



CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, September 20 2011
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

- I. Minutes: none.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost:
 - D. Statewide Senate:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. ASI Representative:
 - G. Caucus Chairs:
 - H. Other:
- IV. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Academic Senate and university committee vacancies for 2011-2013:** (p. 2-3).
 - B. **Academic Senate committee charges for 2011-2012:** (pp. 4-7).
 - C. **Resolution on Modification to *Bylaws of the Academic Senate*, Section III: Election Procedures:** Executive Committee (pp. 8-9).
 - D. **Resolution on Protecting the "American Institutions" Requirements at Cal Poly:** Lewis Call, senator and assistant professor of History (pp. 10-24).
- V. Discussion Item(s):

Academic Senate Executive Committee: should proxies be provided for Executive Committee matters? [The *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* is silent on this matter; however, traditional practice has been to not allow Executive Committee members to give their proxy to another Executive Committee member.]
- VI. Adjournment:

ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE VACANCIES

2011-2013

College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Science

DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS COMMITTEE
GRADUATE PROGRAMS SUBCOMMITTEE
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE (2011-2012)

College of Architecture and Environmental Design

DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS COMMITTEE
GE GOVERNANCE BOARD (2011-2014)
GRADUATE PROGRAMS SUBCOMMITTEE
GRANTS REVIEW COMMITTEE
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

College of Engineering

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

College of Liberal Arts

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (2011-2012)

College of Science and Mathematics

BUDGET & LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE (2011-2012)
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
FAIRNESS BOARD
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

Professional Consultative Services

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITTEE VACANCIES

ACADEMIC ADVISING EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Josh Machamer, Chair of the GE Governance Board (interim appointment)

CAL POLY HOUSING CORPORATION BOARD - one vacancy (2011-2013)

CAL POLY PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE – two vacancies (2011-2012)

CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE – two vacancies (2011-2013)

Renoda Campbell, Student Life & Leadership (5 years at Cal Poly)

I have worked at Cal Poly for five years and am interested in taking a larger role in interacting with faculty, staff, administration and the CSU system. I am hoping to contribute in ways to make the university an easier property to navigate and to help make it more accessible for students, faculty, staff and the community at large.

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY CITIZENSHIP (CUCIT) – two vacancies (2011-2013)

INSTITUTIONAL ANIMAL CARE AND USE COMMITTEE (IACUC) – one vacancy (2011-2014)

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW COMMITTEE – one **CSM vacancy** (2011-2014)

ACADEMIC SENATE APPOINTMENTS TO THE ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COUNCIL

ONE FACULTY MEMBER FROM EACH:

College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Science

College of Architecture and Environmental Design

College of Engineering

College of Liberal Arts

College of Science and Mathematics

Orfalea College of Business

Professional Consultative Services

Committee Charges for 2011-2012

Budget and Long Range Planning Committee

- General for Budget and Long Range Planning: submit procedures for approval (retreat should provide input on desired role) **Resolution due to Senate office by Fall 2011**

Budget:

- Work with Provost and others toward a process for evaluating budgetary decisions including targeted growth. Ideally one that the deans support. Discuss the mode and level approach in contrast to other possible approaches under discussion by the deans. Presentation to the Senate regarding how the university has developed its' approach to budget. **Due Winter 2011**

Long Range Planning:

- Follow up on establishing relationship with Advancement and seek consultation on new campaign plans
- Enrollment management: obviously tied to how much state \$ CP gets, our programs, and student fees, so how does it work at CP? Reach out to Provost and to colleges for discussion.
- Participate in strategic planning

Curriculum Committee

- Ongoing review of curriculum proposals: catalog cycle proposals and continuous course review proposals
- Review of curriculum handbook: does it reflect current curriculum review processes? Preferred review processes? Prepare a report for the Academic Senate
- Develop process for eliminating concentrations
- Internal to committee: should committee have a policy that says one should recuse oneself from deliberations if one's own proposal is being considered?
- Mode of instruction: do we need to adopt a more flexible approach to issues of mode of instruction? Discuss with on-line education task force chair
- Curriculum Committee Chair to work with AVP in Academic Programs and Planning, Office of the Registrar
- Continue process working toward paperless curriculum review

Distinguished Scholarship Award Committee

- Ongoing evaluation of candidates and recipients of the DSA
- Submit new procedures

Distinguished Teaching Award Committee

- Ongoing evaluation of candidates and recipients of the DTA

Faculty Affairs Committee

- Resolution on shared governance and collegiality (including on budgetary matters, as well as the importance of collegiality in the Senate and extending down through the colleges between faculty, staff, deans)
Resolution due to Senate office by end of Fall 2011
- Resolution on University-wide RPT Committee (consult with chair of Teacher-Scholar Task Force, 2010-2011 and Cal Poly WASC Team)
Resolution due by mid-winter 2012

