Academic Senate of the California State University

Academic Affairs Committee

Minutes, Meeting of December 2, 2005

Present: Jacinta Amaral, Luis Arroyo, J Vincent Buck, Myron Hood, Rochelle Kellner, J Ken Nishita, Barry Pasternack, CE Tapie Rohm, Barabara Swerkes, Mark Van Selst, Darlene Yee

Guest: Keith O. Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

1. Call to order at 10:30 a.m.
   Meeting called to order at 10:30 a.m.

2. Approval of the agenda.
   Agenda approved with the withdrawal of item 6.6 on the importance of seeking a permanent CSU Chief Academic Officer since action has now been undertaken by the Chancellor’s Office that meet the spirit of the resolution.

3. Approval of the minutes from the meeting of November 2-3, 2005.
   Minutes were approved with minor editorial revisions as submitted. Many thanks went to Luis Arroyo (CSULB) for recording these comprehensive meeting minutes.

4. Announcements, information items, general discussion.
   Amaral noted the transient nature of Deans at Fresno. Hood told us that professional applications were currently down on his campus. Pasternack said that summer programs would be cut due to low enrollment. Yee reported that SFSU will have a major presence in the heart of San Francisco’s central business district when a new SFSU Downtown Campus opens at the Westfield Centre in January 2007 – The College of Business graduate programs and the College of Extended Learning will be key occupants. The committee expressed concerns about interdisciplinary programs and potentially limited student electives at the satellite campus. Rohm shared comments about faculty recruiting and salary scale. Pasternack reported that the CSU Business Deans had met and wanted to dissociate salary and rank. The lack of laboratory facilities for nursing facilities was mentioned. “Tidal Wave II” unmet capacity demands were discussed in the context of raised student fees, accessibility, and the quality of the applicant pool at each CSU. The issue of accessibility to night (only) students was discussed and determined to be a largely campus and program-specific issue to address.

5. Liaison reports.
a. IMPAC. Van Selst reported that IMPAC met on November 19, 2005, and will meet on January 26, 2005. IMPAC is continuing work that may be used by the LDTP discipline groups in writing course descriptors for the systemwide courses as well as campus-specific LDTP courses.

b. GEAC. Van Selst reported on the developments unfolding in the GE advisory committee revisitation of the statewide GE requirements. Swerkes said that EO 595 outlines patterns for GE in the CSU. A GE survey will be sent to campuses next Friday, December 9. Hopefully, someone familiar with system and local requirements will complete and return this survey in early March 2006.

c. EDD. Van Selst reported that the Task Force is working on the recommendations for implementation of the Independent Doctorate in Educational Leadership. Topics under discussion include but are not limited to curriculum, faculty (categories A, B, C), review process (campus, system) and workload issues. Yee said that the Task Force will meet via videoconference during intersession and in person during the January meeting to draft and finalize these recommendations.

d. LDTP. Van Selst reported on the aggressive timeline on the project on lower division transfer patterns in developing the Transfer CSU (T-CSU) course descriptors. Concern was mentioned regarding the very small size and lack of inclusiveness in the descriptor development groups. Business met in November 2005 (discussed computer efficiency; word-processing); A Business Law course was sent back.

e. EAP. No new report at this time.

f. Admissions Advisory Council. Hood and Kellner reported on the following discussion and decision items: Only 7 campuses met target this year to date; over target campuses will be rewarded. Fall 2006 applications to date are up although fee waiver limit to 6; proposed changes on policy regarding TOEFL/iBT with no established cut off on each score; CSU impaction policy with refinements and changes [2 campuses (Pomona and San Marcos) have declared impaction but still accept students]; remaining items from AAC/BOARS meeting (GPA “bump” for AP and A-G differences between CSU and UC); CSU reaction to UC AP score changes for exemption from English Placement (UC exempt at 4 on AP exam; CSU exempt at 3 on AP exam); proposed CSU policy on CAHSEE (UC announce that in Fall 2007 applicants must graduate from regionally accredited school; will address Christian and home schools); admission by way of testing alone (e.g. the home-schooled student); SAT writing scores/data collection; admission impact of LDTP and logistical considerations of LDTP (Student Function Team look to CMS system for students who apply to get priority); Fall 2005 enrollment and the rising tide of high school graduations and possible future enrollment trends ["dashboard indicators" showing student need (e.g., night students)].
g. **Student Health Services Advisory Council.** Yee reported that an issue of systemwide import for the Student Health Centers has arisen regarding a birth control patch. The Manufacturers of the Ortho Evra birth control patch recently acknowledged that the patch increases the risks of stroke or death by blood clots, and apparently exposes women to a dramatic increase in estrogen—more so than typical birth-control pills. At least 17 women have died from this; the FDA recently issued a warning and the manufacturer will begin to issue health warnings on its packaging. The Chancellor’s Office has prepared an informational piece for distribution to all Student Health Centers and Student Health Centers are posting this information on their websites and alerting students who have been prescribed this patch.

