AGENDA  Academic Senate CSU

January 20-21, 2005
Thursday, 10:00 a.m.- 5:00 p.m.;
Social hour, 6:00 p.m.;
Friday, 8:00 a.m.-noon (est. time)

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

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of agenda
4. Approval of minutes
5. Announcements/Communications
6. Introductions
7. Reports:
   7.1. Chair
   7.2. Standing committees
   7.3. Other committees
   7.4. Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence (Time certain: 1:00 pm, Thursday)
   7.5. Executive Vice Chancellor Richard West (Time certain: 2:00 pm, Thursday)
   7.6. Kathleen Kaiser, Faculty Trustee
   7.7. Kate Clark, California Community Colleges Academic Senate President
   7.8. John Travis, CFA President
   7.9. Jeff Obayashi, CSSA Academic Senate Liaison
8. Committee Recommendations:
   8.1 Service of Lecturer Faculty on Campus  AS-2674-04/FA
      Academic Senates  Second Reading
   8.2 Reaffirmation of Academic Freedom  AS-2675-04/FA
      Second Reading
   8.3 Academic Freedom for Students  AS-2676-04/FA
      Second Reading
   8.4 Opposition to the California Performance Review’s  AS-2677-04/AA
      Proposed Mandatory Community Service  Second Reading
      Graduation Requirement
   8.5 Flexibility in Student Completion of the General  AS-2678-04/AA
      Education Package Prior to Upper Division Transfer  Second Reading
   8.6 Maintaining the Quality of Faculty Who Teach  AS-2679-04/AA
      in the Extended University  Second Reading
9. Adjournment
Service of Lecturer Faculty on Campus Academic Senates

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) commend the more than 75 percent of campus senates (at least 18) that consider lecturer faculty eligible for Academic Senate membership; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU commend especially those campuses that have established policies ensuring equitable representation of lecturers; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU encourage campus senate chairs to discuss with their constituencies and each other, and to develop a common understanding of, the current state of, and possible best practice about how all CSU faculty can participate in the shared governance process.

RATIONALE: In the past decade, CSU faculties have included among their numbers a significant percent (currently approximately 54%) of individuals identified technically as “temporary,” more accurately as non-tenure-track, and colloquially as lecturer faculty; over time, a majority of the campuses has chosen to recognize them as eligible for positions on the campus senates. It is to the clear advantage of any campus representative body to ensure that it formally acknowledge and provide designated
positions for this cadre of faculty, who provide substantial amounts of teaching,
research, and campus or statewide service--in some instances, having served as officers
of their campus senates and in at least three having served on the Academic Senate
CSU. It would be similarly advantageous if the campuses were to develop a shared
understanding about practices throughout CSU for lecturer representation and rights
on the campus senates, consistent with the needs and wishes of each of the individual
campuses, and to identify those that most closely resemble “best” practice for ensuring
appropriate representation of this subset of faculty.

SECOND READING – January 20-21, 2005
Reaffirmation of Academic Freedom

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University (CSU) strongly reaffirm its commitment to upholding and preserving the principles of academic freedom as stated in 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 (http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/1940stat.htm);

and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU affirm that 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

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; that these 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 that conditions of hiring never include reference to political and/or religious affiliations; and be it further
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

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge that the CSU and local campus senates undertake a substantive review of existing campus policies for the protection of freedom of inquiry, research, expression and teaching both inside and beyond the classroom.

RATIONALE: Academic freedom is essential to the search for truth, knowledge and understanding. Recent events, including the passage 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 recent controversy concerning the appearance of a prominent filmmaker at CSU San Marcos 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 must not be allowed. Academic freedom is the pillar of a university’s fundamental mission of discovery and advancement of knowledge and its dissemination to students and the public. Restrictions on freedom to teach, conduct research, express points of view, and publish create obstacles in 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.
Academic Freedom and Free Speech Rights

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) reaffirm its commitment to upholding and preserving the principles of academic freedom: the right of faculty to teach, conduct research or other scholarship, and publish free of external constraints other than those normally denoted by the scholarly standards of a discipline; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU call upon the campuses to foster the free speech rights embedded in the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and to ensure that guests on any campus have full opportunity to the appropriate exercise of these rights; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU call on the university community to ensure that the campuses be open forums for free expression of ideas and diverse views in the framework of scholarly inquiry and professional ethics; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU encourage the local campus senates to develop or review campus policies for the protection of freedom of inquiry, research, expression, and teaching both inside the classroom and beyond; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU call for review and, if necessary, repeal, of any CSU or campus policy that would restrict academic freedom under justifications such as “security” or “a balanced approach” to controversial issues.

