Academic Senate of the California State University
Academic Affairs Committee

Minutes, Meeting of May 4, 2005


1. Call to order at 10:00 a.m.
Meeting called to order at 10:15 a.m.

2. Approval of the agenda.
Agenda approved with the addition of a report on the Admissions Advisory Council meeting from Senator Kellner.

3. (NEW) Approval of the minutes from the meeting of April 8, 2005
Minutes were approved as submitted.

4. Announcements, liaison reports, information items, general discussion.
   • Discussion of the Early Assessment Program, the English Placement Test, the New SAT, other admissions tools and exams.
   • Discussion of whether campuses should be formally informed about the demise of CAN.
   • SB 5, the Student Bill of Rights, is still alive and will be considered again after January 1, 2006.
   • At SJSU, the interim President will likely become President, without a search, until 2007.

5. Times certain.

6. Liaison Reports
   a. Keith Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
      • LDTP – progress is good. Work continues on obtaining the campus specific 15 units from each campus for each LDTP system wide agreement.
      • Marshall Cates will continue on this project next year.
      • For next year, the 30 programs to be the subject of system wide and campus agreements have been identified, based on the number of rising community college students to the CSU.
      • CAN and CSU equivalent – work continues in this area. Reed and Drummond will be signing a MOU on articulation.
      • He would like to work with the Executive Committee of the ASCSU on the facilitators for next year.
      • Facilitating Graduation at the campus level – 22 recommendations in this area are on the BOT agenda for the May meeting next week. He talked with the Deans of Humanities and Social Sciences last week about these. He would also like to have
Next year, with a roster of faculty who would visit other campuses to report to that campus on how its facilitating graduation efforts appear to the outside. The Presidents will receive these reports.

- One of these items asks campuses to address the extent to which they can reduce graduation requirements, including GE. The CO wishes to put money behind this effort, with a RFP for campuses that wish to take this on.
- Professional / Applied Doctorates – SB 724 is still active in the legislature. These programs would be funded based on marginal cost plus a special a higher student fee that will be in the same ballpark as the fees for the Joint EDDs we have with the University of California. They will be almost equal but not quite. We do not concede that the current marginal cost for graduate programs is sufficient; instead, we continue to put on the table a proposal that the dollars per FTE/S for graduate instruction should be higher.

b. Admissions Advisory Council – Oakland April 15th – with BOARS – Rochelle Kellner:
- At this meeting, there were an hour of questions on the EAP program.
- Kellner presented a discussion of the LDTP program.
- A-G Alignment – didn’t get very far with this. There is a joint list of classes to distribute to high school students – if you take these classes, you can be admitted to both UC and CSU.
- There was a discussion, at the behest of the UC members of BOARS, on the extra points awarded to students for taking AP/Honors classes. The UC faculty have proposed eliminating the extra grade points for these classes.

7. Items of business

7.1 Advisement issues
- The committee decided that given the reference to course repeats that occurs in the March resolution on advising, it was not necessary at this point to do a separate resolution on advising.
- However, the committee requests that AA collect current information on campus repeat and withdrawal policies, particularly on measures that CSU campuses have in place at the Department or College level to deal with these issues. In some majors, there are limits on the number of times students wishing to major in the discipline may repeat core courses. If they go over the limits, they need to shift to another major.

7.2 Lower division core project
- Update reports from Keith Boyum and Marshall Cates on the implementation process.
- Latest updates are on the LDTP web site: http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ldtp.shtml
7.3 Remedial programs
- The committee made editorial changes to the Thompson resolution and sent it to the floor for its second reading.

7.4 Faculty Role in Intercollegiate Athletics
- The committee revised this resolution and rationale and sent it to the floor for its second reading.

7.5 Admissions and the SAT Writing Test -
- Resolution was amended to include soliciting input from various interested groups, including the English Council, the EPT committee and others.
- Amended to include statement that writing is a fundamental skill integral for success in college and sent to the floor for its second reading.

7.6 Other resolution possibilities connected with Facilitating Graduation –
- Requiring the declaration of a major by the end of the first year for frosh and at entrance for Upper Division transfers – given the statements in the advising resolution of March, 2005, this was viewed as not needed.
- Chair McNeil presented the text of a resolution “Reaffirming the Role of Faculty in Initiatives for ‘Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree’.” This was amended to read as follows and sent to the floor for first reading/waiver/second reading at the current May, 2005, meetings:
  - RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the CSU review the Board of Trustees action item for May 10-11, 2005 on “Recommended Items for Campus Plans for Facilitating Graduation” and advise campus senates on their role in responding to these recommendations, with special attention to the General Education requirements. In advising the campus senates, the ASCSU should point out strongly that the faculty under Title 5 control the curriculum, and that these recommendations as regards the curriculum are advisory only. The ASCSU should also comment on the academic principles that guide program design and other considerations, particularly student choice of courses, that affect student progress to graduation.
  - RATIONALE: This resolution directs the Executive Committee of the ASCSU to respond to the Board of Trustees action item, “Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree.” We are particularly concerned that the BOT is directing the Presidents and faculty to implement the recommendations prior to consultation with the campus Academic Senates and without regard for the role of the faculty in determining the curriculum.
  - Attachment: CSU Board of Trustees, Committee on Educational Policy, “Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree,” May 10-11, 2005.

7.7 Death of CAN, birth of a/the CSU Transfer (articulation) Number
- The CAN resolution written in April, 2005, was amended and sent to the floor for its first reading/waiver/second reading. Since the committee was equally divided on the issue of giving the community college observer a vote on the descriptor
committees, this issue was to be brought up on the floor for a vote of the entire ASCSCU.

7.7 Revising the 21st Century Report (“The CSU at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California”) --
  ▪ Discussion of how to proceed for the revision. General consensus that little can be done until the tables and graphs are to be updated, which will in turn wait for the CSU Statistical Abstract to be published this summer.
  ▪ Next year, general consensus to have subgroups to work on various sections of the document and to add/upgrade a section on graduate education.

7.8 Revising the GE package next year –
  • General consensus to review the entire statewide GE package during the next academic year.
  • WASC requires 45 units in GE; our systemwide package is 48 units. Many campuses have other requirements, such as a second semester/quarter of English composition.

7.9 Class limits for online courses
  • Should there be class size limits for online courses? Committee consensus that this is both an academic quality issue and a workload issue; the chair is to consult with Faculty Affairs on the question and report back at the next meeting in September.

Adjournment