

**Academic Senate CSU**

**Plenary Agenda**

Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium

**Thursday**      March 11, 2010      10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. (5:00 if committees do not need  
to reconvene)  
4:00-5:00 Standing Committees reconvene (if needed)

**Senate Social** – Faculty Affairs Committee Hosting - 5:15 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.

**Friday**      March 12, 2010      8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of agenda
4. Approval of minutes
5. Announcements
6. Presentations/Introductions
7. Reports:
  - 7.1. Chair
  - 7.2. Standing committees
  - 7.3. Other committees and committee liaisons
  - 7.4. Gerard Hanley, Senior Director, Academic Technology Services (Time Certain 10:30 a.m. Thursday),
  - 7.5. Ben Quillian, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer & Garrett Ashley, Vice Chancellor, University Relations and Advancement (Time Certain 1:00 p.m., Thursday)
  - 7.6. Allison Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support (Time Certain 10:30 a.m. Friday),
  - 7.7. John Travis, CFA
  - 7.8. Dunixi Guereca, CSSA Liaison
8. Committee Recommendations
  - 8.1. Private Donors' Respect for Academic Freedom AS-2936-10/FA (Rev)  
Second Reading
  - 8.2. Opposition to AB 440, as amended (July 4, 2009), Beal. AS-2937-10/AA/FGA (Rev)  
Second Reading  
California Community Colleges: student transfer
  - 8.3. Openness of the Accountability Process in the Graduate AS-2938-10/AA (Rev)  
Second Reading  
Professional Business Programs

8.4. Use and Implementation of The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)

AS-2939-10/AA (Rev)  
Second Reading

8.5. Proposed Repeal of Title 5 Section 40503 Relative to Bachelor of Vocational Education Degrees

AS-2940-10/AA (Rev)  
Second Reading

9. Adjournment

# # 1 Agenda Item

AS-2936-10/FA (Rev)  
January 21, 2010  
Second Reading

## **Resolution on private donors' respect for academic freedom**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) strongly reaffirm its commitment to academic freedom of the faculty and “the protection of freedom of inquiry, research, expression and teaching both inside and beyond the classroom” (AS-2675-04/FA - November 11-12, 2004); and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm that decisions affecting the curriculum and the selection of the faculty for academic programs are under the purview of campus faculty (AS-2822-07/FA); and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU deplore attempts by private donors to pressure local administrations to intervene in faculty's academic decisions and activities inside and beyond the classroom based upon donors' political and economic views and interests; and be it further
4. RESOLVED: That ASCSU request that the Chancellor Office and campus presidents and provosts educate all CSU employees dealing with donors about the importance of safeguarding academic freedom and remind them of their obligation to convey to the donors the principle of non-intervention in faculty academic decisions inside and beyond the classroom.

RATIONALE: Seeking private funding has become an important way of supplementing the dwindling state support for the higher education. Some of the non-academic organizations

which donate to CSU programs are not familiar with, nor respectful of, the principle of academic freedom as the cornerstone of the university life. In the absence of clear guidelines for the advancement staff to firmly communicate with the donors the principle of non-intervention in faculty's educational decisions, we will run the risk of outside pressure on our faculty to change the content of their educational programs inside and beyond the classroom.

**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**of**  
**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2675-04/FA  
November 11-12, 2004

**Reaffirmation of Academic Freedom**

- 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-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
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU oppose any attempt, made in the name of academic freedom, to quell open discussion of controversial material in the classroom and 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”; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU oppose SB 5, presented as a “Student Bill of Rights” (the Morrow bill), on the grounds that this legislation erodes the role of faculty in determining curriculum (*Papers and Policies of the CSU*, and HEERA); 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 an individual’s 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 and forward relevant policies to the Academic Senate CSU, along with findings and recommendations based upon their campus review, no later than March 15, 2005; and be it further
- 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 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. Specifically, 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 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.*

**APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY – January 20-21, 2005**

**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**of**  
**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2649-04/FA

March 11-12, 2004

**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**

American Association of University Professors



## Controversy in the Classroom

A statement issued by the AAUP's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure

Advertisements have appeared in the campus press by an organization, "Students for Academic Freedom," calling on students to report professors who try to "impose their political opinions" in the classroom. This is not the first time that self-appointed watchdogs of classroom utterances have focused on the professoriate: The John Birch Society undertook that role in the 1960s, an organization called "Accuracy in Academia" did so in the 1980s, and "Campus Watch" assumed that role for professors of Middle Eastern studies after September 11, 2001. What is different is that this organization purports to rely on AAUP principles in condemning the introduction of "controversial matter having no relation to the subject" and to take upon itself the mission of defining what is in and out of bounds.

