Academic Senate of the California State University

Academic Affairs Committee

Agenda: 11.12.03 (10:00-5:30) & 11.13.03 (8:00-10:15)

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of 05.07.03 & 10.03.03
4. Announcements
5. Times Certain: 11/12: 10:00 Jo Service re 7d; 11:00: Barbara O'Connor and Ilene Rockman re 7c; 12:00 ExComm re 7i, Munitz Room)
7. Items of Business
   b. A Review of the CSU Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) in 2002 Report of the CSU GWAR Review Committee. See:
   c. CSU & ETS Assessment Initiative: Information and Communication Technology. See:
      i. ETS' information: http://www.calstate.edu/PA/news/ETS.shtml
   e. Headquarters' access to faculty computers and data. See
      iii. The CO policy which notes: "Federal law permits the system
administrator access to e-mail and stored electronic communications if
that access is necessary for the rendition of service. Random
monitoring of electronic communications by the Chancellor's Office is
not conducted unless required to do so by law (e.g., subpoena or court
order)." http://www.calstate.edu/HRS/policies_internet_use.shtml

f. CAN & POL
g. Defining " Quality" http://rhet.csustan.edu/aa/docs/quality.pdf
h. Cornerstones
i. Transfer Issues http://rhet.csustan.edu/aa/docs/transferbackground.htm

8. Reports
9. Other

Academic Senate, California State University

Academic Affairs Committee

Draft Minutes, Meeting of 11/12/03

Draft, 11-22-03 ; addition in 7g, 11-23-03

Present: Ted Anagnoson (LA), Vince Buck (FU), Rochelle Kellner (PO), Len Mathy
(LA), Ken Nishita (MB), Paul Persons (CH), Manolo Platin (HU-student
representative), Brent Rushall (SD), John Tarjan (BA), Mark Thompson , Chair (ST),
Louise Timmer (SA), Mark Van Selst (SJ).

Chancellor's Office (Academic Affairs) Liaison: L. Roth.

Guests: Barbara O'Connor (SA), Ilene Rockman (CO), Jo Service (CO).

1. Call to order. 10:03 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda.
   • It was decided to discuss the reception that Academic Affairs Committee is
     responsible for over lunch.
   • The joint Academic Affairs-Executive Committee meeting will be Thursday at
     1 p.m. , not Wednesday.
   • The agenda was approved as amended.

3. Approval of Minutes of 5/7/03 and 10/3/03 . These were approved as
   submitted.

4. Announcements and Questions.
   • Sen. Mathy asked whether the situation he had heard of on the Los Angeles
     campus was widespread. That situation was where a chair moved the limit of
     a 40 student class to 60 and made that limit the minimum rather than the
     maximum. The problem here is the reduction of quality and the change in the
     very nature of the class. It was decided to discuss this situation and others
     like it further under “Defining Quality” below.
   • Sen. Rushall announced that 23 faculty and staff, as well as 50 students, at
     SDSU had lost their homes in the recent fires. Another 50 cannot get into
     their homes because of damage, but it is thought at this point that the homes

http://rhet.csustan.edu/aa/agendas/11-12-03.htm 5/24/2005
will eventually be livable.

5. **Times certain.**
   - 10:00 a.m., Dean Jo Service, re 7d.
   - 11:00 a.m., Profs. Barbara O’Connor and Ilene Rockman, re 7c.
   - 12:00 Executive Committee re 7i, in the Munitz Room. Changed to Thursday at 1:00 p.m.

6. **Liaison Reports.**

   **Chancellor’s Office Academic Affairs Report (L. Roth):**
   - **A letter from State Sen. Dede Alpert re SB 81 clarification on the meaning of the term “consultation with the faculty”** – should have been received. Senators had received an electronic copy of the letter.

   - **Hammerstrom position search.** The Chancellor’s Office has posted the announcement for the Gary Hammerstrom position on the Chancellor’s Office website. Applicants are required to apply electronically. Resumes will be reviewed as of December 1st. There are three faculty on the search committee (Bob Cherny, Bob Snyder, and Sandy Sutphen). In answer to a question, Assistant Vice Chancellor Roth clarified that no students were on the search committee.

