May 12, 2011

Dr. Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
The California State University
401 Golden Shore, Room 641
Long Beach, California 90802-4210

Dear Chancellor Reed:

At its meeting on May 5-6, 2011, at CSU headquarters in Long Beach, the Academic Senate of the California State University discussed and acted upon a number of matters.

Enclosed is a copy of the items upon which the Senate took action. These documents are sent to you for consideration and action as appropriate.

Sincerely,

James Postma, Chair
Academic Senate of the California State University

Attachments

Distribution list:
Members, Academic Senate CSU
Chancellor’s Office Representatives
Board of Trustees
Presidents
Provosts/Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Chairs, Campus Academic Senates
CSU Alumni Council
California State Student Association
STATUS OF SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The status of the resolutions that were circulated for Senate consideration at the May 5-6, 2011 meeting in Long Beach are listed below:

1) AS-3009-11/APEP (Rev) Commendation to the Office of the Chancellor in Responding To Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code - Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses Approved Unanimously

2) AS-3011-11/FGA (Rev) Support of SB 8 (Yee) Public Records: Auxiliary Organizations Approved


4) AS-3013-11/EX (Rev) Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2011-2012 Meetings Approved Unanimously

5) AS-3014-11/APEP (Rev) Common Reporting Requirements of Campuses’ Early Start Program Effectiveness Approved Unanimously

6) AS-3015-11/FGA (Rev) Statewide Access to California State University Approved

7) AS-3017-11/EX (Rev) Addition of a Second Faculty Trustee to the CSU Board of Trustees Approved Unanimously

8) AS-3020-11/APEP/AA (Rev) Grade Minima for CSU General Education Courses in the “Golden Four” Approved Unanimously

9) AS-3022-11/AA Support for Proposed Title 5 Additions Related to the Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree Approved Unanimously

10) AS-3023-11/AA Support for Proposed Title 5 Additions Related to the Doctor Of Physical Therapy Degree Approved Unanimously

11) AS-3025-11/AA Support for Proposed Title 5 Changes Related to Baccalaureate Degrees Completed in Postbaccalaureate Standing Approved

12) AS-3026-11/FA/FGA Reaffirmation of CSU System-wide Policies Governing Special Sessions Approved Without Dissent

13) AS-3027-11/FGA/AA Support for the California State University’s Professional Doctorate Tuition Fee Approved

14) AS-3029-11/AA Request to the Board of Trustees to Delay Action on Recommended Changes to the Title 5 “American Institutions” Graduation Requirement until It’s November 2011 meeting Approved Unanimously
AS-3030-11/APEP  The Importance of Civic Education (CSU Graduation Requirements in United States History, Constitution, and American Institutions) for both Native and Transfer Students

The following item was withdrawn at the May 5-6, 2011 meeting.

AS-3016-10/FGA (Rev) Concerns about Summer Session Courses and Fees

The following items failed at the May 5-6, 2011 meeting.

AS-3024-11/AA/APEP Support for the Establishment of a CSU Independent Doctoral Program Advisory Committee


AS-3031-11/AA A Commitment to Civility by the Academic Senate, California State University

Resolutions of Commendation (copies not included) were approved in honor of the following people

AS-3032-11/ Commendation of Michael Ault Approved by CSU Bakersfield Delegation Acclamation

AS-3033-11/ Commendation of Dr. John R. (Dick) Montanari Approved by CSU San Marcos Delegation Acclamation

AS-3034-11/ Commendation in Honor of Senator Margaret Costa Approved by CSU Long Beach Delegation Acclamation
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-3009-11/APEP (Rev)
January 20-21 2011

Commendation to the Office of the Chancellor in Responding to Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code – Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) commend the Office of the Chancellor for initiating a process for the implementation of the provisions specified in Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code that call for the development of model curriculum criteria to be used to identify Career Technical Education (CTE) courses that would meet the category “g” requirement for admission of high school graduates to the CSU, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU specifically commend:

- Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support, Eric Forbes,
- Associate Director, Academic Outreach and Enrollment Management Services, Carolina Cardenas,
- Associate Director for Teacher Education and Public Schools Programs, Zee Cline, and
- Assistant Vice Chancellor for Teacher Education and Public School Programs, Beverly Young

for their inclusive leadership in facilitating the process which will provide for an increase in the breadth and number of area “g” electives that meet the CTE requirements, especially in the 15 disciplines not offered by the University of California, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize and commend the on-going work of the University of California’s Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and their collaboration with the California State University in the review and approval of CTE courses, providing for significant growth in the number of schools offering CTE courses and the even greater growth in the number of approved CTE courses that provide for rigorous academic study and career technical skills over the last six years.

RATIONALE: Section 66205.8 of the California Code calls for the development of model curriculum criteria to be used to identify CTE courses that would meet the category “g” requirement for admission of high school graduates to the CSU. According to the California Education Code these criteria are to be developed by “CSU faculty, approved by the ASCSU” and then submitted to the Board of Trustees for review and approval by January 1, 2014. While state law requires the CSU to take the lead in establishing these criteria, AS-2933-10/APEP recommended that the process be developed in consultation with the
University of California. Consultation in providing for such a process is well under way, ensuring that the required criteria will be developed and ready for approval by the Board of Trustees on or before the statutory deadline of January 1, 2014.

Approved Unanimously – May 5-6, 2011
Establishment of a Task Force to Respond to Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code – Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) call for the creation of a Task Force consisting of CSU faculty to study, in consultation with Office of the Chancellor administration, Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code and to submit to the ASCSU by May 1, 2010 a proposal for implementing the requirements specified in the law; and be it further

RESOLVED: That of the two options provided in Section 66205.8 (“1. Criteria adopted pursuant to subdivision (b), or 2. Model uniform academic standards for career technical education courses adopted pursuant to Section 66205.5”) the ASCSU recommend that the Task Force, in consultation with representatives from the University of California, propose an implementation plan based on the first option: “criteria adopted pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 66205.8”; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Chancellor, campus Presidents, campus Provosts, and campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: In October 2009, Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code was signed into law. The law requires that the CSU develop and implement a procedure for allowing a high school student to meet the category “g” requirement for admission to the CSU by completing a career technical education (CTE) course. The law provides two options: 1) follow criteria adopted pursuant to subdivision (b) of the law, or 2) accept the model curriculum standards established by the Superintendent of Public Instruction as the criteria for identifying courses that are acceptable for the purpose of admission to the CSU campuses. If the CSU has not developed criteria to be used for developing and submitting CTE courses for approval by January 1, 2014 (the first option), the second option will prevail.

Subdivision (b) of the law provides that a model curriculum for acceptable CTE courses be developed by CSU faculty, approved by the ASCSU, and forwarded to the Board of Trustees for review and adoption.

In 2006, the CSU and UC worked together to enable implementation of earlier CTE legislation that created Section 66205.5 of the California Education Code. At that time, it was determined that it was in the best interest of both systems to have one set of standards for CTE courses for both university systems. After the initial cooperation of the two systems to establish the current admissions standards for CTE courses, the CSU deferred to the UC regarding the
establishment of specific course criteria and review. Because some of the more recently developed CTE courses designed by high school faculty are closer to discipline areas within the CSU than the UC, recent collaborative efforts have taken place between the two systems regarding development of CTE course criteria. What is now needed is the formalization of a process by which the CSU plays a more active leadership role in the creation of CTE course criteria. The alternative is for the CSU to create its own course criteria and course review process. Having two separate review processes would be both expensive and confusing to high school students who may enroll in either a CSU or UC campus.

