

Academic Senate CSU Executive Committee
June 11-12, 2007
Minutes

Attendees

Barry Pasternack, John Tarjan, Mark Van Selst, Darlene Yee-Melichar, Rochelle Kellner, Thobaben, Jim Postma, Bernadette Cheyne, Fred Hornbeck (conference call), Bob Buckley

Guests

Faculty Trustee nominees Craig Smith and Kathy Kaiser, Alison Jones, Gary Reichard, Ann Peacock

Executive Committee

The Exec Committee approved the agenda and minutes of May 9, 2007. Systemwide committee selections were completed.

Allison Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support, met with the Executive Committee

1. CSU met with lobbyists for career technology. The presentation from the local CEOs described the high school requirements for their work. Effectively career tech + college program. CSU is training people for careers – the trend for career preparation training is away from the narrow “CTP” (career technical preparation) narrow streaming to a more general preparation for independent critical thinking. High school graduation requirements allow a student to meet the a-g requirements easily so there is no reason for career tech preparation to also count for CSU admissions. The UC requirements are not as easily met but are also from a population less likely to take a career tech prep sequence. The CSU is working with “connect-ED” to meet the requirements of the bill requiring clarity in the career tech preparation relationship to UC (SB 1543). CSU is looking at strengthening the content of career tech to meet the a-g requirements and thus the faculty expectations re: what constitutes an appropriate academic background.

Some model technology areas are being examined that include nursing and health technology. The current plan is to set the criteria against which courses would be evaluated. (area g courses). The goal is to establish a model set of standards that meet area g content requirements and thus a student who had taken career technical preparation courses would be more likely to be CSU eligible. The simplest requirements would be that there must be theory as well as application within the courses. The criteria would determine how much theory/content vs. skill/practice. One of the early models was to use magnet schools as illustrative of school programs that can relatively easily meet CSU a-g requirements. The traditional high school district career preparation programs currently vary considerably in terms of the traction they may be able to find in terms of qualifying for CSU a-g requirements.

When CSU considers admissions advisory impact, UC Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has proposed a process for defining C & D but the process dramatically under-represents the CSU.

2. A second issue concerns the applicability of military credit for academic credit. “Troops to College” is a governors initiative that makes higher education more accessible for active duty military members, their spouses, and their children by having them pay “in state” rather than “out of state” fees. Pending legislation extends this offer from one year to many years. Currently there are about 5000 veterans in the CSU system. California is the only state that does not offer education benefits for the National Guard. CSU has been working with various service officers to expand the military presence within the CSU – both active duty and veterans.

One of the thoughts is to bring the college training to the troops themselves, be it on the base, shipboard, or on duty around the world. There are some existing effective examples of this.

Another question concerns eligibility; ought there be a different standard for post-military placement into the CSU? What type of social support is available for vets to support their continued involvement with education? The military wants to work with faculty to facilitate transfer of military units to credit units. Would there be any interest in pulling together faculty to talk about the ACE guide and which courses may transfer for college level credit? Lower division transfer project or GE would likely work well at a system level. Upper division coursework acceptability is more of a departmental decision. This is a concern since many students would end up having a plethora of “post-military” elective units but have many requirements in the major not met.

A concern would be that they would have to meet the impaction criteria but then eligible members float to the top. A “dual standard” approach could be detrimental to the long-term health of the affected populations; Many would be or would displace otherwise admitted students who lack the appropriate background to succeed (i.e., many need remediation).

Additionally, there may be a differential need to provide a different type of mental health and health services to these students and/or have a different mental health/counseling resource use pattern.

Exec committee and standing committee chairs

Selection of standing committee members was completed. It was stated that the agenda for upcoming committee meetings are to be completed two week prior to the meeting date so that the agenda can be posted on the respective committee’s webpage.

The use of listserves for committee business was discussed. The members of each committee would be provided with a complete list of the members. Executive committee and chancellor’s office liaisons were selected.

Committee year end reports were discussed. All committee’s year end report will be posted.

