Wednesday, 2 November 2005  10:30 AM – 2 PM
Thursday, 3 November 2005, 8:35 AM – 9:55 AM

Members Present:  Van Selst, Edelman (Wed only), Yee, Arroyo, Buck, Hood, Kellner, Nishita, Pasternack, Rohm, Sowby, Swerkes, Amaral (Thurs. only), Thompson (Thurs. only).

Guests: (Wed.)  Maria Viera, CSULB; Jo Service, CO; Keith Boyum, CO; Marshall Cates, CSULA.

Remarks for Good of the Order:
CSUF. Pasternack reported that 87 of 170 applicants had been approved for equity salary raises. The approval rates for the applicants were 86% for Assistant Professors, 47% for Associate Professors, 12% for Professors -- the 1 Librarian who applied was denied a raise.

CSUSB. Rohm reported that CSUSB continues to experience great difficulties in attracting applicants and hiring new faculty in a number of fields; the San Bernardino campus recently hired some faculty at above market rates in Public Administration. The high cost of living, big work loads, and low salaries (especially compared to the private sector) are the major drawbacks to hiring new faculty.

Exec. Comm. Van Selst reported that the Exec. Comm. is urging campus Academic Senates to tell Visiting Trustees their stories about challenges in hiring and retaining faculty.

SFSU. Yee reported that her campus is experiencing difficulties in filling MPP positions; the Administration is now looking to hire candidates with non-traditional backgrounds and professional degrees for positions such as Dean.

Yee also reported that the campus Academic Senate had approved adding a B.A. degree in Native American Studies to the campus Master Plan. The Administration envisions hiring additional faculty members to initially staff Native American Studies. Some faculty are wondering how the Administration will fund the new faculty positions when monies have been unavailable for other faculty hires.

CSULB. Arroyo reported that the presidential search had benefited CSULB by providing faculty, staff, students, and administrators many opportunities to discuss with one another their visions for the campus’ future.
1. **Call to Order**  
Van Selst called meeting to order at 10:35 a.m.

2. **Approval of Agenda**  
Agenda approved as amended (move repeat policy to 7.b.ii.)

3. **Approval of September Meeting Minutes**  
Approved.

4. **Announcements**  
Rohm reported that faculty trustee Smith visited CSUSB and reminded the campus that 120 units is supposed to be the minimum number of units for a major, not the maximum.

Nishita called the committee’s attention to Peter’s email to Van Selst about the “22 points of light.”

5. **Reports**  
**IMPAC.** Van Selst reported that he is encouraging the IMPAC representatives to write LDTP-style course proposals, including learning objectives and outcomes, so that these proposals may be used by the LDTP discipline groups in writing course descriptors for the systemwide courses (when many campuses require the same course) as well as campus-specific LDTP courses. Van Selst’s report stimulated discussion about the need for the CSU to convene annual meetings of discipline chairs to review LDTP issues.

**GEAC.** Will meet Wed 3PM. The initial GE survey was sent out to the campuses and some (9) have returned commentary despite the very short timeframe.

**EDD.** Will meet Wed. 6PM. In his discussion with the Exec. Comm., Boyum has stressed the urgency for all to assist in getting the Ed.D. programs off the ground as soon as possible.

**LDTP.** Boyum and Cates provided updates on the LDTP. It was noted that the LDTP steering committee has never formally met and is thus largely depending on the goodwill of Boyum and Cates in representing faculty concerns.