Approved Unanimously – January 21-22, 2010
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support SB 8, (Yee, D-San Francisco), Public Records: Auxiliary Organizations, which promotes accountability and transparency in public institutions of higher education by requiring auxiliaries affiliated with the California Community Colleges, the California State University and the University of California to comply with the California Public Records Act; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, campus Presidents, campus Senate Chairs, California Faculty Association, and Senator Leland Yee.

RATIONALE: AS-2894-09/FGA supported (if amended to protect the donor records of those who request anonymity) SB 218 (Yee, D-San Francisco) Amendments to the California Public Records Act (CPRA), which would have amended the CPRA to include auxiliary organizations that receive public funds or perform a governmental function on behalf of the California Community Colleges (CCC), the California State University (CSU) or the University of California. SB 218 was passed by both houses of the California State Legislature. Governor Schwarzenegger vetoed the bill in October of 2009 out of concern that the bill would result in the loss of private donations and volunteer activities supporting California’s public institutions of higher education. Senator Yee re-introduced the bill as SB 330, but Governor Schwarzenegger vetoed that legislation on the same grounds in July 2010.

SB 8 (Yee, D-San Francisco), introduced in December 2010, accomplishes the same goal as SB 218 and 330, to promote accountability and transparency in public institutions of higher education. SB 8 would amend the Education and Government Codes to require that specific entities affiliated with the CCC, the CSU and the UC to comply with the California Public Records Act. Addressing Governor Schwarzenegger's earlier concerns about the bill, SB 8 provides exemptions from disclosure, including (a) information obtained in the process of soliciting potential donors that has actual or potential independent economic value because it is not generally known to the public or because the individuals can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use; and (b) the names, addresses and telephone numbers of donors and volunteers requesting anonymity, unless the donor or volunteer meet specified conditions. Passing AS-3011-11/FGA would reaffirm the ASCSU commitment to transparency and accountability in the CSU and California’s other public institutions of higher education.

Sources:
“2011 Legislation,” Website of Senator Leland Yee
(http://dist08.casen.govoffice.com/index.asp?Type=B_BASIC&SEC=/A44EA5A4-AAA9-498C-AFAE-5C26FAAE50D9)

AS-2894-09/FGA Support of SB 218 (Yee, D-San Francisco) Amendment to California
Public Records Act (http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2008-
2009/documents/2894.pdf)

SB 8 (http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/11-12/bill/sen/sb_0001-
0050/sca_8_bill_20110217 Introduced.pdf)

SB 218 (http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/sen/sb_0201-
0250/sb_218_bill_20090910_enrolled.pdf)

SB 330 (http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/sen/sb_0301-
0350/sb_330_bill_20100819_enrolled.pdf)

Sasha Lekach, “Two bills to increase transparency and accountability at UCs, CSUs,”
The California Aggie, January 12, 2010 (http://theaggie.org/article/2010/01/12/two-
bills-to-increase-transparency-and-accountability-at-ucs-csus)

Approved – May 5-6, 2011
Support of AB 130 (Cedillo) Student Financial Aid: Eligibility: California Dream Act of 2011

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support AB 130 (Cedillo, D-Los Angeles) the California Dream Act of 2011, which would allow students attending any of California’s public institutions of higher education and who are exempt from paying nonresident tuition under existing law, to be eligible for scholarships derived from nonstate funds intended for scholarships that are received by the higher education segment at which they are students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, the CSU Chancellor, campus Presidents, campus Senate Chairs, California Faculty Association, University of California President, California Community Colleges Chancellor, California State Student Association, and Assemblymember Cedillo.

RATIONALE: Under the Donahoe Higher Education Act students qualify for in-state tuition at public colleges and universities in California regardless of their immigration status if they: 1. Attend high school for three or more years in California; 2. graduate from a California high school or get a GED; and 3. if undocumented, file a prescribed affidavit. AB 130 would allow any student attending, and exempt from paying nonresident tuition to, any of California’s three public institutions of higher education, to be eligible for scholarships funded by monies donated to the segments specifically for scholarships. Language in the bill states that increased access to financial aid for all students in California’s universities and colleges increases the state’s collective productivity and economic growth.

The ASCSU has a record of supporting the principle that persons without lawful immigration status be exempt from paying nonresident tuition in California’s public institutions of higher education (AS-2802-07/FGA). This legislation would extend that principle to include eligibility for non-state funded scholarships for all students paying nonresident tuition. Support for this resolution would also allow the ASCSU to join our California State University and California Faculty Association colleagues in support of AB 130.

Sources:
AB 130 (http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/11-12/bill/asm/ab_0101-0150/ab_130_bill_20110502_amended_asm_v95.pdf)
“Legislative Report No. 2,” California State University Board of Trustees Committee on Governmental Relations Agenda, Tuesday March 22, 2011
(http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/mar11/GovRel.pdf)

Conversation with John Travis, California Faculty Association Representative to the Academic Senate California State University, March 17, 2011

Approved Unanimously – May 5-6, 2011
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-3013-11/EX (Rev)
March 17-18, 2011

Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2011-2012 Meetings

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the following schedule for 2011-2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 15-16 Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>January 18-20 Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7 Interim Committees</td>
<td>February 17 Interim Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2-4 Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>March 14-16 Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9 Interim Committees</td>
<td>April 13 Interim Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 2-4 Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of the CSU be authorized to change the schedule of meetings approved, with adequate notice to the Academic Senate of the 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 2010-2011, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 21-22 Headquarters</td>
<td>January 24-25, 2012 Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10-11 Headquarters</td>
<td>March 20-21, 2012 Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12 Headquarters</td>
<td>May 8-9, 2012 Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20-21 Headquarters</td>
<td>July 17, 2012 Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15-16 Headquarters</td>
<td>September 18-19, 2012 Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 13-14, 2012 Headquarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Unanimously – May 5-6, 2011

Note: Long Beach Grand Prix Weekend – Will not be announced until October of 2011; Veteran’s day is November 11, 2010 and 2012
Common Reporting Requirements of Campuses’ Early Start Program Effectiveness

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) request that the Office of the Chancellor charge the Early Start Implementation Team, in consultation with CSU Mathematics and English Council, to develop evaluation tools to ascertain relative effectiveness of various remediation strategies campuses employed in their implementation of Early Start; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that reporting requirements be established as a means of providing common metrics for assessment; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend the CSU Early Start Implementation Team, in collaboration with CSU Mathematics and English Council, examine the impact of various Early Start remediation strategies campuses employed on students’ proficiency scores on EPT and ELM or comparable type of examinations; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that an annual report be developed by the CSU Early Start Implementation Team, delineating its findings on the impact of various Early Start remediation strategies and recommendations; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the following individuals and entities within the CSU: the Chancellor; the Board of Trustees (and thus including the Educational Policies Committee); the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer; Campus Presidents, Provosts, Deans of Humanities, Deans of Math and Science, and Campus Deans of Education; Campus Senate Chairs; the Statewide “Early Start Implementation Team”; the CSU Mathematics Council; and the CSU English Council.

RATIONALE: The intent of the Mandatory implementation of Early Start Programs per Executive Order No. 1048 (http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1048.pdf) is to: a) provide students needed remediation in math and/or English prior to entering the university, b) reduce the number of units/courses needed to reach mathematics and English proficiency prior to the end of the freshman year, and, c) facilitate reductions in time to graduation through changes in policies on fulfilling entry-level proficiencies in English and mathematics.

However, with the flexibility the EO 1048 gave to each CSU campus to develop its own approach to satisfying the requirements of the Early Start Program (EO 1048, B.5), a wide variation in the program implementation strategies is anticipated, which may have the consequence of producing difficulties in measuring program effectiveness. Therefore, development of evaluation tools


utilizing common metrics for assessment are deemed critical in order to ascertain comparative effectiveness of Early Start Program implementation strategies campuses employed.