The AAUP has long maintained that instructors should avoid the persistent intrusion of matter, controversial or not, that has no bearing on the subject of instruction. Any such practice would be expected to be taken up as part of the regular evaluations of teaching routinely conducted in higher education, evaluations that commonly include surveys of student experience.

The advertised call goes well beyond a concern for poor pedagogy, however. It rests on a right, claimed in the name of academic freedom, not to be confronted with controversy in the classroom—not, at least, beyond what the organization conceives of as germane to the subject as defined by it. The project's stated purpose, as its ad puts it, is to rule out of bounds any reference to the war in Iraq in a course whose "subject" is not the war in Iraq, or statements about George W. Bush in a course that is not about "contemporary American presidents, presidential administrations or some similar subject."

Controversy is often at the heart of instruction; good teaching is often served by referring to contemporary controversies even if only to stimulate student interest and debate. If these watchdogs have their way, a professor of classics, history, ethics, or even museum administration could make no reference to the Iraq conflict or to George Bush—in their courses on the Roman Empire, colonialism, the morality of war, or trade in the artifacts of ancient civilizations—because the "subject" of these courses is not *this* war or *this* president. Contrary to defending academic freedom, the project is inimical to it and, indeed, to the very idea of liberal education.

(Posted 03/2/04)

---

American Association of University Professors, 1012 Fourteenth Street, NW, Suite #500; Washington, DC 20005  
202-737-5900 Fax: 202-737-5526

[AAUP Home Page](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Join AAUP](#)

## **ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

Freedom of inquiry and the open exchange of ideas are fundamental to the vitality of our academic institutions. The current notion that freedom and national security are opposed denies the basic premise of a free democratic society where open exchange of information, public access to vital information and ability to openly challenge governmental decisions without fear of reprisals, increases rather than hinders national security.

The principles of academic freedom are critical to ensure higher education's important contribution to the common good. Basic academic freedom includes the ability to research and publish, the freedom to teach and the freedom to communicate extramurally. These freedoms have not been so challenged since The McCarthyism era of the 1950's. The essence of academic liberty is profoundly threatened by background investigations, the monitoring of classrooms, the surveillance of library research and monitoring of e-mail communications.

The authority for academic freedom is broad based. The most recognized authoritative definition is traced to the American Association of University Professors 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom, with the 1970 and later Interpretive Comments ([www.AAUP.org](http://www.AAUP.org)). This statement has been endorsed by most institutions of higher education. The U.S Constitution's First Amendment is an additional primary source cited for academic freedom. The concept that constitutional law's primary focus is to control the exercise of excessive governmental power highlights consistent judicial interpretations that apply the principles of the First Amendment free speech protections to academic freedom (Regents of Univ. of California v Bakke (1978); Widmar v Vincent (1981)). Other authority for academic freedom is found in Federal legislative enactments, state constitutions and statutes, contractual rights and recognized academic custom and usage (an academic freedom common law).

In California, the Higher Educational Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), section 3561(b), provides: "The legislature recognizes that joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of such institutions, and declares that it is the purpose

of this act to both preserve and encourage that process”. In a recent California case, Moosa v. State Personnel Board (2002), the Court of Appeals, 3<sup>rd</sup> District, found that academic freedom rights are often contained in institutional rules, letters of appointments, faculty handbooks, and collective bargaining agreements. Thus, academic freedoms can derive from many sources in addition to those provided by the Constitution.

The court will generally respect the academic decision making process and the professional judgment of faculty, giving deference to the special knowledge and expertise of faculty in matters concerning academic quality. This includes retention, promotion and tenure decisions and student assessment. (University of Michigan v Irving (1985) 474 US 214).

