Academic Senate Executive Committee  
August 18, 2006  
Minutes

Attendees:  
Marshall Cates, Barry Pasternack, Paul Persons, and Marshelle Thobaben

Visitors:  
Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi (Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs), Ann Peacock (ASCSU Executive Director) Gary Reichard (Executive Vice Chancellor) and Lori Roth (Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs)

Executive Committee Meeting

Approval of the Agenda
1. The agenda was approved  
2. Minutes of July 17-18 were approved  
3. The Executive Committee (including ASCSU Executive Director) discussed and clarified our expectations for the proposed draft of the Planning Beyond Cornerstones: committee structure, process and timetable  
   Issues discussed:  
   a. Membership on the steering committee  
      i. ASCSU should be included  
      ii. Faculty inclusion  
   b. Should there be a cumulating conference?  
   c. Should there be a formal update of the Cornerstone document before a strategic plan or is the strategic plan the update of Cornerstones?  
   d. Is the strategic plan synonymous with Cornerstones?  
   e. We will seek information on desired outcomes before recommending membership.
4. The Executive Committee including visitors  
   What is the outcome of this planning process? Is it separate from Cornerstones? Reichard responded that a report to the Board of Trustees on the accomplishments of the previous Cornerstones report will be given, and a new “post-Cornerstones” document is envisioned. The strategic plan is synonymous with the new “post-Cornerstones” plan. Reichard envisions that this will be a combined planning and implementation document.

Reichard said it is intended there will be full campus discussion. Meaningful input from campuses is important from the beginning. A Cornerstones report card will first be sent to the Board and this will begin the process. The Steering Committee would flesh out the Board report and send to the campuses those issues that needed comment. This is not to constrain the campus meetings, but would assure that some of the key issues be addressed. The hope is that a campus will spend a day in conversations, and that they will address system issues that could help drive the system goal. Reichard stated that by providing questions and/or issues, the Steering Committee could focus the campus discussions. The Committee would collect information from campus meetings and the Academic Senate CSU
(ASCSU) before setting up regional summits (after discussion, it was decided that a single system-wide summit would be preferable; see below). Examples of larger issues might be: Graduate Education, Globalization, Research, Sustainability, Civic Engagement, (Access and Excellence)

Reichard spoke about the Steering Committee Membership. It was agreed that even if the membership of the current ASCSU Executive Committee changes, the original members of the Senate Executive Committee would continue. Also, it was agreed that the Committee would include the Faculty Trustee, three junior faculty members who have tenure, less than 15 years experience, and who have campus Senate experience. On the Steering Committee there is to be one undergraduate and one graduate student (recommended by CSSA); one member (recommended by the Alumni Council); and two individuals from outside the CSU (one member from P-12; and one member from industry). In addition, Reichard stated that Trustees, including student trustees, Presidents and Provosts would be asked to volunteer to serve on the steering committee up to specified limits for each group. It was noted that the Steering Committee would meet prior to October 19, if possible.

Reichard emphasized that Statewide Senators should be part of each campus group and training. Letters from the Steering Committee will specifically mention statewide senators as expected members of campus teams. Senators will participate through their own campus teams. It is proposed that in April 2007 a CSU-wide “Issue Summit” will be held for the purpose of discussing major issues and ideas from campus discussions with recommendations formulated and sent to the Steering Committee (this summit would replace the proposed “regional summits” in the draft under discussion). It is also proposed that in May 2007, there will be a first draft of the final plan followed by a fall dissemination of the draft strategic plan to campuses, with a request for feedback by November 2007. In December 2007 – January 2008 it is proposed that the Steering Committee will consider suggestions for revision to the strategic plan, circulate the revised draft and prepare an item for the Board of Trustees for information in March 2007 and approval at the May 2007 meeting.

Evaluation of Achievements Under Cornerstones
Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi reported the initial summary assessments of the CSU Academic Affairs senior staff with respect to individual Cornerstones principles, as follows:
Principle 1: Standards for the major have been dealt with, but not in regard to the baccalaureate degree as a whole.
Principle 2: Has been done well.
Principle 3: Completed.
Principle 4: Reports have been made on how to close the gap.
Principle 5: Good progress with EAP and LDTP.
Principle 6: Continued work needs to be done.
Principle 7 and 8: Continued work needs to be done.
Principle 9: Completed.
Principle 10: Completed.
Enrollment issues should also be considered in reviewing Cornerstones.

Tools for Assessing the Baccalaureate

Roth stated that some campuses have participated in various assessments of the baccalaureate, but there is no mandate to participate. Roth stated that it is expected there will be some legislative interest in having participation of all campuses.

Some examples of assessment currently used are:

1. Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)
   The CLA compares what students know when they start college with what they know when they finish. There are four CSU campuses that have administered the assessment

2. ICT Literacy Assessment
   This literacy assessment measures seven different skill areas of information and communication technology literacy. The CSU was involved in the creation of ICT.

3. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
   Several CSU campuses participated as a consortium in NSSE. This survey collects information to assess the extent to which students engage in good educational practices.

Graduate Education

Reichard commented that there is an ongoing discussion regarding applied doctorate degrees. The strategic need for applied doctorate degrees is a system issue, not a regional issue. Additional help is needed in funding access for graduate programs. Reichard commented that the report The Place of Graduate Education in the CSU is a good report for stimulating ideas. This report will be distributed to the ASCSU and Campus Senate Chairs.