I. Minutes: Approval of the October 8 and October 15, 1996 minutes of the Academic Senate (pp. 3-6).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
   A. **If all items on today's agenda have not concluded their first reading, there will be an additional meeting on November 12 to complete all first-reading Business Items (A-G) before continuing to second-reading items (H and I). That meeting will take place from 3-5pm in UU220. Please mark your calendars.**
   B. Disposition of Resolutions Adopted by the Academic Senate During 1995-1996 (pp. 7-7g).

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair:
   B. President's Office:
   C. Provost's Office:
   D. Statewide Senators:
   E. CFA Campus President:
   F. Staff Council representative:
   G. ASI representatives:
   H. IACC representative:
   I. Athletics Governing Board representative:
   J. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   A. **GE&B course proposals:** Smidt, chair of the GE&B Committee, first reading (pp. 12-13, see separate document enclosed).
   B. **Cultural Pluralism Requirement course proposals:** Williamson, former chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading (p. 14, see separate document enclosed).
   C. **Curriculum course proposals:** Williamson, former chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading (pp. 15-103, see separate document enclosed).
   D. **Resolution on Policy on Amorous Relationships:** Swartz, chair of the Status of Women Committee, first reading (pp. 14-17 on your October 8 agenda).
   E. **Resolution on Allocation of Cal Poly Funds:** Hood, chair of the Budget Committee, first reading (p. 18 on your October 8 agenda).
   F. **Resolution on Input into Campus Planning:** Greenwald, Academic Senate Chair, first reading (p. 19 on your October 8 agenda).

continued on page two
G. Resolution on Program Review and Improvement Committee's Findings for 1995-1996 programs reviewed: Morrobel-Sosa, first reading (see separate document enclosed with your October 8 agenda).

H. Resolution on The Academic Calendar: First Day of Instruction: Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading (revised resolution on p. 8 of this agenda).

I. Resolution on Credit for Advanced Placement Exams: Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading (revised resolution on pp. 9-11 of this agenda).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date approved by President Baker</th>
<th>Resolution No.</th>
<th>Resolution Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.15.95</td>
<td>AS-445-95/EEC</td>
<td>Resolution to Support Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2274-95/GA &quot;...Principles that Guide Programs to Achieve Educational Equity and Faculty Diversity...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.96</td>
<td>AS-446-95/Chem</td>
<td>Resolution on Department Name Change for the Chemistry Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15.95</td>
<td>AS-447-95/TFGA</td>
<td>Resolution on Revisions to the California Polytechnic State University Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.96</td>
<td>AS-449-95/IC</td>
<td>Resolution on &quot;U&quot; Grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.13.95 (ack)</td>
<td>AS-450-95/BC</td>
<td>Resolution on the Cal Poly Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.14.95</td>
<td>AS-451-95/PSSI</td>
<td>Resolution on Performance Salary Step Increase Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.96</td>
<td>AS-452-96/CAGR</td>
<td>Resolution to Establish an Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.24.96</td>
<td>AS-453-96/CC</td>
<td>Resolution on Standardizing Course Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no action needed</td>
<td>AS-454-96</td>
<td>Resolution Commending Steven Marx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no action needed</td>
<td>AS-455-96/EC</td>
<td>Resolution on Academic Senate Released Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.12.96</td>
<td>AS-456-96/EC</td>
<td>Resolution on the Reorganization of Academic Senate Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no action needed</td>
<td>AS-457-96/EC</td>
<td>Resolution on General Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9.96</td>
<td>AS-458-96/AE</td>
<td>Resolution on Department Name Change for the Agricultural Engineering Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see attached)</td>
<td>AS-459-96/LRPC</td>
<td>Resolution to Approve Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see attached)</td>
<td>AS-460-96/PRAIC</td>
<td>Resolution on External Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see attached)</td>
<td>AS-461-96/PRAIC</td>
<td>Resolution to Approve Procedures for External Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15.96</td>
<td>AS-462-96/CSM</td>
<td>Resolution on Proposal to Establish an Environmental Biotechnology Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.12.96</td>
<td>AS-463-96/CLS</td>
<td>Resolution on Information Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see attached)</td>
<td>AS-464-96</td>
<td>Resolution on Credit/No Credit Grading for General Education and Breadth Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: Harvey Greenwald, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
      President