Approved Unanimously – May 5-6, 2011
ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Statewide Access to California State University

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognize that the individual CSU campuses were brought together as a system by the Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1960; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that the universities which comprise the CSU are public institutions of higher education dedicated to serving students drawn from the entire state of California and beyond, and are not, nor should they be, considered solely regional institutions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that a shift to a mandated regionalization of CSU campuses would diminish the broad diversity of the CSU campuses, thereby diminishing the quality of the educational experience for their students as well as making it more difficult for the CSU campuses to navigate the difficult fiscal situation; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, campus Presidents, campus Provosts/Vice Presidents Academic Affairs, California State Student Association, and campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: On February 14, 2011, the Legislative Analyst issued a report called, “The Master Plan at 50: Guaranteed Regional Access Needed for State Universities” (http://lao.ca.gov/reports/2011/edu/regional_access/regional_access_021411.pdf). The ASCSU disagrees with the premise and conclusion of that document. The report stated that, “While the Master Plan did not specifically assign to the California State University (CSU) a regional role, CSU campuses—through their admissions policies and other practices—largely focused on regional education needs.” In response the LAO recommended that, “…the Legislature (1) formalize a regional education role for CSU in statute, (2) codify its expectations for CSU’s eligibility pool, and (3) direct CSU to adjust its enrollment policies accordingly.”

The diverse CSU institutions have historically attracted a mixture of local and out-of-area students. In recent years, inadequate budgets have resulted in student admissions cutbacks that led to some preferential treatment for local-area applicants at some campuses. The ASCSU strongly advocate a return to adequate state funding that would not limit out-of-area enrollments and that would maintain the geographical diversity of student bodies as well as access of California students to the campus of their choice. A legislatively enforced regional focus for CSU campuses would be detrimental to the diversity of the student bodies of the CSU campuses, and, since CSU campuses differ in their academic offerings, would also impair access to students seeking entry into majors offered only at campuses outside their local area. Since CSU campuses differ in their offerings, imposing a regional focus would also impair access for students seeking entry into majors offered only at campuses outside their local area.
California has changed dramatically in the 50 years since the passage of the Donahoe Act. The CSU and its campuses must be allowed reasonable flexibility in dealing with the new demographic and fiscal realities that they operate under. The ASCSU strongly believe that far-reaching policy changes such as those proposed in the LAO report are best left within the purview of the faculty and administrations, the individual CSU campuses, and the CSU Chancellor’s Office.

The ASCSU notes that the California Community Colleges are so named to reflect their inherently local constituencies; the California State University is so named to reflect its service to the entire state population.

Approved – May 5-6, 2011
Addition of a Second Faculty Trustee to the CSU Board of Trustees

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) request that the CSU Board of Trustees recommend to the Governor the addition of a second faculty trustee to the Board with a term of appointment staggered with that of the current faculty trustee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Chancellor and the CSU Board of Trustees.

RATIONALE: The addition of a second faculty trustee with a staggered term would eliminate situations where a vacancy due to a delay in the appointment of a single faculty trustee, or for any other reason, would mean the Board would not benefit from the wisdom and perspectives of a current faculty member. It would also provide for a second faculty perspective on the numerous and diverse issues in a system with over 22,000 faculty and 410,000 students. It would also allow for the mentoring of newly appointed faculty trustees by a sitting faculty trustee

Approved Unanimously – May 5-6, 2011
Grade Minima for CSU General Education Courses in the “Golden Four”

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support a minimum grade of C (2.0) in the “Golden Four” CSU General Education areas (Written Communication/English Composition, Mathematical Concepts/Quantitative Reasoning, Oral Communication, and Critical Thinking) for both native and transfer students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage the CSU Board of Trustees to wait for faculty input prior to enshrining such grade minima requirements into Title 5 (as opposed to transfer admissions, which is already policy albeit not in Title 5); and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that campuses without a minimum grade of "C" (2.0) or better to receive General Education credit for courses in the “Golden Four” of CSU General Education consider such policies; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU use communications from the campus senates to inform potential actions to endorse changing the criteria in Title 5 for General Education certification requirements; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to: the General Education Advisory Committee; CSU Campus Senate Chairs; Directors of Campus General Education Committees; Leadership of the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges; CSU Board of Trustees; Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Academic Support, CSU; CSU Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer.

RATIONALE:
Completion of CSU GE curricula is a requirement of all CSU students. It is a CSU eligibility requirement to complete the “Golden Four” of CSU GE curricula prior to admission for all transfer students. Many, but not all, campuses of the CSU require a minimum grade of “C” (2.0) or better (as opposed to a “C-” (1.7) or no minimum grade standard) in the “Golden Four” as a campus requirement for native students. [All transfer students must have a “C” (2.0) or better in the “Golden Four.” An eventual statewide requirement of a “C” (2.0) or better in Golden Four courses would create greater parallelism between requirements for native and transfer students.]

It is noted that the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges already has weighed in positively on encouraging a grade minima of a C (2.0) or better as a required element of “Transfer AA” degrees (see attachment).

It is the intention that the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee would help inform ASCSU action prior to encouraging any such change in Title 5 GE requirements.
Feedback to the ASCSU on this issue could be as straightforward as submitting a statement of existing campus policy or could be a more inclusive commentary of the status of arguments for and against grade minima in the Golden Four.

Approved Unanimously – May 5-6, 2011
Resolution 9.09 from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges 42nd Fall Session Resolutions (Final Resolutions) [http://asccc.org/events/2010/11/plenary-session]

9.09  F10  Golden Four Grades in New Transfer Degrees
Michelle Pilati, Rio Hondo College, Executive Committee

Whereas, SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) has been signed into law, with one of its primary goals to decrease student accumulation of units as they complete a degree and prepare to transfer;

Whereas, Resolution 4.03 S10 recognized that a “transfer degree” was imminent and called for the Academic Senate to “strongly encourage all local senates to ensure that students are provided with the degree options that meet their needs, be that aligning degree requirements with transfer institutions or offering degrees that serve as preparation for work”; and

Whereas, The California State University currently requires completion in the areas of the “Golden Four” with a minimum grade of “C” for transfer admission (i.e., A3--critical thinking, A1--communication, A2--English composition, and B4--quantitative reasoning) but not included in SB 1440;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly urge requiring a minimum grade of “C” in the “Golden Four” in any associate degree for transfer.

MSC  Disposition: Local Senates
Assigned: Relations with Local Senates and Curriculum Committees
Support for Proposed Title 5 Additions Related to the Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognize that the development and implementation of Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) Programs will require changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, including proposed additions such as information about the DNP degree, requirements for the DNP degree, criteria for admission to DNP Degree Programs, and the establishment of DNP degree pilot programs at the three campuses chosen by the CSU Board of Trustees; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU support these proposed additions to Title 5, California Code of Regulations and urge their adoption by the Board of Trustees; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU Executive Vice-Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, campus Presidents, campus Senate Chairs, campus Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs.