Fairness Board

- Ongoing review of filed grievance

General Education Governance Board

- Ongoing review of curriculum proposals: catalog cycle proposals and continuous course review proposals
- Additional on-going charges were approved by Academic Senate Executive Committee, May 10, 2011
- American Institutions Requirement: in light of changes at the CSU level, do we need upper division American Institutions options? Discuss with relevant departments.
- GE Chair to work with AVP in Academic Programs and Planning, Office of the Registrar
- Update AS-713-10: Resolution on the Establishment of an Academic Senate General Education Governance Board, as appropriate resulting from discussions with Academic Programs and Planning, and for Senate approval

Grants Review Committee

- Ongoing review and awarding of campus grants

Instruction Committee

- Calendar: for 2013-2014, possibly revisit 2012-2013 (President Armstrong will instruct Senate Chair)
- Resolution on corporate relations in the classroom
- Discuss merits and demerits of a policy on grade inflation or an implementation of student ranking as part of the grading process: consult widely with students and faculty
- Use of class aliases by anyone: for instance, is there a way we could opt out of free use of class aliases through the portal?
- MWF 4 unit classes: work with Registrar and Provost to determine whether a MWF unit class can return as an allowable instruction schedule

Research Committee

- Continue review of current policy regarding research and human subjects – Senate Chair continues to hear complaints from faculty members who think the procedures outlined in the policy are outdated and timelines for approval are problematic. Some faculty members have suggested that the policy ought to be separated from the procedures, and either or both be

updated. Develop methodology to allow for anonymous reporting of concerns from faculty as part of the review. Make recommendation to Senate to endorse the policy as it is, or to revise it in light of feedback from faculty members.

Resolution due to Senate office early Winter 2012

- Develop a list of support mechanisms to better implement the teacher-scholar model

Sustainability Committee:

- Submit description and procedures for approval (e.g., Suscat)
- Consult with GE Chair re: possible sustainability requirement (similar to USCP, no additional units)
- Make recommendations regarding how faculty can better incorporate sustainability issues into their curriculum, whatever the course.

In-House Resolutions

- Resolution on amendment to bylaws adding language for General Faculty Voting procedures

Possible Expected Non-Senate Committee developed resolutions

- Proposed changes to Adult Degree Program or proposal to eliminate (may depend in part on line task force results)
- Resolution including course learning objectives/outcomes in Syllabus
- Resolution on American Institutions Requirement: CSU waiver decision
- Decision tree for allocation of space

Task Forces

- Honors Program: how to revise existing program so that all students have similar opportunities to those in the Honors Program?

Set up task force in fall 2011, work complete mid-winter 2012

- UNIV Courses: Vice Provost wants them to be decentralized and run through colleges

Set up task force in fall 2011, work complete end of fall 2011

- On-line education: review and if necessary revise Distance Education Policy, develop principles and description of direction Cal Poly wants to go with on-line education, including how management of on-line curriculum and intellectual property (members to come from ASCC, CTL, ITS, and ASIC, library (resources issue), among other constituencies).

Set up task force in fall 2011, work complete mid-winter 2012

- Expectations of a Cal Poly Mustang or Cal Poly Student Code of Ethics (President Armstrong will instruct Senate Chair)

Set up task force in fall 2011, work complete mid-winter 2012

- Resolution to endorse protocol for international efforts, such as possible satellite campuses, along with basic principles the faculty wants to maintain in all international efforts (e.g., academic freedom)

Set up task force in fall 2011, work complete by mid-winter 2012

- Resolution setting out process for disbanding policies put in place by the Senate that the university no longer abides by

Set up task force mid-fall 2011, work complete early winter 2012

- Preface Program: review the program and make recommendations for either reviving it as it was implemented up to 2009, or recommend changes or cessation of program

Set up task force in fall 2011, work complete by end of fall 2011

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

AS-__-11

**RESOLUTION ON MODIFICATION TO *BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE*,
SECTION III: ELECTION PROCEDURES**

1 WHEREAS, The *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* does not currently contain procedural language specific
2 to matters requiring a vote by the General Faculty; therefore, be it
3

4 RESOLVED: That the following modifications be added to *Bylaws of the Academic Senate*, Section III:
5 Election Procedures:
6

7 [Add to Section III heading]

8 VOTING AND ELECTION PROCEDURES
9

10 [Add second paragraph under Section III]

11 The balloting procedures described in 'Section III.A: General Procedures' will
12 be used when voting on amendments to the *Constitution of the Faculty* and all
13 campus or statewide measures requiring a vote by the General Faculty.
14

15 [Add to III.A.6]

16 For elections, those candidates who receive the highest number of votes shall be
17 declared elected.
18

19 [Add as III.A.8]

20 For other matters and issues requiring faculty votes, measures are approved
21 when they receive a majority of faculty voting on the matter, unless documents
22 governing a measure specify a different formula for approval.
23
24
25

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: September 20 2011

III. ELECTION PROCEDURES

Elections shall be held for membership to the Academic Senate, Senate offices, Academic Senate CSU, Grants Review Committee, appropriate recall elections for the preceding as per Section IX of these bylaws, and ad hoc committees created to search for such university positions as president, provost, vice presidents, college deans, and similar type administrative positions.

