



Academic Senate CSU

Plenary Minutes

Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium

Wednesday November 12, 2008 4:00 p.m. — 5:00 p.m.

Thursday November 13, 2008 8:30 a.m. — 3:00 p.m.

1. Call to order (4:04 PM Wednesday)
2. Roll call:
 - Quorum was confirmed
 - New senators were welcomed
3. Approval of agenda:
 - No reordering was requested
 - Agenda was approved
4. Approval of minutes: approved as amended
5. Announcements:
 - Request for senators to self-nominate for task-forces on dual-degrees (multiple institutions) and joint self-support/state-support programs. A call was sent out on email.
6. Presentations/Introductions
 - 6.1 Katherine Stevenson (Time Certain, 9:00 a.m. Thursday, November 13) Presentation on Transforming Course Design
 - Math course submitted to “transforming course design” – “college algebra”
 - Focus of course ‘feels’ far away from major.
 - Failure rate of 60-70%
 - Pulled ‘general math’ constituencies out from ‘business math’
 - The preparation for the course is wildly variable across students.
 - There were some common experience across sections (shared exam questions, shared practice questions, etc.)
 - Students in supplemental instruction sections did very well. Students in other supplemental instruction sections did not do well. Students who did not participate in the supplemental instruction sections did poorly. The actual “in course” focus was variable across instructors. There were two issues to be addressed: (1) background preparation (2) heterogeneity in course coverage. The background mathematics test was used as a placement test to allocate students to appropriate mathematical instruction. Those students without appropriate background were required to take a laboratory course. The laboratory sections were not associated with particular lecture sections. The laboratory focus guides the faculty member in terms of desired course content. The student gains experience via the lab with (a) a successful student who has taken the course before, (b) a successful

Academic Senate CSU

graduate student, and (c) a cohort experience. The online homework is common for all sections.

- The online assessment provides tailored feedback on particular areas of weakness. Spring 2008 was the first full implementation.
- With movement from having new graduate students “teach” to having new graduate students “run lab” for a couple years prior to teaching – this has the consequence of leading to better qualified teachers.
- Northridge tailors students to course sequences.
- Q: Poor quantitative preparation seems to be fixed by devoting additional resources. This seems to follow naturally. What evidence is there that separate streams of math are required? A: Students served define content-relevance as important; also, specific majors have requested the math questions follow discipline relevant content.
- Q: how does the fiscal side of this work? A: students no longer teach courses (at student $n=30$), they instruct labs and the class sizes increased accordingly (student $n=60$). The “extra” course students sign up for pay for a substantial chunk of the cost of the additional resources provided. The move to online questions decreases the need for as many mathematics undergraduates (and thus ensures a sufficient supply of students for the laboratory sections).
- Q: this approach follows CSU CI where proficiency exams guide students to take longer in some of the introductory courses. This is student selected and is student-empowering. At Maritime Academy, the small sections that necessarily exist are supplemented by multi-modal approaches as described. One of the benefits from such diversity of approaches used within a single course is that student pay-offs are large. A: The multiple modality approach used here prescribes what needs to happen rather than leaving it entirely up to the student.
- Q: students in the course use “ALEKS” the online system for tutorial support. Who pays for this? A: ALEX costs \$40 per student as the “textbook” for the laboratory for the section of the course.
- Q: “transforming course design” is an unfortunate name; the initial percept was that the CO had invested in technology and thus technology should be used as the hammer to “fix” pedagogy. The current activities to re-envision course components to assist success in the courses demonstrate potential successes for such approaches.
- Q: how much of the gain is due to ‘newness’ and ‘extra commitment’? A: this is always a concern. The hope is that structural changes are sufficient to protect most of the gains made. The intent was to make the changes mostly independent of leadership.
- Q: K-12 does not supply the resources for students to know that they are “deficient” in what the CSU considers as “math ready”. Is there the opportunity to ‘move back’ and allow some of these interventions earlier into the educational sequence. A: this would be useful.

