Academic Affairs Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, May 7, 2008
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

CSU Chancellor’s Office – Anacapa Room

Present: Jacinta Armaral, Fresno; Vince Buck, Fullerton; James Postma, Chico; Jacquelyn Kegley, Bakersfield; Andrea Boyle, San Francisco; Fullerton; Ken Nishita, Monterey Bay; Michael Gorman, San Jose; Michael Perkins, San Diego; Henry Reichman, East Bay; Tapie Rohm, Dominguez Hills. Steven Stepanek, Northridge; Maria Viera, Long Beach

Guests: Christine Hanson and Keith Boyum.

Absent: None

1. Welcome: Call to Order: James Postma, Chair – Jim announced that Barbara Swerkes will be coming to the committee to discuss LDTP. Our committee and APEP will then meet after lunch.

2. Approval of the Agenda (Action Item) – LDTP was added to the agenda.

3. Approval of the Minutes from the Meetings of April 4, 2008 (Action Item) – The minutes were approved as presented.

4. Chair’s report: Jim Postma

5. Administrative Reports
   5.1 Keith O. Boyum – Reported on a meeting of the LDTP Advisory Committee and two pilot projects, one at East Bay and the other at Northridge intended to increase student access to information needed for transfer and possible connections to a CC Associates Degree. The CCC faculty again raised a number of concerns about LDTP and transfer. SB 1288 (the Nursing Doctorate bill) appears to be moving. It does not appear likely that CSU, at this time, will pursue other doctorates such as in audiology. The decision about the graduate business fee by the Board has been postponed until a later Board meeting. The CO is working with East Bay and AFES on a project to offer on-line curriculum overseas and in the U.S. to military personnel and retirees. There will also be a needs assessment conducted by AFES. It is clear that a large number of armed services enlisted personnel do not have a university degree.

   5.2 Christine Hanson – The Ed.D. programs at East Bay, Stanislaus, and Northridge have been approved and sent to CPEC. Dealings with CPEC have been problematic and misunderstandings have occurred. However now it appears that it appears that CEPC does not want to see degree proposals until they have been approved by the Chancellor and Board. There is work proceeding on changes in procedures for approving programs and this will
come to the committee in the future. Some issues include definitions of “substantial change”
and move from state-support to self-support.

5.3 Barbara Swerkes – LDTP: Almost two years of the course review process has been
completed. Barbara distributed a summary of the activity involved. She also shared a copy
of an e-mail from Barry Pasternack that proposes an alternative course verification process.
This is parallel to the process used within the CSU, namely, sending a checklist to
Department Chairs which when completed will come back to the review committee and then
approved if it follows the criteria for a LDTP descriptor. Within the LDTP Committee there
is no agreement on this proposal and thus the opinion of the Academic Affairs Committee is
being sought. Jim Postma noted that the curriculum process within the CCC is much more
top-down and the faculty do not “own” the curriculum in the same sense as do CSU faculty. It
is the articulation officers who are the key players. He also sees the sign-off process as more
appropriate to non-professional settings. Stephen Stepanek affirmed the view that CCC
faculty are not involved in LDTP and are often not even aware of this project. Self-reporting
also raises a conflict with accreditation. Jackie Kegley also reported an occasion of a course
that had been rejected in the course review process and when follow-up occurred with the
Department Chair and faculty member it became clear that there was a clear disconnect with
what was actually being taught in the course and the material submitted for review. Ken and
Hank both suggested that a self-verification approach pilot might be useful to test this. Keith
reported that we have several pilot projects already in process with the Community Colleges
and this would be a venue for a test. Barbara pointed out that 21 Community Colleges have
not submitted any courses for review. The CCC faculty members have repeatedly
encouraged faculty-faculty interchanges and there are several pilot projects, one in chemistry
and one in business, that seek to do this. Jim Postma suggested that different problems such
as lab requirements, or prerequisites, or non-participation might be the subject of different
pilot projects. The consensus seems to be no support for trading the present process for this
self-report, self-verification process. However, there appeared to be support for considering
some variant of this self-report, verification process in a refresh situation, especially after
some pilot projects.