The balloting procedures described in 'Section III.A: General Procedures' will be used when voting on amendments to the *Constitution of the Academic Senate* and all campus or statewide measures requiring a vote by the General Faculty.

A. GENERAL PROCEDURES

Balloting procedures shall use either: an electronic voting system or a "double envelope system" (outside envelope signed, inside envelope sealed and containing the voted ballot), whichever is more appropriate to the nature of the election and which ensures that only eligible persons will vote and ballots remain secret.

1. Time and manner of nominations and elections will be announced in a timely fashion to facilitate maximum faculty participation.
2. Voter and candidate eligibility shall be verified.
3. The Executive Committee will rule on questions as they arise and serve as an appeals body to rule on any allegations of irregularities in the nomination and election process.
4. Votes will be publicly tallied at an announced time and place, and results of the election will be published.
5. Ballots will be counted electronically if electronic voting is used. If the "double envelope system" is used, ballots will be counted only if they are properly signed and received by the announced closing date. Individual voting information will be retained for ten working days.
6. For elections, those candidates who receive the highest number of votes shall be declared elected.
7. Department/teaching area representation shall have precedence in elections according to Article II.C.3 of the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate*.
8. For other matters and issues requiring faculty votes, measures are approved when they receive a majority of faculty voting on the matter, unless documents governing a measure specify a different formula for approval.

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

AS-__-11

**RESOLUTION ON PROTECTING THE “AMERICAN
INSTITUTIONS” REQUIREMENT AT CAL POLY**

1 WHEREAS, For the past fifty years, every campus of the California State University (and every campus
2 of its predecessor institution, the California State Colleges) has been required to “provide for
3 comprehensive study of American history and American government including the historical
4 development of American institutions and ideals, the Constitution of the United States and
5 the operation of representative democratic government under that Constitution, and the
6 processes of state and local government” (California Administrative Code Title 5, § 40404);
7 and
8

9 WHEREAS, The purpose of this “American Institutions” requirement “is to ensure that students acquire
10 knowledge and skills that will help them to comprehend the workings of American
11 democracy and of the society in which they live to enable them to contribute to that society
12 as responsible and constructive citizens” (California Administrative code Title 5, § 40404);
13 and
14

15 WHEREAS, Encouraging students to become such “responsible and constructive citizens” is a vital part
16 of the CSU’s educational mission, as it has been for the past fifty years; and
17

18 WHEREAS, In 2010, the California state legislature passed SB 1440 (“The Student Transfer
19 Achievement Reform Act”), a measure designed to streamline transfers from the California
20 Community Colleges (CCC) to the CSU; and
21

22 WHEREAS, SB 1440 did not require the CCC to fulfill the American Institutions requirement as a
23 condition for transfer to the CSU, and the CCC has since refused to include this requirement
24 as part of all newly created transfer degrees; and
25

26 WHEREAS, The CSU Chancellor’s Office has proposed a revision of California Administrative Code
27 Title 5, which would allow entire programs to waive the American Institutions requirement
28 in order to facilitate the implementation of SB 1440; and
29

30 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of the CSU and thirteen local campus Senates have passed resolutions
31 either objecting to this proposed waiver or requesting that the CSU Board of Trustees delay
32 its decision regarding the proposed waiver until such time as the consultation required by the
33 practice of shared governance has occurred; and
34

35 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (Cal
36 Poly) passed such a resolution (AS-733-11) on May 31 2011; and
37

38 WHEREAS, Over 500 CSU faculty members have signed the position paper of the American Institutions
39 Working Group of Political Science and History Chairs (attached), which explains in detail
40 the importance of the American Institutions requirement for civic education and the failure
41 of the Chancellor's Office to provide an adequate explanation for the proposed waiver; and
42

43 WHEREAS, On July 12 2011, the Trustees of the CSU voted to revise Title 5 to allow for blanket
44 waivers of the American Institutions requirement, thus ignoring the recommendations of the
45 ASCSU, thirteen campus Senates, the American Institutions Working Group of Political
46 Science and History Chairs, and over 500 CSU faculty members; and
47

48 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly is the "appropriate campus authority" (California
49 Administrative Code Title 5, § 40404) to make decisions regarding the American
50 Institutions requirement, or any other aspect of Cal Poly's curriculum; and
51

52 WHEREAS, The August 26 2011 memorandum from Executive Vice Chancellor Ephraim Smith
53 regarding "Transfer Curriculum Developed Under SB 1440/STAR Act" (attached) specifies
54 that "the Chancellor's intervention [i.e., to waive the American Institutions requirement] is a
55 last resort" and further states that "wherever possible" the CSU Chancellor's Office wants
56 the faculty of each campus "to make the decisions about how to develop TMC [Transfer
57 Model Curricula] degree requirements that conform to state law"; therefore be it
58

