Academic Senate of the California State University

Academic Affairs Committee

Agenda: 10.03.03

10:00-3:00

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of 05.07.03 & 09.04.03
4. Announcements
5. Times Certain
7. Items of Business
   a. AS: 2623: Articulation Agreements for Multiple Subject Integrated Teacher Preparation Programs: Principles for Formation of Regions (2nd reading in AS)
      http://rhet.csustan.edu/aa/resolutions/ITPRegions.pdf (TEKR will provide changes based on discussion in AS and at ITP Task Force.)
   b. A Review of the CSU Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) in 2002 Report of the CSU GWAR Review Committee
      http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/GWAR_review_2002.shtml
   c. CSU & ETS Assessment Initiative: Information and Communication Technology
      http://www.calstate.edu/PA/news/ETS.shtml
   e. CAN & POL
   f. Defining Quality
8. Reports
9. Other

---

Academic Senate, CSU

Academic Affairs Committee

Minutes, Meeting of 10/3/03

Present: T. Anagnoson (LA), M. Thompson (ST), L. Cooke (liaison from the Executive Committee), P. Persons (CH), K. Nishita (MB), R. Kellner (PO), T. Rohm (SB), V. Buck (FU).

1. Call to order. 10:10 a.m. by Chair Thompson.

2. Approval of agenda.

   · There was a request to add the composition of the teams for the “Facilitating Graduation” conference. This was discussed during Lori Roth’s report.
The relationship between POL (the Program on LD Requirements for Majors) and CAN was added to the agenda as item 7E.

3. **Approval of minutes of 5/7/03 and 9/4/03.**

- Minutes of September 4 – m/s/p with several changes. Anagnoson will send out revised paragraphs soon.
- Minutes from May 7, 2003, are still not available, but they should be by the next meeting.

4. **Announcements and Reports.**

- Senator Persons announced that the President of CSU Chico had agreed to fund him, as a first year Senator, to come to the interim committee meetings.

- Question regarding the privacy of email and web use – can the administration read your email? The answer is that technically the ability has recently become available for the CO to read an individual's email on campus. This item will be added to the agenda next time.

5. **Times certain.** None.

6. **Liaison report – L. Roth**

   - **Facilitating Graduation Conference** – Conference is set for 12/4-5 at the Radisson Hotel, LAX. The Chancellor’s Office has asked for 12 member teams from each campus. Provosts, Campus Senate Chairs and Student Affairs VPs all got a letter in June announcing the conference. More information is about to be sent out (10/3/03). The CO letter states that the campuses should formulate 12 person teams, with six funded by the campus and six funded by the CO. It is up to the campus to identify the composition of the teams. The statewide senators will be funded to attend the conference. The committee recommended strongly that Department chairs be involved, because they and the faculty have the strongest input into the curriculum. The tough part is to achieve faculty buy-in to change the curriculum to make the goal of the report a success. There was concern from committee members that faculty on campus would not hear about the conference.

   - **Leadership transition in AA** – With the retirement of Gary Hammerstrom 9/30/03, the division of labor for the short term will have the four Assistant Vice Chancellors in AA fill in. Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi will be the chief Academic Affairs budget person, Alison Jones will be the chief Board of Trustees and legislative person, Beverly Young will be the chief liaison to the Provosts, and Lori will be the liaison to the ASCSU and handle operational matters.

   - **Academic Technology** – from last year’s planning process emerged a set of eight initiatives from the Academic Tech Planning Committee. Over the summer the Chancellor’s Office got approval from the Provosts and Presidents for the eight initiatives. However, with Gary’s retirement and little or no money this year, Gerry Handley has been recruited to spend half time continuing the academic technology project, reporting directly to Dave Spence.

7. **Items of business.**

   A. **AS 2623 Articulation Agreements for Multiple Subject Teacher Preparation Programs: Principles for the Formation of Regions.**

   This will be a second reading item in the November meetings. TEKR will initiate any revisions. Should quarters be a consideration? If CSUs have to agree on common lower division requirements for these programs, it will probably be easier with similar calendars. Looking at the historical data, the committee felt, will be less relevant because of the early closures for Winter and Spring quarters and Spring semester during the current academic year. Local context is important because students are often willing to travel to the next campus.