RATIONALE: In recent years, in the name of security, some universities have developed policies that place restrictions on academic freedom. There have been attempts to quell discussion of contentious issues under the guise of a need for a “balanced” approach to controversial issues. Academic freedom is the pillar of a university’s fundamental mission of discovery and advancement of knowledge and its dissemination to students and the public. Restrictions on freedom to teach, conduct research, express points of view, and publish create obstacles in fulfilling the academic 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 education to the students and to the public.

APPROVED – May 6-7, 2004
Academic Freedom for Students

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU),
   recognize that the academic freedom of students rests first upon their access to a high
   quality education and their right to select the most appropriate and desirable field of
   study; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm its support of the principles of
   academic freedom as they apply to the rights of students to a classroom and university
   environment that fosters respect, open inquiry and freedom of expression; and be it
   further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU affirm further that these principles also
   support the University’s mission to foster in students a maturity and independence of
   mind by providing within the classroom and university an environment where students
   and faculty are free to express the widest range of viewpoints within the standards of
   scholarly inquiry and professional ethics; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge all campus senates to review and/or
   create policies and procedures that advance the principles stated above; and be it
   further
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU also urge campus senates to make these policies and procedures easily accessible and undertake processes to educate their campus community about the meanings of academic freedom as they apply to students and faculty.

RATIONALE: The Academic Senate of the California State University reminds the public that they endorse the importance of academic freedom for students as well as faculty members and that the CSU and its campuses have procedures for both students and faculty who believe their rights to academic freedom have been violated. Further, essential to the acceptance of the concept of academic freedom is the notion that truth is best discovered through the open investigation of data and through a broad and open inquiry regardless of personal beliefs. Such inquiry requires an atmosphere devoid of fear of reprisal, or ridicule.

SECOND READING – January 20-21, 2005
Opposition to the California Performance Review’s Proposed Mandatory Community Service Graduation Requirement

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) affirm its support for voluntary, not mandatory, community service and service learning programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm AS-2488-00/AA (March 9-10, 2000), noting that the budget cuts of the last three years do not permit CSU’s funding the administrative infrastructure necessary to support a required community service graduation requirement, even at 16 hours, and affirming our calling upon “the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to work with the Governor and the Legislature to provide the CSU local campuses and their faculties with the infrastructure support required to provide opportunities for all CSU students who so desire to engage in [community] service....”

RATIONALE: We are responding to the call from the California Performance Review (CPR): “students attending the state’s public colleges and universities should be required to perform a minimum amount of community service” in return for “the
significant investment of taxpayer funds in their education and their future….” The call for required community service reflects a number of noble objectives. However, there are significant drawbacks to this proposal:

First, our opposition to this proposal is based on the fundamental incompatibility of a “requiring” “voluntary” work. The quality of the learning experience is fundamentally different when the student is compelled to be present, rather than volunteering as at present.

Second, the resources required to go from the present level of community service, approximately 15% of the student body in 2003-04, will be substantial. While CSU has promised to increase over time the community service effort, to phase in a 100% community service requirement would require resources far beyond what is contemplated under any reasonable budget scenario today.

Third, CPR’s call for required community service states that the CPR recognizes that CSU and other “public colleges and universities enroll a significant number of students who have full-time employment or who have significant family responsibilities; it is not a desire to create an undue hardship on these or any other students. This minimum number of community service hours is recommended as a first step toward public college and university students in providing their communities with a small amount of
their time in exchange for a significant public investment in their higher education.”

This statement does not take into account that students who are less than full-time
would likely have a reduced community service requirement. While 16 hours is
minimal, less than 16 is silly.

Fourth, it is not clear that there are sufficient, meaningful placements in the state’s
nonprofit organizations to accommodate over 2 million college students, compared
with the estimated 50,000 or more that CSU campuses currently place, along with
complicable numbers from the University of California and the community colleges.

Fifth, required community service would also involve a substantial increase in
placements and overhead, and many would be further from campuses than at present,
producing transportation, child care, and other difficulties.

