1. Call to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Approval of the agenda.

3. Approval of the minutes from the meeting of January 19, 2005

4. Announcements.

5. Times certain.

6. Liaison Reports
   - Keith Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

7. Items of business

7.1 Advisement issues
   - Proposed Resolution (to be sent separately)
   - Tomorrow’s Professor on advising standards and objectives.
     - Attachment A
   - Advising email exchange from D. McNeil.
     - Attachment B

7.2 Lower division core project
   - Update reports from Keith Boyum and Marshall Cates on the implementation process.
   - Latest updates are on the LDTP web site: http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ldtp.shtml

7.3 Remedial programs
   - Thompson resolution:
   - Thompson communication to the committee (04-2)
     - Attachment C

7.4 Faculty Role in Intercollegiate Athletics
   - Revised resolution (to be sent)
   - Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics:
   - Resolution with Myron’s language –
7.5 Admissions and the SAT Writing Test

- About the SAT writing test, part of the SAT I, from the College Board (the new test will have three scores on the familiar scale of 200-800: writing, mathematics, and critical reading):
  - The University of California’s use (read carefully):
  - [http://www.ucop.edu/pathways/ucnotes/september04/admissionnews1.html](http://www.ucop.edu/pathways/ucnotes/september04/admissionnews1.html)

7.6 Extended Education and Self-Support Issues

8. Information items.

9. Liaison Reports.

Adjournment
Folks:

The posting below looks at faculty advising of students and how to make it a successful, and rewarded, part of your academic duties. It is from CHAPTER 4: Expectations and Training of Faculty Advisors, by Faye Vowell and Phillip J. Farren in Faculty Advising Examined Enhancing the Potential of College Faculty as Advisors, Gary L. Kramer, editor, Brigham Young University. Copyright © 2003 by Anker Publishing Company, Inc. All rights reserved. Anker Publishing Company, Inc., 176 Ballville Road, P.O. Box 249, Bolton, MA 01740-0249 USA. <www.ankerpub.com> Reprinted with permission.

Regards,

Rick Reis
reis@stanford.edu

ESTABLISHING CLEAR EXPECTATIONS FOR ADVISING

If good advising is to be considered in the faculty-reward process, clearly defined expectations must be in place. Ideally, such expectations need to be established and reviewed by the major participants in the process: faculty, the staff supporting advising, and students. They need to be included in the faculty handbook and available on the institutional web site. The most basic statement of expectation should be found in an institutional advising mission statement. Mission statements vary by the kind, type, history, and culture of an institution. The following examples show the similarities and differences among mission statements for a number of different schools.

Aims Community College offers the following institutional philosophy statement and accompanying institutional goals for academic advising:

Academic advising exists to help students gain the maximum educational and personal benefits from Aims Community College. The advisor facilitates the development of these benefits by knowing the resources of the institution, by understanding the needs and goals of individuals, and by bringing these elements together in the development of meaningful educational plans.

Institutional Goals of Advising

1) To assist students in their consideration and clarification of educational goals.
2) To assist students in developing an education plan, college program, and selection of courses consistent with the student's goals and objectives.

3) To provide accurate information about institutional policies, procedures, resources, and programs.

4) To assist students in evaluation or re-evaluation of progress toward established goals and educational plans.

5) To involve all faculty in student advising.

6) To make referrals to resources within and out of the college as appropriate.

7) To empower and encourage students to be self-directed learners.

(Aims Community College, 2002)

Hamilton College, a liberal arts college, defines expectations for advising in the following language:

Academic advising is one of the many ways in which students engage with faculty on an individual basis. Advisors and advisees work together to craft a unique, individual academic plan based upon each student's strengths, weaknesses, and goals. The College views the advising relationship as an ongoing conversation that transcends mere course selection and attempts to assist students as they explore the breadth of the liberal arts curriculum, experience college life, focus on a major concentration, and prepare for life after college. (Hamilton College, 2002).

