MINUTES

Members Present: Darlene Yee-Melichar (San Francisco), John Tarjan (Bakersfield), 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), Andrea Boyle (San Francisco), Barry Pasternack (Fullerton), Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee, Teacher Education and K-12 Relations Committee

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:00am by chair Darlene Yee-Melichar.

2. The agenda was approved as amended (replace discussion of 21st century report with discussion of English language instruction in GE and add liaison report on Services to Students with Disabilities Committee).

3. The minutes from the meeting of October 19, 2006 were approved. Grateful appreciation was extended to John Tarjan for his outstanding work in recording these comprehensive and timely meeting minutes.

4. Chair’s Report: Darlene Yee-Melichar
   a. Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation—next steps? Please send comments and suggestions to ASCSU chair Marshelle Thobaben ASAP.
   b. EdD Faculty Consultation Group—volunteer reviewers are needed. If you are interested in serving as a volunteer reviewer, please let me know ASAP.
   c. Daily Clips Access (user name is clips and password is csu—all lower case)
   d. ASCSU Newsletter—input for committee report needs to be submitted by next week
   e. Ted Anagnoson gave an overview of the campus peer review visits on facilitating graduation, specifically the visit to San Bernardino yesterday.
5. Visitor Presentations
   a. 11:00am—Chancellor’s Office: Keith O. Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
      i. The "Access to Excellence" strategic planning effort
         1. The 46 member steering committee met for the first time on October 16, 2006.
         2. The group developed a set of domains (themes) and topics to guide their discussions.
         3. The Provosts met to react to this preliminary document. These comments informed the final version of the document.
         4. Campuses will be asked to respond via town hall meetings. Their discussions need not be restricted to the domains and topics.
         5. All campus constituencies should be involved in discussions.
      ii. The provost’s white paper on graduate education
         1. This has resulted in an examination of faculty research and the role the system can play in facilitating these activities.
      iii. Access to Information Technology by disabled persons
         1. People from across the system came together to discuss strategies and share ideas. There is a large cost to coming into compliance with statutes. We have deadlines for the system but we will be struggling with this for a long time.
            a. Textbook adoption dates will need to be adapted.
      iv. New Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Initiatives and Partnerships
         1. Dr. Beth Ambos, formerly of CSU Long Beach, will serve on an interim basis until a search can be undertaken.
         2. We are looking at the Strategic Language Initiative with federal intelligence agencies. Campuses across the system can participate through technology.
         3. We hope to explore ways in which the system can facilitate partnerships across the system.
      v. Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation – CSU Campus Practices for Student Success Conference; next steps on this initiative
         1. The reactions to the conference were very positive. There were many good ideas shared.
         2. Where do we go after the campus visits are completed? The Trustees are very interested that we continue to focus on student success.
      vi. “Academic Transformation” as discussed by ATAC
         1. On-line degree programs have been examined by a subcommittee. It has developed some suggestions for how to move forward with these programs. The chancellor feels that the CSU should move forward to increase these offerings. We might want to develop a common portal for delivery. We should conduct a market analysis to explore
areas that should be explored. We may either put out a call to the CSU or to outside groups to help with portal development and market research. We should look at the number of similar programs that should be offered and how we coordinate across the system. Comments:
   a. Why should we do this?
   b. How will these programs been funded?
   c. How do we know our current programs have quality?
   d. How will we handle the intellectual property?
   e. There may be problems with having only one campus “own” a course or program.

2. Perhaps some on-campus students can benefit from electronically delivered content more so than by sitting in large lecture sections. Some of the literature supports this concept and a number of CSU presidents are interesting in pursuing this.
   a. Perhaps a department on a campus could be supported in examining alternative modes of delivery of content with an eye towards better accomplishing learning objectives.
   b. This can be done but not cheaply.
   c. It appears to be done better by groups of discipline or other faculty on a campus rather than piecemeal across campuses.
   d. Comments:
      i. Is this geared towards the military? Boyum: no.
      ii. It is great to focus on quality but the faculty may be dubious about hidden agendas.
      iii. Are lower-division students prepared to learn independently?
      iv. There is some good software out there but it is not cheap.