   - **Early assessment of high school students** – considerable progress has been made in this area. 11th graders presently take the California Standards Test, which will be augmented by an extra 40 minutes of testing with items developed by the English and Math Councils. The test will now substitute for the EPT and ELM and indicate at the end of the junior year whether the student is ready to go on to college level work in the CSU. If not, students will have the senior year to take appropriate courses to upgrade their English and/or Math skills. The current plan is for the test to be available this Spring, 2004 for all 11th graders. If students pass with a high enough score, they will not have to take the ELM and EPT. This change has a real advantage for high schools in providing an incentive for students to do well on the test, which is otherwise used for the school API ranking.

   - **Student Success/Facilitating Graduation Conference** – December 4-6, 2003. All Senators and Campus Senate Chairs have been invited. Teams from the campuses will be attending the conference, whose theme is improving transfer and degree completion. Sen. Rushall asked whether students who come from the community colleges can overcome academic deficiencies that are not remedied there and whether that will be addressed at the conference. Sen. Kellner stated that the readiness of the student to commit to a major and to college work is a major factor. If we at CSU allowed students to transfer in without a declared major, that is, in a “transfer undeclared” status, there would be huge numbers in this status. Sen. Buck brought up the problem of some of the community colleges’ offering seven or eight courses in Political Science, while the CSU Fullerton department requires only three. Consequently students have taken extra courses that do not count toward the major, indicating that students are not getting good advice on what does and does not transfer.

   - **Academic Technology Volume.** The Chancellor’s Office will be publishing a volume of articles by CSU faculty on academic technology by the end of December, 2003. These are already-published pieces, with 175 submitted, blind reviews, and 28 accepted for publication in this special volume.

   - **Companies who pay students to take notes in class.** These are often posted on the World Wide Web. Sen. Gloria Romero’s legislation on this topic was
passed and signed some time ago, but was not incorporated into Title 5 and subsequently into campus regulations in an oversight. This action is being taken now.

Executive Committee Liaison Report (Lynne Cook).

a. Sen. Cook reported that the Executive Committee had drafted a letter to the Chancellor regarding the actions of the Chancellor’s Office when Governor Davis appointed Prof. Susan Meisenhelder to the Board. The letter was issued to Senators during the meetings the next day.

IMPAC / Articulation Issues (John Tarjan).

a. Sen. Tarjan reported that current thinking among those involved is that these efforts are overlapping, and that the current structure does not serve us as well as it could. There may be economies of scale that can be utilized. There is money in the CAN process/organization for discipline review, but it has not been spent as yet. The Senate’s and Chancellor Office’s Core Alignment project, now abbreviated to POL, is currently the top priority in this area.

7. Items of Business.

a. AS 2623, Articulation Agreements for Multiple Subject Integrated Teacher Education Programs, Principles for the Formation of Regions. This item is a second reading item before the plenary session of the ASCSU.

   o The main purpose of the resolution is to guide future actions. The regions at this point have been developed following these principles. We want to endorse a process for the future for adjusting the regions.

   o TEKR has revised the resolution, and we have the revisions before us. Fresno is now an independent region. There was also concern re campus impactions and future growth patterns. Some campuses might want eventually to be in a different region.

   o #2 – Change “which” to “that.”

   o #3 – “Regions will be formed on the basis of 3 year trends of CCC to CSU total transfers, plus additional relevant factors, including, (a) …..” Comma before (d) and (e).

   o “Guidelines” instead of “principles” in the first paragraph.

   o The committee discussed the draft text from the Integrated Teacher Preparation Task Force on “Appropriate Program Balance for Integrated Multiple Subject Teacher Preparation Programs.”

The committee decided to change the third resolved to read as follows: "That the Academic Senate CSU recommend that campus senates and administrations review the report with the intention of adopting its content or implications as campus policy."

The committee approved the resolution and rationale as amended.

c. CSU and ETS Assessment Initiative: Information and Communication Technology.

Chair Thompson introduced Barbara O'Connor, faculty member from CSU Sacramento and Ilene Rockman, manager of the information competency initiative for the CO. ASCSU has passed resolutions on information competence (IC) in the past. In 2000-01, CSU conducted a series of qualitative studies on IC with a random sample of 100 students, following them to see how they collected information.

The current opportunity to work with the Educational Testing Service arose in early 2003. There have been many meetings, with the current goal being to produce a two hour test, with eight questions, by 2005. The cost will be approximately $20 per person for the 2005 test, aimed at present at more than 2,000 students. The purpose of the test is flexible, with the current plan being that the Chancellor's Office will not mandate it, but simply make it available for Department s and programs to use if they wish.