CSU’s record of encouraging community service and service learning activities has
produced a plethora of activities on every campus, along with one campus (Monterey
Bay) whose curriculum has been designed to incorporate and require service learning.
The voluntary approach has produced increasing numbers of both students and
organizations participating over time. The voluntary nature of this service is working
well, but to compel it would be to change it fundamentally in the wrong direction.

SECOND READING – January 20-21, 2005
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University, having requested and received thoughtful input from each of the local campuses and their faculties indicating strong support for an ethic of volunteerism and for community service and service learning programs, affirm our support for both these programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to work with the Governor and the Legislature to provide the CSU local campuses and their faculties with the infrastructure support required to provide opportunities for all CSU students who so desire to engage in a broad spectrum of meaningful service activities within their communities.

RATIONALE: The Academic Senate of the California State University recognize that a plethora of community service and service learning opportunities exists in the CSU and commends them to the attention of the Governor.

Additionally, the Academic Senate CSU recognizes that CSU faculty, programs and campuses have responded effectively to the call for community service and service learning programs in their local regions.

Furthermore, the Academic Senate CSU recognizes that authority, responsibility and accountability for community service and service learning programs properly resides with local campuses and their faculties.

And finally, because a strong correlation exists between the quality of community service and service learning programs and the sufficiency and stability of funding needed to sustain them, the Governor, Legislature, Board of Trustees, and Chancellor need to commit to providing the resources required to insure local program excellence.

An Executive Summary containing comments from the individual campuses of the California State University is attached in further support of this resolution.

APPROVED – March 9-10, 2000
An Executive Summary from the Academic Affairs Committee

On

Community Service and Service Learning

In

The California State University

1) State of Community Service and Service Learning in the CSU
On May 6-7, 1999, the Academic Senate of the California State University passed a resolution (AS-2455-99/AA) which called for a determination of “the appropriate resources and mechanisms to provide the opportunities and incentives necessary to engage CSU students in meaningful service activities,” noting that incentives and opportunities are more appropriate ways of fostering an ethic of service than would mandating community service for all CSU students, and that such mandatory service would raise resources, liability, and public relations issues.

On July 15, 1999, Governor Gray Davis requested that the CSU and the other public higher education segments in California to “establish a community service requirement for undergraduate students.” He asked that such a requirement be approached thoughtfully, and that the Chancellor “develop a plan for adoption by the Trustees that would establish a graduation requirement for community service.” The Governor requested that faculty work together “to create a proposal implementing a community service graduation requirement” and that this process begin with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates.

In August 1999, representatives of the Senates to the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates agreed that response to the community service graduation proposal should be deferred to each of the System senates, and from them to the faculty on the campuses.

On August 12, 1999, a Review of Information and Issues to Consider in Developing a Plan to Require Community Service of Public University Students was prepared by Erika Freihage, Coordinator of Community Service Learning, CSU Chancellor’s Office. This review contained questions to address in the development of a community service requirement; theoretical underpinnings in defining outcomes that such requirement would have on students; input from involved faculty, students, community service and service learning practitioners, community agencies and members; types of service activities that students can
participate in; challenges such as philosophical concerns about mandating community service, placements, coordination of placements, infrastructure support, risk management issues, monitoring the requirement, transportation to community, and logistics; and models of effective community service and service learning programs and initiatives.

On September 9-10, 1999, the Academic Senate of the California State University passed a resolution (AS-2471-99/AA/FGA) which requested that the CSU campus senates consider the Governor’s request for a community service graduation requirement and respond to the Academic Senate CSU by February 1, 2000. In so doing, the Academic Senate CSU requested that the local senates assess the impact of a community service graduation requirement. Their assessment was to focus on such issues as resource allocation, time to degree, liability issues, faculty/staff workload issues and other aspects of implementing such a change.

It is important to reiterate that the California State University has long accepted that part of our mission as a state-supported system of higher education is the promotion of appropriate forms of service to the communities—local, regional and statewide—within which our campuses are located. The desirability of civic engagement on the part of our students is spelled out in the recent Study of the Baccalaureate conducted by the Academic Senate of the California State University.