6. Liaison Reports

6.1 Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC): Jackie Kegley –
There was a show-and-tell by Mike Kerb, CSULA, the Developmental Math Coordinator and
Silvia Heuback, Math Department Chair on their “Transforming Course Design” project. There
was also extensive discussion on a goal of the Presidents’ Council to encourage multi-campus
on-line instruction. Concerns raised included: possible barriers, faculty development, student
issues, workload and intellectual property, the possibility of offering on-line General Education
courses, and online degrees. Three documents related to information security policies were
distributed. Concerns were raised concerning faculty consultation and whether these
consultant-initiated documents really fit with the CSU environment. There was a brief Digital
Marketplace prototype demonstration.

6.2 Admission Advisory Council: Jacinta Amaral, Vince Buck, Hank Reichman, Steven Stepanek –
This group would be meeting next week. There was discussion of the eligibility study report.

6.3 California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP): Jacinta Amaral (May 22) – There will be a
conference in Sacramento in late May.
6.4 CSU Ed.D. Advisory Committee: Jim Postma – This group has not met.

6.5 Disabilities Advisory Committee: Ken Nishita (April 17) – There was a written report on this meeting. Ken reported that *Troops to College* was a major item of discussion. There was also discussion of a Civil Rights issue at San Bernardino.

6.6 Early Assessment Program Advisory Committee (EAP): Ken Nishita – There was no report since the committee had not met.

6.7 Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Development Committee: Jim Postma – This group has not met.

6.8 Commission on Extended University: Michael Gorman – There was discussion of *Troops to College*. An *Innovative Projects* initiative is being established to honor Extended Education Dean Ed McAleer. There was a “Mind Mapping” exercise to produce an Action Plan for the Commission.

6.9 General Education Advisory Committee: Maria Viera, Jim Postma – This group has not met since the last Academic Affairs meeting.

6.10 Institute for Teaching and Learning: No liaison – There was no report.

6.11 International Programs: Jacinta Amaral and Michael Gorman – both argued that there is much confusion about what “International Programs” means in general and on campuses.
   a. CSU International Programs Planning Group: The report was distributed to the committee. The committee decided that it would not develop a resolution on this report for the Plenary.
   c. Potential Resolution: Voting Rights for International Program (IP) Coordinator Liaisons: The committee needs clarification on who Coordinator Liaisons are, their roles, and also on the business that comes to the Council for vote. It was decided to table this potential resolution, which means it can be taken up again next year.

6.12 Library Directors, Council of (COLD): Jackie Kegley – This group is meeting now at CSU Channel Islands.

6.13 Lower Division Transfer Program Advisory Committee: Jim Postma – LDTP has already been discussed.

6.14 Other

7. **Old Business**

7.1 Senate 2nd Reading Item: Approval of Revised Executive Order 595: “CSU General Education Breadth Requirements” – There was a discussion of the use of the verb “will” and a number of
the members of the committee were uncomfortable statement of student learning outcomes. However, it was decided to not make this an issue at this time. {For a bit of humor- A suggested summary was that the committee discussed a Derridian view of signification and Hank Reichmann thought this was all “load of crap.”}

7.2 Senate 2nd Reading Item: Academic Senate of the CSU Support of the “Troops to College” Initiative – this appears fine.

7.3 Support for the Virtual Library Proposal – this resolution is fine.

7.4 Other

8. New Items of Business

8.1 International Programs Planning Group Report – see above discussion. Leo Van Cleve joined us at 3 p.m. to provide information on ACIP. The Coordinator Liaisons choose the four from their number who sit on the ACIP.

8.2 Report of the Joint Committee on Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness – Jim Postma reported that Chico has developed a set of “Best Practices” relevant to evaluation of teaching that he believes is well done. He will distribute this to committee members. The committee decided to defer this item to next year.-

8.2 Other: Joint meeting with APEP at 1:30 – The Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee recommends using a checklist with a limited number of programs and cases for LDTP course approval. This would be the process for soliciting follow-up information. This would bypass a need for a write-up of the course of record because it seems to be a revision of the submitted description. This could also constitute a pilot project. After much discussion and with assurance that discipline faculty are in charge of the process, it was agreed that the committees (AA & APEP) approve this process.

8.3 The committee reviewed the draft of the Annual Report for the Academic Affairs Committee. Reference to on-line instruction was added as well as the issue of faculty credit for products in which they no longer participate. ACIP and SET Best Practices were also added for items for next year’s committee.

9. Other

10. Adjournment: The committee adjourned at 3:10 p.m.