Agenda

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:10am.

Present: Darlene Yee-Melichar (SFSU), Catherine Nelson (SSU), Bill Eadie (Chair, SDSU), Robert Collins (SFSU), Jodie Ullman (CSUSB), Chris Mallon (CO Liaison), Simone Aloisio (CSUCI), Judith Lessow-Hurley (SJSU), James LoCascio (SLO), Mark Van Selst (SJSU), Mary Ann Creadon (HSU)

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes (March 2015)

The following changes to the minutes were requested.

Senator LoCascio clarified that his question for CO Liaison Mallon about the SLO Mechanical Engineering 120 waiver request was because either his dean or provost modified the request from 198 units total in the major to 196 units. The CO approved the modified waiver, but his understanding is that that is not in the rules. The CO is supposed to either approve or disapprove waivers as written, not as modified.

Senator Yee-Melichar indicated that Senator Lessow-Hurley should be added to the list of those present at the March meeting.

The minutes were approved subject to the editorial corrections above.

4. Pending Business

4.1 Executive Committee Referral on Duplication of Degrees

Discussion

120 Unit Waiver: CO Liaison Mallon first responded to Senator LoCascio’s characterization of the 120 unit waiver request process. According to Mallon, a campus request is submitted from the Academic Senate Chair and Provost/President, not from a department. The CO accepted what was sent from the campus. Senator LoCascio commented that that was not his understanding from the beginning. Mallon said that the form requires that the request come from the Academic Senate Chair and Administration. LoCascio responded that the faculty controls the curriculum; the dean and provost are not faculty.
Chair Eadie introduced the agenda item by reviewing the results of the CCC BA consultation process. There was considerable agreement from campus faculty and administration that most CCC degree proposals had enough overlap that some campuses would declare each proposal to be duplicative. The CO chose to declare many of the degrees non-duplicative. In response, the Executive Committee would like AA to consider the varying definitions of “duplication of programs or curriculum” arising from the CCC BA Pilot experience, and think about what standards should be used to declare a degree duplicative. The goal is for AA to develop a workable definition of duplication for the next round of CCC BA degree proposals so that as we go forward there will be fewer surprises. CO Liaison Mallon suggested that the Executive Committee talk to the CO. She was outside of the process, and came up with the same overall graphic of campus responses as the Executive Committee. The rest is up to CO and his understanding of the political climate; he came up with a definition on his own.

Chair Eadie asked how much overlap would be needed to rise to the level of duplication. Mallon indicated that the committee should make sure we use the word duplication, as that is the language in the legislation authorizing the CCC BA.

Senator Van Selst suggested that a definition would be useful for the senate definition, but won’t necessarily change the decision of the CO. CO Liaison Mallon agreed. She suggested that the committee find out if a definition would be helpful to the CO; otherwise it might be an exercise in frustration.

Senator Yee-Melichar commented that at SFSU there is a dual process; there are separate course review and curriculum review committees. The former reviews new courses, the latter new degrees. The committees look for duplication in the title, program and course description and student learning outcomes (SLOs). SFSU’s review of CCC BA degree proposals concluded that the health information management degree was duplicative, but the CO deemed it not so. She asked who will be in the driver’s seat, as the conclusion about duplication can vary from person to person and campus to system.

Chair Eadie indicated that duplication referred to the entire degree, and SLOs for the entire degree.

CO Liaison Mallon said that duplication of courses, SLOs, titles and learning outcomes are all a reasonable measure of duplication, and what SFSU did was the same as other campuses. She further commented that just because the CO didn’t say to the CCC that there was duplication, doesn’t mean he didn’t think there was a duplication. She repeated that she thinks the Executive Committee needs to ask the CO if perhaps the faculty didn’t write a convincing case for duplication or if he is constrained by politics.
Chair Eadie noted that at SDSU the conclusion was that the CCC automobile technology sales/management degree duplicated non-quantitative parts of their business program.

