Chair's Report, January 2004

Since our last plenary meeting, I've represented the Senate in a number of meetings:

IMPAC Steering Committee, November 14 and January 16. The November 14 steering committee meeting was an abbreviated one, conducted over dinner in the midst of a restaurant. IMPAC Executive Director Julie Adams distributed a draft of a memorandum of understanding between IMPAC and CAN, but it was withdrawn when I announced that parts of it were unacceptable to the CSU. Aside from a few reports from particular disciplines, there was no other significant business transacted. The January 16 meeting was especially scheduled, to last for five hours. The agenda included a number of important items. Senator Pasternack, the CSU lead faculty member for IMPAC, will report on IMPAC at more length.

CSSA Board Meeting, CSU Fullerton, November 15. I reported to the CSSA directors on our November plenary, particularly on our resolutions on fee policy and enrollment. They were also interested in our resolution on the USA Patriot Act.

CSU Academic Council, December 3. The Academic Council consists of the campus vice-presidents for academic affairs. Among the items of discussion were the budget (of course), enrollments, online applications, and the possibility of a systemwide approach to application dates.

CFA Board Meeting, December 6. I was particularly interested in discussion of Prop 56, the Budget Accountability Act, and a report by Dean Tipps, SEIU's state director, who presented insights into the situation in Sacramento. I reported to them on a variety of things, including my comments on the day before, at our conference on facilitating graduation, regarding the need to back the chancellor on the budget. I also suggested the need for us to work together for changes in AB 242, since it involves both terms and conditions as well as criteria and standards. Finally, after a discussion of CFA's spring program, the board voted to spend up to $50,000 to mobilize a large demonstration against cuts in the CSU budget. I indicated that we would like to be involved in the planning, and suggested that they should invite CSSA as well. The proposal was approved unanimously.

System Budget Advisory Committee, December 16. There was not much new information on the budget situation. The forthcoming BOT policy on student fees was discussed.

Naming Facilities Review Panel. I serve on this panel, which reviews all proposals to the Trustees to name campus buildings. My concern is always that every proposal have the support of the faculty, preferably through the academic senate or the senate executive committee. Senator may want to have a discussion with your campus senate leadership to make certain that your campus has a policy on this, and that the policy clearly establishes the role of the faculty.
**Campus Visits:** Trustee Kaiser and I visited San Diego on December 2 and Stanislaus on December 11. At San Diego, we met with the senate and took questions on a number of matters, especially the budget. Senator Rushall gave us a tour of a number of new facilities, including the new mega-lecture hall that you've all heard about, and a new, and very impressive, fitness center funded by student fees. At Stanislaus, we met with members of the senate executive committee, and again focused especially on the budget. We were especially impressed with the "green" building design for the Faculty Development Center at Stanislaus. We are scheduled to visit Los Angeles on January 20.

**Assembly Higher Education Committee Hearings on Funding Higher Education:** The final hearing of the original sequence of four will be on Tuesday, January 20. Because I had previously agreed to visit the CSULA campus that day, Cristy Jensen, chair of FGA, will represent the Senate. We can look forward to more information about that hearing during our plenary. The committee is scheduled to consider the following topics:

1. Differential funding by level of instruction.
2. Incentive funding to achieve state priorities.
3. Fee management, most likely something similar to the resolution that we passed.
4. Restructuring of financial aid.
5. Funding some demonstration projects in redesigning courses to achieve increased learning at lower cost.
6. Creating a "rainy day" fund by setting aside funds in years of increasing state revenues to be used in years of declining state revenues.
7. Community college funding.

Regarding course redesign to achieve increased learning at lower cost, I've had several discussions involving the work of the Center on Academic Technology (CAT) at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, headed by Carol Twigg. As many of you know by now, Twigg promotes redesigning classes to achieve (she claims) increased learning at lower cost through technology. I first discussed this informally with Bruce Hamlett and Keith Nitta, staff members to the Assembly Higher Education Committee. Then Trustee Kaiser and I attended the First Annual K-20 Summit Re: Teaching and Learning in the Digital Age, held in Sacramento on December 8. Twigg was the luncheon speaker.

On December 9, I attended an informal discussion arranged by Bruce Hamlett, head staff member for the Assembly Higher Education Committee. Others present included Susan Meisenhelder and David Hawkins from CFA, Jeff Vaca from the Chancellor's Office in Sacramento, representatives of faculty and administration from CCC, one person from UC, a representative from CPEC, several legislative staff members, and, of course, Carol Twigg. Twigg spoke briefly and again emphasized that the key to enhancing learning and cutting costs is select a large, lower-division survey class that operates in multiple sections and for the faculty to undertake a total redesign of a course that incorporates extensive use of technology and the transfer of many tasks to less-expensive assistants rather than high-cost faculty members. She briefly mentioned the datum that, in most universities and community colleges across the country, 1% of the courses account for 35-50% of the campus's total enrollment, and she argued that focusing on these large, introductory courses provides a large payoff for course redesign. Several times during the discussion she emphasized that these are not primarily technology projects and were definitely not distance learning projects--they are course redesign projects that use technology to enhance learning and cut costs. She also emphasized that the savings come partly from faculty salaries, partly from reducing the numbers of D-F-W grades (thus reducing the number of students who have to repeat the course), and partly from freeing up space for other uses. Most of the meeting was Q&A.
My conclusions:

- Twigg has presented a very attractive package by emphasizing enhancing learning and cutting costs. Her projects also seem to have the potential to put the course redesign objectives up front as the driver of the technology, rather than buying the technology and then trying to figure out how to make it do what we need. This is also the lesson from CMS that is reflected in the Academic Technology Initiative.
- I anticipate that there will be a proposal this spring to make funds available for demonstration projects.
- If this happens, we need to put faculty representatives (either the senate or ATAC or ITL or some special taskforce) in a position to have as much control as possible over all aspects of the projects' design, especially the goals, the selection of applicants, and the evaluation process (especially the evaluation of student learning), and we need to do everything possible to figure out how to keep the savings in the department that generates them.
- We need to begin to identify knowledgeable faculty members around the system whom we can call upon for advice and assistance.

