Academic Senate of the California State University

Academic Affairs Committee

Agenda: 2.13.04

10:00-3:00

California State University, Sacramento

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of 1.21-22.04
4. Announcements
5. Times Certain: 10:30 Allison Jones on 7a; 1:30 Ray Boddy on 7b
7. Items of Business
   b. "Excess" units: http://rhet.csustan.edu/aa/docs/ExcessUnits.htm
   c. Report from the conference on Facilitating Student Success
   d. Policies for System-wide Centers and Institutes (see EO751 http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-751.pdf)
   e. Defining "Quality" (Cook, Rushall, Tarjan)
   f. Possible revision of addendum to EO365. See: http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-365.pdf (Awaiting draft changes from Jo Service.)

8. Reports
9. Other

Academic Senate, CSU

Academic Affairs Committee

Minutes of the Meeting of February, 13, 2004


Guests: Alison Jones, Lori Roth.

1. Call to order – 10: 10 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda – approved with the addition of 7g, California Higher Education State Policy Goals.

3. Approval of Minutes of 1/21-22/04

Deferred to 3/10/04.

4. Announcements
Today, February 13, the Legislative Analyst is releasing a report on admissions and enrollment management in the UC and CSU. There is support in the report for redirecting students to the community colleges and for reducing the proportion of special admissions. Special admissions according to the Master Plan were to be at 2%; they are now at 8%. Another recommendation is to have a standard date across the system when all campuses would stop accepting applications. They also feel that both UC and CSU have defined the 12.5% and 33 1/3rd % of the high school class to reach deeper into the class than is warranted; there is a recommendation that the legislature define the terms more precisely.

The Chancellor’s Office is proposing to the Board of Trustees that the CSU fee structure reflect the following fee increase percentages for 2004-2005: 11% u/g, 25% post bac credentials, 40% for graduate students.

Under discussion at this point in the Chancellor’s Office is the possibility that campuses would not admit students in the following four categories for next year: 1. Lower division transfers; 2. Upper division transfers not fully eligible; 3. post baccalaureate students who are not classified into a program; and 4. second bachelor’s degrees, except nursing and other critical areas to be determined.

5. Times Certain.
   A. Allison Jones on 7a, 10:30 a.m.
   B. Ray Boddy, 1:00 on 7b

6. Liaison Reports
   A. L. Roth, Academic Affairs, Chancellor’s Office
      - Repeats – L. Roth did a study of repeat policies on campuses last Summer and produced a draft matrix of campus repeat policies. ASCSU Chair Cherny will ask each Campus Senate Chair to review the policies on his or her own campus. There may be a need for a system wide policy.
      - “Emails to Earthquakes” is the book that the Institute for Teaching and Learning, the ATAC group, and the ASCSU have jointly published. This is a collection of articles, already published, on uses of technology in the CSU.
      - Gary Hammerstrom’s replacement – the search is proceeding, with two finalists to be interviewed at the end of February.

   B. Lynne Cook, Executive Committee, ASCSU
      - Regarding the Integrated Teacher Preparation Program requirement for 30 units to be standardized statewide, 15 to be standardized regionally, and 15 to be locally determined, where is the responsibility for declaring consensus? How will this be decided? It is thought that the decision rules for deciding what “agreement” constitutes should originate in the Academic Affairs Committee. This is a problem we should be thinking about.
      - We should emphasize that these are transfer agreements, not an agreement on curriculum to be offered. The campuses are not being asked to change their own courses, only to accept what they will take and give appropriate credit for from the surrounding community colleges.

   C. Vince Buck – Faculty Affairs Committee, ASCSU
      - Bill Hauck, member of the CSU Board of Trustees, spoke today to the Executive
Committee and others. He emphasized the relevance of the master plan. He felt that the CSU was in good standing in Sacramento.

7. Items of business

A. Transfer issues

- These were discussed at the January meetings both in committee and in the ASCSU Committee of the Whole session. There are two basic questions – do we need a statewide transfer pattern for each major, and if we are going to have it, what should the process be to define consensus and how would disagreements be mediated?

- Flexibility is needed, according to committee members, in the following areas: majors where the lower division has substantial requirements; campuses where minors are required;

- Are we hunting jackrabbits with a howitzer or elephants with a BB gun?

- Will dual admission address the problem? This was brought up with the Academic Senate of the Community Colleges in October; they are still adamantly opposed to the idea.

- Admissions Advisory Council will meet soon – meeting on 2/20/04. We will have their input.

- There is a need for better transfer counseling; however at the community colleges, counselors are frequently called upon to do vocational counseling for things like beauticians, etc.

- There was discussion of whether we should accept 60 or 70 semester units. Current policy is 70. There is opposition to a movement to 60 on some campuses.

- There was discussion of how native students and transfer students should be placed on an equal playing field.

- There was discussion of whether students should be able to change majors in their senior year. There was some sympathy for prohibiting this among the committee members, with the exception of those who can graduate earlier with a change of major. Later it appeared that this sort of prohibition is not necessary in either the 45/15 policy or the “excess units” policy.

- Sen. Boddy felt that the most important thing about 45/15 was that it was something that we would have done anyway if we had thought of it. It protects the integrity of CSU programs and at the same time helps the students. It treats transfer students very similarly to native students. Since the major departments are agreeing on what to accept, they can recommend the GE package plus two courses or another combination of courses. These will be courses that we will transfer in, not necessarily what we will teach ourselves.

- The plan according to the chair is to obtain feedback from the Admissions Advisory Council and the Campus Senate Chairs and then to do a resolution.

B. Excess Units

- A long discussion ensued on this issue. Some of the many considerations offered were:
There is a “Task Force on Excess Units,” with representatives from all groups and D. Spence as chair. It is trying to schedule a meeting for late February or early March.

- How to accommodate students who re-take courses over and over? Double majors? Extra minors?
- How are we defining excess units? Governor 10%. CSU, 15%. Others, 20%.
- Change of majors – non science are easier than science and engineering.
- There was some sense among some members that with the new roadmaps and with degree programs filed earlier, the problem may take care of itself.
- Concern over Sacramento Semester and Washington Semester programs – how can these units be included? Some sense to accommodate them within the 20 units over what is required for the degree program.
- Another suggestion was to give priority registration for students following the roadmaps – give a positive incentive to graduate on time.

C. Report on the Conference on Facilitating Student Success
- A short update was offered.

D. Policies for System Wide Centers and Institutes
- Deferred until the next meeting.

- The chair gave out a handout on the subject and asked for feedback.

F. Defining “quality” Postponed for lack of time.

G. Possible Revision of Addendum to EO 365
- No update available at this point.

8. Reports.

None.

Adjournment at 3:05 p.m.