

Possible actions by EC regarding ROTC

1. Motion to table action on the recommendation until a written legal opinion is rendered by the University Counsel (re: Solomon Amendment). Then tell Senate that EC is awaiting legal counsel's opinion. Go ahead and give AS the report, but no action.
2. If EC votes to accept the recommendation (do not proceed with ROTC course consideration), then the choices are:
 - a. Inform Senate that EC voted accept. No discussion in Senate.
 - b. EC writes a resolution to take to Senate to ask Senate to endorse the EC's decision to accept the recommendation. Discussion will be on the *appropriateness of the EC's action*. If Senate approves the resolution, then that's the end of the process. If Senate does not approve the resolution, then the matter will be back in front of EC to reconsider its acceptance of the recommendation.
 - c. EC writes a resolution to take to Senate to ask Senate to endorse the recommendation of the Study Group. Discussion will be on the *recommendation of the Study Group's report*. If Senate approves the resolution, then that's the end of the process. If Senate does not approve the resolution, then the matter will be back in front of EC to consider next steps (Contingencies).
 - d. EC takes the report to the Senate as an agenda item in New Business, for a *discussion of the full report*. A senator could move to accept (or reject) the report.
3. If EC votes to reject the recommendation (therefore to proceed with ROTC course consideration, potentially using the Contingencies), then the choices are:
 - a. Inform Senate that EC voted to proceed. No discussion in Senate.
 - b. EC writes a resolution to take to Senate to ask Senate to endorse the EC's decision to reject the recommendation. Discussion will be on the *appropriateness of the EC's action*. If Senate approves the resolution, then EC will proceed with the Contingencies (will go into next year with the curriculum approval process). If Senate does not approve the resolution, then the matter will be back in front of EC to reconsider its rejection of the recommendation.
 - c. EC writes a resolution to take to Senate to ask Senate to reject the recommendation of the Study Group and to proceed with ROTC. Discussion will be on the *recommendation of the Study Group's report*. If Senate approves the resolution, then EC will initiate the curriculum approval process, potentially using the Contingencies. If Senate does not approve the resolution, then the process is done and there will be no further action on ROTC.
 - d. EC takes the report to the Senate as an agenda item in New Business, for a *discussion of the full report*. A senator could move to accept (or reject) the report.

**Study Group on Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) at CSUSM
Recommendation and Documentation**

*Study Group Members: Don Barrett (Faculty, COAS), David Barsky (Assoc VP for Academic Programs), Victoria Hernandez (Veterans Affairs and Athletic Compliance Coordinator), Zach Morrison (ASI Board of Directors), Moses Ochanji (Faculty, COE), Linda Pershing (Faculty, COAS).
Fall '08 only: Patty Seleski (Faculty, COAS)
Spring '09 only: Staci Beavers (Faculty, COAS),*

The Study Group on ROTC was charged with engaging the CSUSM community in a wide-ranging discussion regarding ROTC and the following issues¹:

- University Curriculum Committee's questions about how to treat the courses proposed since, while they are not part of a minor or major program, they are clearly a defined sequence of courses which lead to a professional goal
- Benefits of Army ROTC training and about the opportunities a CSUSM-based Army ROTC program will provide for many CSUSM students
- Concerns about whether the presence of Army ROTC on campus would conflict with CSUSM statements on non-discrimination
- Resource implications that such program offerings might entail

Before proceeding further we note that ROTC course credit is already accepted at CSUSM through partnerships with other institutions in the County and that the particular question focused on by the group was that of whether for-credit ROTC courses of study should be offered on campus at CSUSM.

This document contains the Recommendation of the Study Group, recommended Contingencies if the Recommendation is not followed, and Qualifying Statements from the individual members of the group. Following the Recommendation and Contingencies are sections documenting the analysis and the process.

Table of Contents:

- A. Recommendations, Contingencies, and Qualifying Statements
- B. ROTC, the Military Policy of Exclusion, and CSU's Anti-Discrimination Policy
- C. ROTC, The Benefit And Opportunities For CSUSM And Its Students
- D. Exposing ROTC students to a Liberal Arts Environment
- E. Assessing the Effects of ROTC on Campus Environment
- F. ROTC Related Actions Taken by Other Universities
- G. Oversight and resources issues
- H. Summary of Community Discussion Process

¹ "Composition and Charge for the Study Group to Explore Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) at CSUSM" Approved by Executive Committee, Academic Senate, 09/10/2008

88 **A. Recommendation, Contingencies, and Qualifying Statements**

89
90 Because of the complexity of the issue, the Study Group proposes both a recommendation and
91 recommended contingencies, along with statements of qualifying support by members of the study
92 group. The recommendation is based on the results of the overall assessment process; the
93 contingencies are to be considered if the study group’s recommendation is not followed. The study
94 group’s decisions are not unanimous, thus qualifying statements of support are also provided.