Subject: Initial Response to AS-459-96/LRPC, Resolution to
         Approve Policy and Review Procedures for
         Discontinuance of an Academic Program

This is in response to the above subject Academic Senate resolution. The following are a number of initial observations of this Resolution. However, based upon the complexities involved, further administrative review by the Academic Deans' Council, Faculty Affairs, and University Legal Counsel must be conducted. This review will begin this Fall Quarter.

General Comments:

Throughout the document, references to the Vice President for Academic Affairs should be revised to refer to the Chief Academic Officer.

References to "school" should be revised to refer to colleges or other appropriate units.

Department "heads" should be revised to "chairs/heads."

The process and information required by this policy should be consistent with the resolutions on external program review, the information required for program and course proposals, and the requirements of the Program Review and Improvement Committee.

Specific Comments:

Opening paragraph, sentence 2: as proposed, there is only one condition for discontinuance—reduction of financial support. There could be others, some of them voluntary, such as loss of student enrollments. As an example, in the past, this policy was used to discontinue the master's degree in Chemistry at the request of the Department.
I. Procedures

A. Initiation of a discontinuance proposal. This section states that a proposal to discontinue an academic program will ordinarily be the result of a regular program review. However, the opening paragraphs propose that discontinuance will occur only when there is a reduction of financial support.

The first bulleted item differentiates programs and departments, and requires a vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in those departments to instigate a special review. This may result in procedural difficulties if a program includes more than one department.

B. "will review the proposal for discontinuance" revise to "will review the proposal for special review."

C. The first group: 2: Two members of the Deans Council. The Deans Council's membership includes individuals who are not college deans. If the membership of this committee is intended to include college deans specifically, then please revise accordingly.

The second group: "Faculty representatives involved in the program,"--something has been omitted from this statement. Should it be item 4?

Last sentence in this section: revise to read: "There will be at least one faculty member from each program involved if more than one program is being reviewed." However, this requirement could make the memberships of these committees very complex. It is not merely a case of adding faculty members, but affects Items 1, 2, and 3 as well if the programs include more than one department and college.

D. Recommendations from the committee:

First sentence: "merits or lack of merit," revised to "strengths and weaknesses."

Paragraph 2, sentence 1: "terminated," revise to "discontinued."

Paragraph 3: it is not clear who "all faculty members" in Sentence One refers to--all faculty members on the committees? Or in the affected programs/departments? Or in the University? Item 5 of the timetable suggests this may be all faculty members in the University.

Last paragraph in item D:

Sentence 1: the "eleven members" could be considerably larger given the conditions for membership set forth in Item C.
Sentence 2: it is not clear who the "other groups" are.

Reference to the document produced by the State Analyst: this is desirable, but perhaps not achievable. The State Analyst is a disinterested party; the document called for in this paragraph will not be produced by disinterested parties.

The process set forth in this paragraph may be workable, but it is not certain that the two groups can produce the report called for, or that it would not result in unnecessary bitterness and acrimony that could be avoided by having the two reports forwarded to the Chief Academic Officer, who will then have them reviewed according to the proposed procedure.

II. Considerations in Program Discontinuance Review

Item 2: "program to meet the identified needs," revise to: "program in meeting its goals and objectives."

Item 4: FTEF and FTES data from comparable programs in other institutions might be difficult to obtain. Further, it might be problematic if the programs are not identical.

Item 5: "sifts," revise to "changes."

III. Information for Program Discontinuance Review

B. Sentence 1, revise to: "The most recent report of external review, if a program is accredited or approved."

A "panel of professionals outside the CSU." This condition needs to be consistent with the requirements for external program review, which may include reviewers from CSU institutions.

1. FTEF "required." It is not clear what "required" means in this context.

Time Table for Program Discontinuance

Item 6: "produce a critique of the arguments," revise to "produces a critique of the findings."