Syracuse University, a research institution, has the following expectations in regard to advising:

Academic advising is an essential part of a Syracuse University education. The University is committed to providing the individual advice and assistance that students need at every step throughout their degree programs. A successful system of academic advising is highly dependent upon a shared commitment of students, faculty and staff to the process and the availability of timely, accurate information. (Syracuse University, 2002)
The final example is from Western New Mexico University, a four-year, public, comprehensive institution. A faculty committee crafted the mission statement and definition of advising which they then shared with the faculty as a whole to offer them a chance to comment and react.

Academic Advising Mission Statement

The mission of academic advising is to assist students in relating their needs, values, abilities, and goals to the educational programs of the University. In support of the University's mission statement, academic advising recognizes the need to address the diverse cultural and academic background of its students, while promoting academic excellence. Successful advising contributes to a significant goal of a college education-developing mature and self-directed students, capable of thinking, judging, and making appropriate decisions.

Definition of Successful Advising

Academic advising goes beyond the clerical functions of scheduling classes and preparing degree plans. Good academic advising assists students in clarifying personal and career goals, developing consistent educational goals, and evaluating their progress toward established goals. Academic advising utilizes the resources of the University and refers students to the appropriate academic support services. It is a decision-making process in which the sharing of information between student and advisor promotes responsible and appropriate choices and facilitates a successful academic experience. (Western New Mexico University, 2002c)

For advising to be considered a major factor in the promotion, tenure, and merit pay process, it should be accorded a weight equal to that given to teaching or research. Requirements for documenting advising success will vary according to the history and culture of the institution. But the expectations should be stated as clearly as possible so that advising administrators can construct training that will enable faculty advisors to meet them.

The following example of an attempt to clarify expectations for promotion and tenure comes from Western New Mexico University. At this institution, the annual faculty evaluation process included various elements. Every spring each academic department establishes goals and objectives for the next year within the context of the school's goals and objectives. Early each fall, faculty members establish goals and objectives in five areas: teaching, advising, scholarly and creative activity, professional contributions, and personal relationships. Then the chair meet twice that year with faculty to review progress toward meeting these goals. This evaluation
process included a discussion of progress toward tenure and promotion for untenured faculty members.

A group of faculty met and brainstormed the following expectations for faculty in relation to tenure and promotion. This list, shared broadly with faculty through email and the institutional intranet, is discussed and refined annually. The guiding purpose of this activity was to help faculty see how expectations increase and roles change with different ranks and years of service and to establish a minimum expectation for attaining tenure. The expectations for tenure and for assistant professor should be viewed together since most faculty are hired as assistant professors. The expectations listed for assistant, associate, and full professors assume that earlier expectations continue, so only new expectations are given.

Expectations for Tenure

- Know advisees both personally and in terms of institutional demographics,
- Understand the kinds of challenges and problems faced by these students.
- Keep good advising records.
- Know how to use the student information system for advising.
- Demonstrate basic knowledge of general-education and major requirements.
- Demonstrate knowledge of all majors within the department.
- Establish a track record of successful advising.
- Demonstrate awareness of the professional qualities graduates need for success in a field.
- Make progress toward mastery of advising as demonstrated in the annual evaluation process.

Expectations for Assistant Professor Rank

- Demonstrate an interest in mentoring students.
- Establish rapport with students.
- Be active in retention efforts.
- Attend advisor-training sessions.
- Advise undergraduate students.
- Direct students in majors appropriately.
- Follow all university policies and procedures in regard to advising.
- Understand the emerging needs of the field and communicate them to advisees.
- Be knowledgeable about and use campus support services.

Expectations for Associate Professor Rank
_ Demonstrate more experience and maturity in mentoring.
_ Attend advisor-training sessions and help deliver training.
_ Advise students on issues after graduation-work or graduate school.
_ Effectively facilitate student decision making.
_ Create degree plans focusing on student needs.

