courses may be
articulated, according to the usual procedures, to the
corresponding CSU courses or course descriptions.
(g) (1) On or before June 1, 2006, the Chancellor of CSU and
the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, in
consultation with the Academic Senate of the California
Community Colleges, shall articulate those lower division,
baccalaureate-level courses at each campus of the California
Community Colleges that meet for each degree major the
systemwide lower division transfer curriculum requirements
specified in paragraph (1) of subdivision (f).
(2) To the extent that the goals of efficiency and urgency are
advanced, existing articulation procedures such as the California
Articulation Number (CAN) program shall be employed.
(3) On or before June 1, 2006, each CSU campus shall have
identified any additional specific, nonelective course
requirements beyond the systemwide lower division transfer
curriculum requirements for each major, up to a maximum of 60
semester units or the quarter-unit equivalent, for the systemwide
and campus-specific requirements combined. To the extent these
additional course requirements are identified, each CSU campus shall provide that information to all community colleges.

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

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

(1) Completion of the 60 semester units of college-level coursework, or the quarter-unit equivalent, specified for the student’s major degree program.

(2) Declaration of a major.

(3) Satisfactory completion of the systemwide lower division transfer curriculum requirements for the student’s declared major.

(4) Satisfactory completion of any requirements beyond the systemwide lower division transfer curriculum that are specified by the CSU destination campus.

(5) Any impaction criteria for that campus or major.

(i) A CSU campus shall guarantee that the transfer students admitted under this section will be able to complete the baccalaureate degree in the minimum number of course units required for that degree.
Title 5 Language to Accommodate the Independent Doctorate of Education within the CSU

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) endorse and recommend the attached Title V language for submission to the CSU Board of Trustees.

RATIONALE: The appended language is congruent with the legislative intent and requirements of SB-724 (2005). Given faculty control of the curriculum it is imperative that the policies governing the curriculum of the Ed.D. be approved by the Academic Senate CSU prior to such changes to Title 5. This resolution documents such approval.

The version sent out to campuses (April, 2006) is a preliminary version of the proposed title 5 language subject to modification prior to Senate action (May, 2006) and the Board of Trustee’s action (July, 2006)

SECOND READING – May 4-5, 2006
§ 40050.1 Function: Instruction Leading to the Doctor of Education Degree.

Notwithstanding Section 40050, the Doctor of Education degree may be awarded independently of any other institution of higher education, provided that the program leading to the degree satisfies the criteria in Subdivision (b) of Section 40511.

§ 40100. Authorization to Establish Curricula.

A campus may be authorized by the Board of Trustees to establish and maintain curricula leading to the bachelor’s degree, and the master’s degree, and the doctoral degree provided, that in the case of the doctoral degree, the requirements of Section 40050 and Section 40050.1 are satisfied.

§ 40511. The Doctor of Education Degree.

(a) A California State University program leading to a Doctor of Education degree is distinguished from a University of California doctoral degree program by its conformity to the criteria in Subdivision (b).

(b) A California State University program leading to a Doctor of Education degree shall:

1. prepare administrative leaders for possible service in one or more of the following settings:
   (A) public elementary schools.
   (B) public secondary schools.
   (C) community colleges;

2. focus on the knowledge and skills needed by administrators to be effective leaders in California public schools and community colleges;

3. be offered through partnerships in which California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges, as appropriate, shall participate substantively in program design, candidate recruitment and admissions, teaching, dissertation development, and program assessment and evaluation;

4. enable professionals to earn the degree while working full time.

(c) Each campus shall create and distribute to each student enrolled in a program leading to the Doctor of Education degree a student manual or handbook detailing, at a minimum, the following:
(1) requirements for admission with classified status;
(2) policy on the transfer of credit earned at other institutions;
(3) policy on professional ethics and academic integrity;
(4) policies on student fees;
(5) provisions for advising;
(6) policy and procedures for petitioning for a variance in academic requirements;
(7) policy and procedures for obtaining a leave of absence or withdrawing from the university;
(8) policy and procedures regarding student grievances;
(9) policy on harassment and discrimination;
(10) policy and procedures for establishing and amending a plan of study;
(11) requirements for satisfactory progress in the program;
(12) policy on academic probation;
(13) requirements for field experience;
(14) requirements for advancement to candidacy;
(15) policies and procedures for the formation of a committee for administering a qualifying examination (if the qualifying examination is unique to the individual student);
(16) dissertation requirements;
(17) policies and procedures for the formation of a committee for supervising a dissertation;
(18) forms to be completed by students in the course of the degree program;
(19) the names and areas of expertise of faculty members affiliated with the degree program.

§ 40512. The Doctor of Education Degree: Requirements.

(a) Advancement to Candidacy. For advancement to candidacy for the Doctor of Education degree, the student shall meet the requirements of Section 41011 and such particular requirements as the chancellor and the campus may prescribe. The requirements shall include a qualifying examination.

(b) To be eligible for the Doctor of Education degree, the candidate shall have completed the following minimum requirements:

(1) The completion of a specified pattern of study approved by the appropriate campus authority.

(A) The curriculum shall be organized as a cohort-based program and shall include learning experiences that balance research, theory, and practice, including field
experiences. The core curriculum shall provide professional preparation for leadership, including theory and research methods, the structure and culture of education, and leadership in curriculum and instruction, equity, and assessment.

(B) The pattern of study shall be composed of at least 60 semester units earned in graduate status. At least two-thirds of the units required for the degree shall be in courses organized primarily for doctoral students, and the remaining units required for the degree shall be in courses organized primarily for master’s or doctoral students.

(C) At least 21 semester units shall be completed in residence at the campus or campuses awarding the degree. The appropriate campus authority may authorize the substitution of credit earned by alternate means for part of this residence requirement. The campus may establish a transfer policy allowing application to degree requirements of relevant coursework and credits completed as a matriculated student in another graduate program, on the condition that the other program is appropriately accredited.

(D) A grade point average of 3.0 (grade of B) or better shall be maintained in all courses taken to satisfy the requirements for the degree, except that a course in which no letter grade is assigned shall not be used in computing the grade point average.

(2) The completion of a dissertation.

(A) The dissertation shall be the written product of systematic, rigorous research on a significant professional issue. The dissertation is expected to contribute to an improvement in professional practices or policy. It shall evidence originality, critical and independent thinking, appropriate form and organization, and a rationale.

(B) The dissertation shall identify the research question, state the major assumptions, explain the significance of the undertaking and relate it to the relevant scholarly and professional literature, set forth the sources for and methods of gathering data, analyze the data, and offer a conclusion or recommendation. It shall include a written abstract that summarizes the significance of the work, objectives, methodology, and a conclusion or recommendation.

(C) No more than 12 semester units shall be allowed for a dissertation.

(D) An oral defense of the dissertation shall be required.

(c) The student shall complete all requirements for the degree within a time limit established by the campus. The time shall be measured from the point of a student’s matriculation in the doctoral program. The time limit shall be at least five years but no greater than seven years. It shall apply to all students enrolled in the program, but a student may be granted an extension of time beyond the limit by the appropriate campus authority if

(1) the extension is warranted by individual circumstances and

(2) the outdated work is validated by a demonstration of competence prescribed by the campus.