

1991-92  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, September 12, 1991  
Forest Suite, University Union

INFORMATION

1. Tentative Schedule--Fall 1991 Academic Senate Meetings,  
Thursdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m., Forest Suite, University Union:

September 26	November 14
	November 21
October 10	December 5
October 24	December 12

2. Please be sure and return the two questionnaires discussed at  
the Senate Retreat.

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 91-70/ConC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Academic Policies Committee:

MARGARET GOODART, At-large, 1994  
LEN WYCOSKY, Prof Serv, 1994  
GARY SHANNON, Senator, 1993  
DAN DECIOUS, Senator, 1992

Committee on Diversity and Equity/AA:

PAT RICE, A&S, 1994  
PEGGY WILSON, At-large, 1994  
CHRIS MILLER, Senator, 1993  
NORA PUGH, Prof Serv, 1994  
JUAN HERNANDEZ, H&HS, 1994

Curriculum Committee:

AMIN ELMALLAH, At-large, 1994  
LINDA GOODRICH, Prof Sch, 1994  
WILLIAM OWEN, At-large, 1994

Elections Committee:

LISA TAYLOR, At-large, 1992  
SUSAN GERINGER, At-large, 1992  
MARK STONER, At-large, 1992  
BETTE POLKINGHORN, At-large, 1992  
LINDA RHODES, At-large, 1992

Faculty Affairs Committee:

JERRY TOBEY, At-large, 1994  
 CYD GUNSTON-PARKS, Senator, 1993  
 SUSAN GERINGER, At-large, 1994

Faculty Endowment Fund Committee:

Hyun-SOOK PARK, At-large, 1994

Faculty Professional Development Committee:

JEAN-PIERRE BAYARD, E&CS, 1994  
 BRIAN HAUSBACK, A&S, 1994

Fiscal Affairs Committee:

DEBBY COLBERG, Senator, 1993  
 ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, At-large, 1994

General Education Committee:

LINDA BOMSTAD, A&S/A&H, 1994 ('91-92 appt)  
 NANCY TOOKER, Senator, 1993

Graduate Policies and Programs Committee:

SUSAN WILLOUGHBY, A&S, 1994  
 MAHLON HELLER, Prof Sch, 1994  
 STARLA MEDARIS, At-large, 1994  
 MARJORIE GELUS, Senator, 1993

Library Committee:

DAVID FORKEY, A&S, 1994  
 LINDA MARTIN, Senator, 1993  
 JOYCE BURRIS, H&HS, 1993  
 CYRUS ARYANI, E&CS, 1994  
 AL GUTOWSKY, Senator, 1993

Research and Creative Activity Committee:

RICK ROBERTSON, H&HS, 1993  
 M. ELIZABETH STRASSER, A&S, 1993

University Teacher Education Council:

JANET CROSS, Education, Field Services, 1994  
 RICHARD KORNWEIBEL, A&S, Dept w/Single Subj Waiver Prog, 1994  
 WILLIAM EDWARDS, H&HS, Health and Physical Education, 1993  
 RON SANTORA, A&S, Dept w/Single Subj Waiver Prog, 1993  
 MICHAEL LEWIS, Education, At-large, 1994  
 SUSAN WANLASS, A&S, Liberal Studies Program, 1994

University Writing Committee:

GARY SHANNON, At-large, 1994

Visiting Scholars Committee:

STELA SERRANO, A&S, 1994  
 TONY PLATT, H&HS, 1994  
 MARK STONER, A&S, 1992  
 FRAN TODER, Prof Serv, 1994

AS 91-71/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--SENATEAcademic Policies Committee:

CAROLYN KENNER, Prof Serv (Student Affairs), 1993

Committee on Diversity and Equity/AA:

NORA PUGH, Senator, 1993  
 JENNIFER WARE, Prof Serv, 1994 (repl. N. Pugh)

Faculty Endowment Fund Committee:

LINDA RHODES, At-large, 1992 (repl. R. Curry)

Fiscal Affairs Committee:

HARRY GUSTAFSON, At-large, 1994

Library Committee:

LOUELLYN COHAN, A&S, 1993

Research and Creative Activity Committee:

FRED BALDINI, H&HS, 1993 (repl. R. Robertson)

AS 91-72/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--UNIVERSITYAcademic Telecommunications Advisory Committee:

JOHN SCHAEUBLE, At-large, 1994

Administrative Review, Committee on:

VERNON HORNBACK, At-large, 1993

Administrative Telecommunications Advisory Committee:

BARBARA HOADLEY, At-large, 1993

Aids Advisory Committee:

LUCIEN AGOSTA, At-large, 1994

Alcohol and Drug Steering Committee:

EILEEN HEASER, Prof Serv, 1994

ASI Board, Faculty Representative:

SUSAN HOLL, At-large, 1992

ASI Elections Complaint Committee:

PAT CLARK-ELLIS, At-large, 1992

Athletic Advisory Board:

J. MICHAEL BOSSERT, At-large, 1993

CSU Governmental Affairs Specialist:

CRISTY JENSEN, At-large, 1992

Council for University Planning:

JEANNE NOVOSEL, Non-Instructional Faculty, 1993

CHARLOTTE COOK, Executive Committee Member, 1992

Hornet Foundation Board of Directors:

SUSAN SLAYMAKER, At-large, 9/30/95

Persons with Disabilities, Committee for:

BARBARA HOADLEY, Instructional Faculty, 1994

SUSAN BEELICK, Library Faculty, 1992 (repl. M. Snow)

Protection of Human Subjects, Committee for the:

RICK ROBERTSON, Faculty, Health and Physical Education

Satisfactory Progress Appeals Board:

JAMES BOSCO (F '91 only), At-large, 1993 (repl. C. Perez-Davidson)

University Copyright and Patent Committee:

FLOYD LECUREUX, At-large, 1992

**CONSENT INFORMATION**AS 91-67/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTSG.E. Dean Selection Advisory Committee:

GENE BARNES, Arts and Sciences Faculty

CHRIS MILLER, Arts and Sciences Faculty

JESSIE MULIRA, Arts and Sciences Faculty

STEVEN DE HAAS, Professional School Faculty

PATRICIA KEARLEY, Professional School Faculty

AS 91-68/Ex. ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE--REVISE CHARGE AND MEMBERSHIP; ACADEMIC STANDARDS SUBCOMMITTEE--REVISE CHARGE

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, approves the following amendment to the charge and membership of the Academic Policies Committee and the charge of the Academic Standards Committee, as follows:

## Academic Policies Committee:

**Charge:**

Shall review and recommend policies concerning academic standards (including admission and retention of students), instructional services, and other academic matters (including assessment) except curriculum and programs; shall formulate academic policies in the area of student life; and shall administer procedures to hear student appeals from administrative decisions arising from the application of these policies.

**Membership:**

Two Professional Services Members (one each from the Student Affairs and Academic Affairs areas)

## Academic Standards Subcommittee:

**Charge:**

~~Shall advise on student admission, scholarships, and honors; shall recommend policies for on academic standards as guides for scholarship and probationary status (e.g., graduation with honors, probationary status, and repeat course policy); and shall make decisions on individual cases that require special consideration petitions from students seeking exception to established academic standards.~~

**REGULAR AGENDA**

AS 91-69/Flr. MINUTES *agreed*

Approval of the Minutes of meetings of May 16 (#2) and May 2 (#1), 1991 (organizational meetings of 1991-92 Academic Senate) and May 16 (#25) and May 9 (#24), 1991.

AS 91-74/FIR ROTC

**FRIST READING**

AS 91-73/Ex. PROFESSIONAL LEAVES--CRITERIA AND POLICIES (Amends AS 84-39; PM 84-05)

The Academic Senate recommends amendment of the "Policy on Leaves With Pay," as follows [strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition]:

## POLICY ON LEAVES WITH PAY

*MOU sections*

Traditionally, paid academic leaves are not a privilege, but a right. In affirming that tradition, the Statement of Principles on Leaves of Absence, adopted by the American Association of University Professors in 1972, states:

*delete repetitive language*

Leaves of absence are among the most important means by which a faculty member's teaching effectiveness may be enhanced, his scholarly usefulness enlarged, and an institution's academic program strengthened and developed. A sound program of leaves is therefore of vital importance to a college or university, and it is the obligation of every faculty member to make use of the available means, including leaves, to promote his professional competence. The major purpose is to provide opportunity for continued professional growth and new, or renewed, intellectual achievement through study, research, writing, or travel.