59 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly reaffirm its commitment to the principle that all
60 graduates of our institution should demonstrate comprehension of "the workings of
61 American democracy and of the society in which they live" so that they may "contribute to
62 that society as responsible and constructive citizens"; and be it further
63

64 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly oppose all blanket waivers of the American
65 Institutions requirement; and be it further
66

67 RESOLVED: That Cal Poly will not waive the American Institutions requirement for any baccalaureate
68 degrees; and be it further
69

70 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly request that the California state legislature amend
71 "The Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act" (SB 1440) to clarify that the American
72 Institutions requirement should be fully maintained during the implementation of that law;
73 and be it further
74

75 RESOLVED That copies of this resolution be distributed to the Chancellor, the CSU Board of Trustees,
76 the Academic Senate of the California State University, all campus Senates, the chairs of all
77 CSU History and Political Science departments, the Assembly Committee on Higher
78 Education, and the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges.

Proposed by: Lewis Call, Academic Senate Liberal Arts
Caucus Chair and Assistant Professor of History

Date: September 12 2011

Revised: September 14 2011

Department of History
College of Arts and Humanities

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 1, 2011

To: Members of the Board of Trustees of the California State University System and Dr. Charles B. Reed,
Chancellor

From: CSU American Institutions Working Group of Political Science and History Chairs

RE: CSU American Institutions Graduation Requirement

The CSU American Institutions Working Group of Political Science and History Chairs attaches our position paper on the preservation of the American Institutions graduation requirement. We respectfully, but energetically, oppose the proposal to weaken and dilute the American Institutions requirement, which is scheduled for Board consideration on July 12th. In the absence of a Faculty Trustee, we are submitting this position statement directly to each member of the Board of Trustees and to Chancellor Reed.

We chose to submit our position paper on July 1, 2011, because today's date marks an important milestone in the development of the CSU system. It was fifty years ago today - on July 1, 1961 - that the American Institutions requirement took effect on the basis of a decision by the first Board of Trustees of the CSU System. It is our sincere hope that the Board of Trustees will celebrate this anniversary by reaffirming its support for the enduring commitment to civic education that each Board has maintained in that half century. In our view, this is not the time to take the heart out of one of the proudest standards of the CSU system.

In the short time that we have circulated this proposal, we have received over 450 endorsements from CSU and CCC faculty.

We wish you all the best on this holiday weekend, and look forward to discussing our position paper with you at the July 12th Board of Trustees meeting.

Sincerely,



Kate Fawver, Coordinator
American Institutions Working Group of Political Science and History Chairs
Chair and Associate Professor of History
ASCSU Senator

**An Open Letter to the CSU Board of Trustees in Support of the California State University
American Institutions Graduation Requirement**

July 1, 2011

**Title 5, California Code of Regulations
Division 5 -- Board of Trustees of the California State Universities
Chapter 1 -- California State University
Subchapter -- 2 Educational Program
Article 5 -- General Requirements for Graduation**

40404. Requirements in United States History, Constitution and American Ideals.

(a) The purpose of the following requirements is to ensure that students 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. To this end each campus shall provide for comprehensive study of American history and American government including the historical development of American institutions and ideals, the Constitution of the United States and the operation of representative democratic government under that Constitution, and the processes of state and local government. To qualify for graduation each student shall demonstrate competence by completing courses in the foregoing fields or by passing comprehensive examinations in those fields. Students transferring from other accredited institutions of collegiate grade, who have been certified by such institutions as meeting these requirements, shall not be required to take further courses or examinations therein. The Chancellor may institute such guidelines as may be appropriate for the administration of this section.

I. Introduction

In April 2011, the Chancellor's Office of the California State University (CSU) announced its intention to seek approval from the Board of Trustees for a waiver that would allow entire programs to seek exemption from the long-standing, system-wide American Institutions graduation requirement. The waiver proposal was presented to the Board of Trustees as an information item on May 10, 2011; it is on the agenda of the Board's upcoming meeting scheduled for July 12, 2011 as an action item.

On May 26-27, 2011, chairs and faculty members of the CSU History and Political Science departments met with representatives of the Chancellor's Office and executive committee members from the Academic Senate of the CSU to discuss the American Institutions waiver proposal. After these deliberations, we the undersigned chairs and faculty of History and Political Science departments from across the CSU decided to oppose the proposed waiver because: 1) we believe that the American Institutions requirement serves a particularly vital purpose for our democratic society and is worthy of its protected status as a graduation requirement; 2) the passage of the waiver will significantly undermine the ability of the CSU system to support civic literacy in the state of California; and 3) insufficient evidence has been presented to demonstrate a need for such a waiver.

II. Background: California's Historical Commitment to Civic Education in Institutions of Higher Learning

California's commitment to civic education in institutions of higher learning predates the founding of the CSU. State law mandated that student matriculating at California's state teacher colleges – from which the CSU evolved – complete coursework in American history and government as a prerequisite for graduation. As early as 1942, a study by the American Historical Association found California at the forefront of efforts to ensure that civic literacy was incorporated into the curriculum of rapidly growing public university systems.