Faculty must be diligent in defending the right to exercise control over their teaching methods, course content, grading practices and policies, inquiry and research, and extramural communication. Each of these areas has been the subject of recent litigation. Faculty who have maintained germaneness to the subject matter and accuracy, and acted within established professional norms, have prevailed. Inaccurate statements not related to the subject matter that fall outside professional norms, such as sexually or racially degrading comments, will not be protected academic speech, in or outside the classroom (Bonell v Lorenzo (2001) 241 F3d 800).

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2822-07/FA (Rev)  
November 8-9, 2007

**Protecting Academic Freedom for California State University (CSU)  
Academic Programs, Including Area Studies**

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) strongly support the academic freedom of its faculty in proposing, developing, and implementing academic programs; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm that decisions affecting the curriculum and the selection of the faculty for academic programs are under the purview of campus faculty; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the ASCSU object to and deplore recent actions and attempts by political organizations and citizens' groups to bring pressure to bear on our universities and/or its programs, including Area Studies, to unduly change academic offerings and/or content; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage faculty and administration to support the integrity of all academic programs and the academic freedom of faculty teaching in these programs, including Area Studies.

*RATIONALE: Consistent with constitutional protections and long-standing American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) principles, the CSU is obligated to support the faculty and the integrity of its programs, including Area Studies. In addition, a Report of the Board of Trustees' Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, Collegiality, and Responsibility in the California State University (Adopted by the Board of Trustees of the CSU on September, 1985) states in paragraph three:*

*Collegial governance assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the institution in accordance with basic policy as determined by the Board of Trustees. This includes admission and degree requirements, **the curriculum and methods of teaching**, academic and professional standards, and the conduct of creative and scholarly activities. [Emphasis added]*

*Specifically, Area Studies, by their very nature, address social and geopolitical issues that can raise strong emotional reactions. However, in an environment that respects academic freedom and recognizes First Amendment rights, civil discourse should be encouraged and ad hominem attacks deplored.*

*Most recently the Middle Eastern Studies Project at CSU Fresno has come under attack based on unsubstantiated accusations against the faculty teaching in that area.*

*Personal political attacks on faculty have a chilling effect on freedom of teaching, inquiry and the advancement of knowledge. Such attacks undermine the campus learning and working environment and seriously damage the free flow of research and discussion.*

**Approved Unanimously – January 17-18, 2008**

# #2 Agenda Item

AS-2937-10/AA/FGA (Rev)

January 21, 2010

Second Reading

## **Opposition to AB 440, as amended (July 4, 2009), Beal. California Community Colleges: student transfer**

1. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU finds the description of the “transfer” degrees as identified by the current version of AB 440 (BEALL) as amended. The modification of AB440 to require 18 units (27 quarter units) of “coursework in the major or an area of emphasis” will act to induce many students to take extra lower division units that cannot count towards their chosen major after transfer. The change to add the 18-unit requirement removes the virtue of the transfer-focused option of the original degree.

RATIONALE: : AB 440 seeks to ensure that Community College Districts have the ability to offer degrees designed to facilitate expedient transfer. AB 440 does not require districts to offer these “for transfer” degrees nor does it require local CSU campus be required to accept all such graduates – although it is noted that such programs could very effectively be used with transfer admission guarantees as negotiated with local campuses. The addition of the “extra” 18 unit in the major or area of focus requirement to the originally proposed “for transfer” degrees voids the gains inherent in facilitating transfer that was the original impetus for the original bill.

The ASCSU would not support any such proposal that would REQUIRE the offering of a transfer degree by any or all Community College Districts or that would REQUIRE the admission of all degree graduates to their local CSU campus (and thus bypass impaction or

other admissions criteria which should be under the purview of the local campus). We hold that the legislation in its current form propagates the harm done to AA-degree seeking students in their eventual baccalaureate degree attainment by the changes in title 5 to require 18 units of major or area of focus coursework.