Cates reminded us that the LDTP is unfolding in three phases. Phase one began last year when 30 majors at 20 campuses formed discipline groups and reached agreements on system-wide general education requirements for their respective majors and that the departments -- with the exception of fifteen -- have established their specific major requirements. Cates is working with Provosts’ designees to collar the wayward departments. Phase two began this year; it involves 15 majors at 20 campuses. The Exec. Comm. has named facilitators for all 15 discipline groups. Cates will train the facilitators on 11 November, and then the discipline groups will meet on 19 November and 2 December to hammer out their system-wide general education requirements. He is encouraging the discipline groups to decide upon their campus major requirements as soon as possible. Phase three also began this year with 19 discipline groups meeting to
develop CSU transfer course descriptions. This will be done by revising CAN course
descriptions if possible and writing descriptions for other courses as needed. The
discipline groups are to write “robust descriptions” sufficiently detailed so the Junior
Colleges will have a clear understanding of the objectives, outcomes, and content desired
by the CSU discipline group. The discipline groups are to submit their draft course
descriptions to the CO by 2 December, the CO will in turn send the drafts to the
campuses for department review and approval. Approval by 75% of the department’s is
the minimum required for adoption of a description by a discipline group. In cases where
a course is offered by one discipline to meet the needs of another discipline (i.e., English
offering composition at the request of Political Science), a faculty from the “requesting”
department would serve with the “providing” department faculty to evaluate the course
descriptor(s). Approximately, one-third of all the CSU transfer courses are these kinds of
service courses.

In the ensuing discussion on Cates’ report, several colleagues voiced concern that 1)
faculty should attend the discipline group meetings on 19 November instead of the
IMPAC meeting scheduled that same day (this was less of an issue than originally
thought, it is only the later phase (smaller) LDTP groups that will be meeting on Nov 19);
2) the CO should do everything possible to avoid double scheduling with IMPAC in the
future; 3) everyone involved should clearly understand that the CSU transfer course
descriptions address the minimum objectives, outcomes, and content, CSU faculty deem
necessary for junior colleges to offer their students in order to be well prepared to pursue
majors at the CSU; and, 4) that the CSU transfer course descriptions will not necessarily
be the same as CSU descriptions for its own courses with the same titles. Subsequent
discussion clarified that each discipline group will need a review committee (3 to 5
persons) to review the course description proposals submitted by the junior colleges.
Boyum and Cates suggested that OSCAR might be used to facilitate course evaluation.
There was also speculation about what processes might be needed to decertify -- in future
years -- a junior college course deemed as no longer meeting the transfer course
description.

EAP. Cates discussed the EAP, emphasizing that the Math Council has established a
professional development program to train high school algebra teachers to better prepare
12th grade students to pass the ELM. This program is similar to the one developed by the
English Council to aid high school English teachers. So far, 100 algebra teachers have
completed the program.

6. Actions and items considered for action
6.1 (Hiring a Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs)
Van Selst observed that the CO may not be acting in an expeditious manner on AA-
related ASCSU resolutions because the VPAA position is vacant. Discussion
ensued and the AA committee decided that under “New Items”, the committee
would formulate a resolution urging the CO to fill the VPAA position -- Van Selst
asked Edelman to write a draft of the resolution for the committee’s consideration.
Upon returning to this item, Edelman presented the initial draft of a resolution
urging the Chancellor to hire a new Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The
committee suggested several changes to guide Edelman’s revision of the draft. The resolution was revised and revisited Thursday morning.

6.2 (Faculty Housing)
The AA committee also decided to ask the Faculty Affairs Committee to prod the CO to address the faculty housing issue.

6.3 (Repeat Policies)
Pasternack presented the revised version of the “repeat policies” resolution drafted by the Fullerton Four (Pasternack, Kellner, Buck, Arroyo). Van Selst presented a version drafted by the FGA committee. After extensive discussion of the two drafts, Van Selst asked Pasternack to draft a new version of the “repeat policies” resolution. Upon returning to this item, the committee reviewed a fourth draft of the “repeat policies” resolution drafted by Pasternack. The resolution was revisited on Thursday Morning.

6.4 (Distinguishing Levels of Coursework)
At Van Selst’s request, Jo Service shared her thoughts with the committee about 1) distinguishing between lower division and upper division courses and 2) about the responsibility of departments to provide students with opportunities to test out of courses. Far-ranging discussion ensued. It was noted that two-thirds of CSU grads began college at the junior colleges and that, the CSU has an obligation to provide students with pathways at the lower division and upper division levels to help them earn their B.A. degrees in a timely and efficient manner. Several colleagues raised concerns about departments accepting lower division courses taken at the junior college as fulfilling upper division requirements in the major. Other colleagues noted that the LDTP, along with pressures to limit majors to 120 units, might result in departments increasing their lower-division requirements, while reducing their upper-division requirements. Van Selst asked the committee whether we should draft a resolution encouraging campuses to provide LDTP transfer students with explicit roadmaps to fulfilling their degree requirements. After extensive discussion, the committee decided that such an action was not a sufficient policy issue to warrant a resolution.

