Executive Committee Minutes for April 7, 8, 2005
Thursday, April 7, 8:30 pm – 10:00 am Anacapa Room
2:00-4:00 Chair’s Office
Friday, April 8, 8:30 - 2:30pm Munitz Room

Attendees: Cristy Jensen, Marshelle Thobaben, David McNeil, John Tarjan
Visitors: Jim Blackburn (Student Academic Support, CO), Kathy Kaiser, Keith Boyum, John Karras, Judy Osman, Kathy Kaiser (Faculty Trustee), Ann Peacock (ASCSU Exec. Dir.)
Standing Committee Chairs: Jan Gregory (FA), Ted Anagnoson (AA), Hank Reichman (FGA)

1. CSU Transfer Initiatives
   a. LDTP Patterns
      i. Campus-specific units (15) are late in coming forward, are being modified by campuses.
      ii. The campus-specific units have proved to be more difficult than the statewide pattern.
   b. Course Numbering/Descriptors
      i. Faculty will develop the descriptors
      ii. The ASCSU will take the lead in developing faculty groups
      iii. The groups should have CCC representation, majority CSU participation
      iv. Descriptors should have student learning outcomes, be as complete a template as possible
      v. We need a method for approving course descriptors (75% of campuses offering the program)
      vi. Should the group doing the reviews be the same as the group developing the descriptors? The consensus is yes.
      vii. The chair of the group would be the nexus of communications with many groups. It may appear that this person soon be perceived as a quasi bureaucrat.
   c. The processes we develop apply to both statewide and campus-specific portions of the pattern
   d. The existing CAN descriptors should be considered valid until they are replaced by new CSU descriptors.
   e. The development, review of service courses needs to be addressed.
2. Why has CAN been discontinued?
   a. We have worked for two years to develop a process to meet the directives in SB 1785.
   b. There was a disagreement over the role of IMPAC in developing descriptors.
   c. The only segment that felt urgency to get the process completed was the CSU.
   d. The CSU needed to push ahead to deal with SB 1785.
   e. There were also personnel issues but they were not determinate in forcing this change.

3. What will happen to the money devoted to CAN?
   a. $545,000 goes to CCC campuses and is probably used for general articulation activities.
   b. $850,000 comes from Prop 98 funds through CCC
   c. The remaining $300,000 may need to be used for IMPAC, something else.
   d. CSU contributes about $154,000 to CAN. This money will be used for our new system.

4. A flow chart illustrating tasks, players in the overall LDTP processes was reviewed. Patterns, descriptors will be widely available electronically.

5. The timeline is very short to:
   a. Develop the data elements for course descriptors
   b. Develop a process for developing/approving course descriptors and soliciting/reviewing CCC course offerings.

6. Recommendations Regarding ATAC Groups to Facilitate Faculty Development
   a. These groups could be formed around disciplines.
   b. They can also be formed around topics such as writing across the curriculum and critical thinking.
   c. We will ask Cristy about the discipline groups.

7. AB 1452 (Nuñez) about the collection of demographic data in the admissions process.
   a. The administration is not supporting this bill.
   b. It will be referred to academic affairs and FGA.

8. Review of Lobby Days
   a. Attendance was down.
   b. The legislative program was thin.
   c. There was no orientation, pre-lobby briefing.
   d. We may want to attempt to lobby the governor’s staff directly relative to the budget.
9. Relationships between ASCSU and CO leadership were discussed.

10. LDTP Timeline, Procedures
   a. Disciplines have sub-fields, making agreement on descriptors more difficult.
   b. Could we use LDTP groups as the approval body for the course descriptors?
   c. Who should have a vote in course descriptors? Only campuses that require the course in their pattern?
   d. Tasks yet to be accomplished in this cycle
      i. Develop procedures for establishing the groups which will develop/propose course descriptors.
      ii. Appoint the course descriptor groups (same as the CSU course review teams?)
      iii. Develop procedures for approving course descriptors (LDTP and campus-specific both).
      iv. Approve course descriptors.
      v. Publicize course descriptors.
      vi. Develop procedure for establishing the CSU Course Review Teams.
      vii. Appoint the CSU Course Review Teams.
      viii. Solicit CCC course offerings for review.
      ix. Review courses.
      x. Communicate results of the review.
      xi. Publicize the results of the review.

11. Accountability Item 10—tabled until next year.


   a. Discussion on assigned time.
   b. Attendance at committee meetings, plenaries needs further attention.
   c. Conserving travel funds may be an issue.
   d. Job descriptors for senate positions. For next ExComm?
   e. Responsibilities for senate appointees. In a letter?
   f. Senators need to understand that they do not speak for the entire senate on boards, task forces, committees, etc.

