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

1. As amended, the minutes were approved without dissent.

2. Announcements:
   a) TEKR will speak to us re: Authority and ability to offer the Ed.D. in the CSU, (and post-Bac programs, generally) and suggestions of appropriate roles of AA and TEKR respectively in this effort.
   b) Incursion of Teacher Prep. Coursework in traditional degree and discipline curricula is a looming concern.
   c) Current events… dual admissions plan of UC shelved/no funds.
   d) Friday courses to be added generally at CSUS – students displeased. (RK)
   e) Budget cuts in UC are provoking demands for termination of YRO and increase in students fees, by the UC Academic Senate Leadership. (SM)
   f) Credit by examination and Articulation of 2 + 2 Programs – topics arising from CCC dialog and concerns… we should add this to our agenda. (RS)
   g) CSU – UC agreement re: guidelines for joint doctorates… agreed to by UC and CSU (currently in DRAFT form)… are we to have any input in crafting this agreement? Add to agenda.

3. Items of Business:
   a) Dual admissions – (RK) CSU – CCC program is hung up on whether budgetary concerns should be a part of discussions designed to lead to the crafting of the details of the dual admissions program. CCC folks seemed not to be aware of the plethora of CSU programs that currently exists to facilitate CCC – CSU transfer. A draft is being developed by “Dual Admissions Implementation Committee” … but not for general dissemination. (note: the Implementation Committee is an outgrowth of a M.O.U. generated last spring between CCC and CSU, at the system level) Depending on qualifications of students, they would be able to take one or two courses per term on a CSU campus… receiving dual credit toward both the AA and the baccalaureate degree.
   b) CSU – UC joint Ed.D. Programs draft… is not really a draft, it’s a fait accompli.
   c) Remediation – should the system be doing some assessment of the efficacy of its remediation programs… including follow-up on student success following successful remediation efforts?

Should non-academic entities (ex., Student Affairs) have oversight responsibility for administration of remediation programs and courses? Great pressure exists to retain students in spite of failures to remediate within established timelines (RK).

Position proposed that a system wide remediation policy exist requiring students to complete remedial efforts and take a follow-up GE course in area requiring remediation in the next semester. (BR)

Implement new tracking tools. (RS)
Executive Order 665 lays out the guidelines and expectations of CSU remediation efforts and programs. In light of the modifications that are being made to the ELM, the definition and dynamics of remediation will change. A bridge exam approach may end up being necessary to screen for readiness for math intensive majors. Standard SAT, ACT and AP Calculus exemptions exist. (MC)

In spite of the battle having been lost years ago, the notion that State administered examinations testing for math and English competencies, administered in the Junior year, followed by remediation efforts during the Senior year of high school is a preferred philosophical premise. (JW)

Counter opinion to requiring students to follow remedial courses with the necessary GE courses in the respective areas suggests that all students be placed in the same GE status was offered… i.e., not remove flexibility from one group and not others. (MT)

Question was posed whether we have the pedagogical expertise (for example reading instruction) to address the specific deficiencies identified by EPT, for example. (MT)

Questions posed by Senator Kaiser via e-mail include:

(1) Do we have post remediation data focusing on GPA’s, course loads, and progress toward degree for students who required remediation?

(2) Can we obtain comparison data for those needing and not needing remediation?

Chair Snyder will draft a letter for committee review and input that will include requests for…

(1) data documenting progress toward degree and follow-up GE course pass rates and…

(2) data documenting success rates of remedial students in comparison with students for whom remediation was not necessary.

Discussion of various campus arrangements to administer/facilitate remediation efforts. Some entities are not as directly tied to academic departments as others. The degree to which a remediation/academic department nexus fails to exist is potentially problematic. Recommendation is to keep an eye on this area… being particularly sensitive to any greater degree of attenuation that appears to be developing. (MC)

Issue raised that on some campuses the courses utilized for remediation purposes have not gone through the campus course approval process. (LP)

d) TEKR Guests (including TEKR Chair Cook) led a discussion of the Ed.D. and related issues in teacher preparation.

