California State University  
Academic Senate  
Academic Affairs Committee  

Minutes, Meeting of May 6, 2004  

Present: T. Anagnoson (LA), Mark Thompson (ST), Paul Persons (CH), Rochelle Kellner (PO), Mark Van Selst (SJ), Lori Roth (CO), Tapie Rohm (SB), Luis Arroyo (LB), Len Mathy (EM), Manolo Platin (HU), Louise Timmer (SA), John Tarjan (BA), Vince Buck (FU).

1. Call to order – 10:10 a.m.

2. Approval of agenda – m/s/p

3. Approval of minutes of 3/10/04 and 4/2/04 – both approved.


5. Times certain – A. Jones, re admissions issues, Thursday morning, 8:30 a.m.

6. Liaison reports

   A. Lori Roth, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs.
   - CO personnel and organizational changes. Retirees include two teacher education faculty. The pre-doctoral director is leaving and will be replaced by another rotating faculty member. Community Service Learning has been reorganized with the departure of Erica Randall. A faculty scholar will join the staff to handle service learning.
   - On the budget side, the May revise is expected about May 14th. If there is a further cut of 3%, this will be handled 50% from an increase in student fees and 50% from reduced enrollment.
   - Many issues are continuing, including the 45/15 program that is before the Board of Trustees, the early assessment program for 11th graders, etc. The Governor has insisted on having a dual admission program to redirect more students to the community colleges, which is controversial.
   - The CO is implementing its own budget cuts, including a 7.5% cut already, not an across-the-board. There have been staff layoffs, mostly in the computer area.
   - The CSU Board of Trustees still has vacancies, and the Board awaits the Governor’s nominees for the vacant seats.
   - There is interest from some campuses in changing programs from state support to self support. A memo is being created to remind campuses of the guidelines in cases of such decisions.
   - There is talk of the possibility of a Partnership with the Governor.

7. Items of business
A. Transfer issues – Proposed 45/15 Pattern:

- **Background.** There is an item before the Board of Trustees that differs somewhat from our resolution on this issue. One difference is the extent to which the GE package is included – the Board’s item says that ordinarily it is included. Our resolution gives more freedom for the faculty groups to choose the most appropriate courses.

- **Impact of the program on campus impaction criteria.** The new program will not supersede impaction criteria.

- **Other issues**
  - Some majors have students taking upper division courses in the sophomore year
  - The transfer pattern should mirror as closely as possible what native students do
  - What would the admissions priority would be for students who complete this pattern? They would receive highest priority as UD transfers
  - Whether this procedure would restrict access to campuses

- **Response to SB 1785 (Scott and Alpert): Public Postsecondary Education; dual admissions education.** Our language opposes this bill. If you oppose a bill “in its present form” then it is viewed as agreeing with the purposes. That is why we oppose. Committee members felt that the Humboldt State Academic Senate resolutions on this issue were well done. The chair is to look at the rationale for coherence and whether it is appropriately up to date. The committee decided not to make any other changes to the resolution.

B. Process for reaching consensus on systemwide and regional course requirements: Integrated Teacher Preparation Program, Proposed 45/15 Pattern, etc. The committee decided to adopt the following changes to the existing resolution:

- “Faculty” changed to “Faculty representatives” line 9.
- “All campuses” changed to “all affected campuses.” Line 9.
- Cherny suggestion was to require positive approval of representatives of each program faculty. Language in line 10 changed to include: “and approval requires an explicit affirmative vote of the representatives.”

C. Intra-CSU Transfer

Intra-CSU transfer has a low systemwide priority. To change the priority would require legislation. We could do a resolution on this, which would be advisory. Relevant issues include

- Whether to support the general idea or to be more specific
• Whether an advisory resolution would do any good
• Whether the “Golden 4” (English, critical thinking, oral communication, mathematics) must be completed prior to transfer
• Whether any specific number of units must be completed
• Some members felt that in the absence of intra-CSU transfer, the meaning of CSU as a “system” is lessened.
• Whether special admits should be included and if so, with what language or conditions
• Whether, with a large and mobile state, allowing eligible good students to move from one campus to another more easily is a “natural”
• What to say about major course GPA requirements – whether the requirements of one campus would meet another campus’ different requirements

Committee consensus was to bring the issue back in September.

D. Excess units.

The committee Alternative resolution with other ideas.
• C. p. 3 – line 8. say: New D – “implement the degree audit module in of the CMS (PeopleSoft) as soon as possible in all campuses.”
• P. 4, line 2, add “as resources allow.”
• Discussion of the need for alternate plans to advise students who take courses out of sequence.
• P. 4 – “E. Campuses should consider giving students with excess units who are not close to degree consideration lower priority for registration.” Consensus not to add.
• Campuses should develop financial aid policies to encourage students to take degree-appropriate units and finish their programs expeditiously.
• Line 15 p. 3 – E. Campuses should provide resources and funding for high quality advising in both the major and general education.

E. Self-support MA programs

• There is talk of moving entire degree programs to self-support. The CSU business deans drafted a document that contemplated moving MBA programs to self-support. Chair Cherny expressed his concern that these programs not be taught solely on overloads or by lecturers. We would want them taught by regular faculty, with the courses being part of regular course loads.
• The committee discussed this issue but did not have time to prepare a resolution for this meeting.

F. AB 1932, CCC baccalaureate degree

• Without sufficient information to know whether this bill had a chance of passing, the committee decided not to do a resolution at this time.
G. SB 1415, Common CAN

- Discussion postponed for lack of time.

H. Possible revision of addendum to EO 365. Awaiting draft changes from Jo Service. Changes were not received.

Adjourned at 10 a.m. Thursday, May 7th.