2) Need for Oversight by CSU Local Campuses and Their Faculties
It is important to note both the responsibility of the faculty in defining curricula and the manner in which core principles of academic freedom grant to the faculty autonomy and rights in the design and execution of their instructional efforts. In response to AS-2471-99/AA/FGA, concerns and input from some CSU campuses include:

a) CSU Fullerton: it is the historic responsibility of the faculty to determine curriculum and graduation requirements
b) CSU Northridge: it is the responsibility of faculty to determine degree requirements
c) SSU: control of the curriculum must reside with the faculty

The CSU as a whole, individual campuses of the CSU, campus administrators, faculty and staff, all could be exposed to potential civil liability should an individual student’s conduct, while engaged in mandatory community service, fall short of that deemed legally acceptable. Although they do not comprise an exhaustive list, issues above related to control of the curriculum, academic freedom, and civil liability compel the Academic Senate of the California State University to agree with other campus constituencies that have declared that community service and service learning must not be mandatory for our students,
but rather should be made available to our students, through opportunities to serve, on a voluntary basis.

The terms and conditions of employment for CSU faculty are subject to collective bargaining. As community service and service learning become increasingly integrated into both the curriculum and co-curriculum of individual CSU campuses, impacts on the workload (i.e. terms and conditions of employment) of Unit-3 employees must be assessed. To the extent faculty involvement in community service and service learning programs requires the dedication of time and effort to either program supervision or assigned time loads, the bargaining agent for Unit-3 personnel must be consulted.

3) Community Service and Service Learning as Opportunities

Fostering an ethic of volunteerism and service to one’s community is considered, by most, to be intrinsically good. However, an ethic of volunteerism and community service cannot truly be fostered by mandated community service.

In response to AS-2471-99/AA/FGA, concerns and input from many CSU campuses include:

a) Bakersfield: the potential benefits and burdens of community service as a requirement may not be shared equally among all members of the diverse CSUB population

b) Fresno: there are philosophical and legal implications of mandating “volunteer” service

c) Fullerton: required community service may present hardships for some students, most notably those with family or work obligations; believe that a service requirement would be inconsistent with the spirit of service

d) Hayward: the idea of requiring community service violates the very spirit of community service

e) Los Angeles: we recognize that there are considerable difficulties, both physical and philosophical, with making such service a graduation requirement; we oppose such service being made mandatory

f) Maritime: feels that the imposition of a mandatory community service component to the graduation requirements of our public colleges and universities should be refuted

g) Monterey Bay: has adopted a service learning graduation requirement through which all CSUMB students engage in community service activities as part of their academic coursework

h) Northridge: the efficacy of mandating volunteerism

i) Sacramento: promotion of service would best be accomplished through incentives

j) San Diego: most community partners did not support a mandatory service requirement because of overwhelming numbers of students, a lack of resources to properly handle a significant increase in volunteers, and a sense
that they are not interested in working with volunteers that “don’t want to be there”

k) San Francisco: provide adequate incentives and appropriate resources for the careful planning and execution of community service learning opportunities for all CSU students than to mandate service as a graduation requirement

l) San Jose: although we recognize the tremendous importance of a community service ethic, we believe that ethic is better instilled through developing incentives and opportunities than in imposing a requirement

m) San Luis Obispo: a service ethic is better fostered by providing incentives and opportunities than by mandating service

n) Sonoma: has not demonstrated any support for requiring community service learning courses as either a part of all majors, or as a graduation requirement

o) Stanislaus: while our commitment to service is visible in both words and action, we are strongly opposed to a graduation requirement of service for students in public institutions of higher education

4) CSU Support for Community Service and Service Learning

It is important to state unequivocally that in our response to the Governor’s request for a community service graduation requirement we:

a) affirm the ethics associated with both community service and volunteerism

b) recognize the considerable value of a vast array of service learning options currently available to students throughout the CSU

c) support and celebrate ongoing community service efforts on the part of both students and their mentors within the CSU

d) recognize the desirability of conducting a needs assessment to identify areas for development and/or expansion of service learning opportunities

e) express a system-wide commitment to encourage, and, whenever possible, provide the resources for expansion of the already impressive efforts in service that take place

f) applaud and support the efforts of our faculty as they work to augment the service learning opportunities available on all campuses of the CSU

In essence, the Academic Senate of the California State University’s position urges support of campus-community efforts in identifying and promoting opportunities and incentives for meaningful service rather than mandating such service. Furthermore, we wish to urge the Governor to carefully examine and ultimately acknowledge the commitment and dedication to service that the faculty and students of the CSU have already shown through the years.