The Statement further states that leaves should "be provided with reasonable frequency and preferably be available at regular intervals because they are important to the continuing growth of the faculty member and the effectiveness of the institution." At many reputable institutions of higher learning, sabbatical leaves are granted automatically as an incentive for professional growth. Sabbatical and other paid leaves are among the most precious assets that the University and its faculty possess and should be used as instruments of policy. Through the leaves faculty development and renewal occurs, faculty advance their disciplinary knowledge, attain additional competence in related or new fields of inquiry, and produce impressive scholarly and creative works. Through the experience gained by faculty on leaves the University benefits from revitalized people who bring new insights, vigor, and enthusiasm to their teaching assignments and other scholarly pursuits. The University promotes program development by assisting faculty through paid leaves to gain new awareness, knowledge, and skills in advancing and new fields. ~~By not adhering to this standard policy on sabbatical leaves, the California State University has long been doing a disservice to its faculty, its students, and the people of the State.~~

~~Because the California State University does not provide sabbatical leaves according to the ideal pattern, a limited number of leaves must be allocated to a larger number of eligible faculty. CSU policy with regard to sabbatical leaves is defined in Articles 27 and 28 of the Memorandum of Understanding. The following shall be the policy of CSU, Sacramento; it conforms to and elucidates Articles 27 and 28.~~

The President shall establish annually the initial number of professional leaves to be granted. This determination will be made following consultation with the School Deans, the Dean of the Library, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The number of sabbatical leaves granted shall be no less than the number budgeted for the 1991-92 year. In order to minimize the inequities in the granting of sabbaticals based upon such issues as the size of the department or school and the recent sabbatical history of the department or school, the funds for the support of sabbatical leaves shall be centralized. The number of sabbaticals actually granted within each school shall not be predetermined. The President shall ~~allocate~~ grant professional leaves on the basis of recommendations of a Professional Leave Committee and the School Deans or Dean of the Library. The Professional Leave Committee will be a University Committee, composed of nine elected members serving staggered three-year terms; to include four members elected by and from faculty members in Arts and Sciences, and one each elected by and from faculty members in Business and ~~Public Administration~~, Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Health and Human Services, and the Library. Persons applying for sabbatical or difference-in-pay leaves shall be ineligible for election to the Professional Leave Committee. Normally, the term of membership shall be three years. Persons elected previously to membership on the Professional Leave Committee who apply for sabbatical or difference-in-pay leaves shall become ineligible to serve during the year in which their application is to be considered and shall be replaced for the remainder of their term by an appropriate election. The Professional Leave Committee shall recognize the importance to individual faculty members and to the University of professional leaves. The Committee shall function according to the following process and criteria.

#### I. APPLICATION PROCESS FOR PROFESSIONAL LEAVES

- 1A. An eligible faculty member who applies for a sabbatical leave must submit ~~two~~ four copies of his/her proposal ~~on~~ with the application form provided, by the announced University deadline, to the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs.
- 2B. The ~~Associate Provost for~~ Dean of Faculty and Staff Affairs shall send a copy of the proposal to the Professional Leave Committee, and to the faculty member's home department or unit, ~~and to the appropriate School Dean or Librarian.~~
- 3C. The Department or Library unit shall prepare a statement regarding the possible effect on the curriculum and the operation of the department during the time of the leave should it be granted. This

statement shall be written in consideration of the fact that the school and department shall be reimbursed for sabbatical leaves from the centralized fund. This statement shall be forwarded to the School Dean.

5D. After reviewing all leave proposals against the specified criteria ~~(6.B below)~~ in Section II and considering the deans' comments concerning the merits of the proposed projects, the Professional Leave Committee shall sort the proposed projects into no more than three categories as follows:

a) 1. Those that are judged by the Professional Leave Committee to be not acceptable;

b) 2. Those that are judged by the Professional Leave Committee to be meritorious;

e) 3. Those that are judged by the Professional Leave Committee to be outstanding and exceptional.

Of the three categories, it is the intention of this policy that the third category, those projects judged to be outstanding and exceptional, be reserved for those projects which, by virtue of some feature or features of extraordinary value or promise, warrant that the proposals be approved for funding regardless of equity, defined as accrued service since the establishment of initial eligibility for sabbatical leave.

The Committee shall recommend to the President that all proposals for projects placed in the second category, those judged to be meritorious, be ranked in order of accrued service and forwarded to the President with a recommendation that they be funded. The Professional Leave Committee shall rank any proposals in the third category ahead of those in the second category.

