Members Present: Darlene Yee-Melichar (San Francisco), John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Jacinta Amaral (Fresno), Ted Anagnoson (Los Angeles), Vince Buck (Fullerton), Myron Hood (San Luis Obispo), Rochelle Kellner (Pomona), Marvin Klein (Pomona), Ken Nishita (Monterey Bay), Jim Postma (Chico), Tapie Rohm (San Bernardino), Steve Stepanek (Northridge), Maria Viera (Long Beach)

Guests Present: Keith Boyum (CSU Chancellor’s Office), Chris Hanson (CSU Chancellor’s Office), Allison Jones (CSU Chancellor’s Office), Andrea Boyle (San Francisco), Barry Pasternack (Fullerton), Barbara Swerkes (Northridge)

Minutes:

1. The committee was welcomed by the chair and attendees introduced themselves.

2. The agenda was approved as amended.

3. The minutes from the meeting of May 2006 were approved.

4. Chair’s Report (reminders)
   a. Members receiving assigned time are expected to attend all meetings.
   b. Make sure to get the Y-Cal rate. This can be facilitated by getting a campus American Express card.
   c. Fill out the hotel tax exemption form.
   d. Attempt to take the Super Shuttle or share cars.
   e. Per diem amounts were reviewed.
   f. Our October interim meeting will be held at the LAX Hilton Hotel. The Academic Conference will be held at the LAX Radisson Hotel. We need to register for the conference. All conference-related expenses will be reimbursed through the ASCSU process.
   g. Our November plenary meeting will be held on November 8 & 9. No meeting will be held on November 10 (Veterans Day Holiday).

5. Chancellor’s Office Report (Keith O. Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs)
   i. We are looking at the accomplishments/progress of Cornerstones.
1. We believe we have done well in accountability processes and progress to graduation.

2. We have not done as well in graduate and extended education initiatives, even though we have a lot of progress in on-line courses and programs.

3. We will have a conference with large faculty representation to consider actions associated with the theme “Access and Excellence.” It will be held the week of October 16th and is open to all.

ii. We have been somewhat stalled on the graduate education issue. The enhanced formula for new graduate students will help. We are working hard on the new independent EdD and are working with UC for joint doctorates. Audiology will be the first focus but Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy and Nursing will be coming up soon. The UC only produced 25 PhD nurses last year. This number does not even meet CSU’s needs. The provosts have developed a paper on graduate education that is available for review in draft form. The cost of doctoral programs is high. We are looking at ways to approach the problem. We hope to have federal aid for these students.

iii. We have not closed the salary gap. This is an ongoing problem. There are some projections which indicate that the State situation may be better in the future.

iv. Assessment
   1. We are very interested in systemic assessment of student learning. AA is willing to put money into these efforts. Some campuses have been looking at GE-related outcomes with campus-specific tools. One standardized instrument (CLA) attempts to look at value added. Our high transfer population complicates the assessment process.
   2. There are a number of on-going efforts to develop assessment instruments.

v. Online degree programs—they can reach two populations.
   1. Remote groups (e.g., Indian tribes).
   2. Folks who have competing schedules (work, family).
   3. What should be the System role in this area? It is interesting to note that we do not have an on-line program in the largest major, Business. ATAC will next meet on October 4th.
   4. Comments:
      a. Many students who take these courses could take on-campus courses.
      b. We seem to have a lot of duplication of efforts (many sections of Biology 100 across campuses).
      c. AAC should have a representative on the subcommittee that looks at on-line programs.
vi. Strategic planning for International Programs—Dean Van Cleave is in the midst of initiating a new thrust in IP. There will be a large committee convened to consider this initiative. Senators and members of ACIP will be on the group.
   1. International students do not carry FTEs, even though they pay significantly higher fees.
   2. After one year, out-of-state students are considered Californians.

vii. The status of the 3 Trustee Graduation Initiatives
   1. EAP is on the Trustee agenda. We expect increasing numbers of students who may not be on a college track to take the test.
   2. There will be a revision to some of the scoring on the English portion of the exam. This will lead to a delay in English reporting until October.
   3. We are communicating valuable information about expected preparation even if student scores are not as high as we would like.
   4. We are continuing on Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation. This will be the focus of our Academic Conference next month. We expect a successful conference. The campus visits continue and seem to be very worthwhile. There is a good interchange of ideas.
   5. LDTP committees continue to meet. Communications continue to be a focus.