AMENDED IN SENATE JULY 2, 2009  
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 27, 2009  
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 16, 2009  
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2009—10 REGULAR SESSION

**ASSEMBLY BILL**

**No. 440**

---

---

**Introduced by Assembly Member Beall**  
(Principal coauthor: Senator Padilla)  
**(Coauthors: Assembly Members Block, Chesbro, Coto, De Leon,  
and Fong Eng, Fong, Swanson, and Torrico)**

February 24, 2009

---

---

An act to add Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745) to Chapter 9.2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code, relating to community colleges.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 440, as amended, Beall. California Community Colleges: student transfer.

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 are administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

Existing law establishes community college districts throughout the state, and authorizes them to provide instruction to students at community college campuses.

Existing law, known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, authorizes the community colleges to grant associate in arts and associate in science degrees. The act also requires the regents, the trustees, and the board of governors to have as a fundamental policy the maintenance of a healthy and expanded program to increase the number of transfer students from community colleges.

This bill would enact the ~~College Student Success Associate Degree and Recognition of Student Transfer Preparation Act~~, which would authorize a community college ~~district~~ to grant an associate ~~in arts~~ degree in ~~transfer studies or an equivalent program~~ *the student's field of study, that is designated as being "for transfer,"* to a student ~~meeting specified requirements~~ *who completes 60 transferable semester units or 27 quarter units, as specified, and meets the minimum requirements for transfer to a public university or alternative path to transfer program. The bill would prohibit a community college district from imposing any requirements, in addition to these requirements, for the granting of an associate degree with the "for transfer" designation.*

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: no.  
State-mandated local program: no.

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

- 1 SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the
- 2 following:
- 3 (a) Since the enactment of the Master Plan for Higher Education
- 4 in 1960, preparing students to transfer to a four-year university
- 5 has been a core function of the California Community Colleges.
- 6 (b) Successful progression from lower division coursework to
- 7 degree completion is a basic principle of California higher
- 8 education and is critical to the future of the state's economy.
- 9 (c) Currently, the coursework necessary to transfer to a campus
- 10 of the California State University or the University of California
- 11 differs from the coursework needed to earn an associate degree.
- 12 As a result, many transfer students leave the community college
- 13 system having completed transfer requirements, but are unable to
- 14 participate in community college graduation ceremonies, do not
- 15 have a degree to show for their work, and are ineligible for some
- 16 awards and scholarships because they did not fulfill current
- 17 requirements for an associate degree.

1 (d) Today, one in every four jobs requires an associate degree  
 2 or higher. In the near future, one in every three jobs will require  
 3 an associate degree or higher.

4 (e) The community college system allows the state to address  
 5 the serious shortage of educated workers.

6 (f) To meet workforce demands in a cost-effective way, ~~a~~  
 7 ~~transfer studies associate degree program provides increased~~  
 8 ~~educational opportunities for Californians throughout the state~~  
 9 ~~who might not otherwise earn a baccalaureate degree because of~~  
 10 ~~interruptions in their education. incentivizing students to earn an~~  
 11 ~~associate degree while preparing for transfer to a four-year college~~  
 12 ~~or university, and recognizing that they have completed a transfer~~  
 13 ~~preparation course pattern, provides students encouragement and~~  
 14 ~~support to complete their overall educational pursuits.~~

15 ~~(g) In the current difficult fiscal times, increasing student success~~  
 16 ~~will have long-term benefits for California's economy.~~

17 ~~(h) A transfer studies associate degree program is a manageable~~  
 18 ~~reform in an otherwise bleak economic climate.~~

19 SEC. 2. Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745) is added  
 20 to Chapter 9.2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education  
 21 Code, to read:

22  
 23 Article 3. ~~Transfer Studies Program~~ *Associate Degree and*  
 24 *Recognition of Student Transfer Preparation*  
 25

26 66745. ~~This act~~ *(a) This article shall be known, and may be*  
 27 *cited, as the* ~~College Student Success Act.~~ *Community College*  
 28 *Associate Degree and Recognition of Student Transfer Preparation*  
 29 *Act.*

30 *(b) It is the intent of the Legislature that, whenever possible, a*  
 31 *community college shall consider the requirements for transfer as*  
 32 *it develops associate degree requirements and encourages students*  
 33 *to take courses that simultaneously meet both of the requirements*  
 34 *of Section 66746.*