Proposals in the second category shall be ranked in order of accrued service. The Professional Leave Committee shall forward through the appropriate School Dean to the President a recommendation for approval of the number of top-ranked leaves for which there is funding. The recommendation that those leaves be approved shall also be a recommendation that they be considered for granting, contingent upon the possible effect on the curriculum and the operation of the institution. A list of alternates shall comprise those proposals in the second or third categories that are not recommended for approval. The alternates list will be constructed by order of ranking.



The Professional Leave Committee shall provide the ~~President with~~ a written statement of the reasons for recommending or not recommending funding approval of each proposal, including, when appropriate, a justification for recommending outstanding and exceptional projects for funding approval irrespective of accrued service. ~~In conveying its recommendations to the President, the Professional Leave Committee shall include the departmental statements and the deans' comments.~~ The Committee's recommendation shall be forwarded to the President via the appropriate School Dean.

4E. After considering the departmental statement and the recommendation of the Professional Leave Committee, the ~~Dean or Librarian~~ shall forward to the Professional Leave Committee President an assessment of the implications to the department's program, other campus programs, and the budget, should the leave be granted, and ~~may comment concerning the merit of the proposal as compared with the specified criteria.~~ The Dean shall include the departmental statement and the recommendations of the Professional Leave Committee with the material forwarded to the Professional Leave Committee President. A copy of the Dean's recommendation shall also be sent to the Professional Leave Committee.

F. Upon receipt of comments from a School Dean concerning the merit of a proposal, the Professional Leave Committee shall have the opportunity to respond to those comments by submitting a statement directly to the President.

## II. EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS

### A. Dimensions of Evaluation

The Committee shall assess the *appropriateness* of the substance of each proposal, the *benefits* which would ensue from its being undertaken, and its *practicability*. A copy of the Dean's recommendation shall also be sent to the Professional Leave Committee. Upon receipt of comments from a School Dean concerning the merit of a proposal, the Professional Leave Committee shall have the opportunity to respond to those comments by submitting a statement directly to the President.

**B. Criteria**

1. *Appropriateness.* Appropriate sabbatical leave activities may include the following; this list implies no ranking of relative worth among the categories. The PLC will evaluate each proposal on the basis of standards relevant to its character.

a. A course of study leading to increased mastery of the applicant's own field, or the development of an additional area of specialization within his/her field, or the development of a new field of specialization;

b. A plan for professionally beneficial travel, which will enable the applicant further to develop his/her knowledge, skill, or expertise in a discipline or area of specialization within a discipline;

c. Professional development of a scope or nature not possible through normal workload assignment;

d. Pursuit of a scholarly, research, or creative project of a scope or nature not permitted through normal workload assignment;

e. Study or experience designed to improve teaching effectiveness;

f. Study or experience designed to improve professional practice.

2. *Benefit.* Sabbatical leave projects should demonstrate clear promise of producing results beneficial to students, to the development of the profession or a discipline within the profession, to the University, and/or to the faculty member as a teacher, scholar, or professional practitioner.

3. *Practicability.* The PLC shall determine whether the proposed project is clearly defined and articulated, and conforms to the requirements of Contract Article 27.3, and the stated objectives of the proposal are realistically attainable.

**III. DIFFERENCE-IN-PAY APPLICATIONS**

**A.** Faculty members eligible for Difference-in-Pay leaves shall submit four copies of their proposals with the

applications to the PLC on the forms provided to the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs. Deans and departments will submit to the PLC assessments of the impact of proposed leaves on curriculum and programs. The PLC will forward to the Provost President via the appropriate School Dean all Difference-in-Pay proposals which meet minimal quality standards. After considering the departmental statement and the recommendation of the Professional Leave Committee, the Dean shall forward to the President an assessment of the implications to the department's program, other campus programs, and the budget, should the leave be granted, and may comment concerning the merit of the proposal as compared with the specified criteria. The Dean shall include the departmental statement and the recommendations of the Professional Leave Committee with the material forwarded to the President.

- B. Deadlines for Difference-in-Pay applications shall be flexible; it shall be campus practice to grant Difference-in-Pay leaves whenever possible in the interests of faculty members, departments, and schools.
- C. Sabbatical leave applications that have been recommended by the PLC shall also be considered to have been recommended for Difference-in-Pay leaves if requested.

AS 91-75/FIR.

Kornweibel/Moore

WRITING REQUIREMENTS - G.E.