14. New Business
   a. 21st Century Report—tabled until next year.
   b. Standing committee structure
i. student affairs/issues are not adequately represented—to TEKR for consideration of revision of charge in by-laws

ii. workload is uneven

c. Senate Ed Committee Meetings (13th, 20th)

i. SB 5—perhaps will not come out of committee

ii. SB 724 (applied docs)

iii. Trustee Confirmation

d. BOT Orientation—should be planned for next year. Vice Chair Achtenberg wishes to increase communication between Trustee and ASCSU committees (Ed Policies and Academic Affairs & Gov Affairs and FGA).

e. Invitees for May Plenary

i. Trustee Guzman Moore—Questions to be asked/topics to be addressed?

1. Access vs. success.

2. Graduate education.

3. Quality of our graduates/college experience.

4. Role of the Board in ensuring continuing high quality among CSU faculty.

5. David will prepare a packet for Melinda.

ii. Charles Reed

iii. David Spence

iv. Trustee Kathy Kaiser

v. CSSA—Manal Yamout

FRIDAY, APRIL 8th

15. The LDTP descriptor development, course approval process was discussed.

a. The timeline is short

b. Faculty prerogatives concerning curriculum need to be addressed.

c. The Tarjan draft document was discussed.

d. A draft policies/procedures document will be shared with people involved in LDTP for feedback prior to our May meeting. It will take the form of a letter from David McNeil.

16. ATAC Appointments

a. We need 3-4 discipline groups which could be convened this year to examine how technology could be used to facilitate discipline interaction and sharing of resources.

b. The focus should be on teaching and learning.

c. Perhaps existing councils could be asked for suggestions.
d. Perhaps areas such as writing across the curriculum and critical thinking could be the basis of these groups.

e. Perhaps the groups could be chosen across discipline areas such as humanities, social science, traditional sciences

f. Perhaps campus teaching/learning centers could be tapped to nominate participants

g. Perhaps we could consult with faculty already involved with technology at Chico, other campuses.

h. Perhaps the GE course review committee (who use OSCAR) could be asked

17. ICAS Transfer Document

   a. Is being reviewed for accuracy by John Karras.
   b. The Executive Committee reviewed the edited document.

18. Spence Commendation

   a. The language was perfected.

19. Meeting with Drs. Spence and Boyum

   a. Post-CAN, LDTP were discussed.
   b. The relationship with CCC was discussed.
   c. Applied doctorate (SB 724) testimony on April 13th.
      i. The CO will have representatives
      ii. ASCSU chair, vice-chair will attend

d. Facilitating Graduation

   i. The Trustee item will indicate that campuses will review and update plans. In the fall campus representatives may be called together to update and refresh the plans.
   ii. Perhaps we could get provosts and campus senate chairs together for a preliminary conference in May. Agendas for next fall university days could borrow from this conference.

   e. Spence Replacement—no news to report.

20. Committee Agendas

   a. Academic Affairs
      i. Athletics
      ii. Remediation
      iii. LDTP—discussion with Keith Boyum, development of procedures
      iv. New SAT—weighting of sections
      v. Price of Textbooks
      vi. Extended University—Ed McAleer
vii. Consideration of model policies on repeats, withdrawals, declaration of major, etc.

viii. 21st Century report revision

ix. COLD issues
   1. Information competency is contained in the strategic plan. This should probably be carefully reviewed.
   2. ExComm, Academic Affairs will draft feedback on the COLD strategic plan.
   3. The ASCSU role in filling this position was discussed.

b. Faculty Affairs
   i. Consideration of the survey of business deans as per EUD is postponed.
   ii. Access to info technology for the disabled.
   iii. Censorship of textbooks.
   iv. Resolution on FERP
   v. Resolution on merit pay
   vi. Resolution on salary issues
      1. perhaps a general statement could be included
      2. perhaps the AAUP data could be included
      3. Perhaps Kegley, Cherny and McNeil could draft a private letter to Chancellor on these issues. This could be addressed to the Chancellor and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board of Trustees.

c. Fiscal & Governmental Affairs
   i. Review of lobby days
      1. perhaps a follow-up with the Governor’s staff would be appropriate
   ii. Will discuss the CPEC study—perhaps a joint resolution with FA
   iii. Individual student identifiers
      1. the federal government may start requiring
      2. the Nunez bill was discussed
   iv. Budget priorities resolution
   v. Legislative staff award