Academic Senate CSU

7. Reports:

7.1 Chair

- Chairs report was posted on the Senate web site.
- Information technology policy: The deadline for responses was moved back in response to campus feedback.
- Campus student representatives will meet with the Chancellor on Friday
- CSU impaction: will be voted on at the BoT meeting
- Statewide senators and campus senate chairs were asked to forward “budget stories” to Senator Barrett who will collate them and forward to Robert Turnage to use in a report to Sacramento on the impact of budget cuts on the CSU.
- Chair Tarjan attended the ASCCC plenary last week.
- ICAS will next meet on Dec. 2nd
- Comment: kudos for a quick and informative response to concerns about the “transforming course design” question from the history chairs.
- Comment: CFA is also seeking “budget stories” of the type identified by Senator Barrett.
- Comment: Campus senate chairs were instrumental in pushing back the date for the campus responses to IT policy.

7.2 Standing Committees

AA (Postma):

- AA will bring forth four resolutions.
- There was a discussion with Keith Boyum and Jim Blackburn around implementation of EO-1037 (drops and withdrawals). This EO tightens up the requirements. The need for additional clarity before implementation was requested.

APEP (Stepanek):

- There was discussion of the LDTP project
- There was discussion on the Troops to College Initiative (and the resultant [now draft] MOU with the University of Maryland)
- There was discussion on the current status of Career technical Education
- APEP will bring forth one resolution (co-sponsorship)

FA (McNamara):

- FA will bring forth three resolutions
 - constructive engagement between CFA and CO on reopener [waiver, FGA will cosponsor]
 - protection of instruction
 - collection of faculty survey data
- The Student detained in Iran has been released on bail.

FGA (Barrett):

- John Travis on budget and contract reopener
- Alison Jones on systemwide impaction
- discussion on enrollment management

Academic Senate CSU

- Legislative update (new legislators, new dynamics)
- Discussion on what would constitute “quality budget indicators”
- FGA lobby effort options

7.3 Other committees and committee liaisons

- LDTP (Swerkes)
 - Joint meeting following up on September resolution was a success. The meeting produced some excellent discussion, clear sharing of perspectives. There are very real perceptual differences in terms of the direction of the LDTP project. The meeting led to a commitment to produce a joint statement of principles. The two person writing group produced a document that, ultimately, the CCC leadership did not want to sign off on. At this point the CCC asked for confirmation that LDTP was not designed to eliminate all campus to campus articulation. The statement forthcoming from Chair Tarjan and EVC Reichard attested to this. The statement was well received by the ASCCC.
 - More than 500 courses have been submitted for the Fall/08 submission cycle. This represents a substantial increase in the number of course submissions relative to previous cycles.
 - There is recognition within the CCCs that LDTP is not going away.
 - The LDTP Steering Committee has been asked to review the pathways included within the University of Maryland MOU (Troops to College).
- Q: there are larger and larger numbers of “pending” courses with the current cycle... why?
A: technical difficulties in the April review.
- CLA Task-Force (Nelson)
- GEAC (Baaske)
 - AP and IBAC test credits towards graduation
 - Troops to College (MOU with the University of Maryland)
 - Draft roadmaps were included in the MOU
 - GE Breadth articulation by self-certification for new CCCs. It has been proposed to use the same procedure for the University of Maryland.
 - LDTP will examine the MOU roadmaps for evaluation of consistency
- COMPASS (baaske)
 - University of Wisconsin and University of Oregon participating partners
 - “high impact practices” in GE
 - COMPASS builds upon LEAP outcomes (incorporated into CSU GE outcomes)
 - summer of 2010 conference demonstrating “best practices”
 - the project is designed to increase engagement in learning with the goal of increasing graduation rates

Academic Senate CSU

7.4 Richard West (Time Certain, 4:30 p.m. Wednesday, November 12)

- introduced Ben Quillian (his successor)
- The 08/09 budget is now in its fourth revision
 - There are fundamental budget issues that are not being dealt with
 - The special session does not hold much promise even though the fiscal picture keeps getting worse. There are only ten possible “work days” to achieve a solution. The only reason to believe that anything may break loose is that the budget situation for the state of California is getting to be truly awful.