Areas amended by Executive Committee after publication of 9/12/91 Academic Senate Agenda are shown in **bold print**:

Top of page 7:

The President shall establish annually the initial number of professional leaves to be granted. This determination will be made following consultation with the School Deans, the Dean of the Library, **and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Council for University Planning.** The number of sabbatical leaves granted shall be no less than the number budgeted for the 1991-92 year. In order to minimize ~~the~~ inequities in the granting of sabbaticals based upon such issues as the size of the department or school and the recent sabbatical history of the department or school, **the funds for the support of sabbatical leaves shall be centralized.** ~~T~~the number of sabbaticals actually granted within each school shall not be predetermined. **Rather, a centralized reserve, or some other funding mechanism, shall be established to avoid such inequities.**

Top of page 8:

This statement shall be written in consideration of the fact that the ~~school and~~ department shall **normally** be reimbursed ~~for sabbatical leaves from the centralized fund~~ **as necessary to meet programmatic needs.** This statement shall be forwarded to the School Dean.

Bottom of page 8:

~~...A list of alternates shall comprise those proposals in the second or third categories that are not recommended for approval. Those proposals in the second or third category that are not included in the above-mentioned recommendation shall be recommended as alternates for approval. The alternates list will be constructed by order of ranking.~~

September 12, 1991

To: Academic Senate

From: Shirley Moore  
Dick Kornweibel  
History Department

In preparation for the Fall 1991 semester, the History Department was told to open many of its classes to room capacity. Other departments in the School of Arts and Sciences received similar instructions. Yesterday, September 11, 1991 history faculty acted on two motions presented last week by Professor Richard Lower. In the first the department voted to permit instructors in classes with increased enrollment to abandon departmentally imposed writing requirements.

In the second motion, the faculty requested that we ask the Senate to recommend the suspension of university imposed writing requirements (specifically in general education) in those classes where class size has been or will be raised above traditional limits. We so move and second.



California State University  
Sacramento

The President  
Sacramento, California 95819  
916-233-7341  
FAX 916-233-0939

May 13, 1991

California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819

MAY 15 1991

Academic Senate Minutes  
413

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Dr. Juanita Barrena  
Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Donald R. Gerth

Your memorandum of April 29 containing the recommendation of the Academic Senate from its April 25 meeting is at hand.

The recommendation concerning committee appointments are noted and are to be addressed by appropriate senior members of the administration.

The recommendations concerning General Education content are approved. The Vice President for Academic Affairs is responsible for the implementation of these (AS 91-39, AS 91-24).

The Senate has recommended several actions concerning ROTC:

- o campus enactment of procedures to ensure observation of its non-discrimination policy,
- o use of the moral force of the office of the CSUS President to cause Congress to abandon Department of Defense policy barring homosexuals from military service.
- o cooperative efforts with other campuses to exert influence on Congress regarding the Department of Defense policy

Dr. Juanita Barrena  
Page 2

Because of its concern about discrimination, the Senate has recommended additionally that:

- o CSUS discontinue the admission of new students to the ROTC program effective in the fall of 1992.
- o should the Department of Defense change its policy, however, the ROTC program should be reinstated immediately.

The question concerning ROTC is in my judgment to be decided in terms of two issues:

1. the exclusion of homosexuals from military service as a matter of public policy, which has been characterized by many who have shared their views with me as either a moral or a political question;
2. the essential purposes of the University and the interests of its students.

I believe that the categorical exclusion of homosexuals in the military is not consistent with egalitarian American values or good public policy. There is no evidence to support the assertion that homosexuals as a group, any more than any other group, are either less capable or less willing to serve in the armed forces. Moreover, the participation of the University in a process which leads to this exclusion is contrary to the policy of the California State University and to the goals and values of this campus. Our basic goal is to broaden opportunities for our students.

For the past months I have been working diligently with a group of university presidents from across the country, with the active support and involvement of the Board of Directors and President of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and with other educational leaders, in an attempt to change this Department of Defense policy. To this date, we have not succeeded. I intend to continue my active participation in this national coalition that is emerging because I believe ultimately this policy will change. I encourage you and your colleagues also to work with national organizations to assert influence on the Department of Defense.

Dr. Juanita Barrena  
Page 3

I support the moral position of the Academic Senate. I also applaud the Senate's decision to allow students currently enrolled in ROTC to continue. However, to abruptly close ROTC would narrow opportunities for our students at a time when our goal is to broaden these opportunities. Consequently, I have decided to reserve action on discontinuing new enrollment in ROTC to allow the efforts, currently underway, to have an effective impact on the Congress or the courts to abandon the Department of Defense's discriminatory policy against homosexuals.

