Academic Senate of the California State University
Academic Affairs Committee

Wednesday, March 5, 2008
10:00* a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

CSU Chancellor’s Office – Anacapa Room

*AA will meet briefly at 10:00 a.m. in the Munitz Room with the full Senate and then convene in the Anacapa Room

Minutes

Present: James Postma, Chico; Jacinta Armaral, Fresno; Andrea Boyle, San Francisco; Michael Gorman, San Jose; Jackie Kegley, Bakersfield; Ken Nishita, Monterey Bay; Michael Perkins, San Diego State; Henry Reichman, East Bay; Steven Stepanek, Northridge; and Maria Viera, Long Beach. Guests: Keith Boyum and Chris Hanson.

1. Welcome/Call to Order: James Postma, Chair

2. Approval of the Agenda (Action Item)
   http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/Academic_Affairs/agendas.shtml
   Agenda was approved as presented.

3. Approval of the Minutes from the Meetings of January 16, 2007 (Action Item)
   http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/academic_affairs/meetings.shtml
   The minutes were approved as presented.

4. Chair’s report: Jim Postma
   
   Jim had no report.

5. Administrative Reports

5.1 Keith O. Boyum - Keith briefly discussed the Board of Trustees agenda. Title 5 changes to graduate/post-baccalaureate admissions are on the agenda as is Academic Program review. There will be a feature on faculty and student research-this time from San Diego State. There will also be a first reading of Access to Excellence draft. This will also been presented to various members of the legislature. The rolling out of the Professional Science Masters program is continuing. There was a recent meeting of a group of CEO’s of technology firms about the PSM. The CEO’s noted that they had not realized how important the CSU is to their work. The work on the Transforming Course Design is on fast pace. By the end of spring or early summer deliverables will be on hand. Within a day or so a memo will go the Presidents concerning adoption of Learning Management Systems. The system is seeking to leverage the size of the CSU in purchase of these systems. ATAC urged that faculty be given significant opportunity to provide feedback on these issues; this point will be stressed in the memos to the campus. ATAC meet virtually and there have been some assessments of this experiment. Chair Pasternack provided a balanced review of the experience; he especially noted the inadequacy for the sharing software to allow discussion and edits of documents. The Board of Trustees, in January, adopted a new direction in remedial education. Keith noted that
Academic Affairs had good input on this direction. A web-site has been set up, intended for sharing of best practices for effective remediation. The Council of Library Directors made a presentation to the Academic Council concerning the Virtual Library proposal. A number of resources have been purchased that are available to all campuses. This is something that the system should be doing. There is still some interaction with the Bureau of State Audits regarding textbook costs. The Bureau is surveying the CCCs, the UC and CSU system in this regard. The Vice Presidents of Student Affairs on campuses will be asked to facilitate this effort on campuses. The CSU is obviously in a better place on this than the other systems because of the work of the Task Force on Textbook costs. At the May Board meeting there will be a report on the quality of teacher preparation programs in the CSU. The current expectation is that the Board, in May, will take action on student fees. CSU, with invitations to the other systems, is advocating for buyout of student fees by the State.

Christine Hanson reported that Senator Scott has put forth the bill for the support of the Doctorate in Nursing Practice. It should be clear that we are advocating for authorization and not for funding at this time. San Diego State has already announced that it intends to put forth the first offering of this doctorate. The annual Academic Plan is on the Board Agenda next week. This year there are 70 proposals for developing new programs. A majority of these are on the graduate level. We need to make clear to the Trustees the importance of graduate education in the CSU, especially for addressing the workforce needs of California. In the Board packet many of these programs are projected for 2008 or sooner startups. The Title 5 changes are also on the Board agenda. Academic Affairs is working on program review, including a clear policy on “substantial change” and the relation to WASC. Work is also being done concerning On-Line Programs. Other policies include Certificates, and Program Discontinuance. Chris reported on the G.E. Affinity meeting: It was a very successful meeting for exchange of idea. Smaller groups looked at different area: Program Review and Assessment, funding of General Education, Integration with other programs, and facilitating a GE Hub for interchange of ideas. The group has some excellent comments on the new Executive Order 595. Jackie commented that she found the meeting very useful. An especially useful part of the meeting was informing faculty about system resources such as Community-Service Learning, ITL and even Transforming Course Design. Tapie Rohm also thought the meeting very enlightening and effective.