Expectations for Professor Rank

_ Demonstrate mastery of mentoring process.
_ Work toward building collaboration among students in the major.
_ Conduct advisor-training session, help organizing training, attend training sessions.
_ Demonstrate competence in helping students reach their goals.
_ Exhibit few advising errors.
_ Share expertise with junior faculty.
_ Be actively involved in advising both students and faculty.
_ Identify improvement needed to departmental and institutional policies and procedures.
_ Direct graduate programs.
_ Demonstrate knowledge of degree plans across departments.
_ Answer colleagues’ questions on advising issues.
_ Assist with difficult advising situations.
_ Know the major and work to shape it appropriately.
_ Look to the future and imagine.

(Western New Mexico University, 2002d)

Clearly delineating expectations for faculty at different stages in their tenure track will help faculty and administrators set benchmarks and goals for faculty advising.

-----------------------------
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TOMORROW'S PROFESSOR LISTSERV is a shared mission partnership with the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) http://www.aahe.org/
The National Teaching and Learning Forum (NT&LF) http://www.ntlf.com/
The Stanford Center for Innovations in Learning (SCIL) http://scil.stanford.edu/
Email Exchange McNeil / Nellen 12/03

I found the old message below in my archives, from an SJSU chair (and senate activist), and I note her observation that many students come to us in need not only of remediation but also of advising -- not merely advice about what to take to finish the major in a minimum number of units, but also advice about what major they ought to be in. If we advise them to stick with their initial choice and they fail to finish after, say, 60 or 90 or 105 units, then those units are "excess" costs to the university (and, for the student, a waste of time, perhaps a waste of an education).

She/I may be wrong about this, or some of it, but I do think that whatever we "do about advising" we would be well-advised to consult CSU chairs (or designees) on the subject.

BTW, we now have a very thorough list with email addresses of chairs/designees for 30 majors....

David

Prof. David McNeil
Department of History
San Jose State University 95192-0117
Chair, Academic Senate of the CSU
408-924-5545 office
562-505-8962 cellular

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Mon, 22 Dec 2003 22:49:23 -0800
From: Sally Veregge <sveregge@email.sjsu.edu>
To: David O. McNeil <dmcneil@email.sjsu.edu>
Subject: Re: [Fwd: BAC Suggestions]

David, I totally agree that many of our students should change majors. In Biology, we have many entering students who have no concept of what it takes to get a Biology degree or what they might do with such a degree other than going to medical school. Many struggle. We do what we can to help them including intensive advising. For those whose aptitude is clearly elsewhere, we advise them out of the major and try to help them find another
major that matches their interests and talents. I also agree that students should be allowed to explore within reason. One can often learn more in the process of getting lost than by going directly from point A to point B. There are very few students who are wasteful with units, i.e., who purposely take many more units than they need. Most of our students want to graduate as quickly as possible. If money were to be invested anywhere in terms of helping students graduate with fewer units, advising would be my choice—advising and annual campus meetings with community college advisors to better coordinate advising.

Regarding the UC comparison, UC spends about 2.5 times as much as we do to educate a student—let's use that comparison. They take the top 10% of graduating seniors, and likely fewer of their students need remediation. Remediation for a Biology Major means that s/he cannot start the required Biology or Chemistry series for at least one semester. That automatically sets the student back by one semester at the minimum.

I would vote for investing more in good advising. Finally, or likely not finally, I would not turn graduate students away but would vote for significantly increasing the cost of graduate education (masters or post-bac) in order to keep the cost of the first degree low—one inexpensive degree (with the option of changing majors) per student.

