Members present: Snyder, Amaral, Edelman, Gooden, McGough, Cates, Kellner, Thompson, McKillop, Nishita, Wheeler

Visitors: Mike Lee, Gary Hammerstrom, Allison Jones, Nancy Sprotte, Jo Service, Kathy Kaiser

1. Approval/amendments to the agenda:
   add ACIP; ITA… approved as amended.

2. Approval/amendments to the minutes: minutes approved as presented.

3. Announcements:
   a) Gift purchase collection to be undertaken
   b) We welcome Phil McGough and Jacinta Amaral as new members of Academic Affairs.

4. Pre-Collegiate Academic Development Program (PAD) & California Academic Preparation Initiative (CAPI) – Senator Thompson raised concerns regarding whether these programs will continue to be funded... and/or will be funded adequately. The concern on the Stanislaus campus is that CAPI might eventually displace PAD on their campus.

5. Time Certain: 9:30 a.m.; Allison Jones joined the committee to add input to PAD/CAPI discussion. Question posed… “Are the missions of the two programs so similar as to threaten the continued existence of either?”

   In 1996, the PAD program was initiated, with a permanent, $5 million funding base; in 2000, CAPI was initiated with a permanent, $9 million funding base. Presently, a joint allocation letter goes to campuses referencing both programs. The Office of the Chancellor has requested (but has not mandated) that PAD money be use to supplement CAPI funds directed toward tutoring and mentoring programs on individual campuses. CAPI and PAD directors were brought together for a joint meeting in October of 2001. In a related area, a Reading Institute is being developed to help 11th grade students improve their reading skills. Given that this reading problem has been identified, and CAPI has the tutoring and mentoring function, some justification exists for redirection of PAD funds.

MT – Is there a behind-the-scenes process going on that will diminish or eliminate PAD program or programs?

AJ – CAPI is now recognized as the overarching program of the CAPI/PAD efforts, both by the Chancellor’s Office and the State. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence wants to know what we can do to insure the success of that group of 250 schools that send us the preponderance of students in need of remediation. Should we move all of PAD money into the CAPI program, and focus allocations on the 250?
SE – Suggests that the overlap makes consolidation (i.e., PAD will go away) only too reasonable.

AJ – One of the major policy decisions that has occurred is the use of both CAPI funds and other funding sources to train instructors in reading development skills. CAPI will be the CSU program under which this effort will occur. Training will occur primarily through the Professional Development Institute(s) of the UC.

SM – Why should UC be the agency who gets credit for Reading Instruction Training through its PD Institutes (an intersegmental project)?

MC – What is the nature of the deployment of PAD tutors?

AJ – Middle schools and high school...

JW – how much money is to be shifted? Is this the first step in exploring the “effective” elimination of PAD?

AJ – No amounts specified; no elimination contemplated.

6. E.O. 365 & E.O. 167 Area of concern… transfer credit for courses taken in the high schools.

NS – The ever increasing interest in outreach to university-bound students, including the possibility of granting CSU credit for courses taken in the high school, has raised the issue of what are appropriate parameters and criteria for course acceptance. Some Community Colleges do allow college credit for courses taught in high schools. Problem, therefore, includes transfer students from Community Colleges who may have been given college credit for a course taken at a high school. These credits could easily end up being masked upon transfer.

SE – Community Colleges are offering courses that receive “college credit” but actually have no transfer worth or acceptability. It’s a status thing for K-12 students to have taken and passed a “college course”... and they are willing to pay for what is effectively a “vanity press” course.

RK – Why would we want to encourage the expansion of any of these college course credit programs at the K-12 level? We have credit by examination options that students may exercise.

KN – Committee report on recommendations re: E.O. 167: Committee agreed that CSU should not embrace any 2 + 2 + 2 program structure. Is there really a transfer credit review board (joint CCC-CSU)? No. The Committee offered editing suggestions re: rewrite portions of E.O. 167.

PM – Why not just let AP course option take care of the problem?

MT – Why should this be done at the high school level?

SM – Courses could be brought under the aegis of a CSU campus by utilizing adjunct
professor status for otherwise non-CSU instructors.

KN – Existing E.O. 167 assigns “appropriate (CSU) campus authority” ultimate responsibility to make the call on whether a course meets the “baccalaureate level” requirement.

Recommendation: editing suggestions will be submitted by Academic Affairs re: 167, and sent to Gary Hammerstrom.

7. Credit by Examination – at Jo Service’s recommendation discussions on hold.

8. Challenge Policy discussion... issue under consideration is whether there ought to be specific System-wide Course Challenge Provisions. Several members of the committee described the protocols employed on their individual campuses. E.O. 365 includes some general guidelines, but leaves the development of any protocols and procedures to the individual campuses.