Some evidence on this question is furnished by the examination of college requirements with respect to American history. In a survey made in 1942, Benjamin Fine of *The New York Times* found that about 18 percent of 690 colleges and universities required a course in American history for graduation. Among teachers colleges the percentage was 48, a significantly higher figure. In addition, many colleges required American history for those who majored in related subjects, such as economics, sociology, and political science. **At least one state, California, requires by law that college graduates shall have had a course in "American institutions."**¹ (emphasis added)

¹ *The Report of the Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges of The American Historical Association, The Mississippi Valley Historical Association, The National Council for the Social Studies*, Edgar B. Wesley, Director of the Committee, (The Macmillan Company, 1944).
http://www.historians.org/pubs/archives/americanhistory_1944/3_American_History_in_the_Classroom.htm

At its first meeting, on June 19, 1961, the newly formed Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges voted to maintain a system-wide graduation requirement in American Institutions. The new requirement took effect on July 1, 1961 exactly fifty years ago today.² Later enshrined as Article 5, Section 40404 of the Administrative Code of the CSU system (Title 5), this requirement has been maintained by every succeeding Board of Trustees. The baton has been passed for fifty years from Board to Board, with support from all ends of the political spectrum. Rarely has one policy in the civic arena drawn such consensus.

The California Legislature's Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education reaffirmed the state's commitment to civic education in a 1989 report, saying:

We in the Legislature are charged with a broader responsibility, to define the parameters of the public interest in education and in the definition of the educated citizen as California approaches the 21st Century. We have no desire to write curricula or determine professional standards. Instead, we seek to clarify what California's people can broadly and appropriately expect from higher education.

We make here our basic claim: that the future social, economic, and cultural development of California demands an education for responsible citizenship in a Multicultural Democracy.

They have a right to expect an education which empowers them intellectually, morally, and vocationally. **They can expect an education which offers them an opportunity to become fully thoughtful citizens, which provides them an occasion for engaging the enduring questions in our evolving and complex culture, and which gives them hopes of becoming fully responsible, productive, and satisfied participants in California's developing multicultural society.**³ (emphasis added)

The appalling state of civic knowledge among Americans and Californians provides evidence of the importance of the American Institutions graduation requirement in contemporary American society. We must be concerned about the data indicating that civic education is vitally necessary today, perhaps more than ever. One recent study summarized the consensus among specialists thusly: "Few people dispute the well-established conclusion that most individual voters are

² *Board of Trustees Minutes and Agendas*, June 19, 1961, CSU Archives, California State University Dominguez Hills, box 1, folder 10.

³ *California Faces, California's Future: Education for Citizenship in a Multicultural Democracy*, produced by the Joint Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, March 1989, pp. 97-98.

abysmally ignorant of even very basic political information. Ever since the seminal research of the 1950s and early 1960s, evidence has accumulated to reinforce this finding.”⁴ Examples abound. In 2001, a study by the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute found that only 28.1% of incoming college freshmen kept up to date on current politics.⁵ The National Center for Education Statistics at the U.S. Department of Education found that among 12th graders, competence in civics actually declined between 2006 and 2010.⁶ It should come as no surprise then that only 24% of citizens between the ages 18 and 29 voted in the 2010 national election. Recently published data suggest that most of the nation’s students are likewise ignorant of American history. A study entitled “The National Report Card: U.S. History 2010,” reported that only twelve percent of high school seniors demonstrated a proficient knowledge and understanding of American history, making “American students less proficient in their nation’s history than in any other subject.”⁷ For example, only two percent of high school seniors correctly identified the social problems addressed by the landmark Brown v. Board of Education ruling of 1954.

Such data make clear the continuing need for an American Institutions graduation requirement at the CSU. Given the growing political divisions within our state and our nation and given the range of seemingly intractable social and economic problems we face, this hardly seems an appropriate time for the largest public university system in the United States to weaken its commitment to civic education.

III. No Convincing Rationale for the Waiver Proposal

In 2011 we have the opportunity to proudly celebrate the golden anniversary of a remarkable and broad-based commitment by the CSU to the ideal of civic education. But instead the Trustees are considering a proposal that would weaken and dilute the American Institutions requirement. The proposal would create a vehicle whereby entire departments and programs – both those designated “high unit” and those bound by SB 1440 (Padilla) now Education Code sections 66745-66749 – could apply for blanket waivers exempting their students from the American Institutions requirement.

⁴ Ilya Somin, “When Ignorance Isn’t Bliss: How Political Ignorance Threatens Democracy.” *Policy Analysis*, 525 (September 22, 2004), p.3. For additional commentary, see Andrew Romano, “How Dumb Are We?” *Newsweek*, 20 March, 2011.