September committee and Plenary meeting – It was decided that the Executive Committee and Standing Committee Chairs would meet at 8:30 am on Wednesday, September 5 and the committee meetings would begin at 10:00 am. The Plenary would start at 3:00 pm. Lieutenant Governor Garamendi would be invited to the Wednesday Plenary and social. If he is unable to

Barry Pasternack, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

attend, Trustee Chair Roberta Achtenberg would be invited. On Thursday, the Plenary session would begin at 8:30 and end by 3:00 pm

Senate newsletter (published 4 times per year) –A suggestion of whether to change from the current format to one addressing topical issues was discussed. In addition, it was suggested the newsletter could have a headline item, short committee reports, and members of the Senate/C.O. profiled. Further discussion to follow.

Discussion with Faculty Trustee candidates

The role of the Faculty Trustee was discussed. It was stated that the point person for the BOT is the Faculty Trustee, and the Executive Committee requested the Faculty Trustee carry the Senate agenda to the BOT as well as to stress that the Senate and CFA are different entities.

It was pointed out there was excellence interaction between the BOT and faculty during the recent *Access to Excellent* summit, held in April.

Monday, June 11 – working dinner

General discussion of *Access to Excellence*

- What is the statewide senate involvement in the review process?
- How will the continued development of the access to excellence document and related plan be structured?

Tuesday, June 12

Executive committee

1. ATAC, PTSC and ATAC appear to have the same agenda and mandate. It was suggested these two groups could be joined to a single group with a coherent function. This should lead to the group(s) having a stronger voice and provide more effective guidance.
2. CFA is meeting on June 15 and Chair Pasternack will attend. A potential meeting with CFA Executive Committee is a possibility in August. There was discussion of CFA's next year's agenda and how will it be pursued. It might be possible to bring CFA and the Senate together in an effort to defeat the CCC initiative. As individuals we can speak against tactical actions but as a larger group we ought to have a strong focus on strategy.
3. Facilitating Graduation – It may be possible to fold it into *Access to Excellence*. Student recruitment, advising, and outreach are handled very differently across different campuses.
4. ICAS/ICC – recently attended meetings were discussed.
5. DWIR Task Force – There is a draft currently with Lori Roth.
7. Textbook Task Force – There is an initial draft undergoing revision. The senate bills on textbook pricing do little to “fix” textbook prices.
8. ERFA – emeritus retired faculty association. Executive committee member will attend.
9. BOT – Executive committee will meet Monday at noon the day before the board meeting to discuss the agenda and meet with Chancellor Reed and Vice Chancellor's.
10. Orientation for first and second year senators.
 - a. Revisions will be brought for the July 8th meeting
11. Guidelines for ASCSU members
 - a. Revisions will be brought for the July 8th meeting
12. Taskforce for a-g requirements (area “g” career tech)
 - a. Career technical education: Alison will respond back to us.

Barry Pasternack, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

- b. Senators Kellner, Buckley, and Geurin will represent the senate
 - c. The law confines technical education classes to area “g”
13. ASSIST task-force – Senator Tarjan will be the designee.

There will be a communication from the chair that each senator must be aware of the actions of their committee. The senior senator for each committee will be responsible for ensuring that a senator will be responsible for forwarding the minutes for each meeting to the senate.

Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

Access to Excellence – The 2006/07 Academic Senate CSU Executive committee will remain as the ASCSU representatives to the steering committee. The final version of the annotated outline, which will be posted on the *Access to Excellence* website as soon as it is approved by the steering committee, will serve as the basis for the first draft of the plan. That draft will be produced over the summer and, after approval by the steering committee, will be circulated within the CSU for comment, probably via the website.

Following the posting of the first draft of the plan, there will be two-to-three stakeholders’ summits during the fall; composition and timing of these summits has yet to be determined by the steering committee (possible participants might be K-14 partners; advocacy/civil-rights groups (underserved, community-based organizations); policy-makers; and business/economic interests. After each summit, there would be time for reaction. The intent of the summits will be to both provide and seek information.