35 66746. A community college ~~district~~ may grant an associate  
 36 ~~in arts degree in transfer studies or an associate in arts degree in~~  
 37 ~~an equivalent program to a student meeting both of the following~~  
 38 ~~requirements:~~

39 ~~(a) Completes a minimum of 60 semester units.~~

1 ~~(b) Meets the minimum requirements for transfer to a campus~~  
 2 ~~of the California State University or the University of California.~~  
 3 *degree, in the student's field of study, on which is designated that*  
 4 *it is "for transfer," to a student who meets both of the following*  
 5 *requirements:*

6 *(a) Completes a minimum of 60 transferable semester units or*  
 7 *90 quarter units, 18 semester units or 27 quarter units of which*  
 8 *shall comprise coursework in a major or an area of emphasis, as*  
 9 *determined by the college.*

10 *(b) Meets the minimum requirements for transfer in an approved*  
 11 *transfer core curriculum program, approved transfer agreement*  
 12 *program, or dual admission program, implemented pursuant to*  
 13 *Chapter 9.2 (commencing with Section 66720) of Part 40 of Title*  
 14 *3 or meets the requirements of an alternative path to transfer*  
 15 *program, including, but not limited to, the Intersegmental General*  
 16 *Education Transfer Curriculum or the California State University*  
 17 *General Education Breadth Requirements.*

18 *66747. If a community college provides a degree with the "for*  
 19 *transfer" designation as provided for in Section 66746, the college*  
 20 *shall not impose any requirements in addition to the requirements*  
 21 *of Section 66746, including any local college or district*  
 22 *requirements.*

23 ~~66747.~~

24 *66748. (a) A degree granted pursuant to this article shall*  
 25 *recognize reflect the completion of lower division general*  
 26 *education requirements.*

27 ~~(b) A degree granted~~ *The granting of a degree pursuant to this*  
 28 *article does not guarantee admission to any institution.*

# #3 Agenda Item

AS-2938-10/AA (Rev)  
January 21, 2010  
Second Reading

## **Openness of the Accountability Process in the Graduate Professional Business Programs**

1. RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) be a part of the accountability process of Executive Order EO-1042 (<http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1042.pdf>) starting with the 2011-12 fiscal year report from the campuses who have implemented the Category I Per Unit Fee in Graduate Professional Business Programs; and be it further,
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU be allowed to appoint statewide senators to the committee that reviews the final reports on the Statewide level for the accountability reports of Executive Order EO-1042; and be it further,
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees and the CSU Office of the Chancellor direct campus presidents of the CSU who implemented EO-1042, appoint a campus committee (made up from faculty from the Graduate Professional Business program and those without the program) to review the Accountability Report that is to be sent to the Chancellor's Office in fulfillment of the Executive Order; and be it further,
4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees and the CSU Office of the Chancellor to direct that the actual budgets for the programs' accountability actions be apart of the accountability report; and be it further,

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees, the CSU Office of the Chancellor, and campus presidents of the CSU who implemented EO-1042, make the accountability reports be available on the web as part of the reporting process.

RATIONALE: With the implementation of Executive Order EO-1042, a new precedent has been set in the history of the CSU system with supplementary fees. The ASCSU is extremely interested in the Accountability process. Executive Order-1042 Accountability process has requested that the collected fees be used for the following:

- a. Enrollment growth in professional master's degree programs in business, consistent with campus strategic plans.
- b. Growth in enrollment diversity in such programs, including improved representation of persons of modest financial means, improved representation of persons from currently underrepresented groups, and a more balanced gender representation among students;
- c. Support for students through such means as providing internships and placement assistance at the completion of their graduate business programs;
- d. Improvements in faculty recruitment and retention rates; and
- e. For programs that seek accreditation by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International, maintenance of accredited status.

The graduate students who are in the program deserve to know where those extra funds collected from them are being spent and what the funds are used for the express purposes of helping their programs. The faculty in the Graduate Professional Business Programs have a

right to know how the funds are being spent. Lastly, the university as a whole has a right to know how and where the extra funds were spent.

Openness of the process and the accountability report will go a long way to help others to know how the funds are used.