Questions raised to Keith: Andrea asked about a proposed joint effort with the University of Maryland. Keith responded that this is preliminary. At UM most of the instruction is in face-to-face classrooms and not on-line. What is being explored is how to make University of Maryland courses count for CSU credit. Jim noted that there are many creative things being done on campuses with regard to remediation. He hoped that these would be presented to the Board. Keith replied that there was a report given to the Board earlier based on campus activities. Jim also noted that there is already sufficient assessment in the Early Assessment programs. Jim noted a disconnect between the investment in teacher-candidate recruitment and the fact that many teachers will be getting pink slips within the next week. He queried whether there would be any attention to employment opportunities in the various evaluations. Keith answered that the emphasis is on the quality of the program and that teacher demand is a regional and campus matter. The only work on labor force is the STEM program. However, Jim noted that even many of the science teachers in Chico are receiving pink slips. On Program Discontinuance, Jim noted that no senate committee is working on a resolution on this; rather Barry sent a memo to campuses reminding them that campuses should have such policies and procedures in place and some of them have responded to the reminder by evaluating their campus structures.

Other
6. Liaison Reports

6.1 Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC): Jackie Kegley- Minutes of the meeting were sent to the ASCSU.

6.2 Admission Advisory Council: Jacinta Amaral, Vince Buck, Hank Reichman, Steven Stepanek – Steven is the new Vice Chair. The IGETC proposal was discussed. Questions were raised about the status of this revision. Is it a completely new document or is it merely incorporating the various memorandums of understanding. Discussed Troops to College and particularly how Executive Order 363 might be redrafted to deal with the question of awarding college credit for military experience. The University of Maryland has an enormous data base on articulation agreements and joint efforts with them would beneficial to the CSU in this regard. The CSU application fee was discussed and approval was given to move from $55 to $60. The number of waivers given for this fee was also a topic of discussion. Five years ago a limit was placed on number of applications to CSU to 6. The committee approved a limit of 4 under the waiver; students could apply to more campuses but would have to pay the application fee. Career Technical Education courses were also discussed. The BOARS Committee is taking primary responsibility for this and has incorporated many suggestions from the Admissions Advisory Committee. BOARS are being urged to meet the deadline for having a policy in place because if the deadline is not met, then all Career Technical Education courses would need to be accepted. Alignment of A to G with UC was discussed. There is now generally a common course pattern. There is a slight difference in the history and social sciences area.

6.3 California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP): Jacinta Amaral indicated that there will be a conference May 22nd. The conference will probably be on best practices.

6.4 CSU Ed.D. Faculty Consultation Group: Andrea Boyle, Michael Perkins, Tapie Rohm, Darlene Yee-Melichar – This group is not meeting. There is a new Ed.D. oversight group but it has not met. Probably this item should be amended on our future agendas.

6.5 Disabilities Advisory Committee: Ken Nishita – This committee will be meeting April 17th. Discussion will be focused on a survey will be given to campuses to seek feedback about revisions to the operating document. The changes in the law have already been incorporated.

6.6 Early Assessment Program Advisory Committee (EAP): Ken Nishita reported that the committee is waiting for the report on the past administration of the test. There has been an increase in the number of students taking the test. It is piggybacked on the STAR test. There is a much better understanding in the High Schools about the test and its purposes. Jim noted that with the increase in test takers, it is more difficult to compare success rates. Apparently each campus received $100,000 to deal with this effort which goes to the person interacting with local high schools regarding the test.

6.7 Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Development Committee: Jim Postma – The committee is working on new test questions. They also received a detailed analysis of the previous EAP administration.