1) A course-topic-coverage-in-juxtaposition-to-accreditation-standards (re: SB 2042) review meeting with representation from various and sundry CSU campuses (all of whom have teacher education preparation programs) will occur on December 6th and 7th in Los Angeles – supported by Office of the Chancellor through Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence.

2) Independent Ed.D. discussions… guests present included Dave Spence, Jackie Kegley, Dave McNeil, Les Pincu, Kathy Kaiser, Bob Cherny, Mike Lee… Lynne Cook gave a brief review of the recent history of the independent Ed.D. vis-à-vis the CSU and TEKR involvement.
Building appropriately qualified Educational Administrative pool for both secondary and community college instructional levels.

UC attempting to derail CSU’s attempts to gain authorization to offer the independent Ed.D., has beefed up the appearance of greater support of joint Ed.D. programs.

Dave Spence: CSU pursuit of independent Ed.D. benefited greatly from Senate input from last spring and forward… UC efforts to derail spurred dialog between UC and CSU (UC initiated) that lead to new joint Ed.D. guidelines i.e., capitulation. Capitulation was based upon political expediencies, specifically low probability of funding for the next three or four years.

UC will fund the programs at their cost (an amount approximately $3,500/student greater than CSU funding per generic student).

Agreement reached to create a Joint Ed.D. Board co-chaired by Dave Spence and his UC counterpart, Jud King… that will have authority to oversee all joint Ed.D. programs

Commitment of $2 mil/system (UC and CSU) as startup funding for the program.

Based upon campus autonomy and approval, time frames will be greatly accelerated over the slothful rate of approval of joint-Doc programs in the past. There will be a regional element to this program… pairs of campuses (UC and CSU) or consortia of campuses will be involved.

Stonewall avoidance… if UC cannot hold up their end of the bargain, programs may still proceed… funding apportioned on the basis of workload… but, of course, still a joint degree.

Why not using existing joint-doc administration structure? (LP)… answer, it has been/is ineffective; not enough specificity and no progress (DS).

UC workload will apply to CSU faculty involved in program (DS).

Why have we not been consulted? (BS) We (CSU) have been in consultation with the senate for five months (TEKR)… and UC’s Senate counterpart is expected to pass a resolution in support within the next three months. (DS)

If UC effectively opts out, can we still keep the degree going? (SE) Yes. (DS)

Multi-campus graduate effort under statewide auspices and administration possible? (SE) Not contemplated… (DS)

What about other applied doctorates? What about the inadequacy of current UC applied doctoral programs? What about standards in either stand alone or joint programs? (BR) Faculty will have responsibility for quality. (DS)

Recommendations on standards for quality are already in writing from TEKR. Seeking National Accreditation should be a requirement of the joint programs. (LC)

Have we foreclosed our ability to offer, in the foreseeable future, stand alone applied doctorates. (JW) To the contrary… (DS)
How have the “privates” responded? (SM) They are mightily distressed. (DS)

What is the source of time pressure? (MT) Legislative process.

Plus, several programs are already in the pipeline.

Will we be in competition with UC with this joint Ed.D.? Not likely… UC has effectively let their Ed.D. programs die on the vine, except for tooling up to respond to the threat of the stand alone CSU.

Reaffirmation of importance of joint and several accreditation of joint Ed.D. programs. (BR)

Admission criteria established by whom? (SM) Who has primary administrative authority? (JW) Guidelines for equitable administrative authority will be established in M.O.U. and/or RFP. Funding details, specifically what happens when the money gets to the campus (CSU). (DS)

Will protection of funding for existing post-Bac programs be assured… as was incorporated in our resolution of last spring in support of the stand alone Ed.D.? (BS) Needs to be… how best to ensure, will be worked on. (DS)

Chair Snyder will draft a letter for committee approval to be sent to Executive Committee via Chair Kegley that reflects our recognition of the consonance of principles, procedures and standards developed by TEKR vis-à-vis the stand alone Ed.D. with those presently incorporated in the document describing the CSU–UC joint doctorate program expansion.