Senator Van Selst remarked that what came back from each campus was probably similar; the request for a definition is probably a prelude to a “don’t do that again” kind of statement to the CO. In his view creating a definition is not necessarily a productive use of our time. Chair Eadie commented that Van Selst was right in his reading between the lines. Van Selst observed that it might be a useful definition to have to be able to say “caught ya” to the CO, but not necessarily useful in terms of the degree review process. Chair Eadie pointed out that individual campuses have mature processes to determine degree duplication; developing a system wide definition of duplication puts AA in the position of serving as a system wide curricular committee.

Senator Yee-Melichar noted that duplication is not always a bad thing; some duplication goes on in our own system that is good, for example campuses trying to work together to offer common courses and/or degrees.

Action

The committee will discuss the request for a definition of duplication with Executive Committee Liaison Praveen Soni when he joins the committee later in the meeting.

4.2 Executive Committee Referral on Upper Division GE Residence Requirements

Chair Eadie reported that the Executive Committee would like AA to give some thought to upper division GE residence requirements. They believe the current position of CourseMatch and AB 386 efforts is that intercampus online courses count for residency requirements. The Executive Committee wants a recommendation on whether the CSU should continue with that approach or advise system and campuses to consider changing it. Eadie indicated that CSU policy is that online courses transferred to any CSU campus will count as upper division GE as if a student took 9 units on that particular campus. See Coded Memo: AA-2015-03 at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/codedMemos/AA-2015-03.pdf.

Senator Van Selst commented that the CCC transfer degree was the other side of the coin; he asked whether or not CCC upper division GE was transferable to the CSU. In his view Executive Order 1100 (General Education, http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1100.html) is ambiguous whether that is the case. Our resolution should address the question of whether or not campuses control their own upper division or whether they are obligated to accept transfer. Chair
Eadie argued that right now, it is common that if upper division GE is taken online from another campus, we should assume the home campus is obligated to accept the course; in other words, it counts toward the upper division residence requirement. Senator Van Selst disagreed, arguing that when a student takes such a course they do so with the idea that it will be accepted, but the home campus makes the determination; there is not an automatic transfer.

Senator LoCascio asked if a student has to verify transferability first. Senator Van Selst noted that it says on the Course Match website to check to make sure a course will count toward a student’s degree requirements (see the SJSU Course Match site at http://www.sjsu.edu/at/ec/coursematch/). Van Selst pointed out that lower division GE courses will count. LoCascio observed that at SLO they accept BYU course units, so what is the argument against accepting the units? Van Selst indicated a campus may be obligated to accept lower division courses depending upon articulation agreements, but that if an upper division course doesn’t meet a campus’ standards, the campus doesn’t have to accept the course. In this case, the courses at issue are upper division GE. LoCascio indicated that SLO faculty get to see the BYU course exam. Van Selst indicated that situation is independent of the question of online/non-online courses.

Senator Nelson indicated that she was told by colleagues at SSU that if the course was listed in Assist.org as meeting a requirement, it must be accepted toward that requirement. She asked if a separate resolution was needed for GE and non-GE online courses. Chair Eadie said no; the committee is talking about residence, where students can claim they met the residence requirement by taking an online GE course hosted by another campus.

CO Liaison Mallon emphasized that upper division GE courses in residence is not a CSU requirement. She observed that the Graduation Initiative encourages campuses to accept upper division GE from other campuses, but does not require them to do so. Also, Title V doesn’t require upper division GE courses in residence, just that campuses have those courses as part of their degree requirements. And EO 1100 says that campuses may require that 9 of 48 GE units be in residence. So the requirement is up to the campuses.

Chair Eadie remarked that faculty want students to avoid duplication of courses, but he understands why campuses want the residence requirement. He also indicated that the subject was discussed at the most recent Council of Senate Chairs meeting. CO Liaison Mallon reiterated that the requirement is at the campus level. Eadie responded that if some campuses have the requirement and some don’t, it get’s difficult to have a system wide standard. Senator Nelson asked how AB 386 requirements factor in to the conversation. Mallon indicated that when EO 1100 was issued, AB 386 wasn’t taken into account, but that we need to pay attention to the requirements of that legislation.
The disposition of the resolution was discussed. Senator Van Selst suggested that modifications be made to the existing resolution addressing the AB 386 residency issue regarding online courses and CCC upper division GE. Van Selst suggested informing campuses that it is a bad idea to just use Area A,B,C,D,E labels and generic definitions in setting up upper division GE requirements. He suggested campuses consider the SJSU model, which uses the letters R, S and V for science, culture, and personal growth respectively. It would be hard to say that another campus has as “Area R” course.