6.8 Commission on Extended University: Michael Gorman – The commission is meeting next Friday. Three major items are on the agenda of the commission. One is the administration of RFP for innovative projects. The grants are for $50,000 and the pot of money has not changed over the years. A Legacy Website is being set up to archive these projects. President Karen Haynes is the new Chair of the Commission and she has a vision for this Commission and has proposed a retreat this June. The second item is thus expanding the vision. For example, Leo
Van Cleve is coming to talk about International programs. There is also concern about lack of clarity about the budget for the Commission. The general sense is that the Commission is energized and is seeking to develop a new vision.

6.9 General Education Advisory Committee: Maria Viera, Jim Postma – GEAC has not met recently and has no plan to meet soon.

6.10 Institute for Teaching and Learning: - The minutes of this meeting were circulated to the senate.

6.11 International Programs: Jacinta Amaral – This item will be picked up under new business.

6.12 Library Directors, Council of (COLD): Jackie Kegley reported that COLD has decided to pursue the Virtual Library concept. Many details still need to be developed in principle they fully support this direction. Jackie, with assistance from Michael Perkins will work on a resolution.

6.13 Lower Division Transfer Program Advisory Committee: Jim Postma reported that the processes of approval are ongoing and it is a major task. In some disciplines there has been a high rate of approval and in others there is a dismal rate. It is a long and hard process.

6.14 Other

7. Old Business

7.1 Resolution in Support of CSU Doctorate of Nursing Practice Degree – There has been no suggested revisions to this resolution.

7.2 The Collegiate Learning Assessment – There has been no suggested revisions to this resolution.

7.3 Revisions to EO 595: General Education – Jackie Kegley presented the proposed resolution. It was discussed and revised and approved by consensus.

7.4 Support for BOT initiative “Troops to College” (possibly in conjunction with FA and FGA) – Andreas Boyle presented the draft resolution. Michael Perkins proposed a new resolve after the third as follows: “That The Academic Senate, CSU urges the provision of student support services adequate and appropriate to the needs and requirements of this student group.” Jim Postma urged that articulation, review and approval be added to Resolve 4.

7.5 Admission to Post-Baccalaureate Standing – Stephen Stepanek presented the draft resolution. There was extensive discussion of the resolution and suggested revisions were made. Chris Hanson and Stephen will finalize the document for the Plenary tomorrow. A waiver for this resolution will be sought.

7.6 Distance Learning- Michael Perkins and Michael Gorman were to work on this issue, but at this time it was decided that there was no need for a resolution.

7.7 On-Line Course/Faculty Evaluations – Tapie Rohm was going to check on this issue with Faculty Affairs. Academic Affairs is not inclined to take on this issue.
7.8 Career Technical Education (with TEKR) – At this time this item does not require committee action.

7.9 Program Discontinuation Policies (with FA) – In February the committee requested that Barry Pasternack send a reminder to campuses that they should make sure they have Program Discontinuance Policies and, if necessary, create or revise them. Thus, this item should be removed from our agenda.

7.10 Other

8. New Items of Business

8.1 Criteria for evaluation of charges for statewide programmatic student fees – Jim noted that this item and 8.3 are the same issue. We had extensive discussion of fee issues on our campus. However, it was decided that no action is required at this time.

8.2 International Programs – Michael Gorman requested that we ask for a report on the findings from the Task Force and also inquire whether there is a need for ongoing consultation with the CSU Academic Senate on International Programs. Maria reported that they are interviewing candidates for the Director of International Studies. She recommended that we check out the website. Some of the concerns include: faculty involvement in approval; uneven quality of programs and having a clearing house.

8.3 CSU Student Fee Policy – See 8.1 above.

8.4 Other (Please identify and bring new items for discussion, referral, and resolution for our April 2008 meeting.)

9. Other

The question is whether we want to co-sponsor with Faculty Affairs a resolution entitled: “Shared Governance, Faculty Primacy in Determining Curriculum, and Principles Governing Systemwide Initiatives with Curricular Implications.” The consensus was that we would wait until the second reading stage.

10. Adjournment