Meeting Time: 10:30 AM – 5:00 PM
Meeting Date: Thursday, September 15th
   • Followed by breakout sessions for working on relevant agenda items.
Meeting Place: Anacapa Room

Last updated: 11 September 2005

Membership:
http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/Academic_Affairs/index.shtml

Present: Jacinta Amaral, Luis Arroyo, Vince Buck, Sam Edelman, Myron Hood, Rochelle Kellner, Ken Nishita, Barry Pasternack, Tapie Rohm, Donn Silvis, Sherman Sowby, Barbara Swerkes, Mark Thompson, Mark Van Selst, Darlene Yee, Jim Postma (guest), Maria Viera (guest), Hirono Okahana (CSSA Liason).

Additional guests include times certain.

Absent: (all members were present)

Agenda:

1. Call to order (10:30 AM)

2. Approval (possible reordering or revision) of the Agenda
http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/Academic_Affairs/agendas.shtml
   No reordering. Agenda approved.

3. Approval of the minutes from the meeting of May 4th, 2005 Moved Tapie, Second Darlene
http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/Academic_Affairs/meetings.shtml
http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/Academic_Affairs/aa_minutes_0505.pdf
   Minutes approved.

4. Announcements, Liaison Reports, Informational Items, General Discussion

   Liaison Reports:
   • Commission on Extended Education: Barry Pasternack reported that it was announce the Pres. Bob Maxum would be overseeing the EDD program if it is approved by Gov. (update: Governor did sign the legislation)
   • IMPAC (Van Selst) Move to change the structure of the meetings so that senior disciplines will meet regionally and/or only meet once a year.
• GEAC (John Tarjan): see GE discussion below
• CPEC
• CSSA (Hirono Okahana) -- Introduced student member Hiro Yokohiro. Hiro commented on reporting double degree on diploma as important for student.
• Executive (Ted Anagnoson)

Travel:
• Must follow YCAL/State Regulations
• Hotel (state)
• Tax Exempt hotel stay. “work orders” available (via senate office?)
• Per diem $9/12/20 + $5 incidental

Budget Consequences.
• Ted Anagnoson (exec) led a discussion on belt tightening and scope of changes or budgetary concerns prompted by the predicted shortfall in the ASCSU budget. The dominant response was that this is a particularly busy year for the ASCSU (LDTP, EDD, Etc.) and that it was unfortunate that the Chancellor’s office is unwilling to fund the required shared governance interactions, esp. given the cheap rate at which senators are bought out from their direct campus responsibilities.

5. Times Certain:
• Lorie Roth / Gordon Smith (Information Literacy Assessment across the CSU) 11:00-11:30 AM

Worked with ETS to develop and online performance based assessment program for information literacy. Two years in development and last Jan we administered the assessment to a largely convenience sample of 3300 students in the CSU. This was not the final form of the test. Students got a small portion of the test and the data was used to finalize the final test. We could not get student individual scores because the object was to test the test and cross comparisons depend on the vagaries of participant selection. But we can get access to individual institutional scores (each campus’ provost were given their campus aggregate data). ETS still has some steps that need to be done for evaluation and validation. Benchmark definitions of low, middle and high performance still need to be defined via consultation with area experts. Given that the extant data was not a random sample, administrators should not use the results as the basis for policy changes. An issue of the reading level required to process the test questions was raised (the test may be a proxy test of English comprehension). Some items had been discarded based on student performance. Rubrics for assessment are in development.

• Keith Boyum – 1:30 PM (LDTP, Facilitating Graduation Timeline)
• Marshall Cates – time to be set (LDTP, CSU numbering system, LDTP Course Certification Process)
  • See LDTP discussion
• Allison Jones – not available for this meeting
6. Items of Business

6.1 Chancellor’s Office Responses to Previous AA resolutions (information)

6.2 CSU Ed.D. (and associated issues) (Information, maybe action)
Quality in the Program:
- Delay of statewide Teacher Education Program Evaluation projects:
- What should the general constraints of the Ed.D. Program structure be?
- Quality concerns on Doctorate Education in the CSU
  - What is the process of establishing a new doctoral program?
  - How do we know if we can offer a strong enough program?
  - How does doctoral education differ from master’s level education?
  (see later item)

Darlene reported on the variety of issues. Quality issues need to be outlined in preparation for the EDD. Second issue is where the EDD should reside either in Colleges of Ed or in some sort of interdisciplinary place.

How prescriptive should we be in quality issues for the EDD? Should there be a special faculty? How should they be paid? Should there be a different course numbering, how many units etc etc. Should we create a system wide oversight academic review group. Look at UC response to 724. Funding needs to be looked at but possibly could be funded under continuing ed. Funds collected for EDD should be funded back into the grad program. Maybe we should review the already existing UC/CSU joint doc program as the basis of our document – but note “sell out” to acquire joint docs put most of the quality responsibility on the UC. We should create a standing committee of the AA or Senate similar to CCGA. Darlene, Sam Tapie and Barbara will form the subcommittee. Lori Roth said there is some agreement with the UC. Issue about non-Edd needs to be included something like in good faith we are going to be pursuing regional joint doctorates in Audiology and Nursing, Physical Therapy. We need a statement on implementation and quality. We also need a Broad general statement on applied docs and statement on resources and financial issues.