Action

In response to the Executive Committee’s request, AA decided to follow Senator Van Selst’s recommendation and modify the existing resolution to address both the AB 386 residency issue regarding online courses and CCC upper division GE. The resolution will recommend that individual campuses make the determination whether or not an upper division GE online course from a different campus or a CCC BA upper division GE course meets campus residency requirements. Senators Van Selst and Nelson will work to revise the resolution to bring forward for a second reading in May. They will consult with CO Liaison Mallon. See 4.4 Second Reading of AS-3211-15/AA, Expectations for Upper Division General Education (Mark) below for further discussion of the resolution.

4.3 Second reading of Resolution AS-3206-15/AA, On CSU Participation in WICHE Transfer Process Resolution (Mark):

Chair Eadie reported that Debra David represented CSU at the WICHE meeting earlier this week. He doesn’t have a report from her yet. Senator Van Selst had a conversation with Senator Tom Krabacher, who also attended the meeting, on Tuesday. Krabacher indicated that Debra David left the meeting early, but she told Krabacher and “Pat from WICHE” that she wanted to talk to AA about what our issues are. Van Selst and Krabacher talked about whether “participate” means conversation or signatory depending upon where you look on the WICHE website. Krabacher was going to clarify what would make AA happy without representing the ASCSU per se.

Chair Eadie inquired about the resolution. Senator Van Selst reported that Ken O’Donnell was willing to write a letter indicating that the CSU was not a signatory to the Passport project, but that there is a stumbling block in what language should be used. The Executive Committee and Chair Steven Filling wanted the word “participate” entirely stricken from the description on the website of the ASCSU’s involvement in the project. The response from Ken O’Donnell was that we are participating. O’Donnell indicated he would let the WICHE folks know the ASCSU would be in touch. Van Selst indicated that O’Donnell believes WICHE has gotten the message. Van Selst suggested the committee get clarification on the matter from Executive Committee Liaison Soni.
The committee reported difficulty locating the first reading resolution and related plenary notes in the AA April Dropbox folder.

Senator Creadon suggested colleagues see the March AA Minutes for background on the WICHE situation.

Chair Eadie’s notes on the resolution from the plenary are:

1. WICHE remove W from the title;
2. Write out ASCSU first time used;
3. Make explicit the limits of ASCSU concern;
4. Uncap Universities in line 8.

Action

The committee agreed to go forward with the resolution and ask Executive Committee Liaison Soni about the exchange between the Executive Committee and Ken O’Donnell.

4.4 Second Reading of AS-3211-15/AA, Expectations for Upper Division General Education (Mark)

Comments from the first reading at the plenary included:

1. There is no consensus across system regarding what constitutes upper division GE.
2. Who defines and sets the standards for upper division GE?
3. How does Coursematch fit in?

Discussion

Senator Creadon asked if a campus has a thematic upper division GE program would that change the definition of upper division GE or the thinking about campus uniqueness? She argued that the campus specific language in the resolution should appease anyone worried about uniqueness. She also pointed out that if the committee agrees with the three characteristics associated with upper division GE in the resolution, then we already have a definition. She also agreed with Senator LoCascio that we don’t want a definition that leaves out innovative GE.

Senator Nelson reported on feedback on the resolution she received from her campus GE committee. It focused on the disciplinary expertise of faculty teaching upper division GE and the developmental nature of GE, as students use the skills and knowledge they acquire in their lower division GE courses in their upper division courses. Senator Van Selst suggested putting the point about
disciplinary expertise in the rationale and integrating the developmental aspect of the feedback into the resolved clauses.

Action

Senators Van Selst and Nelson will revise the resolution to respond to comments from the plenary and the results of the discussion of agenda item 4.2 Upper Division GE Residence Requirements (above).