Sally

> From: "David O. McNeil" <dmcneil@email.sjsu.edu>
> Date: Tue, 9 Dec 2003 09:51:17 -0800 (PST)
> To: Sally Veregge <sveregge@email.sjsu.edu>
> Cc: mjhurley@pacbell.net, Annette Nellen <anellen@email.sjsu.edu>, James Brent
> <jcbrent@email.sjsu.edu>, Monica Rascoe <mrascoe@email.sjsu.edu>, Don Kassing
> <kassing@sjsu.edu>, Terri Thames <tthames@email.sjsu.edu>, Senate Chair
> <senate.chair@sjsu.edu>, Michael Katz <mskatz1@earthlink.net>, Marshall
> Goodman <marshall.goodman@sjsu.edu>, Gilda Pour <gpour@email.sjsu.edu>, AS
> President <president@as.sjsu.edu>, Joe Crowley <sjsupres@sjsu.edu>, Marlene
> Coach <mcoach@email.sjsu.edu>, Debra David <ddavid@email.sjsu.edu>, Cynthia
> Haliasz <haliasz@sjsu.edu>, Sandy Dewitz <SDewitz@sjsu.edu>, Bob Cooper
> <rocooper@email.sjsu.edu>, Pam Stacks <pstacks@jupiter.sjsu.edu>, Robert
Sally, I suspect that statistic is about right: they do, and they should change majors (especially when they discover that they're not suited for their initial choices).

What's happening now is that we are told, emphatically, that although in individual cases changing majors is good for "finding oneself" (personally I found that I wasn't suited for engineering and switched to philosophy, considered political science and theater, and ended up in history), the CSU can NO LONGER AFFORD students who don't follow "clear road maps" after early declaration of a major. Taking "excess" units (above those required for the degree one ultimately gets) means excluding someone else from being in those classes, in a "no enrollment growth" environment, and (we were told at the conference), "access is the primary mission of the CSU."

But think of the implications for the individual's life of following an excellent map to the WRONG destination throughout the college career (not to mention the impact on "access" when such individuals run into impenetrable roadblocks near the end of the trip and drop out)!

We are told that "UC doesn't permit" the sorts of major-changing we do. I guess that means our students and theirs have the same level of preparation for a purposeful college career and that the UC, furthermore, does a better job at teaching students (excuse me, I should have said "at workforce preparation").

David

On Mon, 8 Dec 2003, Sally Veregge wrote:

Judith, I recall reading (somewhere?) that college students change their majors an average of 3 times. Sally
Most of Allison's suggestions echo what several of us heard at the Student Success conference last week. The question of declaring majors is an interesting one. I had the impression that the system would love it if everyone would declare a major sometime between kindergarten and first grade. At lunch at the conference, we did a quick survey of our SJSU table and discovered that the majority of us had changed our majors. In fact, some among us had changed majors more than once. Two big suggestions that kept coming up at the conference were road maps (aka critical pathways) and "intrusive" advising. As best as I could understand, these are serious reform initiatives that amount to 1. letting students know what courses they should take, and 2. actually advising them. Judith

Annette Nellen wrote:
The attached email has suggestions from Allison. These include some financial efficiency ideas (I'm purposefully not calling some of them cost-cutting because that implies that something at the core is being cut) that go beyond delivery of a course and include ideas the CSU is already asking campuses to work on.

Regards,
Annette
All, remediation is an issue I would like to see on the AAC agenda:

I read in the May 24th Modesto Bee that in our campus' home county, Stanislaus, population around 500,000 only 13% of those 25 or older have a college degree; nationwide, "that places Stanislaus fourth from the bottom on a list of 231 counties with populations of 250,000 or more surveyed." The national rate was 25.9% and California's 28.5%. The article goes on to note that the valley "serves as a launching pad for the upwardly mobile," but that our ratio of college graduates both deters businesses and prompts "talent flight." I have taught at Stanislaus for 11 years and believe that our campus is enacting that American ideal of upward mobility through education; at the same time I understand that we must provide balanced access and a fair chance at an education for all of our eligible students if the CSU is to serve as a platform for upward mobility. That access includes, and must include, eligible students who are required to take remedial courses.

However, the administration of the CSU, including the academic administration, is distorting the original goal of the Board of Trustees: to reduce the need for remediation. Instead remediation is demonized and held up as a possible target for punishment at every turn. In a meeting with the Chancellor on my campus two years ago, he stated directly that our enrollment management problems would disappear if we got rid of all remediation. It's more than discouraging to have to report that the majority of the many faculty I have spoken with in the CSU join the chorus to attack remedial students. I have enough trust in the fairness of faculty to believe they just haven't thought carefully enough about what a remedial student is.