In terms of timelines, the revised draft is envisioned in early 2008. The ASCSU will endeavor to have a primary author of the first draft at the November Plenary so that the statewide senate can directly feed into the drafting process. The *Access to Excellence* website is developing into a rich trove of information.

Topics of discussion:

1. New research initiatives and partnerships
 - i. Academic Affairs hopes to sponsor at least 10 meetings of multi-campus personnel looking at funding for research areas that cover multiple areas of expertise, especially based across several centers/campuses.
 - ii. There is probably a role for the system in supporting EDD related research funding.
2. Searchable resource database on research interests/ expertise – A digital storage of research interests so that the expertise within the CSU system is available both internally and externally
3. Ramp-up Academic Affairs collaboration with the office of public information within the CO.
4. There will be an effort over the fall to develop a strategic plan at the Chancellor’s Office level in the area of community-based service learning, drawing from the campus CSL strategic plans now in development. This is a priority item.
5. Nursing – There is a capacity study underway. The CO is exploring a Doctorate in Nursing Science (DNP/DNS) and it may be possible that the State would provide augmented funding for such action. In addition, in response to State need and legislative support, there is an increase in the number of nurse practitioners that are produced by the CSU. There is partial augmentation from Sacramento.

6. There is a survey underway at the current time looking at remediation in the narrow sense of math and English readiness. “Fully remediated” generally refers to coursework as opposed to study skills. The latter may need to be addressed in the future—possibly through the first-year experience programs that campuses are developing. Trustee Carter’s goal in requesting the report on remediation for the September Board meeting is to produce follow-up action to update BOT policy with respect to the long-standing goal of achieving 90% preparedness.
7. Transforming course design. – \$300,000 in grants have been allocated this summer to enhance and accelerate course transformations through innovative collaborations across the CSU. The goal is to advance student learning quite broadly. The president’s academic transformation paper was central in starting the program and has been handed off to the appropriate curricular authorities for implementation.
8. Online course development – There will be a marketing survey then further development. ATAC will be involved
9. EAP is expected to see another 10% increase in number of 11th-graders who take the test. In the coming year, the CSU intends to develop an effective accountability and assessment system.
10. LDTP – Anticipate, by mid-year, beginning of the development of web-based capabilities for students to use these patterns. The technology side of this issue has to be addressed. There is CSU Mentor, ASSIST, etc. that have to be integrated.
11. Troops to College – Congress has shown a lot of interest in the CSU idea as adopted by Governor Schwarzenegger. An important issue is to decide how much military training may be accepted as ameliorating what would otherwise be judged as inadequate high school preparation on the part of the applicant.
12. Facilitating graduation – The hope is that the ASCSU will provide leadership regarding future actions. Much of this initiative may be able to be folded into *Access to Excellence*.
13. As it is revitalized in the coming year, ITL may come to play an important support role for many of the campus initiatives that are being developed.
14. EDD implementation – The first seven campus programs are expected to be up and running in fall 2007, following final WASC approval; the four second-wave campuses are progressing in developing their proposals. Smaller campuses and campuses without prior joint-doctoral experience are benefiting from the experiences of the first-wave campuses.
15. CCC proposition – The CSU has taken no position on this proposition; there is a possibility that CTA could oppose the infringement on Proposition 98.
16. Board items of interest for the fall – in July there will be a report on a pipeline for diversity (number and flow, esp. vis-à-vis STEM disciplines); September – remediation report, the principle of charging an MBA professional fee (if recommended), textbook task force, applied research presentation (faculty/student teams). In November – demonstration of CSUMentor and in November or January a report on LDTP and a report from the Drops/Withdrawals/Incomplete/Repeats (DWIR) task-force.

Meeting adjourned 12:30

Future meetings:

- Agenda setting: Monday July 9th, 2:00 pm with Chancellor Reed and Vice Chancellor’s Reichard, McLain, West, and General Council Helwick. BOT Meeting Tuesday, Wednesday, July 10 and 11.
- CSSA executive committee Tuesday July 10th at 11AM room 210