95
96 **Recommendation**

97
98 Based on a careful consideration of the issues and the sentiments expressed by the university
99 community, the Study Group finds that the over-arching issue is the conflict between the university
100 anti-discrimination policy and the military policy excluding non-heterosexuals from military service
101 (known as “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” or DADT). The majority of the Study Group is in agreement with
102 the sentiment presented by a majority of the public responses (see document B), that ROTC courses
103 should not be offered as long as the military policy of exclusion is in place. Though ROTC students
104 might benefit from inclusion in the campus environment (see document D) and offering ROTC would
105 benefit some students (see document C), the Study Group concludes that offering ROTC courses
106 conflicts with the university’s commitment to non-discrimination and thus the courses should not be
107 offered. The majority position of the Study Group is very eloquently reflected in a statement issued
108 by Rodger D’Andreas, the director of the LGBTQ Pride Center (used with his permission):

109
110 “Should we choose to treat our mission and values with such expediency [as to offer ROTC],
111 it means two things: (1) Institutionally, we lack ethical integrity. Our mission and values are
112 merely words, not commitments; and (2) We believe that institutionalized discrimination of
113 LGBTQ individuals is still socially acceptable, and we are willing to convey our acceptance of
114 said discrimination to current and future CSUSM students, staff and faculty, and community
115 members. I wonder if we would be willing to collude in sending a similar message of
116 institutionally-sanctioned discrimination to individuals of a racial minority, to women, or to
117 folks whose first language is not English. I hardly think so. “

118
119 The Study Group, however, has determined that there is some uncertainty with regard the
120 interpretation of the Solomon amendment and the consequences for the University should it
121 decided to deny a request by a military service to institute ROTC courses. Thus, if this
122 recommendation is adopted, we advise additional investigation into the interpretations of the
123 Solomon amendment.

124
125 **Contingencies**

126
127 In the event that there is a decision to reject the Study Group’s recommendation and to process the
128 proposal to offer ROTC courses at CSUSM, the study group urges the university to consider the
129 following statements regarding oversight of curriculum and faculty, and CSUSM’s response to the
130 conflict between its and the military’s sexual orientation policies.

131
132 Oversight: The Study group urges that:

- 133
134 • all proposed ROTC courses be subject to the standard CSUSM curriculum review process and
135 requirements, including requirements for student learning outcomes and the All-University
136 Writing Requirement;

- 137
- 138
- 139
- 140
- 141
- 142
- 143
- 144
- 145
- 146
- 147
- 148
- the application for the sequence of courses be filed as a minor since the courses represent a coordinated course of study;
 - ROTC courses be sponsored and evaluated by an existing academic program or department so that the curriculum and instructional delivery will be subject to standard review and evaluation policies (regardless of whether the courses are offered through Extended Learning or state-supported);
 - requirements be implemented whereby students pursuing CSUSM ROTC coursework take additional CSUSM coursework that demonstrates commitment to the institution’s stated core “values” (i.e., Intellectual Engagement, Community, Integrity, Innovation, and Inclusiveness²) and thus addresses the conflict the between CSUSM and military policies on sexual orientation.

149 Further, the Study Group urges that, when ROTC courses are presented to the Senate for approval,
150 they be brought forth as regular Senate business rather than as Consent Calendar items.

151

152 **Sexual Orientation Discrimination:** Based on the breadth of concern in the community responses
153 regarding the military’s policy on sexual orientation, the Study Group urges the following actions if
154 an ROTC program of study is implemented at CSUSM:

- 155
- the University explicitly address the conflict between military policy and CSUSM policy in the catalog description of the ROTC offering,
 - the Senate consider a resolution addressing the conflict in policies, and
 - the Senate consider a resolution encouraging University involvement in activities aimed at affecting the revocation of DADT. (Note that we have been advised that any such activity must be carefully presented so as to not appear to be discouraging enrollment in ROTC courses by students.)

163

164 **Qualifying Statements:**

165

166 Of the six members who voted on the above, five voted for the Recommendation and five for the
167 Contingencies. Not all of the analysis sections (documents B thru H) are endorsed by every member
168 of the group.

169

170 The following qualifying statements from members of the Study Group acknowledge the
171 qualifications they place on interpretations of the Recommendation and Contingencies, and on
172 various analysis sections.

173

174 Some qualifying statements were written prior to changes in the language used in this document
175 (document A); changes in language to bring qualifying statements into agreement with current
176 language are in brackets. Not all participants provided qualifying statements.