*****Trustee Pesquiera's remedial tour:
In the mid-90s, then-Trustee Ralph Pesquiera often accompanied by vice-chancellor Peter Hoff toured many campuses of the CSU to help inform the Board of Trustees about remedial issues. I attended the meeting at the Stanislaus campus and noted that the Trustee's introductory remarks included the fact that his children attended private schools where students still learned Latin. With that comparative background in mind, I was relieved to later learn that the Trustees' stance was to reduce the need for remediation in the CSU to 10% by 2007, a very different stance than the ban on remedial classes achieved by the CUNY regents in a revision of their master plan. It is important to keep in mind that the goal is to reduce the need for remediation.

Clearly, some CSU initiatives such as the PAD (pre-collegiate academic development), CAPI (collaborative academic preparation initiative), and EAP (early assessment program) focus on the goal; however, other policies--such as the limitation of remedial work, in some cases to one semester, and proposed policies such as counting prebaccalaureate units in a total of
"sanctionable units"--units beyond which students or campuses will be penalized--have nothing to do with reducing the need for remediation. (For example, a farcical assertion would be that a high school student will better prepare for writing at college because she knows that someday any prebaccalaureate units will count against her as part of her total if she passes 120% of the minimum units required for her future degree program.)

*****Students:
Various sources document that freshman composition courses began at Harvard in the 1880s, a recognition that students who had completed high school were not prepared to write at the university, Harvard University (e.g. Berlin, Boylan). Berlin's rendering has a familiar ring:

In 1874, Eliot [the president of Harvard] introduced a test of the student's ability to write in English as a part of the Harvard entrance requirement . . . . Since the language of learning at the new university was to be English, it seemed appropriate that entering students be tested in this language. Furthermore the test in English ensured that the new open university would not become too open . . . . The fact that no freshman class had ever been able to write in the manner thought appropriate for college work and that additional writing instruction had always been deemed necessary for college students seems not to have been noticed either by Eliot or the staff of his English department. A look at the sample essays from the entrance exam of 1894--published by the Harvard Board of Overseers in indignation at the errors it found--reveals that the best students in the country attending the best university of its time had difficulties in writing. Rather than conclude that perhaps it was expecting too much of these students and their preparatory schools, however, the Board of Overseers excoriated the teachers who had prepared these students and demanded that something be done. This vilification of high school English teacher has since become a common practice as college English teachers have tried to shift the entire responsibility for writing instruction--a responsibility that throughout Anglo-American history has been shared by the college--to the lower schools. (24) [end of quote]

One of the most widely-offered general education courses began as a means to bridge the gap between writing expectations at high school graduation and at university matriculation. Unfortunately, many academics and administrators, once they have completed their degrees, misremember a golden age of writing back in their day, and this mis-remembrance is a step toward demonizing remedial students.

Additionally, over the last 30 years, many university composition programs have shifted from an "introduction to literary explication" focus to an "introduction to academic writing" focus. The vast majority of CSU first-year composition courses fall into the latter category; however, most
high school curricula are still grounded in the analysis of literature and narrative/creative writing. So, many students who must take the English Placement Test are faced with tasks that are quite different from the composition tasks they practiced in high school. If the Early Assessment Project does have an effect on high school curriculum and instruction; part of that change will be to bring the types of writing tasks assigned to high school students into closer alignment with tasks assigned at the university. Ascribing blame to students for different focuses of instruction grounded in state frameworks is a step toward demonizing remedial students.

