Academic Senate CSU
Academic Affairs Committee

Wednesday, 8 March 2006
Thursday, 9 March 2006

Guests Present: Christine Hanson (CO Academic Affairs)

1. Meeting called to order at 10:15 a.m.

2. Agenda approved as revised

3. Minutes of meeting of 25-26 January 2006 approved

* Good of the Order.
  a. Committee discussed Teaching Assistants’ assignments in CSU.

4. Announcements
  a. EDD. CSU Oversight Committee will be reviewing campus drafts of EDD documents.
  b. Peer Team Visits – No reports.
  c. No comments on CO responses.
  d. Discussion of AA social for Thursday assignments

5. Liaison reports
  a. CSSA: Dissatisfied with differences in parking fees charged faculty and staff; this is a collective bargaining issue.

  b. GE Advisory Committee: Mixed responses from campuses: Area E most troublesome, ambiguity between upper-and-lower division requirements, support for beefing up writing requirement, second language, etc. According to Title 5, Section 40405.1., the CSUGE Breadth Requirements state that 9 semesters / 12 quarter units shall be taken at the upper-division level (not taken before student is at upper-division status). This also applies to IGETC. WASC requires some GE instruction at the upper-division level as well.

  c. Commission on Extended University: CO is concerned about Legislature coveting CERF and Trust funds, urging campuses to reduce funds on hand to c.20% of previous year’s accounts. Need to investigate what is a reasonable amount to have on hand. Issue using SURF and Trust funds to bail out CSU SB and Maritime Academy. Concern expressed about campus administrations taking Extension monies and limiting winter sessions in hopes of increasing regular term enrollments. There appears to be mixed messages about how monies should be spent and about reimbursement issues. CFA is seeking a 15% increase for faculty, resulting in $15 million increase in salaries.
d. Admissions Advisory: UC has established a score of 680 on SAT writing component to qualify for exemption from Subject A exam. This is a high score in comparison to extant CSU exemption score. Is CO collecting SAT writing component information to shed light on admissions criteria? The current status of SAT II writing requirement is that it is in data collection mode. It is not implemented within the eligibility index. See http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/codedmemos/AA-2006-04.pdf

e. ATAC: Tackling issue of complying with directives to meet needs of disabled students, i.e. websites. Forthcoming coded memo will outline issues and steps faculty must take to be in compliance. CSU faculty will be impacted; syllabi will need to be updated to reflect federal guidelines, etc. WebCT and Blackboard merger issues were also discussed. Update on the CSU purchasing the Learning Management System via the Digital Marketplace. Discussion of steps needed to encourage faculty to share resources.

f. Question about current salary data for new hires. Impressionistic accounts were exchanged.

6. Items of business

6.1 E-Text
Second draft was revised; changing title to “Provision of Accessible Electronic Materials by Publishers.” The draft was further revised to encourage publishers to provide materials in various ADA compliant formats accessible to the disabled.

The Committee approved the third draft as amended. Thanks to Barry for ‘wordsmithing’ the resolution. The final version of AS-2730-06/AA Provision of Accessible Electronic Material by Publishers is at: http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2005-2006/2730.shtml

6.2 CSU fee structure. Response to resending the referral on the CSU fee structure to the ASCSU Executive Committee, Fiscal and Government Affairs Committee, and Faculty Affairs Committee. This item was to be discussed at a 3PM time-certain.

Supporting a Student Fee Policy that betters Educational Outcomes.

Resolved, that the Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU) continues to support initiatives focused on facilitating graduation; and be it further

Resolved, that the ASCSU requests that the Chancellor’s office undertake a study of CSU Student Fee Policy to determine if changes in this policy would serve to facilitate graduation efforts.

Rationale: How do we change the CSU tuition/fee structure to maximize efficiency? “Front-Loading” of fees versus a flat (two-step) function for most campuses. An alternative model is provided by CSU Monterey Bay. It is believed that such structures discourage students from enrolling in courses that do not contribute to meeting graduation requirements.
NOTE: LAO report suggests a cap on fees at some unit count to encourage taking additional courses. Also suggests option of lower summer fees and/or increased access to impacted campuses for summer entry.

This item was not forwarded for consideration during the March Plenary

6.3 **Registration Priorities.**

The Committee reviewed campus priority policies/practices as stated in e-mail answers to a “registration priority” query sent out via Marshelle. At some campuses, registration priority is determined by number of units completed rather than units to graduation. With the increasing precision of the various degree audit modules, it seems that a change from units completed to units to graduation would seem prudent. This may be more of an implementation, rather than policy, issue and thus may not be pursued further by the committee.

In terms of registration priorities, campuses use widely varied methodologies. Some are student controlled (SLO allows students to select up to three terms to have “priority” for themselves), most use a “disabled, athletes, graduate students, graduating seniors, ... freshmen” type model. The ranking of where to let freshmen register is quite variable. One difficulty in progress-dependent models is the lag in transfer evaluations. At some institutions the transfer transcript evaluation is only performed when the student applies for graduation, and thus the student was chronically labeled at a lower level of progress. Electronic transcript transfer has been proposed as a solution to automate this process (BTW, other than this exception, the degree audit module at SJSU is otherwise working well to facilitate effective advising).