Finally, I want to note the role of the University in public policy nationally. The University has an obligation to be faithful to its own goals, whether these have to do with the provisions for instruction, scholarly activity and public service, or with other stated values. We have, beyond that obligation, an opportunity to support the common good of our society. There is no question in my mind but that this is done by the continued provision in the nation's colleges and universities for the education of a significant portion of the future military leadership of our society.

I thank all of those who have taken part in the dialogue about this important issue.

DRG/mn

- cc: Dean Robert Arellanes  
Vice President Mary Burger  
Dean John Colten  
Dean Don Gillott  
Dean Steve Gregorich  
Vice President Mernoy Harrison  
Vice President Robert Jones  
Dean Charles Martell  
Dean Elizabeth Moulds  
Dean Joseph Moorhead  
Dean William Sullivan  
Dean David Wagner  
Dean George Wayne

The Academic Senate, based on the recommendation of its Committee on Diversity and Equity/Affirmative Action (Attachment C, 4/25/91 Senate Agenda), adopts the following resolution on ROTC amended as recommended by the Executive Committee:

- Whereas, Discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is a violation of basic human rights; and
- Whereas, CSUS maintains relations and contracts with the United States Department of Defense whereby Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) programs are taught on various campuses; and
- Whereas, The United States Department of Defense's policy and regulations exclude homosexuals from military ranks; and
- Whereas, There is scholarly evidence that the policy of discrimination by the military on the basis of sexual orientation is a policy based on prejudice and is not beneficial to the national defense; and
- Whereas, It is a violation of CSU policy for the CSU system, or any part of it, to discriminate in employment or access on the basis of sexual orientation; and
- Whereas, The CSU makes vigorous efforts to create campus climates free of bigotry and prejudice; and
- Whereas, The Department of Defense policy and practice of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is inimical to the values of the university; and
- Whereas, Allowing academic credit for ROTC courses and awarding faculty status to instructors who teach in these programs facilitates such discrimination by lending institutional support and respectability to the Department of Defense's policy of discrimination; and
- Whereas, In May 1990 the Academic Senate CSU called upon the Department of Defense to end its discriminatory policy based on sexual orientation (AS-1939-90/AA); and
- Whereas, In May 1990 the Academic Senate CSU urged the campus senates to consider action if the military's policy of discrimination against homosexuals was not rescinded by January 1, 1991; and
- Whereas, In May 1990 the CSUS Academic Senate passed AS 90-75 (Attachment D, 4/25/91 Senate Agenda) which endorsed the Academic Senate CSU resolution mentioned above; and
- Whereas, In June 1990 the Chair of the Academic Senate CSU received a reply from a Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Department of Defense, which stated: "Accordingly, we [the Department of Defense] do not plan to reassess the Department's policy on homosexuality."; and
- Whereas, In March 1991 the Academic Senate CSU unanimously passed AS-1980-91/AA, which urged campus senates and presidents to enact policies that parallel those that follow; therefore be it

Resolved:

That the CSUS Academic Senate urge the President to enact the following policies:

- a. due to catalogue and admissions deadlines, ROTC programs shall not be allowed to enroll any additional students, effective in Fall, 1992;
  - b. students already enrolled in ROTC programs shall be allowed to complete the program;
  - c. by July 1996 all contracts with the United States military regarding the offering of ROTC programs at the University shall be terminated, not be renewed, or be allowed to expire;
- and be it further

Resolved:

That the CSUS Academic Senate urge the President to enact procedures to ensure that its non-discrimination policy for all students, in all campus programs be observed; and be it further

Resolved:

That the CSUS Academic Senate urge the President to use the moral force of his office to cause the Congress to abandon the Department of Defense's discriminatory policy against homosexuals; and be it further

Resolved:

That the Academic Senate direct the Military Studies Advisory Board, in consultation with the Committee on Diversity and Equity/Affirmative Action, to continue dialogues already begun with sister campuses to determine what actions pertaining to ROTC programs have been adopted by other campus academic senates and administrations, and to develop strategies for working with other campus senates and the Academic Senate CSU to exert influence on Congress to effect change in the Department of Defense's discriminatory policy against homosexuals; and, be it further

Resolved:

That should the Department of Defense end its discriminatory policy regarding homosexuals, the CSUS Academic Senate urge that ROTC be immediately fully reinstated.

Carried 4/25/91.