RATIONALE: Legislation was passed in 2010 authorizing the CSU to offer Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) degrees. Implementation of these practice doctoral degrees will require additions to the current Title 5, California Code of Regulations. These additions include a description of the DNP degree, DNP degree requirements, admission to DNP degree programs and an expansion of the ability to offer these degrees as a pilot program at three campuses chosen by the Board of Trustees. proposed additions to Title 5, California Code of Regulations are available as part of the Board of Trustees agenda at http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/May11/EdPol.pdf

Approved Unanimously – May 5-6, 2011
Support for Proposed Title 5 Additions Related to the Doctor of Physical Therapy Degree

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognize that the development and implementation of Doctor of Physical Therapy programs requires additions to Title 5, California Code of Regulations. The proposed additions include information about the function of the programs, the core degree curriculum, criteria for admission to the programs, development of the student handbook, and a description of the doctoral project; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that Title 5 language related to Section 40515 (c (4) be revised to state "a qualifying exam shall be required," and be it further

RESOLVED: That the additional language in that section be revised to require an oral defense of the doctoral project, and not allow a public presentation of the project to substitute for an oral defense of the doctoral project, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU support these proposed additions to Title 5, California Code of Regulations and urge the Board of Trustees to adopt these additions; and be it further the Board of Trustees,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, Executive Vice-Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, Ephraim Smith, campus Presidents, campus Senate Chairs, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents Academic Affairs

RATIONALE: Legislation was passed in 2010 authorizing the CSU to offer Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) degrees. Implementation of these practice doctoral degrees will require additions to the current Title 5, California Code of Regulations. These additions include a description of the DPT degree, DPT degree requirements, a description of the DPT core curriculum, admission to DPT degree program, development of a student handbook, and a description of the doctoral project. Proposed changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations are are available as part of the Board of Trustees agenda at http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/May11/EdPol.pdf

Approved Unanimously – May 5-6, 2011
Support for Proposed Title 5 Changes Related to Baccalaureate Degrees Completed in Postbaccalaureate Standing

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support the proposed changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations related to baccalaureate degrees completed in postbaccalaureate standing and urge the Board of Trustees to adopt the proposed recommended changes; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, campus Presidents, campus Senate Chairs, and CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs.

RATIONALE: Current Educational Code 66055.8 states that students with an earned bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution who are enrolled in CSU Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree programs are not required to complete courses other than those required for completion of the nursing major. The proposed Title 5 changes would extend this non-requirement to all majors. Proposed benefits of these changes include streamlining baccalaureate degree pathways, accelerated completion of second baccalaureate degrees, and enhanced numbers of graduates ready to enter the workforce.

Approved – May 5-6, 2011
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Baccalaureate Degrees Earned in Postbaccalaureate Standing

Presentation By

Christine Mallon
State University Dean
Academic Programs and Policy

Summary

This item presents two recommended changes to Title 5, both of which intend to serve students, the university, the workforce, and the state, in cases in which students who have previously earned a bachelor’s degree are pursuing a subsequent bachelor’s degree. Under current policy, those students are required to fulfill all CSU General Education (GE)-Breadth requirements, as specified in Title 5 section 40405.1. Additionally, these bachelor’s students in postbaccalaureate standing are required to complete the Title 5 section 40404 requirements in United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals; and they may be held to campus-specific required courses.

The first recommendation limits the degree requirements for “second baccalaureate” students to only those requirements in the major degree program. The language of this proposed new Title 5 is drawn from Education Code 66055.8, which prohibits postbaccalaureate students in Bachelor of Science in Nursing programs from being required to complete courses other than those required for the nursing major program. The second recommendation would impose a similar limitation, this one specific to the systemwide general education requirements established in Title 5 section 40405.1.

In both cases, the proposed changes are based on the assumption that such a previously earned bachelor’s degree from a regionally accredited institution (or equivalent academic preparation, as determined by the appropriate campus authority) would represent a breadth of instruction that is acceptable nationally as appropriate for baccalaureate preparation. The proposed changes will reduce
instructional redundancy and free up valuable GE enrollment opportunities for students pursuing a first bachelor’s degree. The streamlining resulting from this change will allow students to complete CSU baccalaureate programs in reduced time, making the university more responsive to a changing workforce that seeks professional re-training through second (or subsequent) bachelor’s degree programs.

An agenda item will be presented at the July meeting to take action to adopt the following recommended changes to Title 5.
Section 40509 – Baccalaureate Degrees Completed in Postbaccalaureate Standing

A campus of the California State University shall not require a student who has been admitted to a baccalaureate degree program to undertake courses other than those that are specifically required to complete the current major within the degree program if:

(a) The student has previously earned a baccalaureate or higher degree from an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association; or

(b) The student has completed equivalent academic preparation, as determined by the appropriate campus authority.

Board of Trustees of the California State Universities

Chapter 1 -- California State University

Subchapter 2 – Educational Program

Article 5 – General Requirements for Graduation

Section No. 40405.1—California State University General Education-Breadth Requirements.

(a) Each recipient of the bachelor's degree completing the California State University General Education-Breadth Requirements pursuant to this subdivision (a) shall have completed a program that includes a minimum of 48 semester units or 72 quarter units of which nine semester units or 12 quarter units shall be upper-division level and shall be taken no sooner than the term in which the candidate achieves upper-division status. At least nine of the 48 semester units or 12 of the 72 quarter units shall be earned at the campus granting the degree. The 48 semester units or 72 quarter units shall be distributed as follows:

1. A minimum of nine semester units or 12 quarter units in communication in the English language, to include both oral communication and written communication, and in critical thinking, to include consideration of common fallacies in reasoning.

2. A minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units to include inquiry into the physical universe and its life forms, with some immediate participation in laboratory activity, and into mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their applications.

3. A minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units among the arts, literature, philosophy and foreign languages.

4. A minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units dealing with human social, political, and economic institutions and behavior and their historical background.

5. A minimum of three semester units or four quarter units in study designed to equip human beings for lifelong understanding and development of themselves as integrated physiological, social and psychological entities.

The specification of numbers of units implies the right of discretion on each campus to adjust reasonably the proportions among the categories in order that the conjunction of campus courses, credit-unit configurations and these requirements will not unduly exceed any of the prescribed semester or quarter unit minima. However, the total number of units in General Education-Breadth accepted for the bachelor's degree under the provisions of this subdivision (a) should not be less than 48 semester units or 72 quarter units.
(b) The president or an officially authorized representative of a college which is accredited in a manner stated in Section 40601 (d) (1) may certify the extent to which the requirements of subdivision (a) of this section have been met up to a maximum of 39 semester units (or 58 quarter units). Such certification shall be in terms of explicit objectives and procedures issued by the Chancellor.

(c) In the case of a baccalaureate degree being pursued by a postbaccalaureate student, the requirements of this section shall be satisfied if:
(1) The student has previously earned a baccalaureate or higher degree from an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association; or
(2) The student has completed equivalent academic preparation, as determined by the appropriate campus authority.

Reaffirmation of CSU System-wide Policies Governing Special Sessions

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm the provisions contained in the attached Executive Order (EO) 1047, dated May 5, 2010, which sets out policies related to special sessions (which are a part of the Extended University or Extended Education) including, among others, the following provision:

Self-supporting special sessions shall not supplant regular course offerings available on a state-supported basis during the college year (Education Code Section 89708).

and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU acknowledge the attached April 19, 2011 Memorandum from Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Ephraim P. Smith to all CSU Presidents as a “Clarification on Self-Support Programs and Courses,” which reaffirms the provisions contained in EO 1047 and in the Education Code; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the campus faculty and Academic Senates remain vigilant regarding special session activities on their campuses to ensure that the provisions of EO 1047 and the Education Code are honored; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that if campus faculty and Academic Senates have questions regarding the appropriateness of proposals related to special sessions that they contact the State University Dean of Extended Education and/or the State University Dean of Academic Programs and Policy in the Office of the Chancellor; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU strongly urge that, in any case where programs and courses normally offered through state-supported academic programs have already been moved to special sessions contrary to the above regulations, such programs and courses be returned to state-support as expeditiously as possible; and be it further

RESOLVED: That, in keeping with the basic tenets of academic shared governance, faculty retain oversight of all curricular matters, and that academic programs retain oversight of the hiring of faculty to teach courses offered in special sessions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Ephraim P. Smith, State University Dean of Extended Education Sheila Thomas, State University Dean of Academic Programs and Policy Christine Mallon, campus Presidents, and campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: As the fiscal environment in the CSU has deteriorated, some CSU campuses have looked to special sessions as a means of providing ongoing service to students. In some cases, these initiatives have violated the provisions contained in EO 1047 and the Education Code. It is vitally important for student access and their overall
educational experience that the CSU honor its primary mission as a state-supported institution. As programs and courses are proposed for inclusion in special sessions, faculty must assume responsibility for insuring that they fall within the provisions outlined above. In cases where programs and courses already have been moved to special sessions in violation of EO 1047 and the Education Code, such programs and courses should be returned to state-support as expeditiously as possible.

