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

Visitors: Gary Hammerstrom, Mike Lee, LaLisha Norton, Don Moore, Lori Roth, Kathy Kaiser, Les Pincu

1. Approval of Agenda
   Additions: additional liaison reports; Admissions Advisory, ATAC

2. Approval of Minutes: approved without modification

3. Announcements: none

4. Time Certain: 5.5 12:00 on Thursday

5. Items of Business:

   5.1 – English Competency Statement
   Some minor edits to rationale in resolution that we have crafted – MT will bring edits to committee for approval.

   5.2 – Information Competence – 1:30 time certain

   5.3 – NCATE Accreditation for campuses offering the Ed.D. - Discussions centered on the need to ensure campus autonomy. Further, it was not clear from input received whether NCATE accreditation would actually lead to overall program review and thus ensure program quality. Committee agreed unanimously that whether to seek, or not to seek accreditation should be an issue left to individual campuses. Additional discussions focused on how Joint Ed.D. budgets would be handled… specifically, what type of budgeting and funding mechanisms will exist? Committee agreed that budget scrutiny should occur on individual campuses through their normal budget advisory committees processes.

   5.4 – Budapest Open Access Initiative – The Initiative incorporates a proposal to establish electronic journal access at no cost to users. Discussions focused on whether lack of appropriate mechanisms of peer review/refereeing of articles would compromise the viability of the initiative. Committee will request feedback/input from COLD (Gordon Smith), ATAC, and Office of the Chancellor (Gary Hammerstrom).

   5.5 – SB 1450: Joint meeting with FGA, AA, and Susan Meisenhelder
   Committee discussed an array of options available to us in response to SB1450…
      (a) request that legislation be withdrawn
      (b) craft a resolution critical of CFA’s efforts in support of the bill, with our ultimate critique indicating non-support of SB 1450
      (c) offer language that would modify the text of the bill and make the text more palatable to faculty concerns
Committee agreed to engage in a free flowing discussion with Susan Meisenhelder that, at a minimum, should pose questions addressing issues related to (1) definition of terms, (2) lack of consultation, (3) accounting/budgeting concerns (i.e., what, in fact, falls under “instructional costs”), and (4) legislative backdrop (CCC’s?) and implementation issues.

5.6 – Modification of Upper-Division Admission Requirements – Admissions Advisory Council recommends changing maximum transferable units for CCC transfers from 56 to 60 (this would establish parallel provisions within the UC and CSU)... arguments in support:
(1) students can complete G.E. certification more easily
(2) students can complete lower-division Major Requirements more easily
(3) change would motivate CCC’s to develop transfer degrees
(4) change would make transfer more understandable to CCC counselor
(5) change would allow students access to grants and loans tied to upper-division (junior) status

We are concerned that there will not be time for adequate campus consultation and therefore we are considering requesting that the resolution be withdrawn. This modification will not be taken to the Board of Trustees prior to official Senate input (and, ostensibly, support).

Discussions focused on the potential efficacy of tying the increase to the whole transfer degree issue.

LP (ExCom) – Concerns were expressed that change might impact a student’s ability to keep within minimum unit degree requirements for individual degrees and actually transfer over 60 units.

Joint meeting... F&GA, AA, and Susan Meisenhelder

Susan gave a brief overview of CFA’s involvement with Senator Romero vis-à-vis AB 1450. Impetus had roots in similar legislative provisions that now define CCC financing. Definition of “instructional” came from nationally accepted definitions.

TK (F&GA)- After amendment, will 50% provision still be a part of the bill?
SM – As she understood Senator Romero’s intent... yes, but qualifications on what could fall under the 50% umbrella would be suggested.

RG (AA) – Would 50% be enough given that we have no definition of what we mean by “instruction?”
SM – It would put us in a better position than we now enjoy. (this bill represents an attempt to generate more money for salaries, reduce student faculty ratios, etc., internally)

RK (AA) – what would fall under “instruction?”
SM – not included as “instruction”: police, libraries...
RK – might not tying limiting provisions to firm student-faculty ratios be workable
SM – not mutually exclusive.

PM (AA) - might not consultation, before CFA delves into those areas within which there are overlap of concerns, have been/be in order?
SM – yes, and we might try to have a regular colloquium as now occurs with F&GA.

MC (AA) – why didn’t we try to make this parallel with CCC 50% provision (i.e., for salaries and benefits).
SM – it was not politically expedient.

JW – was it not incumbent upon CFA to consult with ASCSU; should we not have a specifically structured mechanism for consultation?
SM – yes, within narrowly drawn spheres of concern.

JS (F&GA) – how about AA’s failure to consult with the Senate as a whole?

TK (F&GA) – specific concern… why establish a specific percentage…. Isn’t that inherently restrictive? And, if we respond with indications of non-support, the public perception (justifiably) will be faculty at odds with one another.
SM – micromanaging via legislation? Yes, it is appropriate for the legislature to have input over monies.