Q: what was your favorite year during your service?

A: any year the budget is good is a good year; every year has been a good year within the CSU. The mission and people of the CSU are special.

Q: Birmingham pays for its universities through a separate fund. It had to increase tuition to compensate for lower budget numbers.

A: There has been very little discussion in Sacramento concerning student fees. In terms of the Governors proposal to meet budget requirements the proposed furloughs would not occur within the CSU.

Q; the LAO report appears weak. What are your thoughts.

A: the LAO has the job of providing alternatives to the legislature. They are serving this role.

7.5 Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

Dr. Keith Boyum currently has less than a week left of service in his current capacity. The search team is about to finalize its “short list” of candidates for this position. The hope is to appoint Keith’s successor prior to the December holiday.

A second search is underway for the State University dean of extended education. The conclusion of this search is hoped to be completed by January.

There are several upcoming BoT items of interest. The accountability plan for A2E is the final board action on A2E. The open period of comment on the draft has produced a number of comments, the vast majority of which were incorporated into the final document. The indicators and metrics section should be of particular interest to the senate. The majority of these indicators can be obtained from existing work – An explicit effort was made to use existing indicators where possible for the biennial report to the BoT. The third component of the plan is a listing of possible campus actions to achieve A2E successes.

The Presidents statement of commitment to the VSA is now about two years old. The CSU needs to revisit the statement. The VSA requires some assessment of student learning to be reported at least every three years. This assessment does not have to be the CLA. The president’s group is revisiting the statement. To provide recommendations to the presidents, a recently appointed joint task-force on the CLA will be considering: what does the CLA measure and what do the results mean? What is the best means of implementation? Does the CLA measure GE outcomes? What are the benefits and costs of using other potential measures (e.g., MAPP, CAAP)?

Academic Senate CSU

The BoT agenda includes the proposed graduate business professional fee as an agenda item. A special fee to support the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) is not being proposed at this time.

On the “transforming course design” initiative; labeling does matter – the program is collaborative, is not required to be technology dependent, the selection process is set up to address ‘gateway’ courses with relatively high failure/withdrawal/repeat rates. Developmental Math and General Chemistry were the first-generation projects – of interest in the next year is the ability of these modules to “scale up” and transfer across campuses. The ‘new’ generation includes the U.S. history survey and microeconomics.

The BoT item on impaction is designed to liberalize and facilitate access to impaction as an additional enrollment management tool at the campus level for 2009/2010 admissions. The CSU will attempt to guarantee admission to some CSU for each qualified student. There will be an “impaction” workshop at the CO on December 1st. The clear consequence of this BoT action will be to reduce access to the CSU. Allison Jones is available to respond to questions about impaction.

A task force has been appointed to engage in strategic planning with respect to learning management services. This group should start meeting in the near future to attempt to (i) assess the relative strengths of the various learning management systems and (ii) advance the goals of the CSU in a cost-effective manner.

The Council for Undergraduate Research has admitted the 23 campuses of the CSU into the CUR, and has recently sponsored two workshops exclusively for the CSU, which were attended by faculty teams from 17 CSU’s. The workshops have produced plans to expand undergraduate research on the participating campuses and to seek non-general funds to provide additional resources to support CSU undergraduate research.

Q: The VSA has provided a strong national presence for the CSU. Accountability is here to stay. The VSA *College Portrait* allows for campus customization and demonstrate campus identity. Criticism of the CLA has been venomous on some campuses. It is seen by some as “the wrong tool used in the wrong way”. The worst aspect of the CLA is that it is a single-measure tool executed with exceptionally poor methodologies. The CLA measures (as provided) appear exceptionally weak.

A: The joint task force on the CLA will be considering these issues.

Q: On impaction, each campus will choose to declare impaction or not. The “take rate” will thus appear to be likely to become exceptionally unstable across future cycles.