Item 8: as the title to the items suggests, the Academic Senate would make "recommendations" to the President, not "a recommendation."
Memorandum

To: Harvey Greenwald, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Date: September 23, 1996

Copies: Paul J. Zingg
Glenn W. Irvin

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolutions AS-460-96/PRAIC, and AS-461-96/PRAIC

I appreciate the work the Academic Senate has accomplished on these resolutions, which will play a significant role in program improvement and efficiency. In order that these two resolutions can be adopted and implemented as quickly as possible, I am requesting the Senate respond to the following issues raised during the administrative review.

AS-460-96/PRAIC, Resolution on External Review

The process and information required for this review should be consistent with that required for program and course proposals, for Program Review and Improvement, and for Program Discontinuance.

1. **Background**

   In the opening sentence, replace "input on academic programs" with "evaluation of academic programs and departments." Paragraph 2 indicates that non-degree granting academic departments will also undergo review.

   Second sentence, revise to read, "For programs and departments which are not subject to accreditation review, formal external review should occur."

2. **Whereas Clauses**

   Whereas 2 states that specialized accreditation "may be deemed unnecessary," but Whereas 3 indicates that all programs will seek either specialized accreditation or undergo external review." Although these two statements are not strictly contradictory, to eliminate any misinterpretation and to clarify the role of external review, the following revision to Whereas 3 is suggested: "that all degree programs, in consultation with their college dean, either undergo external review as part of specialized accreditation or separately; and be it further...."
3. Resolved Clauses

Resolved 1: drop "efforts" in the first line.

AS-461-96/PRAIC. Resolution To Approve Procedures For External Program Review

Throughout the document, references to the Vice President for Academic Affairs should be changed to refer to the "Chief Academic Officer."

References to departments should be revised to indicate "departments/programs," since some degree programs include more than one department and college. Similarly, references to department chairs should also reference program chairs or directors.

The process and information required for this review should be consistent with that required for program and course proposals, for Program Review and Improvement, and for Program Discontinuance.

First paragraph:

First sentence: "for outside evaluation of academic programs and departments."

Review schedule: Revise the statement to make clear that the scheduled internal program review should be adjusted to coincide with the schedule for specialized accreditation review so the effort is not duplicated.

The Review Panel:

The selection of reviewers should involve consultative offices beyond those of the department chair(s) and dean(s), and should include national professional associations, accrediting bodies, other institutions, and appropriate organizations to identify qualified reviewers. The list of reviewers should be determined through mutual agreement of the department, college, and chief academic officer.

Preparation for Review:

A valuable component of the program review process will be a self-study conducted by the faculty and staff of the program. Such a self-study, which is required as part of the process for specialized accreditation, goes beyond the mere collection of data and entails a thorough examination of the various aspects of the program. A self-study should be conducted as part of an external program review.
Statement 2: the statement of program/department mission, goals, and objectives should be accompanied by an assessment of how well the program has met its mission and accomplished its goals and objectives. This assessment might take a variety of forms and address several measures, such as those suggested in the WASC material on assessment, in "Commitment to Visionary Pragmatism," the discussions of the Cal Poly Plan, and other campus documents.

The information requested in this section should be consistent with information requested in program and course proposals.

Reviewer Guidelines:

1. Department Objectives: this section should include an item on assessment and the measures to be used in determining how well the goals and objectives are met.

2.b. Curricular Content: The self-study and report should consider whether the program/department is offering the number and variety of courses appropriate to the size of the faculty and program needs—that is, neither too many nor too few courses.

   This section should address the program's relationship to the co-curriculum and Student Affairs.

3. Faculty: This section should address the department/program's statements and definitions of activities acceptable as professional development, scholarship, research, and creative activity.

   Item c: revise to: "research and creative projects."

Post-Review Recommendations:

The process for responding should complement the regular review schedule of the Program Review and Improvement Committee.

Thank you again for your attention to these matters.
The comments of the Academic Senate Instruction Committee, dated June 3, 1996, are well-taken and should be addressed before Resolution AS-464-96 is accepted and promulgated as policy.