Some Senators were enthusiastic, but others had questions about the initiative. Sen. Rushall stated that IC competence is the latest fad. It is impossible to believe that a series of tests can come out with all of these diagnostics that they are talking about. Disciplines are too specialized. We do not need another round of testing that is supposed to be the answer to our prayers. All the tests are under increasing scrutiny. A new entry into this business is not appealing. It appeals to business people, like those at the ETS. And the technology may change so fast that the test will be incomparable from one year to the next.

Profs. Rockman and O'Connor stated that IC literacy should be in the curriculum, assessed in multiple ways. This is just one way. These are skills learned through experience, with opportunity to find areas to strengthen students before they graduate. It is important to emphasize that IC competence tested through the ETS is not something the IC office is proposing to mandate.

Sen. Rushall expressed concern with information spam on the Internet and with students who cannot discern the difference between good and poor quality information. In general, many students cannot discern the quality of information, but they can access information with the technology. They do not have the critical capability to find the answers they need to find.

Profs. Rockman and O'Connor agreed and added that one of the test questions actually tests this notion. They asserted that the CSU owes it to the taxpayers to obtain information on what the money spent on technology actually gains us in student abilities and competence.
The question of whether the initiative is linked to a move toward a system information competence requirement? The answer given was that the assessment procedures were not planned, however much ETS might enjoy the prospective revenue, as entrance or exit exams. The committee was very concerned with the possibility of legislation in this area to use some instrument as an entrance or exit exam.

The committee chair, Sen. Thompson, asked whether transcripts were marked with an information competence certification. Prof. Rockman stated that one Department was certifying students at CSU Northridge.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Roth stated that IC competence has always been a matter of campus autonomy; there is no possibility of a system wide test. The scenarios in this exam are better than any other test we have seen in the CSU. The ETS project may give us another way to look at students’ information competence.

Sen. Anagnoson expressed fear that the lobbying going on with both the state and the test developer would result in proposed state entry or exit requirements regardless of the assurances to the contrary.

d. Possible revision of EO 365.

Dean Jo Service discussed the proposed revamp of the addendum to EO 365. The addendum contains the list of external exams that every campus must accept at least as electives. It was last updated in 1993 and currently includes the CLEP, all AP exams, English equivalency exam (this no longer exists), and an American Chemical Society exam. Campuses are required to give at least as much credit as is stated in the addendum and can give more if they wish. The reason for the proposed updating is that new AP exams have been created since 1993, the CLEP has been overhauled and rescored, and many campuses are now seeing students who have taken International Baccalaureate exams, which have grown in prominence in California in the last decade. Most campuses are now accepting the higher level IB scores. In addition, EO 365 is the basis used by the GE Committee to determine what exams may be accepted by any community college in the state and then certified as having met the GE breadth requirements for CSU. Prior to the issuance of EO 365, two different colleges might treat the same AP score differently; now any student will have that exam treated the same way anywhere in the state for GE purposes. At this point the entire addendum is out of date, and questions have been received from the community colleges wanting to use the IB exams.

Updates of the addendum traditionally have done in cooperation with ASCSU. Dean Service suggested that they use one of her staff members to gather the background information that will be needed to update the addendum. The proposal would be to examine the three classes of examination (CLEP, AP, and IB) and update the material in the addendum, compiling a matrix of information on what level or score various campuses currently accept, what the University of California accepts, and perhaps other universities. For the AP exams, ETS has recommendations on what credit ought to be offered as well. Depending on the exam,
the basic information and a proposed entry into the addendum would be circulated to the appropriate Department chairs through their discipline councils, asking for feedback. The goal would be to have a draft addendum for circulation in the Spring of 2004.

- Sen. Tarjan urged that discipline chairs meet periodically, although in some disciplines we do not have councils or lists of chairs.

- Sen. Rushall approved of the plan and asked what we would do with the information when it came to us. The answer from Dean Service was that she would probably come with a draft of the update for the addendum and a URL with the background information.