A: using a “rolling admissions” approach would seem to allow campuses to tamp down variations in the ‘take rate’ to prevent over-correction in one direction or another.

Q: is there an estimate of the number of students who will not be allowed to apply and/or be turned back?

A: no, once enrollments are cut-off we cannot measure “unmet demand” since we do not measure those who did not apply?

Q: What is the role of “special admits” and other entrance of not-otherwise-eligible students to the CSU?

Academic Senate CSU

A: the number of special admits, etc., is equal to the amount that the CSU is over-enrolled across the state.

Q: What is the likelihood of “dual-role” students with state-support and self-support becoming a reality as a means of offering educational opportunities?

A: In some circumstances ‘dual offerings’ are appropriate. In other cases there may be a differential disadvantage to minorities.

Q: What is the possibility of campus redirection?

A: The BoT has included dual-admissions programs since students going directly into four-year institutions have faster and greater success rates than those that start within the CCC system; historically redirection has not been effective within the CSU.

Q: Is it the case that wait listing, higher SAT, earlier cut-offs, etc. are all enrollment management options.

A: Yes.

Q: is there an opportunity to abandon YRO in the face of declining state budgets for higher education?

A: at this point there is no movement in this direction. There is a perception on the part of some policy-makers that the system has unused capacity and thus YRO was required. Despite the fact that YRO may limit enrollment, full movement to self-support for summer sessions is not currently something that is likely even though it might afford access to more students (but at likely higher cost to the students).

Q: Colleges of Education are under-resourced; the “teacher performance assessment (TPA)” will be burdensome.

A; The “teacher performance assessment” (TPA) must be implemented and that means that colleges of education will experience additional resource demands. It is likely that this will be a “university wide” cost not carried exclusively by Colleges of Education.

Q: On impactation, is it possible that all campus slots be allocated to “local” students?

A: Theoretically yes, in reality, this has not been experienced on any campus.

7.6 John Travis, CFA

The Governor has requested that the legislature pull a total of approximately the \$96M “restored” to the CSU since the Jan08 budget. This is the \$32M returned by the Chancellor and the amount additionally requested by the Governor to pull from the CSU budget.

CFA is working against the \$97M budget reduction.

The CO has argued that the \$32M is “one time” rather than continuing, but this is based on discussion between the Chancellor and the Governor. This may or may not be reflected in legislative action.

There is little reason to believe that the termed-out legislators will act in the November special session to remediate the CA budget crisis.

Academic Senate CSU

The CO has requested a meet and confer with the CFA on salary increases for 2008-09 because of the budget. The budget context is particularly challenging for negotiation. The difficulties faced by the state of CA are largely self-imposed. There is no money in the budget for salary increases. The budget is fungible. The question of what the money is for is a question of policies. High quality faculty ought to be a central priority of the CSU. Faculty compensation is a sufficiently important element that the CFA cannot walk away from it.

Q: There is a desire to separate the alliance from the CFA/CSU negotiations. Could you address the inherent difficulties engendered by this bargaining crisis?

A: The alliance is for a broader “external” element. It is not partisan. It is designed to support all aspects of the needs of the CSU community.

Q: When resources come to the CSU, the way those resources are allocated depend on priorities. When salaries are not increased, this reflects that salary is not a priority. What methods could or should individuals use to campaign for the elements that ought to be considered priorities?

A: CFA has attempted to build organizational strength by building membership and by increasing the activism of the membership base. One of the objectives of the alliance was to advocate for the CSU broadly. Job action is permitted if the CFA and the CSU are unable to agree on a reopener.

Q: has the option of a golden handshake been discussed?

A: no.

Q: Extended education has been used to “backfill” course offerings. Is there anything that should happen on the campus to investigate retention of health benefits, etc.

A: CFA is concerned about such cases. Have the affected individuals contact CFA.

Q: What is the timeline for the reopener? What is the scope?

A: there is no specific timeline. There are two articles open (31: SSI/GSI and the equity program). Article 41.3 is a required element of the budgetary process that allows management to reopen any item that has a fiscal cost when support for those costs is not met by the state.