Two, in particular, merit attention. First is the issue of student consultation. This item was presented to the Academic Senate as part of a resolution on General Education and Breadth, but was separated on the floor of the Senate and enacted without prolonged debate. Although the Academic Senate contains student representation, it was not present during this process. As a result, there has been little or no student consultation on a matter that affects them more directly than any other campus group. If the students do not wish to provide any input on this matter, that should be determined more directly with their representation rather than to characterize their non-attendance at Senate meetings as indicative of their viewpoint. This matter should receive their attention, but they should not be given the right of veto. Their involvement might be to examine the implications of such a change and the process of implementation. Since such a change could affect student credit unit loads and the progress of students toward their degrees, it is most important to explore its possible consequences.

Another aspect of this resolution that merits attention is its potentially adverse impact on encouraging students to explore the University curriculum in the lower risk context of Cr/NCr grading. Eliminating this option for GE&B courses essentially restricts the option to free electives. But, as you know, free electives constitute a very small portion of our students’ overall program as they have been eroded with the expansion of major requirements. It is expected that the Senate will give this concern attention, and support appropriate steps to protect both the exploratory purpose of Cr/NCr grading and the principle of curricular choice through free electives.

The Administration agrees with the proposal conceptually, but further consultation with the students and attention to the concerns of curricular exploration must occur in this matter before it will be approved.

Attachments
WHEREAS, C.A.M. section 481.B.1 states, "Whenever possible, the first day of instruction in each quarter will be Monday with a 48 day minimum per quarter (49 day minimum spring) and whenever possible the last day of instruction each quarter will be a Friday;" and

WHEREAS, In recent years, including 1996-1997, this stipulation has not been incorporated in the planning of the Academic Calendar; and

WHEREAS, Failure to start Winter quarter on a Monday results in three Monday holidays, which adversely affects scheduling and instruction; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That C.A.M. 481.B.1 shall be revised as follows:

Instructional days—Whenever possible, the first day of instruction in each quarter shall be Monday with a 48 day minimum per quarter (49 day minimum spring) and whenever possible the last day of instruction each quarter will be a Friday.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That C.A.M. 481.B.1. shall be given higher priority in planning the academic calendar than sections 481.A.2 (end Summer Quarter before Labor Day) and 481.A.5 (end Spring Quarter before the second weekend in June).

and be it further

RESOLVED, That at the time of initial review of the Academic Calendar, the Provost may recommend a first day of instruction other than Monday subject to approval by the Academic Senate.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
Revised October 14, 1996
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-96/
RESOLUTION ON
CREDIT FOR ADVANCED PLACEMENT EXAMS

WHEREAS, Incoming students with advanced placement credits are already among the best students admitted to the University. Their intellectual growth should be further stimulated and encouraged; and

WHEREAS, It is common practice elsewhere in the California State University and University of California systems to provide students with specific course credit for advanced placement scores of 3 or higher; and

WHEREAS, The Visionary Pragmatism report recommends that the University should “award credit towards completion of the program for all standardized advanced placement credit earned by the student with a test score of 3 or higher;” therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That whenever possible, students shall receive specific course credit for all scores of 3 or above; and be it further

RESOLVED, That departments are encouraged to identify specific major and GE&B course credits, rather than “free electives,” for the AP exams relevant to their disciplines; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee will evaluate departments' advanced placement policies during the course of their normal review process.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Revised October 14, 1996
ADVANCED PLACEMENT CREDIT-1995 Exams

Overview:
Students receive course and/or free elective credit based on scores received on various exams. These scores may appear on the high school transcript or on score sheets sent to us from ETS (see NOTE on page 2 for ordering information). The type of credit applied will to some extent depend on the student’s major. All exams passed with a score of 3 result in nine units of credit. If course credit is awarded, the unit value of the courses is subtracted from the nine units and any remaining units count as elective credit. Changes from 1994 exams in credit given are marked with an asterisk (*).