⁵ http://www.apsanet.org/content_16883.cfm

⁶ http://nationsreportcard.gov/civics_2010/g12_national.asp

⁷ Sam Dillon, “U.S. Students Remain Poor at History, Tests Show,” *New York Times*, 14 June, 2011. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/15/education/15history.html?_r=4&hp

We believe that it is incumbent on those pursuing the waiver proposal to answer the following questions: **What is wrong with the American Institutions requirement that appears on the front of this position paper? Why are the values embodied in the American Institutions requirement now, after fifty years, dispensable for the graduates of some baccalaureate programs at the CSU?**

The waiver proposal indeed makes no attempt to suggest that the American Institutions graduation requirement is no longer necessary. It simply argues, by implication and suggestion, that American Institutions does not deserve the importance that the CSU system has attached to it for these five decades and therefore should be treated just like any other disposable part of the General Education curriculum.

The core of the proposal is that while the American Institutions is valuable, we are forced to weaken it because of the passage of SB 1440. Passed by the Legislature in 2010, SB 1440 (Padilla) the *Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act* (hereafter SB 1440), requires community colleges to facilitate the creation of transfer majors. It further mandates the CSU system to guarantee that when a student meets the community college transfer curriculum of 60 units, the CSU campus will provide an opportunity for the student to graduate with no more than an additional 60 units. "High unit majors" are explicitly exempted from SB 1440.

Citing comments from "some faculty" indicating that some programs may have difficulty conforming to the 60-unit limit imposed on the CSU by SB 1440, advocates for the proposal concluded that the American Institutions requirement is an impediment to the CSU system's efforts to implement this new legislation.

We wish to make it clear that we do not oppose SB 1440. A number of history and political science chairs are actively engaged in the implementation process, and we, the undersigned faculty, offer our energy and enthusiasm to the Chancellor's Office to help make the implementation of SB 1440 as smooth as possible. But, the fact of the matter is that SB 1440 makes absolutely no mention of the CSU American Institutions requirement. The CSU system has only one obligation under SB 1440, and that is to make it possible for students to graduate with an additional 60 CSU units. Further, departments or programs designated as "high unit" - those programs that required students to complete more than 120 units in order to earn a B.A. or B.S. degree before the passage of SB 1440 - were explicitly exempted from this restriction and may require students to complete more than 60 CSU units in order to earn a degree. Section 66748 states, "Specified high-unit majors shall be exempt from this subdivision upon agreement by the Chancellors of the California State University and the California Community Colleges and their respective academic senates."

So, in essence, the problem is the perceived intransigence of a few departments on a few campuses who may not wish to be designated as high unit majors, and who may be unwilling to

accommodate the American Institutions requirement in their 60 units. In an odd twist, then, the anticipated reluctance of a small number of departments to adjust their curricula to accommodate SB 1440 has resulted in the composition of a proposal that seeks to blame – in advance – any problems encountered in the implementation of SB 1440 on the American Institutions requirement and those who defend it.

Further, the CSU system already supports a variety of mechanisms and curricular processes whereby any problems arising from the implementation of SB 1440 may be solved. Many of these alternatives are spelled out in explicit detail in a memorandum circulated by the Chancellor's Office entitled, *FAQ Proposed American Institutions Title 5 Amendments* (May 24, 2011). Possible alternative solutions include:

- 1) Departments or programs that experience difficulties complying with SB 1440 can seek to be classified as high unit programs not subject to SB 1440.
- 2) Alternatively, such programs might follow the example of other departments and programs and adjust their program requirements in order to comply with SB 1440.
- 3) Campuses and individual programs may explore double counting General Education upper-division units and major requirements.
- 4) Campuses and individual programs may explore double counting the American Institutions requirement and major program requirements.
- 5) Campuses may require American Institutions from within elective units.
- 6) Campuses may require American Institutions and reduce units in campus-specific requirements.
- 7) Campuses and individual programs may use established waiver options for General Education upper-division coursework.

So far, those supporting the proposal have insisted that the American Institutions waiver is the only vehicle through which the CSU can achieve compliance with SB 1440. We do not accept this claim, because they have not been able to explain why the mechanisms listed above are not adequate to this task.

IV. The Waiver Proposal Will Affect Large Numbers of Students and Will Have a Damaging Impact on the CSU System and California's Community Colleges

The proposal does not indicate how many students or how many programs would be eligible to seek the American Institutions waiver. We have been assured that it would be "very few," and that the waiver will not therefore seriously impact civic education at the CSU.

This claim is problematic for three reasons. First, it just does not make sense to change the administrative code and weaken a long-standing system-wide graduation requirement for a small number of students. Secondly, we remain skeptical of the claim that only a few students will be

affected. As chairs, our collective experience with transfer students suggests that the real impact of the proposal will be at the “wholesale” level, as departments and programs will seek to solve their SB 1440 “problems” by securing American Institutions waivers. Finally, the proposal would also enable “high-unit professional programs” to request exemptions from the American Institutions requirement. This latter provision strongly suggests that something more than SB 1440 compliance is at work here and that the waiver will have a much broader impact than we have been led to believe.