9. E.O. 393 – revision of standards for academic disqualification... current E.O. language references “grade point deficiencies”. Revision would use language tied to GPA.

RK – grade point deficiency is cumbersome, but it works, furthermore, the GPA based disqualification standards, as revised, give students very little wiggle room, i.e., it brings on disqualification triggers too quickly.

JW – recommended that discretionary clause (campus) that exists in the “probation” section be explicitly inserted in section dealing with disqualification.

PM and RG – recommended that explicit language be inserted to allow campuses discretion to adopt more stringent probation and disqualification standards.

10. English Language Competency Statement generated (in draft) by ICAS – read and bring comments for the a.m. MT will lead discussions.

11. Foreign Language Requirement Discussion... ref: DRAFT JS 1/23/02; this resolution will disallow students using a first semester foreign language course to satisfy the humanities breadth requirement for the CSU baccalaureate degree. By making this change, the CSU and UC policies would end up being aligned. A lively discussion ensued, with proponents asserting that few, if any, first-term foreign language courses contain any significant cultural component, and the cons asserting that failing to allow first-term courses to satisfy the humanities requirement will significantly reduce the number of students that decide to sample a second (or third) language.

Committee voted to support a resolution requiring more demanding criteria in the evaluation of the use of first semester foreign language courses to satisfy the GE Area C2 humanities breadth requirement.

KN – will redraft the draft resolution for our consideration in the a.m.

11. Politics of math assessment/placement tests… a Department of Education (Golden State Exam) and Board of Education (California Standards Exam) face of has stymied the CSU’s
efforts to develop a math placement/exemption tool (a composite of both the California Standards and Golden State) that (1) would be administered during the 11th grade, (2) would be one route to satisfying the CSU mathematics competency requirements, and (3) would allow the 12th grade year to be directed at remediation efforts, as needed. A move to introduce course sequencing for science and mathematics majors that would not be in accord with IGETC standards will be forthcoming. Math, chemistry, and physics disciplines require both an early start and an early commitment of significant under-division unit loads for budding scientists and mathematicians.

The new ELM will be given the first time in March; the new version of the test will have a greater emphasis on the evaluation of mathematical reasoning and sense and a lesser emphasis on Algebra and/or geometry skills. A cut score on the 45-question exam has arbitrarily been set at 28 for this first application of the tool.

13. Membership on ATAC and SWAT (system-wide academic technology acquisition committee): Issue is the level of faculty representation on these committees… ATAC’s initial charter included provisions that ensured a faculty majority on the committee. On both of these academic technology committees, the role of the faculty is either minimal or diminishing.

Information competence… who has control in this area on individual campuses?

Who is doing “information competency” instruction… who has crafted the syllabi for the delivery of information competence modules or courses?

SE - Senate needs to take steps necessary to increase faculty representation on SWAT.

Teaching faculty and library faculty must work collaboratively to define what information competency involves… both at the system level and on the individual campuses.

14. Ed.D. guidelines (BS) – report of an ad hoc committee which is attempting to influence the implementation of the new UC/CSU Joint Ed.D program policies and principles and provisions.

15. Reapportionment – brief discussions… no committee consensus.

16. Liaison Reports:

a) Dual Admissions (RK) – 4CSU (joint CSU and CCC) program is being developed to provide additional support services for students interested in coming to the CSU. Community Colleges wants to posit student inclusion in the program on students having met certain selection criteria.

b) Grad Task Force (BS, KN, SE) – later…(preliminarily, bring Joint Ed.D. programs under larger umbrella so as not to give short shrift to other Joint Doctoral Programs).

c) ATAC (SE) – meeting in San Jose of campus technology teams on April 12th
and 13th, to listen to ATAC rap highlighting best (and worst!) practices of academic technology infusion. The purpose of this effort will be to help inform the processes through which campus technology plans by individual campuses occurs.

d) Master Plan Task Force (SM) – presented hard copy of task force report.


18. At a lunch meeting on 1-24,02 a majority of the Academic Affairs Committee met. The topic was information competency. We decide to have Chair Snyder write a letter to Chair Kegley asking that Mark Thomson be permitted to make a presentation at the upcoming ATAC meeting where teams are being brought from all the campuses. We also decided to conduct a survey of the campuses to inquire to what extent the resolution AS-2409-98/AA has been implemented. We should send the resolution and the position paper with this survey. The four questions we will ask are: (1) Has your campus acted on this resolution, (2) how have you acted upon this resolution, (3) Has this been a collaborative effort, and (4) Please evaluate this effort. We will send this to Senate Chairs with a cc to Librarians.