Approved Without Dissent – May 5-6, 2011
May 5, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents
FROM: Charles B. Reed
Chancellor
SUBJECT: Special Sessions—Executive Order No 1047

Attached is copy of Executive Order 1047 related to offering special sessions courses and programs including during summer sessions and winter intersession.

In accordance with policy of the California State University, the campus president has the responsibility for implementing executive orders where applicable and for maintaining the campus repository and index for all executive orders.

If you have questions regarding this executive order, please call Sheila A. Thomas, State University Dean, Extended Education, 562/951-4795.

CBR/sat
Attachment
c: Executive Staff, Office of the Chancellor
Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
Chief Financial Officers
Extended Education Deans and Directors

Attachment to AS-3026-11/FA
This executive order is issued pursuant to Section 40200 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations and is effective immediately. This executive order addresses the procedures to be followed by each campus of the California State University in offering special sessions courses and programs including during summer sessions and winter intersession.

A. Definition and Purpose

Special sessions are a means whereby the instructional programs of the CSU can be provided to matriculated students\(^1\) on a self-support basis at times and in locations not supported by State General Fund appropriations. Such offerings shall be consistent with the CSU mission and applicable laws and regulations. Academic standards associated with all aspects of such special sessions are identical to those of comparable instructional programs. Examples of special sessions include: interim sessions between college year terms; programs of a continuing nature offered at military bases, correctional facilities, and other distant or isolated locations; and instructional programs for a specific client group requiring special services.

Special sessions also provide a means whereby state-supported course offerings can be made available to non-matriculated students paying self-support fees through Open University/Concurrent Enrollment (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40202). A maximum of 24 semester units (36 quarter units) in special session course credit earned through state-supported or self-support regular course offerings in non-matriculated status may be applied toward a degree (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40407.1).

Self-supporting special sessions shall not supplant regular course offerings available on a state-supported basis during the college year (Education Code Section 89708).

---

\(^1\) A matriculated student is a student who has, through normal procedures, been formally admitted to and enrolled at a CSU campus to pursue an authorized degree, credential, or certificate.
B. Financing

Special sessions are self-supporting with fees set by the campus to cover the costs of instruction and other services (Education Code Section 89708). Special sessions shall be operated within the framework of the State University Continuing Education Revenue Fund (Education Code Section 89704) with the option now to deposit the revenues in local trust accounts (Education Code Section 89721 (i). Special sessions funds are subject to all the fiscal policies and procedures pertinent to the fund in which the revenues are deposited and are available “for the support and development of self-supporting instructional programs” as provided in Education Code Section 89704.

C. Requisite Conditions

1. For a related group of courses or an entire program that leads to a degree, credential or certificate to be offered under special sessions, both of the following criteria must be met. For individual special sessions courses offered through self support during summer sessions or intersessions between college terms, only criteria “a” must be met.

   a. State General Fund appropriations to support the program must be either unavailable or inappropriate. Examples of inappropriate use of State General Fund appropriations would include courses or programs delivered primarily out of state.

   b. The courses or program must be different from approved, state-supported programs operating on campus by one or more of the following:

      i. The courses or program is designed primarily for career enrichment or retraining (Education Code Section 89708).

      ii. The location of the courses or program offerings is significantly removed from permanent, state-supported campus facilities.

      iii. The client group for the courses or program receives educational or other services at a cost beyond what could be reasonably provided under state support.

2. All special sessions must have the following characteristics:

   a. Each must consist of a planned presentation of a degree, credential or certificate program, or a group of courses offered at a particular location or through a distinct technology. Courses may be presented concurrently or sequentially but in a defined time frame.
b. While a special session need not offer all or even a significant portion of a degree, credential, or certificate program, it must be planned to serve a substantive educational objective supportive of such programs; e.g., an opportunity for a matriculated student to accelerate achievement toward an objective, or a significant portion of a degree program offered for military or business personnel.

c. Degree, credential, or certificate programs offered through special sessions must secure all regular campus and system approvals. Such programs may have a state-supported counterpart operating on campus, or they may operate only as self-supported programs through special sessions. The Chancellor’s Office shall be notified when previously approved, state-supported degree or credential programs are first offered in self-support mode through special sessions.

d. Self-supporting degree, credential, or certificate programs offered under the provisions of this executive order shall be operated in accordance with all appropriate campus and system policies and procedures.

e. Campuses offering special sessions shall provide educational support services (e.g. admissions and records, advising, library, financial aid) appropriate to the nature and scope of the program.

f. All instruction offered shall have been approved under procedures utilized for state-supported programs, and all academic policies governing special sessions shall be identical to or established under the same procedures as those governing state-supported programs.

g. All students in special sessions degree programs and education credential programs must be matriculated. Non-matriculated students paying self-support fees may enroll in special sessions courses on a space-available basis. A maximum of 24 semester units (36 quarter units) in special sessions course credit taken as a non-matriculated student may be applied toward a degree (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40407.1).

h. Location of instruction must be in accordance with pertinent system policies.

i. Special sessions offerings must be consistent with all applicable policies of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and other accrediting bodies under whose jurisdiction special sessions fall.

j. Academic credit offered through special sessions shall be applicable toward residence credit requirements at the campus offering the special sessions.²

² A maximum of 24 semester units (36 quarter units) in special session course credit earned through state-supported regular course offerings (Open University/Concurrent Enrollment) may be applied toward a degree (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40407.1).
k. Special sessions courses shall not be offered at times or places that are likely to supplant or limit offerings of the state-supported program (Education Code Section 89708).

l. Faculty shall be compensated according to approved special sessions salary schedules.

D. Records Maintenance

Each campus shall maintain records of special sessions activity that include:

1. Name, location, and time of each special session course/program.

2. Brief description of the purpose of each special session course/program.

3. Enrollment data, including number of graduates, as specified in system enrollment reporting requirements.

4. Faculty workload and salary data.

5. An indication as to whether the session is one-time or recurrent, including the projected number of cycles of offerings.

6. If applicable, changes anticipated in future cycles of offering.

Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Dated: May 5, 2010
April 19, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: Presidents

FROM: Ephraim P. Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

SUBJECT: Clarification on Self-Support Programs and Courses

At the March 22, 2011 meeting of the Board of Trustees, the Educational Policy Committee heard an information item titled “Strategic Implementation for Expanding Extended Education,” as a follow up to a report presented this past September. While the board item identified possible areas of future modification to extended education policy, at this time CSU directives regarding self-support special sessions have not changed. As you consider available options for providing service during the increasingly difficult fiscal circumstances the university faces, we offer the following information on specific areas of interest to campuses.