If the waiver proposal is adopted, negative competition among campuses will inevitably drive the American Institutions requirement to the lowest common denominator, significantly undermining the CSU’s commitment to civic education. Each campus will be given the “opportunity” to set rules for implementation and a race to the bottom will follow. Campuses will be tempted to lure potential students and increase enrollments by approving American Institutions waivers for popular, growing programs. This will put pressure on other programs and campuses to follow suit, and we will find the waiver option being used to exempt substantial categories of transfer students from the American Institutions requirement. As a result, the requirement will ultimately be rendered incoherent. We will be asked: “Why is it more crucial for student A than for student B, or for department A than department B?” Or, “why do native students have to meet the requirement if some – or most – transfer students do not?” And, having compromised the principle by approving the waiver proposal, neither the administration nor the faculty will in the future be able to find solid ground for insisting on the relevance of civic education.

V. Shared Governance and Faculty Opposition to the Waiver Proposal

Because the proposal was introduced at the end of the academic year, most faculty and deliberative bodies through which faculty exercise control over curriculum learned of the American Institutions waiver only at their final meetings of the spring semester. Consequently, they had little to no time to deliberate over this matter.

Nonetheless, support for civic education at the CSU was sufficiently strong that when informed of the waiver proposal no fewer than thirteen (13) campus senates passed resolutions either objecting to it and/or requesting that a final decision by the Board be deferred until the level of consultation required by the practice of shared governance had occurred. The ASCSU added its voice to this chorus, passing a similar resolution during its last plenary session in May 2011. The stream of resolutions only stopped for the preparation of this position paper. Thus, we can say in good faith that the views outlined here represent the full range of concerns that have been expressed by a number of broadly-based representative faculty bodies across the CSU system. To date, not one duly-constituted faculty body having standing to speak to curricular issues has expressed support for the proposed American Institutions waiver.

Moreover, we have contacted our colleagues in History, Political Science, Social Studies and Ethnic Studies at community colleges across the state and have found that most were unaware of the proposal to weaken the American Institutions requirement at the CSU. Many have expressed concern and solidarity with our position, as their own course offerings in U.S. History and American Government will be negatively impacted if the proposal is approved.

We have been heartened by the broad support shown for the principle of civic education by the faculty of the CSU and California's community colleges who have made themselves heard.

VI. Giving Up on Civic Education Will Hurt the Image of the CSU and the Image of Higher Education in California

There is a general consensus in California that our citizens, and especially our young people, are lacking in civic knowledge. This is one of those issues on which every "person in the street" has an opinion. A decision by the Board of Trustees to pass the waiver proposal and to weaken or dilute the American Institutions requirement will be understood in the media and in the community as a statement that civic education is no longer valued by the CSU system. This message – whether intended or not – will undermine one of the central claims higher education can make on the allegiance of the public.

A recent editorial published in the *Press Enterprise* highlights continuing public support for civic education and outlines clearly the relationship between civic literacy and effective democratic government:

Democracy cannot thrive amid ignorance — and parents and teachers need to instill this in students. People who don't understand how government works have little chance of holding it accountable. Ensuring that government operates properly requires actually knowing how it is supposed to function. A lack of civics knowledge only aids abuses of power, corruption and bad judgment by officials. An informed public, on the other hand, can help prevent such misconduct.

Democracy also depends on guidance from citizens on a variety of policies, from levels of taxation to education to public services to defense and foreign policy. Voters cannot make such decisions wisely without a basic knowledge of the duties and responsibilities of government. Uninformed choices, based on a lack of knowledge, can steer government into the ditch instead of providing useful direction.

After all, people who don't know how government works cannot make careful decisions about elected officials or ballot measures. Understanding what officials do is crucial to

knowing whether candidates are qualified or suitable. The same goes for ballot measures, which can enact sweeping public policy changes.⁸

Or, to take another example, on June 12, 2011 the *San Francisco Chronicle* published an opinion column by California Supreme Court Justice Ming W. Chin, which stressed the significance of civic literacy in a democratic society and called on education policymakers to rededicate themselves to improving civic education across the state. Justice Chin wrote:

... the Judicial Council, which is the governing body of California's judicial branch, established a multi-disciplinary leadership group to develop strategies for increasing civics education in California. We are asking that everyone - especially education policymakers - take stock of the serious shortcomings of civics education in this state. A lot is at stake. As philosopher and education reformer John Dewey once said, "Democracy has to be born anew every generation, and education is its midwife."⁹

We concur with Justice Chin, and would go further still to argue that we need civic education now more than ever before.

VII. Our Request to the Board of Trustees

In that spirit, we the undersigned faculty ask the CSU Board of Trustees to maintain the American Institutions graduation requirement for all undergraduate degree holders of the CSU as vigorously as it has for the last fifty years, and to instruct CSU administration and faculty to find alternative ways to manage whatever challenges may arise in the implementation of SB 1440. Such a decision will give the CSU an opportunity to celebrate the noteworthy commitment to civic and historical knowledge that distinguishes California and the nation's largest public university system.