All credit is given on a credit/no credit basis; no units are calculated into the GPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAM NAME</th>
<th>CREDIT GIVEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art History:</td>
<td>GEB Area C.2 - 3 units of credit (Art 112) and 6 units of elective credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art General:</td>
<td>9 units of elective credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Studio:</td>
<td>9 units of elective credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology:</td>
<td>Bio 151 for 5 units and four units of free elective credit; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoo 131, an E.2 elective, and 2 to 3 free elective units; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bio 220 credit for 4 units and 5 free elective units; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A B.1 Life Science for 3 units, an E.2 elective (Bio 220) for 3 units, and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>free elective units; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bio 101 and 105, an E.2 elective for 3 units, and 2 free elective units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus AB:</td>
<td>Nine units of credit distributed according to the requirements of the student’s major:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math 141 or 131 or 221 and 5 free electives; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math 118 or 120 AND 141 or 131 and any remaining units in free electives, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 6 units of GEB area B.2 Math credit and 3 free elective units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus BC:</td>
<td>Math 141 and 142 or 131 and 132, and one free elective unit, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math 221 and 5 free electives; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 9 units of mathematics credit at a level lower than Math 141 (i.e., Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118, or 120 but not Stats); OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 6 units of GEB area B.2 Math credit and 3 free elective units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE:</td>
<td>If both Calculus AB and BC are taken (with a minimum score of 3):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit is extended only for Calculus BC, since BC duplicates all of what is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>covered in AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry:</td>
<td>9 free elective units; advise student to check with Chemistry Department for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>any possible course credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Government</td>
<td>9 units of free elective credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Politics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science:</td>
<td>F.1 Computer Science elective for 3 units and 6 free electives OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test A or AB:</td>
<td>CSC 118 for 4 units and 5 free elective units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test A and AB:</td>
<td>As above, and 4.5 additional free elective units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English:</td>
<td>Effective Fall 1986, score of 3 results in EPT exemption and free elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Composition)</td>
<td>credit only (9 units) for either Lit/Comp or Lang/Comp exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and Composition: score of 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### English:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and Composition:</th>
<th>Engl 114 and 5 free elective units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>score of 4 or 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### English:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature &amp; Composition:</th>
<th>Engl 114 and Engl 253 (C.1 literature) and 2 free elective units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>score of 4 or 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** If student takes both Lit/Comp and Lang/Comp, only 4.5 units of credit are awarded for the second exam (since the composition portion is duplicated in the second exam) for a total of 13.5 units.

### European History:
| History 102 and 103 and 3 free elective units |

### French:
| score of 3: | Fr 201 and 5 free elective units |
| score of 4 or 5: | Fr 201 and 202 and 1 free elective unit |

### German:
| score of 3: | Ger 201 and 5 free elective units |
| score of 4 or 5: | Ger 201 and 202 and 1 free elective unit |

### Latin:
| 9 free elective units |

### Microeconomics
| Econ 212 and 6 free elective units |

### Macroeconomics
| Econ 211 and 6 free elective units |

### Music Theory:
| Music 101 and Music 104 and 5 free elective units |

### Physics:
| B.1 Physical Science elective (NO LAB CREDIT) for up to 4 units and the remaining units in free electives. Score of 5: possible credit for Phys 121-123; see Department Chair. |

### Physics B exam:
| Score of 3: Physical Science elective credit (NO LAB) for up to 4 units and the remaining in free electives. Score of 4 or 5: Phys 131 for 4 units and 5 free elective units |

### Physics C exam:
| Mechanics: | Score of 3 or 4: Physical Science elective credit (NO LAB) for up to 4 units and the remaining in free electives. Score of 5: Phys 133 for 4 units and 5 free elective units |

### Physics C exam:
| E & M: | Score of 3 or 4: Physical Science elective credit (NO LAB) for up to 4 units and the remaining in free electives. Score of 5: Phys 133 for 4 units and 5 free elective units |

### Psychology
| Psy 201 or 202 and 6 free elective units |

### Spanish Language:
| Span 201 and 5 free elective units |
| score of 3: |
| score of 4 or 5: | Span 201 and 202 and 1 free elective unit |