PM (AA) – implicit in the legislation that the CSU is spending only 42% on instruction… this bill is trying to force the system to be responsive at a 50% level, right?
SM – yes, but doing so avoiding accusatory rhetoric.

SM – concept of “instruction” as a rubric has a national definitional basis… complicated in this bill by specifics that might not normally fall under the rubric.

MT – will reasonable definitions and accounting practices exists such that the bill, if passed, would change anything.
SM – the bill would generate enormous political leverage… even if it did not result in any specific schedule of allocations. Ultimate value: spotlight on where money is going, and leverage for accountability.

RK – support of bill should be unquestioned… the bill would allow faculty to exert leverage vis-à-vis both CSU funding allocations and accounting.

MR – I too support the bill because I believe it would compel the CSU Administration to be more accountable.

SE – I too am concerned with the abuse of power by the CSU, but a legislative solution is probably an ill-advised means to our desired end.
SM – We’d all prefer another way… if not this, what mechanism? Legislature and Governor already issue funding directives.

BS (AA) – bill seeks accountability, seeks a legislative solution to a problem that, as yet, has not attempted to be addressed through more traditional shared governance mechanisms.
SM – it’s the only way CFA could see to have any realistic chance to close the CPEC gap.
Time Certain: 1:30 pm – Information Competence – continuing discussion of status of the Information Competence Taskforce. Sue Curzon’s recommendation was to phase out and replace with a new committee that would report to finance. We sought input from campuses on how they have addressed information competence issues/skills, individually. We also believe that the Taskforce should become a sub-committee of ATAC… and continue to have mini-grant/funding power.

KK (ExCom) – Buy-in of faculty to academic technology occurs, most significantly, within the ranks of the senior faculty. How should the academic technology/information competence threshold be defined… and what are campuses doing to promote both?

SE – ATAC is the proper place for both. Notwithstanding that the two are distinctly different entities. In today’s world, the two are inextricably intertwined. Input from campuses does not indicate that the two areas should contribute to our student’s ability to think and learn. Discussions of information competence should not be centralized within the purview of the libraries… i.e., COLD.

LR (OoC) – Charter member of Information Competence Committee (ICC).

Information Competence = integration of many competencies… library literacy, media literacy, ethics/values, computer literature, communication… the intersection of all of these. The ability to find, evaluate, and use information. The type of advisory structure that might be indicated, thus, is a multi-disciplinary structure.

MT – we should not have an exit requirement of information competence. Focus and locus should not reside within the libraries… rather, more generally, within academics and academic disciplines.

BS – general skills vs. disciplinary skills…

KK (ExCom and former member of ICC) – reward structures for faculty under RTP policies have not incorporated/do not incorporate elements of Academic Technology, and with our students we are doing the same thing… we do not have a reward system that promotes information competence.

SE – akin to/inextricably intertwined with critical thinking.
RG – integration of IC should occur in disciplines at earliest opportunity.

MC – why include the Associate Deans of Education on evolved formulation of ICC.
LR – implications with respect to teacher education.

PM – we always have addressed issues of IC in the context of a discipline (writing term papers)... nothing should change/has changed.

MT – things have changed… the amount of information, and the modes of delivery/availability of that information have changed significantly.

KK – proponent for locating IC within academics.

GH (OoC) – Evaluation of IC within OoC-AA will take place before the fall. Why not wait till the
fall to see how that proceeds, and then decide what sort of recommendations are in order?

SE - ATAC should evolve into an entity, the focus of which should be IC.

LR – this area cries out for a system-wide presence. Any of the three models currently under discussion could work. All have their potential strengths and potential weaknesses.

Consistent with PM's suggestion, we agreed to invite Lori Roth and Ilene Rockman to come share their views with us vis-à-vis support of IC at the system level.

5.7 Enrollment Management – re: “Campus’ Consultation with Faculty Before Enrollment Targets and Enrollment Management Policies for an Admission Cycle” – discussions focus on a 2% provision that triggers rebates if enrollments fall below projections by more than two percent, but does not result in augmentations if enrollments exceed projections by more than two percent. Secondary focus involved the need for faculty consultation in the establishment of the enrollment target on individual campuses. Language of resolution was refined.

5.8 Foreign Language – Motion to table further consideration of Foreign Language Resolution until receipt of input from the Foreign Language Council… approved without dissent.

5.9 5/2 9:30 am – presentation by Dorothy Perry (Chair of UC-BOARS), during which she described the UC's efforts to develop a new entrance/diagnostic/achievement exam that would be more effective than the SAT. Presentation amounted to a sales pitch designed to elicit CSU support of new test. After much discussion, Chair Perry enthusiastically agreed to carry a message to her UC colleagues indicating our interest in being involved in the test development efforts and our desire to be included as full partners in that effort. The Chair of Academic Affairs will write a letter to be sent to Chair Perry.