1. “Migrating” Courses and Programs from General Fund to Self Support

This practice constitutes “supplanting” and is not allowed. Courses and programs that have been offered through state support shall not be moved to self-support, either temporarily or permanently. Moving course sections that have been scheduled regularly during the fall, winter, and spring terms to self-support summer session also constitutes supplanting and is not acceptable. It is permissible for campuses to continue offering the usual number of state-support course sections in the fall, winter, and spring terms, while scheduling additional self-support versions of the courses.

Self-supporting special sessions shall not supplant regular course offerings available on a state-supported basis during the college year (Education Code Section 89708; EO 1047 (A)).

Special sessions courses shall not be offered at times or places that are likely to supplant or limit offerings of the state-supported program (Education Code Section 89708; EO 1047 (C)(2)(k)).

2. Adding a Self-Support Version of an Existing General Fund Degree Program

Campuses may add a self-support version of an existing degree program, provided that the requirements of applicable state laws and campus and systemwide policies are met, and subject to the campus-approved proposal’s review and Chancellor’s Office approval. Campuses are asked to provide evidence documenting that the program meets the requisite criteria for self support and that
there is sufficient demand to sustain both the state-support and self-support programs. Guidance on the process is at: http://www.calstate.edu/app/documents/program_modification/Adding_Self_Support_to_State-Support.pdf.

Once the self-support version has been implemented, it is expected that the General Fund program will be retained. Subsequent discontinuance of the state-support program would amount to supplanting.

Self-support, special sessions courses and programs must meet the requisite conditions specified in the “Special Sessions Programs, Courses and Credit” Executive Order (see http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1047.html).

Self-supporting special sessions shall not supplant regular course offerings available on a state-supported basis during the college year (Education Code Section 89708; EO 1047 (A)).

Special sessions courses shall not be offered at times or places that are likely to supplant or limit offerings of the state-supported program (Education Code Section 89708; EO 1047 (C)(2)(k)).

3. **Creating New Degree Programs in Self-Support**

   New self-support programs must meet state laws and campus and systemwide policies, and a campus-approved proposal must be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor’s Office before the program is implemented.

   Self-support, special sessions courses and programs must meet the requisite conditions specified in the “Special Sessions Programs, Courses and Credit” Executive Order (see http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1047.html).

4. **Offering Self-Support Courses in Summer**

   As stipulated in the February 4, 2011 memorandum issued by the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Budget and Finance, campuses are to elect whether to offer summer 2011 instruction through General Fund or self support. That document is attached.

   Self-Support summer courses are not to be offered in place of course sections usually offered through state support in the fall, winter, and spring terms.

   Self-supporting special sessions shall not supplant regular course offerings available on a state-supported basis during the college year (Education Code Section 89708; EO 1047 (A)).

   Special sessions courses shall not be offered at times or places that are likely to supplant or limit offerings of the state-supported program (Education Code Section 89708; EO 1047 (C)(2)(k)).
5. Remediation Courses in Self-Support

Remediation may be offered on special sessions during the summer but must be on state support during the academic year. We will always ask that you keep the CSU mission as a public university, our dedication to student service, and the CSU values of access, affordability, and diversity at the center of your decision making. In addition to the criteria for offering instruction through special sessions and the prohibition against supplanting state-support courses and programs, we cannot impede students’ access to the university by diminishing the availability of affordable remediation.

6. “Migrating” a Portion of Master of Business Administration Degrees to Self Support

Campuses are not to move “MBA-fee”-approved graduate programs (or portions thereof) from state support to self support, even to provide instruction at a lower cost. The recently instituted per-course fee approved for certain graduate professional business programs was authorized by the trustees to provide resources needed for those programs to maintain the curricular standards and the faculty resources and productivity required for professional accreditation. We cannot jeopardize the strength of those programs by restricting their revenues.

Questions regarding self-support may be directed to Ms. Sheila Thomas, State University Dean, Extended Education at (562) 951-4795 or stthomas@calstate.edu. For questions regarding program proposals, please contact Dr. Christine Mallon, State University Dean, Academic Programs and Policy at emallon@calstate.edu or (562) 951-4672.

ES/clm

Attachment

c: Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Benjamin Quillian, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Provosts and Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
Associate Provosts and Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Advocacy and State Relations
Robert Turnage, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Budget
Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support
Christine Mallon, State University Dean, Academic Programs and Policy
Sheila Thomas, State University Dean, Extended Education
Dean Kulju, Director, Financial Aid Services
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Deans of Extended Education
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Support for the California State University’s Professional Doctorate Tuition Fees

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support the California State University’s Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) recommended tuition fee in order to implement the provisions of AB 867 (Nava); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU support the California State University’s Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) recommended tuition fee in order to implement the provisions of AB 2382 (Blumenfield); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that the tuition fees recommended for the CSU’s DNP and DPT programs achieve the twin objectives of generating sufficient revenue to sustain fiscally sound doctoral programs and ensuring that the quality of support provided to undergraduate programs is not diminished; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, the CSU Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, campus Presidents, campus Provosts/Vice Presidents Academic Affairs, and campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: According to the CSU Board of Trustees May 9-10, 2011 agenda, the Committee on Finance (http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/May11/Finance.pdf) will review information items on the: 1) California State University’s Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) tuition fee; and 2) California State University’s Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) tuition fee.

Based on program-cost analysis conducted in consultation between the CSU Chancellor’s Office and CSU’s DNP campuses, the CSU Doctor of Nursing Practice tuition fee for 2012-13 is recommended to be assessed at $6,552 per term.

Based on program-cost analysis conducted in consultation among the CSU Chancellor’s Office and CSU’s DPT campuses, the CSU Doctor of Physical Therapy tuition fee is recommended to be set at $8,074 per term.

Approved—May 5-6, 2011
Assembly Bill No. 867

CHAPTER 416

An act to add and repeal Article 9 (commencing with Section 89280) of Chapter 2 of Part 55 of Division 8 of Title 3 of the Education Code, relating to nursing degrees.

[Approved by Governor September 28, 2010. Filed with Secretary of State September 28, 2010.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 867, Nava. California State University: Doctor of Nursing Practice degree pilot program.

Existing law establishes the California State University and its various campuses under the administration of the Trustees of the California State University. Existing law requires the California State University to offer undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master’s degree in the liberal arts and sciences and professional education, including teacher education.

This bill, until July 1, 2018, would authorize the California State University to establish a Doctor of Nursing Practice degree pilot program at 3 campuses chosen by the Board of Trustees to award the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree. The bill would distinguish the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree from the doctor of philosophy degree offered at the University of California. The bill would require the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree pilot program to be designed to enable professionals to earn the degree while working full time, train nurses for advanced practice, and prepare clinical faculty to teach in postsecondary nursing programs.

The bill would require the California State University to enroll and maintain no more than 90 full-time equivalent students in the degree pilot program at all 3 campuses combined. The bill would require initial funding to come from existing budgets, without diminishing the quality of undergraduate programs or reducing enrollment therein.

The bill would require the California State University, the Legislative Analyst’s Office, and the Department of Finance to jointly conduct a statewide evaluation of the degree pilot program and report the results to the Legislature and the Governor on or before January 1, 2017.

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

SECTION 1. Article 9 (commencing with Section 89280) is added to Chapter 2 of Part 55 of Division 8 of Title 3 of the Education Code, to read:
Article 9. Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree Pilot Program

89280. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:
(a) The State of California faces an ever-increasing nursing shortage that jeopardizes the health and well-being of the state’s citizens.
(b) Colleges and universities need to expand nursing education programs to prepare more nurses to meet the state’s growing demand for nurses. An estimated state shortage of 47,600 registered nurses is expected by 2010, and by 2020 the shortage is projected to reach 116,600 according to the Governor’s California Nurse Education Initiative Annual Report, September 2006.
(c) Well-trained nursing faculty and practitioners are critical to the ability to expand nursing programs.
(d) Because of the urgent need to prepare and graduate increased numbers of nurses, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish a pilot program that grants the California State University authority to offer the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree, as an exception to the Master Plan for Higher Education.