   B. **A Review of the CSU Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) in 2002.** Report from the
CSU GWAR Review Committee.

Anagnoson reviewed the GWAR recommendations and the composition of the committee that did the reviewing. There was discussion of the question of students shopping for an easier exam at campuses other than the one that the student is matriculated at. However, the Title V regulations state that students must be matriculated at the campus where they take the GWAR, which means that students would have to be matriculated at two campuses either at the same time or in succession. The members of the GWAR committee who had dealt with students and student behavior had not mentioned this phenomenon as a problem during committee deliberations. A later discussion with Alison Jones indicated that this is a theoretical possibility, but that no one knows if students matriculate at more than one campus at the same time or if they transfer to another campus for a quarter or two to fulfill the GWAR and then transfer back.

The committee had mixed feelings, as did the committee members and the report author, about the involvement of local community college faculty as readers of the GWAR exam at CSU campuses.

The chair posed the following options for the committee:

(1) Do nothing.

(2) Do a resolution that recommends a systemwide standardized test of some kind.

(3) Do a sort of "middle of the road" resolution that would endorse the report as sent to the campuses and recommend that the campuses use the report as an opportunity to review and rethink their GWAR processes and options.

Several on the AA committee member recommended that faculty from one CSU grade exams at others in order to encourage comparability across campuses. There was discussion of the GWAR as an obstacle to graduation at some campuses. Dr. Roth had experience with the State of Georgia’s standardized writing exit exam. In this state, all students taking the exam would respond to the same prompt on a certain Saturday. The problem here is that political pressures to pass students, or a certain proportion of students, tended over time to set the bar very low. Only the worst writers get caught on this kind of test. Anagnoson mentioned the teaching exam in Massachusetts where just during the last two years the state found that too few candidates were passing the test and the exam was changed to permit more candidates to pass. Consensus that Anagnoson will work with Lori Roth to write a resolution that will include some mention of cross-campus comparisons, endorse the report, thank the committee and report author for their work. A combination of some of the recommendations and the Executive Summary can form the rationale.

C. CSU and ETS Assessment Initiative: Information and Communication Technology. The origin of this initiative is that Dr. Barbara O’Connor, Director of the Institute for the Study of Politics and Media at CSUS, chaired the Educational Testing Service's "International Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Literacy Panel." The group proposed a list of standards and definitions. Vice Chancellor Spence encouraged this process, since CSU had been involved with information competence in the past.

ETS is looking to develop an assessment or test to assess levels of ICT literacy. The universities listed in the press release will attempt to help. ETS has done earlier work in this area on levels of information competence skills. So the Universities listed are continuing to work with ETS on this assessment. ETS would like CSU some day to use this. Some faculty will be working on this with them in the future.

One question is whether information competence would be a requirement for entrance into CSU or an exit requirement. Would one exam be used for all graduates and majors, or would different exams be appropriate? There was a sense from some that information competence could and perhaps should replace requirements for computer literacy on campuses that have computer literacy requirements.

The consensus of the committee is that the chair at this point will attempt to obtain more information and possibly have Ilene Rockman from the Chancellor’s Office come in to talk with us about this project during the next meeting.
D. Possible Revision of EO 365, Systemwide Credit by Examination.

The question here is whether Academic Affairs would like to take on the task of updating the addendum, which lists the specific tests and the passing scores. The last update was 1993. The goal would be to conclude this task this year. The current list is missing things like the International Baccalaureate. We would check out the current AP, CLEP, and IB exams, and also to check on what UC accepts. It is up to campuses and majors to decide how they use the specific exams.

We will have Academic Dean Jo Service come in to discuss this. Several members felt that this project required staff to obtain basic information before the committee would take any possible action.

E. CAN – Program on LD Requirements for Majors (POL).

The POL program is the former Lower Division Core Alignment project. The goal here is to facilitate faculty discussions to attempt to obtain similar lower division requirements at CSU campuses in given regions offering particular majors.

There was a sense among some committee members that we should endorse this process, but I didn’t get whether we decided to do a resolution or not and who would do it. NEED HELP HERE.

F. Defining a Quality CSU Education.

>From Lynne Cook, our liaison to the Executive Committee of the ASCSU: Richard West answered a question yesterday at the Campus Senate Chairs meeting by saying it would be really helpful to define quality to find evidence regarding quality and class size. Do we want to take this issue on?