b. 11:50am—Chancellor’s Office: Christine Hanson, Interim Dean, Academic Program Planning
   The status of independent EdD degree proposals
   i. Each program proposal will have 8 reviewers.
   ii. SFSU has just entered the review process.
   iii. SDSU, Fullerton and Fresno have completed the process.
   iv. Campuses are not required to alter their proposals based upon review but they are taking the comments seriously.
   v. There also needs to be external review and approval by CPEC.
   vi. We need to look at demand and employer needs more closely on a regional (campus) basis.
   vii. WASC also plays a role in the initiation of these programs.
   viii. Chris gave an update on all phases of the program implementation.
6. Liaison Reports
   a. There may be a problem with notifying new members of committees of meetings. We may need to be more proactive in getting new members and staff together at the beginning of the year.
   b. Admission Advisory Council (Rochelle Kellner)
      The next meeting will be at the CO next week during BOT meeting.
   c. Commission on Extended University (Marvin Klein)
      The next meeting will be at the CO next week.
   d. General Education Advisory Committee (John Tarjan)
      i. The committee met on November 7, 2006.
      ii. Gerald Eisman gave us a presentation on civic engagement and service learning.
      iii. The committee considered potential guidelines for the granting of GE credit for AP examinations. There is an ongoing effort to align CSU and UC guidelines.
      iv. The committee is developing a thought piece on GE which may inform the Access to Excellence strategic planning efforts.
      v. The committee is awaiting the advice of ICAS on the issue of further alignment of GE-Breadth and IGETC.
      vi. It was decided that no further action is warranted in regard to flexibility in completion of GE requirements prior to transfer, often known as the “SciGETC” initiative.
      vii. The committee considered a requirement that all GE courses be taught in English.
   e. Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (Darlene Yee)
      IMPAC will next meet on January 26, 2007 to discuss LDTP, UC Streamlining Majors, C-ID, etc. and how we can continue intersegmental/interdisciplinary discussions even if IMPAC receives no further funding.
   f. Intersegmental Coordinating Council Transfer Committee (John Tarjan)
      Visits to CCC campuses and transfer-related groups continue. The next campus visit will be this month in San Diego. The next meeting of the committee will be on December 11, 2006 at Santa Monica College.
   g. Lower Division Transfer Program Advisory Committee (John Tarjan)
      A thoroughly debated issue was the inclusion of a prerequisite for economics courses. Faculty advice on this matter was accepted. The first round of reviews is continuing. The committee strongly supports our resolution on Principles to Guide the Application of the TSCU Numbering System for CSU Systemwide Articulation.
   h. Services to Students with Disabilities Committee (Ken Nishita)
      A detailed written report was submitted to ASCSU and AAC.

7. Items of Business
   a. Resolution on Laboratory Science Requirement for Freshman Admission (jointly with TEKR)
      i. Lengthy discussion of this resolution and the implications of changes for students in the CSU. The author noted that the intent
of the resolution was to enable students following UC requirements would be able to meet CSU science criteria.

ii. Lengthy discussion of the work of the admission advisory committee as this work relates to the proposed resolution and discussion of this resolution as related to the resolution presented in first reading at the last senate meeting.

iii. Defer discussion of this resolution until TEKR meets with the committee later this afternoon.

iv. The TEKR version would just call for a revision to not require a life science.

v. The AAC version is more prescriptive.

vi. It is unclear what Admissions Advisory Council intended.

b. Resolution on Fulfilling the Principles of Cornerstones in the New Strategic Plan

i. In recognition of the importance of the issues, “priority” was changed from “high to highest” in sections of the resolution.

c. Resolution on A Student Fee Policy that Supports Educational Outcomes

i. FGA has declined to cosponsor at the current time. There were concerns raised over the language dealing with reallocation of resources.

ii. FGA will meet and see if wording changes will alleviate their concerns.

d. Resolution on Principles to Guide the Application of the T-CSU Numbering System for CSU Systemwide Articulation

i. Some wording in the resolution was clarified.

e. Resolution on Response to SB 1543 (Alarcon): High School Curriculum; High School Coursework Requirements (jointly with TEKR)

i. Is this resolution needed? The legislation has been passed and the administration is well aware of the need to respond with a group to develop standards.

g. Resolution on Support of the A-G Curriculum as California’s High School Graduation Course Requirements (jointly with TEKR)

i. Some wording in the resolution was clarified.

h. Resolution on Library Resource Needs for Quality, Independent EdD Degree Programs in the CSU

i. There was a discussion of whether this resolution or a resolution on general resources (FGA resolution) would be more appropriate.

ii. There was a discussion of joint sponsorship of the more specific resolution on library funding.

iii. We have already passed 2 resolutions dealing with more general resources for the EdD.

iv. Tom Krabacher and Ted Anagnoson will attempt to merge the two resolutions dealing with funding in such a way as to allow co-sponsorship of a single resolution.

h. Discussion of 21st Century Report update and how we might contribute to this essential effort
i. Deferred pending further direction from the Executive Committee.

ii. English language instruction in GE.
   i. The question revolves around a requirement that courses in Areas B-E be offered in English only.
   ii. A lengthy discussion of the issue ensued.
   iii. This should be encouraged but not required.
   iv. AAC recommends that the system remain silent in terms of policy yet should discourage instruction in languages other than English.
   v. Consensus was that all course outlines for CCC courses should be submitted in English to facilitate review; Area A courses must be taught in English; and English-language instruction should be encouraged for all courses in Areas B-E, excluding foreign languages and literatures, but not required.

j. Discussion of GE Courses and On-Line Education
   i. This issue is broader than GE. It applies to LDTP course reviews as well.
   ii. Deferred to the next meeting.

k. Discussion of remediation—deferred to the next meeting.

l. Discussion of alternatives to FTEs based-funding—deferred to the next meeting.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00pm.