177

178 **Don Barrett:** I support the Recommendation and Contingencies. I disagree with carrying the ethical
179 concerns addressed by the Study Group beyond the ethics of the sexual orientation issue and thus
180 do not endorse the analysis in documents E and F. I also conclude that processes that balance the
181 rights of a minority against the needs of a majority suggest contingent support for the rights of the
182 minority. Thus, while I agree that the presence of ROTC courses on campus may be of benefit to
183 some students, I do not support conclusions in document D that such benefits outweigh the need to
184 protect minority rights.

² <http://www.csusm.edu/about/facts/mission.html>

185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226

David Barsky: *David Barsky was unable to write a statement due to illness and subsequent demands, but agreed to my noting the following: 1) that he is in support of both the Recommendation and the Contingencies, and 2) that he disagrees with carrying the ethical concerns addressed by the Study Group beyond the ethics of the sexual orientation issue and thus do not endorse the analysis in documents E and F. Don Barrett*

Staci Beavers: I support the recommendations [Recommendation and Contingencies] provided in this report. In terms of the accompanying analysis, I participated in the preparation of and can state my own support only for Section B: "ROTC, the Military Policy of Exclusion, and CSU's Anti-Discrimination Policy."

Victoria Hernandez: I do not support the Recommendation against providing ROTC courses on campus but do support the Contingencies on oversight and on encouraging statements about disagreement with ROTC. I believe the ethical concerns addressed by the Study Group should focus on the sexual orientation issue and thus do not endorse analysis in documents E and F.

Linda Pershing: I support the study group's Recommendation #1 [Recommendation], but I oppose Recommendation #2 [Contingencies]. In addition to the general work of the study group, my task was to draft the reports on "Effects on Campus Environment" and "Related Actions Taken by Other Universities." In reviewing the various arguments and positions, it became clear to me that starting an ROTC program on our campus would do much more harm than good. Many gay, lesbian, and bisexual students and faculty expressed the feeling that the increased military presence on campus would violate their civil rights, increase their feeling that the campus is not a safe environment for them, and would inherently support the blatant discrimination of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT) policy. Would we allow an organization that openly discriminates against women or a racial minority group to start an academic program on our campus? An academic program that discriminates against gays, lesbians, and bisexuals is no more tolerable. Moreover, it would be hypocritical to invite the ROTC to Cal State San Marcos but simultaneously issue a "statement" that the university community disagrees with the DADT policy, thereby failing to take seriously the protection of civil rights for *all* members of our community. Numerous additional issues were raised that violate the university's Mission Statement and dedication to social justice. These include racial profiling in military recruiting, targeting lower-income youth for ROTC recruitment, the rampant sexism and violence against women within the military and the military's failure to address this problem, the important principle that the faculty, and the faculty alone, should design and determine the character and quality of course curricula, and the larger and more troubling issue of universities supporting the study of violence and war, rather than peace and justice studies. If the ROTC were invited to campus, it would be extremely difficult to reverse that decision later. Particularly during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, military culture and discourse have heavily influenced our society and our national identity. Universities need to provide a safe haven from, and critical thinking about, the military industrial complex, rather than an educational system that condones and perpetuates it.




Cal State San Marcos

Office of the President

*California State University San Marcos
San Marcos, California 92096-0001 • USA*

*Tel: 760 750-4040; Fax: 760 750-4033
pres@csusm.edu
www.csusm.edu*

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 14, 2009
TO: Janet McDaniel
Chair, Academic Senate
FROM: Karen S. Haynes
President 
SUBJECT: MPP Positions for 2008-09

Please find below a list of MPP positions that were created or eliminated during the 2008-09 academic year. They are summarized as follows:

Newly Created MPP Positions: 7
MPP Positions Eliminated: 5

NEW MPP Positions Created

- Assistant Dean of Programming, Extended Learning (non-state funded)
- Academic Labor Relations Manager (reclassification of Confidential position)
- Public Information Officer
- Director, School of Nursing
- Campus Building Inspector (funded by capital project funds / temporary position)
- Associate Dean of Students (reclassification of Student Services Professional position)
- Special Assistant to the Dean, CoAS (1-year transition position for former Associate Dean)

TOTAL NEW MPP POSITIONS CREATED – 7
TOTAL NEW PERMANENT MPP POSITIONS - 5

MPP Positions Eliminated

- Assistant Vice President, Campus Enterprises
- Associate Director, Budget
- Associate Vice President, University Advancement

MPP Positions for 2008-09

Page 2

April 13, 2009

MPP Positions Eliminated (continued)

Associate Vice President for Planning, Accreditation and Budget

Assistant to the Dean, CoE

TOTAL MPP POSITIONS ELIMINATED – 5