6. Liaison reports (as updates are available)
   a. Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC): Tapie Rohm
      i. They discussed technology in the classroom.
      ii. The needs of students with disabilities will greatly affect how we do business. All campuses will need to offer comparable services.
      iii. We have notes from the meeting for review.
      iv. We will propose Tapie as a representative to the subcommittee dealing with distance learning.
   b. Admission Advisory Council: Rochelle Kellner
      i. Official notes have been reviewed.
      ii. November 15th will be the first meeting this year.
      iii. Additional agenda items were solicited.
      iv. AB 918 (voc ed and a-g requirements)
      v. Physical science for a-g (San Bernardino)
      vi. Are golden 4 requirements being waived for transfers?
      vii. Items to be on the agenda (from last spring).
         • Ongoing alignment of CSU and UC entrance requirements.
         • The use of the writing portion of SAT with UC.
         • Enrollment planning.
         • Competition for students across campuses.
• Impaction.
• Different approaches to conditional exemption from EAP scores across campuses.

c. Articulation System Stimulating Inter-institutional Student Transfer: Ken Nishita
   i. The next meeting will be in October.

d. California Academic Partnership Program Advisory Committee: Jacinta Amaral
   i. Nine lower-performing high schools have been selected for particular attention. Board members work very closely with the high schools to increase college participation. We are nearing the end of a 3-year effort.

e. CSU EdD Faculty Consultation Group: Darlene Yee-Melichar, Chris Hanson
   i. The purpose of the group is to provide preliminary feedback early in the EdD proposal cycle.
   ii. A proposal from Fresno has been received. We are awaiting a proposal from Fullerton.
   iii. There is significant faculty participation in this curriculum review process.

f. Common Management Systems Project (CMS): Steven Stepanek
   i. No meeting yet.

g. Disabilities Advisory Committee: Ken Nishita
   i. No meeting yet.

h. Early Assessment Program Advisory Committee (EAP): Myron Hood
   i. No meeting yet.

i. English Council: Jacinta Amaral
   i. No meeting yet.

j. Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Development Committee: Myron Hood
   i. The committee met in August.
   ii. The committee has considered what effect the EAP will have on the numbers of students taking the ELM. To date, there has been no drop-off in ELM numbers. EAP numbers are approximately the same as last year.

k. Commission on Extended University: Marvin Klein
   i. The first meeting will be next week.

l. General Education Advisory Committee: John Tarjan, Jim Postma
   Topics discussed included:
   i. “SciGETC”
   ii. Campus Survey
   iii. EO 595
   iv. Alignment of IGETC and Area-Breadth
   v. AB 2169
   vi. CCC articulation of out-of-state and private school GE courses

m. Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum: Darlene Yee-Melichar
i. IMPAC has not been funded for AY 2006-07. There will be no regular IMPAC meetings this year.

ii. There is $30,000 available from last year for planning for the future:
1) be updated on LDTP, UC Streamlining, SciGETC, and C-ID; 2) discuss final steps in IMPAC and how we can continue the work with/without funding; 3) discuss how C-ID, if funded, would continue the faculty-to-faculty dialogue; and 4) strategize about which disciplines would benefit from meeting this year.

n. Intersegmental Coordinating Committee Transfer Committee: John Tarjan
Items discussed included:
1. Regional visits regarding transfer.
2. Time-to-degree.
3. CCC strategic planning process.

o. Lower Division Transfer Program Advisory Committee: Jim Postma, John Tarjan
1. Course submissions are already coming in from the CCs.
2. Recruitment of coordinators and reviewers is a big issue.

p. Systemwide Acquisition of Technology (SWAT): Tapie Rohm, Steven Stepanek
1. No meeting yet.

7. Items of business

a. The committee reviewed the Academic Affairs Committee 2005-2006 Year-End Report. **We decided not to distribute the current report. We will post a revised report on the website as soon as possible.**

b. Resolution on Laboratory Science Requirements for Freshman Admission. **This resolution will be reintroduced in first reading at the plenary.**

c. Barbara Swerkes (Chair, LDTP Advisory/Steering Committees) met with the Academic Affairs Committee to discuss LDTP and TCSU numbering system.

1. A handout dealing with treatment of LDTP-articulated courses in a variety of transfer situations was submitted for AAC review and possible approval.
2. An interpretation of the handout is that T-CSU numbers/articulation has no meaning outside of an LDTP agreement (or completion of the entire statewide portion).
3. Keith Boyum revised the handout and brought it to the committee for consideration. Both expansive and restrictive interpretations of what the implied policies reflect were expressed. The issue revolves around whether T-CSU numbers imply articulation with all comparable CSU campus courses or not.

iv. **We will have a resolution dealing with the issue for consideration by the whole senate. The issue boils down to the difference between considering T-CSU numbers as qualifying courses for inclusion in an LDTP pattern vs.**
system-wide articulation. John Tarjan and Ted Anagnoson will invite Barbara Swerkes to work on a resolution on the issue.

v. There is a fear that the more expansive interpretation would open the door for state-wide course standardization.