Executive Orders 167 (transfer of credit) & 365 (credit by examination)... tabled to 11/1/01.

Liaison reports:

Dual Admissions: No developments...

Joint Use Facilities: Draft document on Off Campus Centers is in the works…(RG)

English Language Competency (intersegmental entity): A revision of 1985 competency statement is in the works which will be routed through AA. (MT) Intersegmental assessment alignment committee exists… we will receive periodic reports. Eventually, identification of instruments that could be used for either placement or waiver purposes may be developed. (MT)

SWAT (System Wide Academic Technology Acquisition): Using COLD model for library acquisitions for acquiring software licenses and technology to take advantage of clout generated by multiple campus numbers. (MT)

ATAC: Campus representatives from ITL, ITAC, etc., met to begin building campus infrastructure for increasing/infusing technology. (MT)

CAN (Course Articulation Numbering system) Lower Division Core: CAN meeting October 18th and 19th in Sacramento… UC opted out, CCC, CSU, and independents agreed to revision of CANNING process that if approved will come to campuses in January. CCC asked about courses that are recommended (as opposed to those that are required – which have historically been the grist for the CAN mill)… might these not also be subjected to the CAN process. (KK)
MATH LIAISON (Marshal Cates) REPORTS:

TEST ALLIGNMENT WORK GROUP: Meeting under the auspices of the State met with representatives from State School Board present.

ELM COMMITTEE: Standards setting group met and failed to satisfy the ELM Advisory Committee’s notions of an appropriately modified ELM.

IMPAC: First regional math meeting in one week. CCC representation has been most significant; CSU sketchy; UC virtually non-existent.

ACIP (Academic Council of International Programs): report by e-mail.

ACIRC (Academic Information Resources Council): looking to do software acquisition utilizing COLD model too… (BR)

11/01/01 - 0845


Agenda items…

e) Master Plan Committee Report by Chair Susan McKillop:

Thirty-three Master Plan work group meetings attended by 16 Senators, either as visitors or as members assigned to the work groups.

Seven different groups… these groups will forward final reports to the legislative Joint Committee chaired by Senator Dede Alpert. All final reports are, in principle, due by January 1, 2002.

Presence, awareness, communication and influence are the goals of our Master Plan effort.

Once the legislative joint committee begins their consideration of reports and schedules hearings, Senate (CSU) presence will again be significant. Preliminary steps will be to identify key personnel and propositions related to the final work product that will ultimately be crafted by the joint committee.

Planning session with Brian Murphy is being scheduled… post work group report strategy will be the focus.

f) Executive Orders 167 (transfer of credit) & 365 (credit by examination) presentation by Jo Service… guidelines for credit earning course work must ensure quality and rigor. Repetition of exposures at secondary and post-secondary levels leads to evaluation problems.

2 + 2 programs – these programs (between high school and community colleges) give college level credit for courses taken in a high school setting. Question is: should CSU accept those courses completed for college credit in a 2+2 program for (CSU) college credit?

Suggestion: CSU should only accept college credits for coursework completed at a college and/or accepted examination based credit. (BR)
Suggestion: Use CSU discipline council structure currently in development state as the agency that will evaluate credit by examination and/or 2+2 credit inquiries. (RG)

Credit by examination: ex., AP exams, CLEP exams (all reconfigured since 1993). Provisions need to be updated to reflect current options and practices… i.e., Executive Order 365 was issued in 1993. Academic Affairs is being asked to determine what should be included in the addendum

Suggestion made that we set up a sub-committee, to include Jo Service… committee charge: bring recommendation for modifications to addendum to E.O. 365 to AA for consideration and endorsement. AA could then sponsor a resolution to bring revision recommendations to entire Senate for its endorsement.

Sub-Committees: E.O. 365 (Marshall Cates, Bob Snyder, Mark Thompson)

E.O. 167 (Sam Edelman, Brent Rushall, Ken Nishita)