There was no action on this item.

6.4 **Doctorate of Audiology.**
Keith Boyum received letters of intent from six campuses expressing interest in developing a joint Au.D. degree in conjunction with the U.C. It was not felt that there was a pressing need for action on this item.

6.5 **Workload** (EDD/graduate faculty).
Mark met with FA during the Interim meeting to discuss graduate faculty workload issues. FA understands the concerns over the risks and benefits of having a two-tiered faculty (“graduate faculty”) and is pursuing the referral. Mark clarified to FA our concerns about workload issues involving a two-tiered faculty. FA will meet with AA today at 4 p.m. to discuss the issues. The Committee discussed concerns about setting graduate student fees and the disbursements of such fees to the units offering the degree programs. The Committee checked a resolution from March 2004 concerning differential fees for graduate programs. This information will be incorporated into our deliberations. One part of the response is AS-2745-06/FA Faculty Workload Issues in
6.6 **21st century report.**
The Committee received updates on progress made on the assignments made at the last meeting. The Committee agreed to devote a two-hour block at the April interim meeting to the 21st century report.

6.7 **CSU Entrance Science Requirement**
Mark spoke with the Chair of the SJSU Biology Department / CSU Biology Council. There is no opposition to aligning the CSU entrance science requirement with the UC’s: not require one life science and one physical science, but instead allow students to choose two courses from Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. Kellner will explore possible opposition from other constituencies to the above-proposed changes, such as the high schools.

6.8 **Opt-Out Proposal**
The issue is moot.

6.9 **LDTP related policies**
The LDTP Oversight Committee decided that 75% of the discipline faculty ASKING for a course and 75% of the discipline faculty PROVIDING the course both need to approve the course descriptor. In case of a lack of 75% agreement within a discipline or disagreement between the disciplines, then the two discipline faculties would meet to reach a consensus.

The Committee discussed what position, if any, to take on the question “Who reviews the course descriptors?” as this question is a curricular issue.

Some members suggested the requesting discipline should approve the course descriptor, while other members felt that the offering discipline should approve the course descriptor. After extensive discussion, Mark volunteered to draft a resolution for the Committee’s consideration Thursday morning.

The LDTP Oversight Committee also considered the question “Who reviews and develops interdisciplinary descriptors.” This is a complicated question because some campuses may offer a degree option in a discipline within a department while other campuses may offer the discipline in its own department.

The Committee consulted with Jo Service about areas that are concentrations or options on some campuses and disciplines on other campuses. She opined that there should be only one LDTP process for such an area.

Note: The resolution: AS-2738-06/AA Policies Governing Transfer-CSU Course Descriptor Development and Adoption for use with the Lower-Division Transfer Patterns was referred back to committee during the plenary (too detail oriented, not focused on the underlying policy questions)
6.10 **Paper Catalog Copy**
The Committee considered a request from the CIAC and TCDA urging CSU campuses to provide “hard” copies of their catalogs to other colleges and universities. The Committee chose to support the CIAC and TCDA resolution; Kellner will write a one-sentence resolution to which the CIAC and TCDA resolution will be attached.

*AS-2739-06/AA Availability of Paper Copy of CSU Catalog*

6.11 **SB1412 (Morrow) – “Student Bill of Rights”**
Tom Krabacher and Buckley Barrett from the FGA Committee joined the AA Committee to discuss SB1412. Tom distributed copies of AS-2675-04/FA and AS-2649-04/FA. Mark proposed the formulation of a resolution by revising AS-2675-04 to include reference to AS2675-04/FA to the first resolve clause and by adding SB 1335 and SB141 (2006) to the third resolve clause. The Committee embraced Mark’s suggestion. The current version is: AS-2741-06/AA/ Opposition to Morrow’s Purported FA/FGA “Student Bill of Rights” (current iteration SB1412) and a Reaffirmation of Academic Freedom

6.12 **Creation of a Statewide Database of CSU Extension Enrollees**
Barry introduced a draft resolution, which the Committee discussed and then approved as amended. The current version is: AS-2740-06/AA Creation of a Statewide Database of CSU Extension Enrollees.

6.13 During the Thursday morning Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, the following resolution was presented as a response to well-intentioned but flawed legislative intrusion. AS-2744-06/AA/FA **Opposition to AB 2168 (Liu): A Single, Common General Education Curriculum.** Additionally, Allison Jones is researching AB2168 and will inform AA of the bill’s content and suggest possible issues for the Committee to consider regarding CSU-UC alignment mandates. There should be more information in a few weeks.

6.14 After a Thursday evening meeting to go over recommended revisions to Title 5 to accommodate the independent doctorate of Education within the CSU. The following resolution was produced during the Thursday Morning Academic Affairs committee meeting. AS-2746-06/AA/TEKR **Title 5 Language to Accommodate the Independent Doctorate of Education within the CSU.**