h. **ATAC.** Rohm reported that EO 508 addresses handicapped disability activities in the CSU. Given legal implications and ramifications, we need policy and training for all faculty and courses. The highest bar at one university will be the expectation for all campuses.

i. There will be a presentation on **Disability Accommodation** at the January 2006 meeting.

j. **Keith O. Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs.** See items 6.3, 6.4, 6.7, 6.12 and 6.14 below.

6. **Items of business**

6.1. **Faculty housing.**

This item was referred to the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee.

6.2 **CSU fee structure.**

We discussed further developing our recommendation that the CSU system consider the advantages of changing the CSU Fee Structure to encourage more efficient use of instruction (measured in credit hours). It is noted that any changes to the CSU fee structure, in particular charging tuition fees per unit rather than the “greater than/less than” approach currently used, would invariably mean an increase in cost per unit with the expectation that students would, in general, take fewer units per semester on average and fewer units overall prior to graduation. The general proposal is to move the CSU away 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. Further interactions with the ASCSU Executive Committee, Fiscal and Government Affairs Committee, and Faculty Affairs Committee will determine the tractability of pursuing this major shift in philosophy for the CSU system.

6.3 **Testing out of courses.**

No further action at this time.
6.4 Campus review of independent doctoral degree program proposals.
See item 5C above.

6.5. Additional funding for academic advising in the CSU.
The committee’s earlier discussion raised concerns that the resolution confused and/or conflated different kinds of academic advising, 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. Our discussion on a motion to seek “Additional Funding for Academic Advising in the CSU" yielded a decision to support the view that advising be more seriously considered in the RTP process, and that commensurately more resources be made available to the increased advising mandate, but that seeking targeted funding from the legislature or elsewhere would not be a desirable intrusion into campus autonomy.

6.6 CSU chief academic officer.
The decision was made to withdraw the resolution on the importance of seeking a permanent CSU chief academic officer since action has now been undertaken by the Chancellor’s Office that meets the spirit of the resolution.

6.7 Accreditation style visits
There were continued concerns about the nature of the CSU accreditation style visits planned for the campuses. Keith Boyum clarified to the committee that these groups would not provide written reports to the Board of Trustees but rather would report out to the individual campus president and or executive team in an attempt to assist them in better understanding the strengths and weaknesses of their campuses. Visits to an initial 9 campuses will begin in the new calendar year. An initial group of 12 faculty and administrators will meet in late January for training and coordination and then visit one campus, after which the 12 would divide into 4 teams of 3, add one or two more people to each, and do two more visits each.

6.8 Registration priority
At some campuses, registration priority is determined by number of units completed rather than units to graduation. With the increasing precision of the various degree audit modules, it seems that a change from units completed to units to graduation would seem prudent. This may be more of an implementation, rather than policy, issue and thus may not be pursued further by the committee.

6.9 22 points reports
The campus-based responses to the 22 points request from the Board of Trustees were due earlier in December. It was determined that a statewide senate overview of where prior resolutions fit within the 22 points seems appropriate as does a discussion of other items identified in the Twenty-First Century Report (and elsewhere) that could also be included within any such response document. The committee will be reviewing the campus responses and will seek additional campus senate input into any
such response document additional to the one already produced by the executive committee over the Summer of 2005.

6.10 Doctorate of audiology
A coded memo from Keith O. Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, was sent to six campus presidents regarding joint programs with the University of California leading to the Au.D. degree. This memo requested regional discussions and a joint letter of intent, which is due on January 18, 2006.

6.11 Workload (EDD/graduate faculty)
See item 5C above.

6.12 21st century report
Arroyo has agreed to coordinate our work on updating the 21st Century report. He will formulate a plan for the work in updating the 21st century report. His goal is to have a draft of the updated report to us for review at the January 2006 meeting.

6.13 CSU one life science, one physical versus any two
UC requires two lab sciences in High School - any lab sciences. CSU requires two lab sciences in High School, but we state explicitly, one life science and one physical science. This is a continued source of confusion for the High School counselors and students. If most students or even all students for all practical purposes take biology/life science, why not drop the specificity and be consistent in this requirement? We may want to confer with the biology faculty/chairs/council. Early feedback suggests retaining the life science requirement.

Darlene Yee, EdD, CHES
December 14, 2005