4.5 Second Reading of Resolution AS-3209-15, Towards a Culture of Assessment in the California State University System: A Call for Faculty Professional Development (Simone, Rob)

Discussion

Feedback from the first reading at the plenary included:

1. There is a lack of time to do assessment; how do we resolve this?
2. Support for assessment implies funding; the resolution doesn’t say anything about that.
3. The use of the term culture of assessment is not helpful; we need a concrete proposal.
4. Hours/funding are the big problem.
5. The resolution negates the idea that we don’t already do assessment.
6. One speaker objects to kind of assessment the resolution talks about altogether.
7. What does the term “culture of assessment” mean?

Senator Yee-Melichar reported on feedback from her colleagues at SFSU. Their comments included:

1. Why we are proposing the resolution at all? What is system wide culture of assessment?
2. We engage in ongoing program review and never get rewarded for it; we are setting ourselves up to be penalized.
3. Let faculty decide how to assess their programs.

Senator Collins recommended pulling the resolution, suggesting that there needs to be more education about inconsistency between what people do administratively and what faculty do. He suggested a white paper that could be done through an academic assessment survey. Senator Aloisio commented that it sounds like main goal of the resolution is to provide faculty development, so perhaps talk about that rather than debate about the importance of assessment. Senator LoCascio pointed out that ASME does run workshops; perhaps the CSU can doing something similar.
CO Liaison Mallon said she sent us the annual Trustees’ report on assessment, which includes reports on cyclical program reviews on campuses. She indicated that there is a wide range of quality among the reviews. Many campuses report on learning outcomes; the CO requests a sample of some example of assessment done by some programs. Senator Ullman asked who looks at the reports. Mallon indicated that the system wide Academic Affairs staff do, but there don’t seem to be consequences for doing well. In her view if assessment is done systematically it will help students learn better. She also suggested the CO wants to build out the ITL connection regarding assessment with the new director. And the Academic Programs Office will not approve new programs without demonstrating how they meet WASC assessment expectations.

Action
The committee agreed to pull the resolution.

**4.6 Access to Excellence Project - High Impact Practices and Student Success (Mary Ann, Darlene)**

The March report on this item was left off because of time constraints. Senator Creadon will send her draft report to senate again. Chair Eadie commented that the report should offer advice to other faculty. Senator Yee-Melichar indicated the report will consolidate all the information gathered on active learning, which should result in a good brief that can go forward. Her question is what do we want the plenary to do with the report? She suggested that the Executive Committee could write a resolution accepting the report, and that the report needs to contain strong recommendations. Chair Eadie suggested the report can go on the ASCSU website. Senator Creadon will reach out to the people writing the review of A2E in October/November.

**4.7 Assessment Project – Compare Institutional Learning Outcomes: (Jodie, Rob)**

Senator Ullman reported little progress on comparing institutional learning outcomes. She would like to move forward with a white paper on silos; she suggested using the term “culture of inquiry” to replace “culture of assessment.” Senator LoCascio remarked that as part of ABET assessment, his department has an exit exam for students. Senator Ullman commented that accredited programs are more used to assessment, but that many faculty are not comfortable with it, especially if it is imposed upon them or the results are used inappropriately. She added that WASC is coming down on the assessment of GE, particularly with regard to “silos.” WASC is also pushing for further discussion about integrating learning goals from the campus to the department level to provide coherence to a student’s education. WASC wants “closing the loop activities.”