### Spanish Literature:
| Span 201 and 5 free elective units |
| score of 3: |
| score of 4: | Span 201 and 202 and 1 free elective unit |
| score of 5: | Span 201 (1 unit), 202, and 233 |

### United States Government and Politics:
| 9 units of elective credit. Student should complete POLS 211 for 1 unit (California government) to cover POLS 210 requirement. Once POLS 211 has been completed: 2 units for POLS 210 and 7 free elective units |

### S. History:
| Hist 201 and 6 free elective units for History majors; OR Hist 204 and 6 free elective units |

**NOTE:** To order AP scores, the student should write to AP Exams, P. O. Box 6671, Princeton, NJ 08541-6671 Phone (609) 771-7300 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. Eastern time.
Support for Educational Equity Programs in the CSU
– Opposition to the California Civil Rights Initiative

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of the California State University is committed to equity of opportunity for access to and success in higher education; and

WHEREAS, Historical, socioeconomic, cultural, and institutional factors contribute to lower matriculation and persistence rates of students from particular racial/ethnic groups and gender representation in selected disciplines; and

WHEREAS, Educational Equity Programs in the California State University attempt to redress inequities in access to and opportunity for success in higher education; and

WHEREAS, Outreach programs that attempt to increase the pool of CSU eligible students from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups, that identify and encourage students from these groups to attend college, and that facilitate access are central to the mission of the CSU; and

WHEREAS, Support programs that address income disparities among various racial/ethnic groups and attempt to create an environment that is sensitive to and meets the academic and personal needs of students from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups are necessary to increase the persistence and success of students from these groups; and

WHEREAS, A proposed statewide constitutional amendment by initiative titled, California Civil Rights Initiative (CCRI) contains a provision that has been interpreted by the Legislative Analyst as applying to educational equity programs in the CSU and if approved, may be enforced in a way that prohibits the CSU from continuing to dedicate efforts to the recruitment and support of students from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University reaffirm its support for the principles that guide programs to achieve educational equity in the CSU as articulated in Academic Senate CSU resolution AS-2274-95, adopted on March 9-10, 1995 (attached), and be it further
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU support the continuation of Educational Equity Programs in the CSU that attempt to address the specific needs of students from underrepresented groups; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU oppose the proposed state constitutional amendment by initiative titled, California Civil Rights Initiative because of the potential for its interpretation and application to perpetuate limited access to higher education of persons from specific racial/ethnic groups; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the campus senates to consider and endorse this resolution.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY -- May 9-10, 1996
Technology and connects these two positions in terms of strategic planning and budget planning.

Hampsey expressed concern that the emphasis on "planning" seemed to be overshadowing the "academic" focus of administrative positions. Zingg responded that due to the former use of formulas in administrating academic matters, not much planning had been done. The present thinking has been to correct this oversight in identifying planning as a priority of the institution.

Amspacher felt it would be unfortunate to proceed with this matter and not have the full support of faculty because the change was made during summer quarter when most faculty would be unaware that this was being considered. He encouraged the Executive Committee to wait until faculty returned for fall quarter before making a final decision.

(Hampsey/Martinez) Motion M/S/P unanimously to delay forwarding a nomination to the search committee for this position until fall quarter when wider faculty discussion can occur.

4. **Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee**: Irene Hoffman was elected as the third Academic Senate representative to the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee. The other two representatives are Harvey Greenwald and John Hampsey.

VI. Discussion Items:

A. **1998 curriculum cycle**: Whiteford informed the committee that the four-unit issue needed to be resolved as soon as possible in preparation for the next catalog cycle.

B. **Faculty computer workstations**: There is a strong possibility that all faculty will be furnished with computer workstations during this next academic year.