Sincerely,

(Signatures below, in the order received)

⁸ "Teach Civics," *The Press Enterprise*, 3 June 2011, http://www.pe.com/localnews/opinion/editorials/stories/PE_OpEd_Opinion_D_op_04_ed_civics.2ee076f.html.

⁹ Ming W. Chin, "Report on Civics Shows We're Failing in Democracy," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 12 June, 2011, <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2011/06/12/INCP1JQF38.DTL>.



Academic Affairs
401 Golden Shore, 6th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210


www.calstate.edu

Ephraim P. Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer
562-951-4710 / Fax 562-951-4986
Email esmith@calstate.edu

August 26, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs

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

SUBJECT: **Transfer Curriculum Developed Under SB 1440/STAR Act**

Thank you for leading your campus faculty's review of the Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) and reporting initial determinations of "similarity" under the new STAR Act legislation (Education Code sections 66745-66749). As you know, nearly all of the reviews in our system have come in with findings of "Yes"—that is, most CSU campuses have at least one degree program that can be completed within 60 semester units (or 90 quarter units) when a student holds an associate degree that is based on a TMC.

On July 12, 2011, the CSU Board of Trustees amended Title 5 section 40404 to include a provision for granting—under specified conditions—exceptions to the American Institutions graduation requirement. This puts that part of the required CSU curriculum on the same footing as our General Education-Breadth requirements, and it allows more flexibility as campuses develop their TMCs. Academic Affairs in the Office of the Chancellor supported this change because it adds to the ways we can turn each "No" decision into "Yes." Because this recent trustee action allows more flexibility in designing curricular requirements subject to The STAR Act, we will be writing to ask your campus for a second review of those TMCs for which your campus answered "No."

- Ken O'Donnell, Associate State University Dean, Academic Programs and Policy, will send your campus Degree Spokesperson a request to review TMCs that have not yet been designated a "Yes." Attached is the TMC Decision Form checklist, to be used as part of the review process. It specifies curriculum-design options available as faculty work to fit each qualifying baccalaureate program into Transfer Model Curricula. At the conclusion of each

CSU Campuses
Bakersfield
Channel Islands
Chico
Dominguez Hills
East Bay

Fresno
Fullerton
Humboldt
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay
Northridge
Pomona
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego

San Francisco
San José
San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Sonoma
Stanislaus

Provosts
August 26, 2011
Page 2

TMC review, please indicate the date on which your faculty considered and either adopted or declined each of the specified options. For TMCs that could be a "yes" only if an American Institutions waiver were granted, the trustees have granted the Chancellor the authority to allow that exception. However, the Chancellor's intervention is a last resort; wherever possible, we want your faculty to make the decisions about how to develop TMC degree requirements that conform to state law.

If your campus is able to achieve a "Yes," fitting CSU degree requirements into 60 units, there is no need to return the TMC decision form. Authorized campus personnel will enter a "Yes" into the CSU Degrees Database. If your campus finds that no options will work, please sign the completed checklist and return it via e-mail to the Office of the Chancellor, attention Ken O'Donnell at kodonnell@calstate.edu.

We would like your response by **January 1, 2012**. On a quarterly basis, Analytic Studies updates will report the number of CSU STAR Act programs and the percentage of community college STAR Act students transferring to finish CSU STAR Act bachelor's programs. If you have questions, please contact Ken O'Donnell at kodonnell@calstate.edu or (562) 951-4735.

ES/clm

c: Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
CSU Presidents
Ron Vogel, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
James Postma, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU
Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support
Christine Mallon, State University Dean, Academic Programs and Policy
Associate Provosts/Associate Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Campus Academic Senate Chairs
Deans of Undergraduate Studies

Provosts
August 26, 2011
Page 3

ATTACHMENT

Notification of TMC Decision

Academic Program [program name] at CSU [campus name] and the STAR Act

The faculty at [CSU campus name] has evaluated the Transfer Model Curriculum in [TMC name], and concluded that for students holding a transfer associate degree based on this TMC, it cannot provide curriculum through the baccalaureate level in 60 semester units, or the equivalent in quarter units.

Option for fitting an academic program to a TMC	Date on which campus faculty concluded the option was not viable
Reduce the number of elective units.	
Reduce the number of units required in the major.	
Move required major courses from upper to lower division.	
Require double-counting of American Institutions with major course requirements.	
Reduce the number of units required in American Institutions.	
Require double counting of American Institutions with upper-division general education requirements.	
Reduce the number of units required in general education.	
Reduce the number of units required in campus-specific graduation requirements (e.g. technological proficiency, cross-cultural competence, or language other than English)	
Require double-counting of American Institutions with campus-specific requirements.	

Submitted to the CSU Office of the Chancellor:

Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs

Date