- With the AP exams, each exam is associated with an AP course, the plan for which is available to anyone, including high school teachers. We give credit for the exam, not the course, but the exams are explicitly based on the expectations incorporated in the course. The GE Committee was comfortable with accepting the AP exams for that reason. Campuses have been much less willing to accept CLEP exams in general – we have never accepted more than three – two Math and one Chemistry. There is much less information available on them, and they are not associated with specific course designs as the AP exams are.

- The committee expressed general approval of this approach.

e. Headquarters access to faculty computers and data.

- Sen. Rohm brought this up at the last meeting. Chair Thompson obtained past Senate resolutions and the current Chancellor’s Office policy, referenced on the agenda.

- Our concern was over the possible monitoring of email, web access, Internet use, etc. The policy in summary form from the Chancellor’s Office is “we can, but we won’t.”

- There was some discussion of the implications of the Patriot Act on the possibilities for outsiders to investigate what is inside faculty computers without notification or knowledge of the faculty member concerned.

- No action seemed to be needed at this point on this issue.

f. CAN and POL

- The Executive Committee of the ASCSU has a draft document, which will be circulated to the committee for comments.

g. Defining quality.

- Draft resolution from Fiscal and Governmental Affairs is in progress.

- Rushall: What we cannot do are minute descriptors of what quality is. What we need are indices that we can use externally,
comparing us with other CPEC institutions. For example, the data in the 21st Century document ought to be used:

- Things like Full-Time Faculty to student ratio, not with part time faculty included. Other indicators include those in the report on librarians and sources of information.

- We could make a statement that the state influences the quality of the CSU by the resources provided and leave it at that. We do a salary comparison already, but we need the other indicators of whether the state gives us the structure for a good education. Libraries, support personnel, other factors that Bob Cherny outlined.

- Can we get the CPEC counterpart data? Politicians will understand this because it is very factual and not just opinion. General consensus was that data for the CPEC comparison institutions would be difficult to obtain.

- Sen. Tarjan stated that the concept of the SFR is difficult to understand for outsiders. What the system does with students who would not otherwise go to college is very positive. We need libraries and support services, but we also need faculty. We should talk about the quality of the learning process, and why these things would lead to it or not.

- Sen. Rushall stated that the traditional CSU structure is being transformed as campuses attempt to deal with large numbers of students and insufficient resources to educate them on the old model. Thus the conversion to a 500 seat lecture hall at SDSU. This should concern us on every campus. What is the political thing we can do with this? Graphs and trends allow us to show that support has gone down, and it is reasonable to assume that quality in the classroom has gone down as well.

- Historically, taking more and more students has led to higher and higher SFRs, and these in turn have become the norm. Given the state’s budget difficulties, it will be difficult to correct these and go back to the older numbers, just as we have not recovered in many areas since the early 1990s.

- Question of co-sponsoring AS-26xx-03/FGA with the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee. m/s/p to co-sponsor the resolution. Comments:

  - Last paragraph, page 2, should be removed. Should not be a part of the rationale. Drop line 41-44.

  - Third resolved clause – should there be a mention of the differential cost of graduate education?

  - 4th resolved clause, question: what is meant by admission policy?

  - Think about deleting the second resolved and adding language to cover that subject in the third resolved.
o Change in rationale out of touch with reality.

o Advise to eliminate the last paragraph.

o Say in the resolution that the number of students given the January budget is X students, period.

o Line 24 – “For the last several decades,” not years.

o Second resolved - “For the CSU 2004-05, to the number of fully supported students (at $12,051 per in the Governor’s budget proposal)”

o Sens. Cook, Rushall, and Tarjan will function as an ad hoc subcommittee to prepare a draft document on quality.

h. Cornerstones
   a. Postponed.

i. Transfer issues.
   o At one p.m. the next day (Thursday, November 13, 2003), the committee met with the Executive Committee for a discussion of transfer issues, in particular, the proposal that every major in CSU identify on a systemwide level 45 (three full semesters) units of work that will transfer to any CSU. During the third semester, the student identifies the CSU to which he or she will transfer, applies (in a specific major), and learns what other courses need to be taken in the fourth semester to complete the transfer process. The goal is to put to rest the legislature’s concern about problems in the transfer process. The proposed changes would be accomplished through Title 5.

   o A thorough discussion ensued.

Respectfully submitted,

Ted Anagnoson

Secretary

Academic Affairs Committee

11/30/03

Comments and corrections to tanagno@calstatela.edu.

Thompson, addition on 7g, p. 6, added 11-23-03.