Q: is the PPI program still protected?

A: yes.

Q: can we accelerate the teaching load of FERP faculty to allow them to complete their FERP obligations early.

A: that is an interesting idea.

Academic Senate CSU

7.7 Craig Smith, Faculty Trustee

- On Access to Excellence:
 - Workload reallocation is an important issue.
 - Implementation details for A2E are similarly important, the execution should be closely watched.
 - Preserving unique excellence of each campus is crucial. We are a confederation, not a union.
- On the BoT agenda
 - On the professional business fees, the 25% hold back for financial aid seems appropriate – The language for the review and monitoring professional business fees ought to be included with any professional fee later proposed. It sets a good precedent.
 - Impaction clearly has a political message. The history of accepting more students despite less money continues to hurt the CSU. There are likely to be 8-10 campuses that will use impaction criteria. The other campuses should let their local region know that they are NOT pursuing impaction. The requirement to consult with an advisory group is an important one. Impaction has two important implications for diversity: first, it creates a wide disparity in academic achievement between those from the university's service area and those from outside it. Second, it can result in less ethnic diversity on a campus if not carefully done.

The lottery funds have declined by about \$2M for this year. We might want to examine if there are programs that could be used more directly for professional development and other lottery-appropriate funds. The various Media Arts programs should be examined in terms of cost benefits.

The idea of per unit tuition could lead to greater educational effectiveness by discouraging enrolling in high numbers of units, which block other students from getting into classes.

Q: What are the steps required to implement per unit tuition?

A: It is a board decision. At this point there are some members of the BoT that would favor such an approach.

Q: The per unit cost impacts access. Students taking 21 units can help to lock out other students from access to classes.

A: yes, this seems true.

Q: San Diego State uses “compacts for success” to deal with the heterogeneity in the classroom. This has been successful.

A: yes, this seems appropriate.

Academic Senate CSU

7.8 Brandon Chapin, CSSA Liaison

CSSA had a total goal of 10K registered voters; 18K were registered. 18% of the people that voted in the elections across the USA were part of the youth vote.

Thanked the ASCSU for scheduling flexibility in shortening and moving this plenary.

8. Committee Recommendations

- | | | |
|------|--|---|
| 8.1 | Advocacy for the California State University | <u>AS-2864-08/FGA</u>
Second Reading
Approved Unanimously |
| 8.2 | Support for Policy Change on Sub-programs: Minors, Options, Concentrations, Special Emphases | <u>AS-2865-08/AA</u>
Second Reading
Approved Unanimously |
| 8.3 | Constructive Engagement in the CFA/CSU 2008-2009 “Reopener” Bargaining | <u>AS-2867-08/FA/FGA</u>
First Reading/Waiver
Approved Unanimously |
| 8.4 | Systemwide Impaction, Enrollment Management and the 2009-2010 Budget Environment | <u>AS-2868-08/FGA/APEP</u>
First Reading /Waiver
Approved Unanimously |
| 8.5 | Acknowledgement of Faculty Involvement in the <i>Access to Excellence Accountability Plan</i> | <u>AS-2869-08/AA</u>
First Reading |
| 8.6 | Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) Support of the <i>Give Students a Compass</i> Project | <u>AS-2870-08/AA</u>
First Reading |
| 8.7 | Quality Assurance in On-Line/Distance Learning/ Technology Mediated Course Offerings | <u>AS-2871-08/AA</u>
First Reading |
| 8.8 | Protection of Instruction During Budget Crisis | <u>AS-2872-08/FA/FGA</u>
First Reading |
| 8.9 | Collecting of Faculty Survey Data About Decisions to Leave or Not to Join the CSU | <u>AS-2873-08/FA</u>
First Reading |
| 8.10 | Commendation for Dr. Keith Boyum | <u>AS-2874-08/EX/AA/APEP</u>
Approved Unanimously |
| 8.11 | Commendation for Dr. Richard West | <u>AS-2875-08/EX/FGA</u>
Approved Unanimously |

9. Adjournment