6.5 (CSU Fee Structure)
Students do need to take greater responsibility for their academic careers. This might be achieved by changing the State University Fee from a two-tier system (0.1 units to 6 units, 6.1 units or more) to a per unit fee. Students would thus be encouraged to register only for courses they truly planned to complete and to exercise judgment in the courses they selected. Several committee members expressed a desire that the committee may take up the issue of student fees in a future meeting. A query to FGA was sent. FGA is willing to collaborate on investigating the tractability of the issue.
6.6 (Testing Out of Courses)
In response to several questions from the committee, Boyum noted: 1) a department advisor has the discretion to accept a junior college course as equivalent to an upper division required in its major; 2) the department advisor would probably require the student to take another course in order to meet the department’s upper division unit requirements; 3) the “Cornerstones” report lays out CSU policy on testing out of courses; 4) testing out will be difficult for students to accomplish until such time as faculty develop measurable course objectives and devise instruments to assess the students’ success in learning; 5) departments should encourage students testing out of courses where appropriate. No action is planned at this time pending further follow-up to collect additional information on both policy and practice.

6.7 The committee discussed the resolution about “Double Major Across Two Different Degree Programs.” The committee decided to revise the resolution to state it would supercede AA72-12. The resolution was tabled until Thursday morning.

6.8 Yee presented a revised draft of the resolution for “Continued Support for CSU/UC Joint Doctorates.” The resolution was revisited Thursday morning.

6.9 After extensive discussion of the rationale, the committee decided to withdraw the resolution “Reaffirmation of Early Declaration of Major.”

6.10 The committee discussed the resolution on “Campus Autonomy in Establishing their Academic Calendar.” Revisions recommended by FA were incorporated. Amaral suggested a revision that added language from the “Cornerstones” report to the rationale. The resolution was revisited Thursday morning.

Thursday, 3 November 2005, 8:35 AM – 9:55 AM

Remarks for Good of the Order:
Van Selst called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. After a brief recap of the EDD meeting (predominantly on the topic of a potential statewide graduate council) and the GEAC meeting (predominantly on the topic of the need for campus participation), the committee reviewed the resolutions we proposed to present to the plenary.

6.11 The now-retitled double majors resolution, “Double Major Across Two Different Degree Programs” produced extensive discussion and revisions; it was M/S/P as revised.

6.12 The now-retitled repeat policies resolution “Support for Campus-specific Limits for Repeating Courses to Improve Grades.” The committee M/S/P the resolution with only one minor grammatical change.
6.13 Resolution “Continued Support for Joint Doctoral Degrees.” Resolution was M/S/P with some minor revisions to the rationale.

6.14 Resolution “Campus Autonomy in Establishing their Academic Calendars.” Resolution was M/S/P with some minor grammatical changes and the creation of a fifth resolved clause.

6.15 Resolution “Campus Review of Independent Doctoral Degree Program Proposals.” After extensive discussion and revision, the resolution was M/S/P as revised.

6.16 A potential resolution on “Additional Funding for Academic Advising in the CSU.” The committee’s discussion raised concerns that the resolution confused and/or conflated different kinds of academic advising, viz., faculty advising, undergraduate peer advising, department staff-member advising, general education advising, etc. There was also concern about seeking targeted funding from the legislature since it encourages the type of directed focus on specific programs that we normally oppose. The committee decided to revisit the resolution (both text and rationale) at its December meeting.

6.17 Resolution “CSU Chief Academic Officer.” The committee M/S/P the resolution with revisions.

Adjournment, Thursday 9:55 AM

With many thanks to our scribe: Luis Arroyo
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