d. The committee discussed the CCC C-ID Numbering System proposal.
   i. There is a potential conflict/duplication of effort of what has been done in LDTP.
   ii. It is unlikely that all three systems will be able to come together to develop any system.
   iii. If this applied only to intra-CCC transfer, there would be no opposition.
   iv. There is approximately $500,000 in the CCC budget to implement this but only if the CSU and UC participate.
   v. Barry Pasternack discussed this effort in conjunction with the UC streamlining majors project and how it would relate to the work already done in the CSU.
   vi. There is a sentiment that this system would undermine the LDTP work. New courses may be submitted for review for a C-ID number rather than a T-CSU number.
   vii. There is some feeling that we should send an observer but not commit to participate in the project yet.
   viii. We should make sure that T-CSU numbers will continue to be used.

e. Allison G. Jones (Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs) met with the Academic Affairs Committee to discuss the following issues:
   i. Introduced the Achieve organization and the American Diploma Project on “Preparing Today’s High School Students for Tomorrow’s Opportunities.”
      • In some ways, California is on the cutting edge in programs.
      • However, there is an ongoing performance gap in the State.
      • There are great variations across ethnic/racial groups in terms of CSU eligibility. Native Americans, African-Americans and Latinos lag in CSU eligibility.
      • Eligibility percentages are inflated because they do not reflect the high percentage of students not completing high school (over 30%).
      • The definition of remediation varies widely across States. The CSU has the highest standards for exempting students from placement testing in the State.
      • The State considered making A-G the core curriculum required for a HS diploma but the initiative was defeated.
      • The CSU will not admit students without a high school diploma. Therefore, students not passing the HS entrance exam cannot directly attend the CSU. CCCs are now
authorized to award a HS diploma to their students. These students can transfer to the CSU.

- Question: should all HS students take a college-preparatory program? Answer: Problems begin in grade school. All students should have the skills embodied in the A-G curriculum even if they do not progress to college. The business community wants these skills and is starting to partner with K-12 education.
  
  a. The CSU continues to support the use of A-G as a HS graduation requirement. **It would be helpful if the ASCSU went on record in support.** Ted and Darlene will work on a resolution. Currently, parents and students have to “opt in” for a college preparation track. This change would mean that they would have to “opt out.”
  
  b. The CSU has not formally supported the addition of a 4th year of mathematics as a requirement.

ii. Assembly Bill 918 (Wyland) on career technical education (CTE) in A-G has been withdrawn.

iii. SB 1543 (Alarcon) requires the inclusion of CTE courses which meet current standards into A-G. The CSU administration is supporting this bill after having worked with the author. The bill would have the effect of compelling us to work more closely with CTE HS faculty to align their courses with our A-G requirements.
  
  - Allison and Gary Reichard attended several CTE courses and talked with administrators in Antelope Valley regarding aligning their courses with our requirements.
  
  - The bill would have the impact of forcing us to review CTE courses for inclusion in A-G by July 2008 or accept them without review. **Perhaps consider a resolution to encourage timely review.**
  
  - Most of the work required would be to work with CTE instructors to bring some courses into alignment with our standards. Many courses would not be candidates for approval. We currently have approved around 4000 of these courses.

f. Discussion of 21st Century Report—item deferred. Perhaps we can develop a new report that deals with a list of topics that reflects current priorities and projects.

g. Discussion of Planning beyond Cornerstones—there is a report currently being developed by the administration. We may wish to wait until we review this report.

h. The impact of the CSU fee structure on progress to degree and encouraging students to take more units that they might be better advised to take concurrently—item deferred. **Perhaps we can confer with FGA on a possible joint resolution.**
i. Library Resources for the EdD.
   i. The chair of COLD sent a memo indicating a baseline amount of $108,400 in annual support which would be needed to support each of the campus programs.
   ii. There is some support for this request.
   iii. AVC Boyum indicated that the memo does not reflect existing resources. It also does not reflect potential growth in programs.
   iv. **We may want to pass a resolution recommending a hold on programs pending adequate support.**

j. Discussion of impaction and selectivity in the CSU—deferred to next meeting.

k. Prioritize following items for future meetings as needed—deferred to next meeting.
   i. Campus autonomy in setting academic calendars
   ii. Information competency as an area of CSU-wide assessment/instruction
   iii. Further action on the importance of campus autonomy across a variety of fields (we did cover the academic calendar but not GE-focused pressures from the CO)
   iv. Differentiating lower from upper division coursework and masters level from doctoral level coursework would seem to be overdue but there was very little interest in tackling the problems within the current committee
   v. Effects of "poaching" of traditional campus service areas
   vi. Effects of increasing emphasis on FTEs funding
   vii. grading standards
   viii. admissions
   ix. competition between programs
   x. effect on high-cost programs
   xi. Remediation
   xii. Legislative intrusion into curriculum
   xiii. Administrative intrusion into curriculum
   xiv. System/campus roles (Cal State Teach, EdD, LDTP, etc.)