Search Committee, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs  This committee held a telephone conversation to discuss the applications. After considerable discussion, there was consensus on six finalists, who will be interviewed by the search committee on January 29. The entire process should be complete by mid- or late February.

POL  The executive committee has completed a set of guidelines on POL, which are attached to a resolution that will be taken up at the plenary.

IMPAC  The executive committee has also completed a statement and set of proposals for basic changes in some aspects of IMPAC, which is attached. These have now been referred to ICAS for discussion and action.

You'll recall that my September report concluded with a photo of me, in front of the Kremlin. When there was no such photo in the November report, Senator Pasternack expressed his disappointment and urged that I include a photo of myself at some world landmark. In the spirit of always complying with requests from senators when it is easy to do so, here's another photo. It is now up to you to figure out where the photo was taken (more than just the city), and to come up with an appropriate caption.

Robert W. Cherny
Chair, Academic Senate, CSU
ATTACHMENT: Executive Committee Proposals regarding IMPAC

All these are proposed changes in conceptualization or governance.

1. Goals of IMPAC:
   - To facilitate dialog regarding common curricular concerns between and among faculty in the three systems of higher education in California,
   - To develop CAN descriptors for lower-division components of baccalaureate majors in the CSU and UC,
   - To support the CSU Project on Lower-division Requirements in Majors (POL), and
   - To support any comparable UC project on lower-division requirements in majors.

2. Implications of these goals:
   - Definitions:
     - "Disciplinary unit" refers to the department, program, or division that includes the faculty members responsible for the curriculum in that discipline.
     - "Disciplinary chair" refers to the department chair, program director, or division chair for the disciplinary unit.
     - "Disciplinary curriculum committee chair" refers to the chair of the committee that has primary responsibility for the curriculum of the CSU or UC disciplinary unit, including first-level approval of the requirements for the baccalaureate degree major(s) and first-level approval of courses that comprise the unit's curriculum.
   - An IMPAC disciplinary project completes its initial phase when participants reach consensus on the CAN course descriptors for courses that normally meet graduation requirements as lower-division prerequisites and requirements in the CSU baccalaureate major(s) for that discipline. For the CSU, those lower-division courses will typically be established through the Project on Lower-Division Requirements in Majors (POL). CAN course descriptors may also be developed solely through POL and be presented to the CAN Board. (There should be similar procedures for UC, if UC chooses to participate in CAN.)
   - If IMPAC participants fail to come to consensus within two years, the project shall be deemed to have failed and no further meetings shall be scheduled for a period of three years. The IMPAC Executive Committee may approve exceptions to this guideline.
   - It is not appropriate for an IMPAC project to consider courses that are taught at the upper-division level at half or more of CSU or UC campuses.
   - An IMPAC disciplinary meeting shall not be deemed valid for the purposes of drafting CAN descriptors unless half or more of the CSU campuses invited to that meeting are represented by disciplinary chairs or disciplinary curriculum committee chairs or their designees. The drafting of CAN descriptors should be by consensus of all participants. (If UC chooses to participate in CAN, there shall be the same requirement for UC disciplinary chairs, disciplinary curriculum committee chairs, or their designees.)
   - For participation by CSU faculty subsequent to completion of the initial phase:
     - Once IMPAC disciplinary projects have completed their initial phase, the second phase will begin three years later, but an earlier meeting may be scheduled by the
Executive Committee based on a request from half or more of CSU disciplinary chairs.

- At the beginning of the second phase, there shall be a follow-up meeting of CSU disciplinary chairs or their designees, through POL, to determine if that discipline's courses in CAN are still the appropriate courses for the lower-division requirements in that discipline's baccalaureate degree major(s) and if the descriptors continue to be appropriate. If so, no further action is necessary. If not, the CSU disciplinary units, through POL, should seek consensus on the appropriate changes in requirements and should develop new or revised CAN course descriptors. (If UC chooses to participate in CAN, there shall be similar procedures for UC departments.)

- Once the review by CSU disciplinary chairs, through POL, is complete, and if the CSU disciplinary chairs see reason for another IMPAC round of disciplinary discussions, that discipline should be included in the next round of IMPAC meetings, to discuss proposed changes in CAN course descriptors with other segments. (If UC chooses to participate in CAN, there shall be similar procedures for UC departments.)

- Subsequent follow-up meetings shall be held at three-year intervals to determine if there is any need to change the CAN descriptors for that discipline.
  - If UC participates in CAN, there shall be similar guidelines regarding subsequent UC participation, to be developed by UC.

3. Governance

- IMPAC Executive Committee: There shall be an IMPAC Executive Committee consisting of the head of the academic senate for each segment or his/her designee.

- The IMPAC Executive Committee shall:
  - develop and approve the annual budget, approve any changes in the budget, and authorize expenditures,
  - approve arrangements for all IMPAC meetings, including date, location, and participating disciplines,
  - select lead faculty members for each discipline after nominations by segments, and
  - evaluate each discipline's progress each year and make recommendations regarding any subsequent year, including changes in the lead faculty and determination that subsequent meetings are not likely to be productive.