We would be writing a 2-3 page narrative on what is a quality education, addressing some of the intangibles that are important in defining a good quality education. We might talk about the importance of a campus experience, importance of learning communities, mentoring, advising, and engaging students in research. We would address why these factors are affected by higher SFRs and the lack of tenure track hires, the loss of librarians, lab conditions. The goal would be to have a good argument for higher quality when the budget improves. A suggestion was made to make the argument about SFR and quality through class size and advising.

Several members of the committee were not interested in this assignment, arguing that it was something we had done over and over again.

On graduate education – Nishita said that he had served on the CSU graduate studies committee – UC argues that they need quality compared with other institutions nationally and internationally. But CSU was defining quality as access to higher education. This was an eye opener in the sense that the selling points of the CSU did not seem to be quality. We should check out the Graduate Studies Report for comparisons.

Mark will go ahead with working on a short draft for us to look at.

8. Reports.

V. Buck, AA Committee Vice Chair and liaison with the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee, discussed legislation – presently there is not too much legislation of relevance to the Academic Affairs Committee. Some bills to keep track of:

· AB 242, however, would require the CO to provide some explanation to the legislature of what the TT faculty are doing that the part-time faculty are not. UC and CSU are asking not to be included in this bill, as the sponsors apparently want it to apply to the community colleges. Neither of these bills is enacted as yet.

· SB 550 would require all community colleges to have a common transfer degree. It too is in the proposal stage at this point
Another action being followed is the progress of the Budget Accountability Act, intended for next March’s primary election ballot. At present the most controversial provision would lower the proportion of each house of the legislature required to approve the budget (and perhaps to raise taxes) to 55% from the present two-thirds.

9. Other.

Report from Alison Jones on admissions and impaction:

1. Admission Advisory Council – first meeting in two weeks; later there is scheduled a joint meeting with BOARS (UC system admissions board) to discuss issues of mutual interest and concern.

2. Impaction and enrollment management – there are a number of steps to manage enrollment that are not considered impaction. Quantitative adjustments are generally enrollment management and thus require no approval by CO. This includes things like requiring UD transfers to complete 39 instead of 30 units; require 60 units on an earlier date than the new rule adopted by the BOT.
   a. To ask for impaction, a campus needs to document the fact, with 3 years worth of data, that there are more fully eligible students than they can accommodate. You then request that you be able to consider supplemental admissions criteria.
   b. SLO impacted at every single major. Every major has separate set of admissions criteria – very sensitive way to admit.
   c. Campus impaction is typically done either for first time frosh or UD transfers or both.
   d. Impacted: CH for 1st time frosh, FU for 1st time frosh, LB 1st time frosh and UD trans, PO 1st time frosh; SDSU both, SM 1st time frosh, SO for 1st time frosh (I think I missed one here). SLO for all majors. Each campus has supplemental admissions criteria for out of area students. Local area students are guaranteed admission based on CSU admissions criteria.
   e. Local area guarantee applies to both 1st time frosh and UD students.
   f. Transfer trends – question regarding possible distortions of data on transfer trends because some campuses close and others stay open. As of 2 days ago, 16 campuses are closed for Spring; 7 open. DH, CH, HA closed to frosh; HU; LA open to all except 2nd BA students; SJSU (again I missed one).
   g. Another change is the recalculation of the GPA based only on the A-G courses – not all courses, which will affect students entering in 2004. The old rule was to calculate the GPA on all courses except ROTC and PE. There will be some students affected, probably not that many in his estimation. There would still be an “exception” category to bring in promising students.
   h. Redirection – changing the way we do it. Old – student marks back up school. If apply to impacted campus, it is up to the campus to redirect the application and send it to the other campus. Campus keeps the application fee. Doesn’t work because more and more campuses experience enrollment pressures. More and more campuses stop accepting applications. For years, not a problem, but as more campuses close earlier, more of a problem. One change – now with electronic application, computer tells students, you just applied to impacted campus or major and you should apply to a backup campus immediately and it is free.
   i. 80-85% of students attend campus in their local region.

Adjournment at 2:47 p.m.