5) Need for Infrastructure Support for CS and SL in the CSU

In response to AS-2471-99/AA/FGA, concerns and input from many CSU campuses indicated the need for infrastructure support for community service and service learning:
a) Bakersfield: the additional budgetary implications of such a proposal will be substantial
b) Fresno: over 107,000 hours of service provided to the community each year by over 3,000 students; estimated 8,000 annual placement opportunities and nearly $500,000 in new funding needed to satisfy mandate
c) Fullerton: urge Governor Davis to support additional funding to provide for further service learning opportunities
d) Hayward: a very large percentage of our students work 20, 30 or more hours a week at paid jobs; a requirement to do community service work would impose a substantial hardship on such students
e) Los Angeles: over 1,200 of our students participate in service programs
f) Monterey Bay: general fund provides approximately $400,000 in annual support for the Service Learning Institute
g) Northridge: requires a significant commitment of additional resources
h) Sacramento: it will require significant infrastructure in both the university and community organizations to handle 2,000-2,500 students per semester; significant new resources will be needed to build this infrastructure
i) San Diego: students, faculty and staff contribute more than 1.2 million hours per year to a wide variety of community endeavors; the implementation costs of establishing and policing such a requirement would be very high in both infrastructure and in personnel
j) San Francisco: currently as many as three quarters of our students engage in some form of service and more than a hundred courses offer significant service learning components
k) San Jose: thousands of students already engage in community service, but many are disadvantaged and do not have the time or other resources to devote themselves to community service at this point in their lives; imposition of a community service requirement would impose significant fiscal and other costs on SJSU (e.g. implementation of a community service requirement could cost up to $1.5 million annually); it is unclear whether the State is prepared to provide the funds necessary to successfully implement a community service requirement
l) San Luis Obispo: more than 3000 students annually engaged in community service and service learning projects
m) San Marcos: more than $500,000 would be needed to meet the mandate for community service and service learning as a graduation requirement
n) Stanislaus: the likelihood is that the 1500-2000 annual placement opportunities needed to satisfy such a mandate are not available; there are significant infrastructure and budgetary implications for the campus; it is estimated that providing the university and the community the services needed to support such a mandate may require form $250,000 to $500,000 annually in new funding
Flexibility in Student Completion of the General Education Package Prior to Upper-division Transfer

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU support the implementation of rules that permit flexibility in student completion of the General Education package prior to upper-division transfer, as has been recently implemented for students majoring in nursing and as embodied in the newly developed Science Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (SCIGETC); and be it further RESOLVED: That specific variations in student completion of the General Education package be deemed acceptable if approved through the normal governance process (recommendation from the appropriate faculty to the General Education Advisory Committee and the Academic Senate CSU’s Academic Affairs Committee).

RATIONALE: It is clear from the number of major preparation courses required in the sciences and other areas that the time to degree is lengthened for community college students who complete the General Education (GE) package in certain majors. Instead, they should be deferring some parts of GE and taking more major preparation courses. The newly developed and approved nursing program, allowing students to transfer after one year in the community colleges, is an example where there are not enough units at the lower-division level typically offered in the community colleges, and...
accelerating transfer is in the interest of both the state, which will receive newly
graduated nurses faster, and the students, who will take less time to finish their
degrees.

The SCIENCE “IGETC” is another example of this sort of flexibility. The SCIGETC
allows the student to defer the completion of three blocks of General Education for
students preparing to major in the sciences or other high-unit lower-division
preparation majors. Up to one course in the humanities, one course in the social
sciences, and the course for Lifelong Understanding may be deferred, with the student
substituting additional lower-division science preparation courses instead.

In order to be eligible for these deferrals, students must complete the identified major
preparation pattern.

This resolution expresses our approval of the implementation of this kind of flexibility,
where appropriate and needed.

SECOND READING – January 20-21, 2005
RESOLVED: That full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty teaching for extra compensation in the Extended University within the faculty member’s academic year may be assigned no more than 12 semester units or the equivalent within a three-year period. Such three-year periods shall begin with the first teaching assignment in the Extended University.

RATIONALE: Some faculty members may attempt excessive teaching loads for extra compensation term after term and year after year in a manner that will undermine the institution of the academic year and the scholarship, research, and professional growth associated with the academic year.

In addition, it may be more difficult to maintain appropriate salary levels when legislators may come to the table armed with anecdotal evidence that faculty earn or can earn very large salaries because of extra compensation earned in the Extended University.

SECOND READING – January 20-21, 2005