89281. (a) Notwithstanding Section 66010.4, in order to meet specific nursing education needs in California, the California State University may establish a Doctor of Nursing Practice degree pilot program at three campuses chosen by the Board of Trustees to award the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree, as described in this section.
(b) The authority to award the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree is limited to the discipline of nursing practice. The Doctor of Nursing Practice degree offered by the California State University through the degree pilot program shall be distinguished from the doctor of philosophy degree offered at, or in conjunction with, the University of California.
(c) The Doctor of Nursing Practice degree pilot program offered by the California State University shall focus on the preparation of clinical faculty to teach in postsecondary nursing education programs and may also train nurses for advanced nursing practice or nurse leadership, or both. The degree pilot program shall not replace or supplant master’s degree nursing programs offered, as of January 1, 2010, by the California State University. The degree pilot program shall be designed to enable professionals to earn the degree while working full time.
(d) A Doctor of Nursing Practice degree pilot program established by the California State University is not exempt from any review and approval processes, including those performed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.
(e) In implementing subdivision (a), the California State University shall comply with the following requirements:
(1) Enrollment and maintenance shall be limited to no more than 90 full-time equivalent students (FTES) in the degree pilot program at all three campuses combined.
(2) Funding on a per FTES basis for each new student in the degree pilot program shall be within the California State University’s enrollment growth levels as agreed to in the annual Budget Act. Enrollments in the degree pilot...
program shall not alter the California State University’s ratio of graduate instruction to total enrollment, and shall not diminish enrollment growth in university undergraduate programs. Funding provided from the state for each FTES shall be at the agreed-upon marginal costs calculation that the California State University receives for graduate enrollment.

(3) The California State University shall provide any initial funding needed for the degree pilot program authorized by this article from within existing budgets for academic programs support, without diminishing the quality of program support offered to California State University undergraduate programs. Funding for the degree pilot program shall not reduce undergraduate enrollments at the California State University. It is the intent of the Legislature that the California State University seek private donations or other nonstate funds to fund startup costs for the degree pilot program.

89282. (a) If the California State University establishes a Doctor of Nursing Practice degree pilot program pursuant to Section 89281, the California State University, the Legislative Analyst’s Office, and the Department of Finance shall jointly conduct a statewide evaluation of the degree pilot program implemented under this article. The results of the evaluation shall be reported, in writing, to the Legislature and the Governor on or before January 1, 2017. The evaluation shall consider all of the following:

(1) The number of Doctor of Nursing Practice degree pilot programs implemented, including information regarding the number of applicants, admissions, enrollments, degree recipients, time-to-degree, attrition, and public school and community college program partners.

(2) The extent to which the degree pilot program is fulfilling identified state needs for training in nursing practice, including statewide supply and demand data that considers capacity at the University of California and in California’s independent colleges and universities.

(3) Information on the place of employment of students and the subsequent job placement of graduates.

(4) Any available evidence on the effects that the graduates of the degree pilot program are having on addressing the state’s nursing shortage.

(5) Pilot program costs and the fund sources that were used to finance the program, including a calculation of cost per degree awarded.

(6) The costs of the degree pilot program to students, the amount of financial aid offered, and student debt levels of graduates of the program.

(7) The extent to which the degree pilot program is in compliance with the requirements of this article.

(8) Recommendations for the degree pilot program, including whether the program should be continued or modified.

(b) A report to be submitted pursuant to subdivision (a) shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.

89283. (a) The California State University shall permit students who enroll in the degree pilot program prior to July 1, 2018, to complete their coursework on or after July 1, 2018.
(b) The California State University shall not enroll any new students in the degree pilot program on or after July 1, 2018.

This article shall remain in effect only until July 1, 2018, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2019, deletes or extends that date.
Assembly Bill No. 2382

CHAPTER 425

An act to add Article 4.7 (commencing with Section 66042) to Chapter 2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of, and to repeal Section 66042.3 of, of the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.

[Approved by Governor September 28, 2010. Filed with Secretary of State September 28, 2010.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 2382, Blumenfield. California State University: Doctor of Physical Therapy degrees.

Existing law, known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, sets forth, among other things, the missions and functions of California’s public and independent segments of higher education, and their respective institutions of higher education. Provisions of the act do not apply to the University of California unless the regents of the university act, by resolution, to make them applicable.

Among other things, the act provides that the University of California has exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education to award the doctoral degree in all fields of learning, except that it may agree with the California State University to award joint doctoral degrees in selected fields. With respect to doctoral degrees, the act limits the California State University to awarding these degrees jointly with the University of California, as described above, or jointly with independent institutions of higher education, provided that the proposed doctoral program is approved by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

This bill would instead authorize the California State University to award the Doctor of Physical Therapy degree. This bill would require the degree to be distinguished from doctoral degree programs at the University of California.

The bill would require that the Doctor of Physical Therapy degree offered by the California State University be focused on preparing physical therapists to provide health care services and shall be consistent with meeting requirements of the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education. The bill would require that each student in the programs authorized by the bill be charged fees no higher than the rate charged for students in state-supported programs in physical therapy at the University of California.

The bill would require the California State University, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst’s Office to jointly conduct a statewide evaluation of the new programs implemented under the bill. The bill would specify topics to be included in this evaluation, and would require
that the evaluation be submitted to the Legislature and the Governor on or before January 1, 2015. This provision would be repealed on January 1, 2019.

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

SECTION 1. Article 4.7 (commencing with Section 66042) is added to Chapter 2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code, to read:

Article 4.7. Doctoral Programs in Physical Therapy

66042. (a) The Legislature finds and declares both of the following:
(1) Since its adoption in 1960, the Master Plan for Higher Education has served to create the largest and most distinguished higher education system in the nation. A key component of the Master Plan for Higher Education is the differentiation of mission and function, whereby doctoral and identified professional programs are limited to the University of California, with the provision that the California State University can provide doctoral education in joint doctoral programs with the University of California and independent California colleges and universities. The differentiation of function has allowed California to provide universal access to postsecondary education while preserving quality.
(2) Because of the need to prepare and educate increased numbers of physical therapists, the State of California is granting the California State University authority to offer the Doctor of Physical Therapy degree as an exception to the differentiation of function in graduate education that assigns sole authority among the California higher education segments to the University of California for awarding doctoral degrees independently. This exception to the Master Plan for Higher Education recognizes the distinctive strengths and respective missions of the California State University and the University of California.
(b) Pursuant to subdivision (a), and notwithstanding Section 66010.4, in order to meet specific physical therapy education needs in California, the California State University may award the Doctor of Physical Therapy (D.P.T.) degree. The authority to award degrees granted by this article is limited to the discipline of physical therapy. The Doctor of Physical Therapy degree offered by the California State University shall be distinguished from doctoral degree programs at the University of California.

66042.1. In implementing Section 66042, the California State University shall comply with all of the following requirements:
(a) Funding on a per full-time equivalent student (FTES) basis for each new student in these degree programs shall be from within the California State University’s enrollment growth levels as agreed to in the annual Budget Act. Enrollments in these programs shall not alter the California State University’s ratio of graduate instruction to total enrollment, and shall not diminish enrollment growth in university undergraduate programs. Funding
provided from the state for each FTES shall be at the agreed-upon marginal cost calculation that the California State University receives.