C. **Fall Enrollment**: This item will be discussed at a future Executive Committee meeting during fall quarter.

D. **Proposition 209**: The Chair brought this matter to the Executive Committee because a response to the statewide Academic Senate was needed prior to fall quarter. An unsuccessful motion was made asking the Executive Committee to decline addressing this issue. A second motion was M/S/P (Hampsey/Martinez) as follows: In light of this resolution coming from the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), the Executive Committee endorses the ICAS resolution so that agency can take action on it now.

**AFFIRMATIVE ACTION RESOLUTION:**

WHEREAS, ICAS is committed to student transfer.
WHEREAS, programs aimed at recruitment, retention and transfer of students historically underrepresented in higher education have a positive impact on student transfer.
WHEREAS, there is current legislation aimed at the legality of such effort.

RESOLVE: that the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates strongly opposes the concepts included in the anti-Affirmative Action legislation and initiative and reaffirms its commitment to Affirmative Action in the recruitment, transfer and support of those historically underrepresented in higher education.
RESOLUTION ON
CALIFORNIA BALLOT PROPOSITION 209 (CCRI)

#RF96-149

At its meeting of October 8, 1996, the Academic Senate approved the following resolution on Proposition 209, California Civil Rights Initiative (CCRI):

WHEREAS The intent and possible effects of Proposition 209 have been both confusing and divisive; and

WHEREAS There is an existing and distinguished body of both Federal and State law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, gender or creed; and

WHEREAS If passed, Proposition 209 would have a negative impact on diversity among students, faculty, and staff of the California State University system and would likewise erode efforts to promote appreciation of diversity; and

WHEREAS The language of this ballot measure fails to provide appropriate remedies for what its proponents allege to be defects in existing affirmative action programs; and

WHEREAS The ballot measure assumes that affirmative action programs are in some way discriminatory against particular populations; and

WHEREAS The measure would jeopardize gains in access to opportunity for many populations in California; therefore be it

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate of San Francisco State University reaffirm the University’s long-standing commitment to diversity; and be it further

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate of San Francisco State University reaffirm its commitment to the programs and policies that promote access to the University and opportunity for higher education for students from all groups; and be it further

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate of San Francisco State University reaffirm its commitment to ensuring the diversity of its faculty and staff; and be it further

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate of San Francisco State University oppose Proposition 209 as detrimental to the University’s efforts to promote diversity, equal access, and equal opportunity for students, faculty, and staff.
The Academic Senate of CSUDH has considered and endorses the resolution approved by the State-Wide Academic Senate of the California State University (AS-2330-96/AA) supporting educational equity programs in the CSU and opposing the California Civil Rights Initiative, and wishes further to emphasize its opposition to Proposition 209, in the following manner:

WHEREAS: The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America stipulates that, "Congress shall make no law...or prohibit...the right of people...to petition the Government for redress of grievances," and

WHEREAS: the people have petitioned for redress of their grievances against the practice of racial discrimination and Congress has responded to the racial and gender prejudice evident in the past and continuing history of this country, and

WHEREAS: the clear Legislative response to the call for redress to the prejudicial tenor of our times is affirmative action, and

WHEREAS: affirmative action response is still necessary to imprint our society with appropriate cultural diversity in our business, academic, and governmental infrastructures, and

WHEREAS: while Proposition 209 explicitly argues that "the State shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education or public contracting," implicitly it intends for the political election agenda, driving the "need" for such a proposition, to attempt to thwart current affirmative action practices, and

WHEREAS: the guise of Proposition 209 is to make strong ethnic distinctions between white and non-white populations, stepping
backward into an era of demagoguery from which a plurality of our enlightened leaders have attempted to emancipate us, be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of the California State University at Dominguez Hills renounces the premise of Proposition 209 that there is no need for affirmative action if we claim that non-discriminatory tolerance is constitutionally protected for all peoples. And, denounces the intent of the proposition which is to mislead the electorate into believing that the generic concept of "constitutional non-discrimination" needs no further law compliance mechanisms to validate its applicability to all citizens and, be it further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of the California State University at Dominguez Hills opposes the spirit, intent and content of Proposition 209.

James L. Welch, Chair
Academic Senate

Jits Furusawa, Secretary
Academic Senate
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