Adjusting to the new type of task and level of expectation in writing performance is a step in the students' development as writers. Another common way of mis-thinking about writing is called the "myth of transience." The myth is that writing is learned as a set of discreet skills that then transfer to all writing situations: they should've learned that in the fourth (or eight or tenth) grade. If we stop and think about it, we know that learning to write is developmental and happens over many years. The university's designation of writing instruction as a required course and/or general education requirement is a recognition that writing is not something one "gets" at a discrete point and that writing is important enough that we require students to submit to instruction. Clearly, "remediation" is every bit as much developmental as it is remedial. (Writing faculty spent years repeating the distinction between developmental and remedial instruction, but that distinction is so ignored in conversations that it is near pointless to keep explaining it.) Many universities, but not most CSUs, require students to take two semesters of first-year composition, an explicit acknowledgment that more than one semester of writing instruction is necessary for most entering university students. Subscribing to the myth of transience is one more step toward demonizing . . .

Another explicit acknowledgement of the importance of writing is that students are tested for placement in appropriate classes if they are not exempted by a passable score on SAT, ACT, or other examinations. Testing in any area will produce numbers of remedial students. If we had no EPT but did have the History Placement Test, the Science Placement Test, and the Philosophy Placement Test, we would also have huge numbers of students who headed to remedial classes in history, science, and philosophy. We could then complain that we didn't want "those remedial (fill in discipline here) students" who couldn't pass the HPT/SPT/PPT in our classes or university. With a placement testing program for each discipline, we might be able to place upwards of 90 percent of eligible incoming students in a demonizable category.

It would be ironic, having spent so much breath recently decrying the demise of the master plan in California, were we to decouple access from remedial programs. If you don't believe that connection exists, I invite you to visit
any remedial writing class on my campus: you will see that remedial programs, at least those in composition, are a bulwark of access sustaining the ethnic and economic diversity in the system. Put more simply: go look at whom the system keeps attempting to pile more sanctions on. If you have ever taught a remedial course, then you aware that these students actually advance and attain degrees. Decoupling remediation from access is one more step toward demonizing . . .

*****Faculty
It is a commonplace, when remedial writing programs are even housed in English departments, that the classes are by and large taught by part-time faculty and graduate-student teaching associates. The disfranchised teaching the disfranchised. Remedial courses are among the cheapest taught at the university; a graduate student teaching 15 students in a remedial course for $2000 is still much cheaper than me as a full professor teaching a freshman composition class of 25 or a graduate course of 15. Remedial composition courses on our campus have high success rates, 75-80% per term (Trustee Galinson was quoted in newspapers allowing that such success rates "don't pass the smell test," an argument that might change once he gets within smelling distance of a remedial writing class for long enough to see what transpires there). Yet, I have heard it repeated in meetings, especially ones connected to the Chancellor's office, that the faculty of these fairly cheap and highly successful programs are protective of these programs, as if a protective attitude toward successful programs that provide access is a negative thing and removes all objectivity of those involved in teaching remedial students. Where else in the CSU system are underpaid instructors who provide the direct instruction in successful access programs demonized for being protective of their programs?

*****System
Beyond EO665 and further sanctions placed on remedial students, it seems that one of the rewards of impaction is a reduction in the number of semesters granted to remedial students to remediate or the use of remedial status to deny students admission altogether. That reduction or denial then becomes the model that the less fortunate un-impacted campuses are directed to aspire to. If another tiering device in the CSU draws a line between remedial and non-remedial campuses, who wants to be in the latter, demonized, group? While the CSU speaks out of one side of its mouth championing outreach programs to save them from the budget axe, it speaks out of the other side by reducing or denying access to the very students it purports to reach out to, including students who are fully eligible for admission under our as yet unrevised master plan.

Soon, when the EAP system is declared functional, valid, and reliable, students will likely be required to take, and perhaps required to complete, remedial work in the summer preceding matriculation as Trustee policy has
been altered to allow them to do. To mount such programs to serve all targeted students in the summer on many campuses would be a monumental undertaking. Would it also be an undertaking that becomes part of the recent budget-driven fetish for conversion back to self-support rather than state support thereby imposing a further economic sanction on the remedial students? The possibilities for sanction seem endless.

Rather than thoughtlessly repeating a mantra to denigrate a certain segment of students, consider what you see as the mission of the CSU--and of your local CSU--and think about how all of your students fit within that mission.


Thanks,

~mt

rhetoric: when the baby says "wah."