# #4 Agenda Item

AS-2939-10/AA (Rev)  
January 21, 2010  
Second Reading

## **Use and Implementation of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)**

1. RESOLVED: That the California State University (CSU) implement the recommendations put forth by the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) taskforce in 2009 and endorsed by the President's Council on Accountability; and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the CSU, in line with those recommendations, allow individual campuses the option to administer the CLA at their discretion but no less frequently than once every three years; and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the CSU convene a taskforce of system test administrators and faculty to develop standardized implementation protocols for use throughout the CSU system; and be it further
4. RESOLVED: That the CSU convene a taskforce of system test administrators and faculty to develop standardized implementation protocols for use throughout the CSU system; and be it further
5. RESOLVED: That the CSU involve its faculty in an open analysis of the resources [money, personnel and time] required for administration of the CLA.

RATIONALE: The CLA is a project of the Council for Aid to Education and in their words is intended to, "focus on how the institution as a whole contributes to student development." Those words emphasize the holistic nature of the analysis, which highlights the reality that implementing improvements to those measures is likely to involve a wide spectrum of

activities and may require more temporally distinct measurements to effectively capture the outcomes of those activities.

The 2007 decision to pilot the CLA was made without faculty discussion or input and hence was a decision that failed to leverage the expertise of the faculty of the CSU on matters of assessment of student learning, analysis of the outcomes of those assessments and determination of the comparative value of those assessments for improving student learning and communicating with the public about the quality of the education offered by the CSU. While the Academic Senate of the CSU affirms the value of assessment in guiding quality education, it is clear that faculty should play a major role in design and/or selection of assessment instruments. The General Education group on each campus may well be an appropriate vector for faculty involvement with administration of the CLA and analysis of the data generated.

In March 2009 the CLA taskforce issued recommendations on the CLA. The recommendations were:

1. Continue to use the CLA as the Accountability Measure required by the Voluntary System of Accountability.
2. Convene a taskforce of system test administrators and faculty to develop standardized implementation protocols for use throughout the CSU system.
3. Delay administration of the CLA for one year. After that, institute requirements that campuses administer the CLA instrument a minimum of once every three years.

4. Characterize the CLA as an accountability instrument instead of an assessment instrument. Assessment is evaluation intended for program improvement while accountability is evaluation intended to demonstrate accomplishments to external groups.

5. Arrange a meeting between representatives from the CSU and CAE to discuss possible changes/ additions to the CLA to tailor it to the CSU's need (e.g., ethical decision-making and quantitative skills).

The President's Council on Accountability endorsed the recommendations and in summer 2009 the Chancellor's Office notified campuses of a requirement, in line with the taskforce recommendations, that the CLA be administered at least once every three years. In fall 2009 those recommendations were overridden and campuses were informed that they would be required to administer the CLA annually.

The basis of any system of accountability is measurement that provides useful information. While the CLA may provide such information, further analysis of the reliability of the instrument and validity of the information provided is warranted before the CSU imposes annual administration of the CLA on campuses. Annual CLA administration forces a focus on the outcomes of that assessment which may lead to suboptimal decisions given that the level of correlation between CLA information and alternative assessment mechanisms already in use has not been determined. It is only prudent to establish the validity of assessment instruments before making decisions based on the outcomes of those assessments.

In addition, the CSU is experiencing unprecedented resource challenges. There are significant costs associated with administration of the CLA, and again it would be prudent to more fully understand the value of the information provided before committing scarce resources to annual administration of the CLA. Most especially, we need to explore the effectiveness of CLA information in driving improvements in practice, and it is far from clear that annual administration of CLA is the appropriate frequency for that project. Devoting significant resources [money, time, personnel] to annual assessment of indicators that change on a longer timeline is not an optimal use of those resources.

# #5 Agenda Item

AS-2940-10/AA (Rev)  
January 21, 2010  
Second Reading

## **Proposed Repeal of Title 5 Section 40503 Relative to Bachelor of Vocational Education Degrees**

1. RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) support the removal of the Bachelor of Vocational Education from the degrees offered by the CSU.

RATIONALE: The degree is not offered on any of the campuses of the CSU and there are no plans for any CSU to offer the degree. The Academic Senate of the CSU has considered and supported the proposal for removal.