**5. Chair’s Report**
5.1 Schedule for remaining items

6. Liaison and Systemwide Committee and Taskforce Reports

6.1 Chancellor’s Office Liaisons: Chris Mallon, Ken O’Donnell (times certain tbd): No reports.

6.2 Executive Committee Liaison: Praveen Soni (time certain 12:30pm)

Report

Senator Soni reported that the Executive Committee is starting to take positions on legislation; they will be discussed by FGA and on the plenary agenda for May. In particular, the Executive Committee is recommending support for: 1. SB 634 (Block) which authorizes the California Department of Consumer Affairs to enter into a regional state authorization reciprocity agreement with other states that provides that a private entity regulated in one member state would be able to provide distance education in other member states. 2. SB 6432 (?), which provides for an exemption for the SSU Green Music Center (GMC) to allow Mondavi to donate wine for GMC events; 3. AB 819 which allows the CSU Alumni Association to enter into affinity programs; the CSU would get a small % of the proceeds; 4. AB 798 (Bonilla), which would establish the College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015 to reduce costs for college students by encouraging faculty to accelerate the adoption of lower cost, high-quality open educational resources. Funding would be provided in the annual Budget Act. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) Legislative advocacy day is Monday. Visits with 15 legislators are planned. Tuesday is the ASCSU advocacy day. Visits with 20+ legislators are planned; students will be joining in on some of the visits.

The Academic Conference website will be up soon. The Executive Committee will meet with CO White to discuss planning for the next conference tentatively scheduled for Spring 2017.

Preference forms for 2015-16 Standing Committee and CSU taskforce membership will be available at the May plenary. New items include ASCSU parliamentarian, Veterans Affairs Liaison and the Academic Conference Planning Committee.

Trustee Lillian Kimbell will be visiting the May plenary. Chancellor White will not be joining us in May. The Executive Committee will ask our new Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to join us in May.

Discussion
Senator Van Selst asked that the Executive Committee update the committee preference form; he will assist.

Senator Nelson asked for an update on the most recent WICHE Passport meeting. Soni reported that San Francisco Community College sent one person as an observer.

Senators Nelson and Van Selst asked about the Executive Committee’s request for a definition of duplication as it applies to CCC BAs. Nelson pointed out that the campus consensus is that if the degree is duplicated one time somewhere, the CO should say no. The CO argues that there is a continuum or varying degrees of duplication. Soni responded that the point is that in the future when issues come up, the Executive Committee will have a working definition. The idea is to approve a definition at the plenary, take it to the CO, and see how he reacts. Van Selst pointed out that campus responses to the initial CCC BA proposals were consistent, and that a system definition is unlikely to influence what we get from the campuses. He noted that the committee believes the CO is fully aware of what duplication is, but declined to say so, and that the committee doesn’t think an ASCSU definition will change his calculus.

6.3 Draft Report on Student Mental Health Issues: Ray Murrillo, Director, Student Programs (time certain 10:30am)

Report (Note: Mr. Murillo’s phone cut in and out throughout the conversation)

The report is based upon a survey of CSU students, faculty and staff conducted by the Rand Corporation in Fall 2013 - Spring 2014. Nine campuses participated. The formal report will be issued the first week in May. The majority of students that responded were white and mostly female, and the vast majority were undergraduates. Most were full time. One third were first generation college students, 7.9% were LBGQT, and 1.8% were veterans. Staff respondents were mostly white; Thirty percent of students reported that in the past 30 days everything effort. Twenty-five percent of students reported being restless 25%, 21% nervous 21%. The three most reported depression related issues were relationship issues, family problems and academic concerns. Twenty-six and 3/10 percent of faculty and staff report concern about 3 or more students. “Harder &Co” has been asked for national comparisons so the CSU knows where it stands as a system. The bigger points are that most students aware of counseling services, and there are an average of 8.4 FTE counseling services providers on each campus, with a range 1.5 – 18. The system wide ration of provider to students is 1/2300; the recommended ratio is 1/1500. Wait times for an initial evaluation average 5.9 days; after that it takes on average an additional 8.7 days for an initial appointment. From providers’ perspective, most students are seen for alcohol/drug use, stress reduction and depression/anxiety. Providers see student awareness of services and wait times as the biggest issues facing them.
Discussion

Senator Yee asked if there was any interface with mental health services as a follow up to actions taken under Title 9 sexual assault policy. Murrillo responded that mental health services is an interim accommodation students are referred to.

Senator LoCascio argued that he can look at transcripts and figure out who has depression. He brings students into his office to stay in touch and make sure students’ grades don’t get too bad. Murillo indicated that many students report they can take care of the situation themselves.