(b) The Doctor of Physical Therapy (D.P.T.) degree offered by the California State University shall be focused on preparing physical therapists to provide health care services, and shall be consistent with meeting the requirements of the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE).

(c) Nothing in this article shall be construed to limit or preclude the California Postsecondary Education Commission from exercising its authority under Chapter 11 (commencing with Section 66900) to review, evaluate, and make recommendations relating to any and all programs established under this article.

(d) Each student in the programs authorized by this article shall be charged fees no higher than the rate charged for students in state-supported doctoral degree programs in physical therapy at the University of California, including joint D.P.T. programs of the California State University and the University of California.

(e) The California State University shall provide any startup funding needed for the programs authorized by this article from within existing budgets for academic programs support, without diminishing the quality of program support offered to California State University undergraduate programs. Funding of these programs shall not result in reduced undergraduate enrollments at the California State University.

66042.3. (a) The California State University, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst’s Office shall jointly conduct a statewide evaluation of the new programs implemented under this article. The results of the evaluation shall be reported, in writing, to the Legislature and the Governor on or before January 1, 2015. The evaluation required by this section shall consider all of the following:

1. The number of new doctoral programs in physical therapy implemented, including information identifying the number of new programs, applicants, admissions, enrollments, and degree recipients.

2. The extent to which the programs established under this article are fulfilling identified needs for physical therapists, including statewide supply and demand data that considers capacity at the University of California and in California’s independent colleges and universities.

3. Information on the place of employment of students and the subsequent job placement of graduates.

4. Program costs and the fund sources that were used to finance these programs, including a calculation of cost per degree awarded.

5. The costs of the programs to students, the amount of financial aid offered, and student debt levels of graduates of the programs.

6. The extent to which the programs established under this article are in compliance with the requirements of this article.

(b) (1) A report to be submitted pursuant to subdivision (a) shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.
(2) Pursuant to Section 10231.5 of the Government Code, this section is repealed on January 1, 2019.
Request to the Board of Trustees to Delay Action on Recommended Changes to the Title 5 “American Institutions” Graduation Requirement until Its November 2011 Meeting

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) respectfully request that the Board of Trustees defer action on the recommended changes to Title 5 “American Institutions” graduation requirement from July until its November 2011 meeting in order to provide sufficient time for faculty, given the variability of campus academic calendars, to examine the proposed changes and to explore and make recommendations for ensuring compliance with SB 1440; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm its historic commitment “to provide opportunities for individuals to develop intellectually, personally, and professionally” and “to prepare significant numbers of educated, responsible people to contribute to California's schools, economy, culture, and future” enshrined in the mission of the California State University and codified in Title 5, California Administrative Code; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that several campus senates (Chico, Dominguez Hills, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San José, San Marcos, Sonoma,) have already passed resolutions and several more campus senates are preparing resolutions (Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach, Maritime, Sacramento, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Stanislaus) requesting a delay in action by the Board of Trustees on the proposed change to Title 5 “American Institution” Graduation Requirement in order to allow for proper faculty consultation; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCU send copies of this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, campus presidents, campus senate chairs, CSU provosts/Vice Presidents Academic Affairs

RATIONALE: For decades the California State University has maintained the graduation requirement known as “American Institutions” in order to ensure that all CSU graduates “acquire knowledge and skills that will help them to comprehend the workings of American democracy and of the society in which they live, to enable them to contribute to that society as responsible and constructive citizens” (Title 5 40404). In so far as it was not the intention of SB 1440 to erode the value of an undergraduate degree from the California State University system, the delay in consideration by the Board of Trustees to changes in Title 5 “American Institutions” Graduation Requirement as recommended herein by the ASCSU will provide the opportunity for sufficient consultation by local academic senates.
The CSUs long-standing commitment to the American Institutions graduation requirement is being called into question because of the presumption that it will prevent CSU campuses from complying with the provisions of the 2010 Student Transfer Achievement Reform (SB 1440), which stipulates that no transfer student completing an approved Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) consisting of 60 units – including CSU General Education Breadth requirements and at least 18 units of coursework meeting disciplinary or major-specific requirements – may be required to take more than 60 units at the CSU in order to obtain a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree. While the ASCSU supports efforts to ensure the timely matriculation of transfer students at the CSU, it considers the proposed changes to Title 5 premature.

The request to delay Board action until November 2011 will not adversely affect the implementation of any TMC or student matriculation.

Approved Unanimously – May 5-6, 2011
The Importance of Civic Education (CSU Graduation Requirements in United States History, Constitution, and American Institutions) for both Native and Transfer Students

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its commitment to the principle that all graduates of our institution should demonstrate an understanding of “American democracy and of the society in which they live” so that they may “contribute to that society as responsible and constructive citizens”; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that a pragmatic consequence of compliance with SB 1440 means CSU departmental and program requirements may come into conflict with statewide graduation requirements as well as local institutional graduation requirements. Although there are many possible solutions that will be explored on the campuses of the CSU, one possible consequence is that the current full version of what is considered as adequate for completion of a baccalaureate degree may not be realized for SB 1440 students; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the faculty and advisors of the California Community Colleges (CCC) encourage transfer AA students to take courses, prior to their transfer to the CSU, that are congruent with graduating at 60 units, and which also fulfill CSU Title 5 graduation requirements (including American Institutions) or other local CSU degree completion requirements; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be distributed to the Chancellor, to the Board of Trustees; to all campus senates; to the current Chairs of CSU History, Political Science, and Ethnic Studies Departments; to the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee; Chancellor of CCC, and the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges.

RATIONALE: The intent of the resolution is to maximize student success and desirable educational outcomes in an efficient manner.

For decades the California State University has maintained a requirement (in Title 5 administrative law) for all CSU graduates to “acquire knowledge and skills that will help them to comprehend the workings of American democracy and of the society in which they live, to enable them to contribute to that society as responsible and constructive citizens” (Title 5 40404). At the present time, most students transferring into the CSU already have these graduation requirements complete (often within GE) upon admission.
An informed citizenry is necessary in American democracy, but mounting evidence shows that "most individual voters are abysmally ignorant of even very basic political information."i

The passing last Autumn of SB 1440 – a measure designed to streamline transfers from the California Community Colleges to the CSU – has enabled the creation of “Transfer AA” degrees from the CCC system; the CCC system, however, has not explicitly included the CSU Title 5 American Institutions requirements as a part of these newly created transfer degrees. SB 1440 does not exclude statewide requirements from inclusion in transfer AA degrees.

Tarjan move 4th paragraph higher

The CSU Board of Trustees is considering changes in the Title 5 “American Institutions” requirement that will enable (but not necessarily require) the Chancellor, Presidents and “appropriate campus authorities” to waive the American Institutions requirement for certain majors and groups. It is widely perceived that these potential changes to Title 5 are closely tied to “unit caps” explicitly required for SB1440 compliance. This produces an unfortunate situation where the American Institutions requirements is perceived as the primary means by which degree unit reductions (seen as required to comply with SB1440) will be met.

Approved Unanimously – May 5-6, 2011

---

i See for example Ilya Somin, “When Ignorance Isn’t Bliss: How Political Ignorance Threatens Democracy” (Policy Analysis No. 525, September 22, 2004.) “In this paper I review the overwhelming evidence that the American electorate fails to meet even minimal criteria for adequate voter knowledge” (p. 2.) See also Andrew Romano, “How Dumb Are We? Newsweek gave 1,000 Americans the U.S. Citizenship Test–38% failed. The country’s future is imperiled by our ignorance,” Newsweek March 28 and April 4, 2011.