6.3 Applied doctorates (Information, maybe action) Take on the response to the UC criticism of the CSU in the 724.

6.4 LDTP (information)
Update from Keith Boyum and Marshall Cates on Implementation

- CSU numbering system and its’ implementation

Things are going just great. Praises to Marshall Cates and the Senate were prolific. Completed definition of patterns for 30 and 3 are left with last minute glitches. Slower has been the rctp of the campus based 15 units. 700 campus specific left out are under 60. This 14 additional disciplines. We will have close to 90 % of the majors chosen by students transferring to the CSU. Course descriptor review groups are being put together. By October 7 we will have the facilitators named by exec of ASCSU. Training will take place in October. From that date until Nov. 11 meetings will be held. Result will be sent to CO by Nov. 18. Draft docs sent to departments for ratification. Once descriptors are approved CCCs will have a year to change their courses.

Senate executive to appoint those LDTP course descriptor leaders.

6.5 Facilitating Graduation (likely some actions, many faceted)

- 22 points of lights report (CO via BoT).
- Anything we want to respond to?
- Usual problem of many good unfunded ideas + some bad ones.
- Without money much of this is moot (cf. CMS).
- Are these initiatives the best use of the available monies?
- What is the data or what data should be sought?
- Item 13: repeat policies; There was a discussion on the issue of whether a c or better might not be eligible, Etc. Work was done to craft the resolution; will look at academic forgiveness next on this stream.
- ACTION: repeat policies resolution
- ACTION: reaffirmation of early declaration of major
- ACTION: GE review (see 6.8)

6.6 Remediation (possible action)

- Training high school educators – funding was delayed with predictable delay in helping to reduce the need for remediation via those three initiatives.
- Mark: CO’s response from prior AA resolution is that the CSU is working on remediation of incoming freshmen and we are not abandoning it.

6.7 Constitution day (information) No need to do something here.

- AA coded memo.
- A brief discussion of the range of campus activities initiated to conform with the “teach the Constitution” requirement

6.8 GE review (information, plan action) See above

1. See the “cornerstones report” on the importance of GE and local autonomy.

http://www.calstate.edu/cornerstones/reports/revisereport.pdf
Note: this is highly recommended reading. It gives a good perspective on current and possible future initiatives.

2. Information competency
   http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/ic.shtml

3. Liberal education
   http://www2.sjsu.edu/senate/SS-S05-5.pdf

4. Current campus GE guidelines from SJSU (just finished review)
   http://www2.sjsu.edu/senate/geguidelines.pdf
   - Statement on double-counting GE and American History
   - Statement on maximum number of courses within a discipline that can count towards GE (lower division)

GEAC report: for the last year and half we have tried to get a handle on what GE is and what it does to add to EO 595. Six major issues (see Johns GEAC report) were dealt with. Committee did brainstorming on goals of GE (see Johns report) List of specific changes (see Johns report) an extensive discussion followed.

Globally what do we want to do? It was suggested that we do a more periodic review of GE and that we either wait for GEAC to do its review or we parallel the GEAC with a reexamination of the principles of GE. AA is going to leave GE in the hands of the GEAC to come up with some conclusions (large overlap between AA and GEAC) but will be kept apprized of current status. Chancellor and David Spence have historically noted that they will approve any ‘reasonable’ reduction in GE (or other campus requirements). Intent to review area A2.

What is function of GE? This question should guide the review.

We need to tell exec to send an alert about GE to the campuses! (also have Mark Van Selst include in his newsletter report)

6.9 21st Century report (plan action)
   - Consensus was to have sub-groups work on sub-sections. Need to distribute these sections.
   - We need to update the text and include in the white paper all of our recommendations on Facilitating Graduation, and aspects of the 2004 Post Bac report.
   - ACTION: Sam, Mark, and Luis will divide and take sections to work on updating. (Ted Anagnoson will also participate)

6.10 COIA (update from May/05) (information)
   - AA no action on this item; no update

6.11 Differentiating “level” of coursework. (plan for action)
   - How does doctoral education differ from master’s level education?
   - How does lower division coursework differ from upper division coursework?
     - Nancy Sherlock (CO, AA) has information re:nationwide
• Should we define the difference to help in dealing with CCC and in dealing with the difference between MA level and Doctoral.
• AA will pursue this in the future.

6.12 “Intelligent Design” and University Credit (action item)
• Requirement that the majority of course offerings cover ‘standard content’ of the discipline.
• AA Elected not to pursue this further at this time (suit with UC rejection of int.design/creationism as not being science).

6.13 University Calendar (January Inter-Session)
• Is there a benefit to either the “late” start date adopted by many campuses? How well are campus facilities used during this period?
• Chancellor’s proposal to eliminate Winter Session. General response was negative.
• Resolution is to support campus autonomy.
• Stanislaus has undertaken this review ea. c.5 years; most recent relatively recently. The timeline of winter session allows northern CA students to work to pay for their spring semester (Tahoe, etc.).
• ACTION: first reading at September Plenary

6.14 Dual-Degrees
• AA has a resolution on this supporting granting double baccalaureate (vs double-major).
• Resolution on Double major to be crafted by Myron Hood.
• ACTION: First reading at September Plenary.

6.15 Responsibilities Document (ASCSU)
• This item was withdrawn

AA proposed the following resolutions during the September Plenary (see plenary website for verbage)

• Double majors (first reading)
• Repeat Policies (first reading)
• Continued Support for Joint Doctoral Programs (first reading)
• Campus Autonomy in setting their Academic Calendars (first reading)
• Joint Task Force on Establishing EdDs (waiver, resolution adopted) [AA/TEKR/FGA]
• Reaffirmation of Early Declaration of Major