6.4. Institute for Teaching and Learning Board (Judith Lessow-Hurley, Jodie Ullman, Darlene Yee-Melichar)

The ITL Advisory Board members participated in a discussion about ITL leadership needs. Consequently, the Academic Affairs Division created an MPP director position in planning for the success of the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning.

Dr. Chris Mallon (A VC, Academic Programs and Faculty Development) asked the ITL Advisory Board to nominate one of its members to serve on the ITL Director search committee.

Since the two ITL Advisory Board co-chairs nominate a board member to serve on the ITL director search committee, Senator Lessow-Hurley nominated Senator Yee-Melichar to co-chair the ITL Advisory Board with EVC Ephraim Smith.

Senator Yee-Melichar nominated Senator Ullman as the ITL Advisory Board representative to the ITL Director search committee. Those already serving on this committee include Leslie Kennedy from Academic Technology who is chairing, Darlene Yee-Melichar who was appointed to serve as the ASCSU representative, and Judy Botelho who was appointed to serve as a CO representative.

6.5 Sustainability - Campus as a Living Lab (CALL) Committee (Simone Aloisio, and Darlene Yee-Melichar)

On February 4, 2015, Elvyra San Juan, AVC, indicated that the CSU Office of the Chancellor Divisions of Business and Finance, Academic Affairs, and the ASCSU were once again partnering in a grant program called Campus As Living Lab (CALL). CALL is a unique opportunity to use the campus as a forum for the exploration of sustainability concepts and theories. CALL provides funds of up to $12,000 for each campus to support the redesign of an existing course that
ties elements of sustainability into opportunities for learning using the campus physical plant. An additional $250,000 is available as part of CALL for infrastructure support such as meters, utility dashboards, and/or retrofits that can help enable student research and learning.

The committee received the applications for Campus as a Living Lab, round 2, for review. There are 17 campuses participating in the 2014/15 CSU Campus as a Living Lab Grant Program. The evaluation process called for members to help guide projects to fit within the CALL criteria so that we can best measure the effectiveness of the course redesigns and student learning.

The committee met on Tuesday, March 17 at 4pm via conference call to focus on evaluating applications and discussing their viability as part of CALL. A review sheet was available to guide the conversation and to provide comments and suggestions. Senators Aloisio and Yee-Melichar will help to evaluate these applications.

A CALL Workshop will be held for our newest cohort of CALL awardees, in collaboration with the CA Higher Ed Sustainability Conference, on Thursday, July 23, 2015, 8:00 AM-5:00 PM at San Francisco State. The agenda is still in development but the goals for this day are to:
- Introduce select teams from 13/14 to share their lessons learned in the CALL program with the new teams
- Course redesign overview
- Student Learning Outcomes
- Assessment
- Academic Technology
- Information Dissemination


7. Member Items/Campus Reports/Potential New Projects

7.1. Possible Resolution on Travel to Indiana in the Wake of Its Religious Freedom Restoration Law. (Darlene): Deferred.

7.2. April is Celebrate National Minority Health Month

Senator Yee-Melichar indicated that April is National Minority Health Month. She shared an event flyer with us, and invited members of the committee to
attend the SF State Brown Bag Seminar on Wednesday, April 22, 2015 if they are local or visiting the SF Bay Area. Please join her and Christina L. Perez (U.S. DHHS-OMH Regional Minority Health Consultant) when they will speak about minority health and health disparities.

7.3. Center for Healthy Aging in Multicultural Populations (CHAMP) Conference

Senator Yee-Melichar announced that San Jose State University is sponsoring the Fourth Annual CHAMP Conference on Friday, April 24, 2015 at the San Jose City Hall. She indicated that it is a CSU system wide conference on Gerontology involving community participants, faculty, staff and students. Please note that Senator Deborah Roberts (Sonoma) is speaking about Listening to Seniors: Results of a University-Community Partnership to Implement a Community Assessment Plan in a Senior Living Community; and Senator Yee-Melichar (San Francisco) is speaking about: Minority women’s health: Living longer, living better.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00pm.

Respectfully submitted by Catherine Nelson