1. **Call to Order**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Present: Bill Eadie (SDSU), Darlene Yee-Melichar (SFSU), Mark Van Selst (SJSU), Jim LoCascio (SLO), Catherine Nelson (SSU), Mary Ann Creadon (CSUH), Rob Collins (SFSU), Judith Lessow-Hurley (SJSU), Chris Mallon (Chancellor’s Office (CO) Liaison), Ken O’Donnell (CO Liaison); Guest: Audrey Hovannesian (CO); Absent: Jodie Ullman (CSUSB).

2. **Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved.

3. **Approval of Minutes (January 2015)**

Senator Yee-Melichar and Senator Van Selst will email corrections to the minutes to Senator Nelson for incorporation into the final version.

Senator Creadon asked that Senator Van Selst include in his rewrite of 4.2 WICHE, that the CSU gives authorization to the CCCs to certify GE, but we have to look over their shoulder. To give authority to an entity outside of the state to make decisions about content would be unusual.

The minutes were approved pending redistribution of a copy with members’ corrections included.

4. **Pending Business**

4.1 **Review of campus reactions to proposed master’s program revisions.** *(Chris, Mary Ann):* See 6.1 Chancellor’s Office Liaison Reports.

4.2 **Review of the Consultation Process with the Community Colleges Regarding Pilot Projects that Result from the Implementation of SB 850 (Community College Baccalaureates) (Chris, Bill):** See 6.1 Chancellor’s Office Liaison Reports.

4.3 **Continuing discussion of mathematics requirements in the CSU, particularly intermediate algebra.** *(Mark, Jim)*
Senator Van Selst said that the taskforce has a choice, either make a curricular recommendation in advance of GEAC, or let GEAC lie. Since this item was first proposed, the UC Intersegmental General Educational Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) has been changed to admit Statway (the pilot alternative pathway for GE B4 Quantitative Reasoning developed by the Carnegie Foundation), that doesn’t require intermediate algebra. Everyone is in a holding mode waiting for CSU-based data on Statway. Van Selst doesn’t see anything changing for the next four months around Statway. He will take advice and guidance from the committee as faculty should control the curriculum, but right now as far as we can go without data is that we’re ok with the Statway pilot. There are two elements to consideration of permanent approval of Statway, access vs. what a degree actually means. The agenda item will be carried over to AA’s March meeting.

4.4 Access to Excellence project - High Impact Practices and Student Success (Mary Ann, Darlene)

Discussion of CO reporting on High-Impact Practices

The committee was joined by Ken O’Donnell, Senior Director, Student Engagement and Academic Initiatives and Partnerships, and Audrey Hovannesian, Associate Director of Assessment, Academic Affairs, CO.

Senator Creadon confirmed that she had received from Ken O’Donnell a document concerning the latest CO efforts to report on high-impact practices. She said the “Task 1” report looked like an inventory of many of the practices at some of the campuses, and asked if anything had been done to report on the success of those practices beyond what had been reported from CSU Fullerton in the report O’Donnell distributed in September 2014. O’Donnell said that they were now preparing to scale the reporting from Task 1, and this would take place in Task 2. Audrey Hovannesian said that they hoped to mimic the CSUF report for other practices at the various campuses, and a Task 2 report might be ready by May 31. Senator Creadon asked when the review of A2E, due this year, would be done, but O’Donnell was not sure.

Senator Yee-Melichar asked if there was any other data to look at for the “active learning” component of Access to Excellence. O’Donnell said yes, and pointed to a STEM Collaborative that begins even before students come to campus. He said we could contact Dawn Digrius, Senior Project Manager for the STEM Collaboratives in the CO. O’Donnell said it is important not to let HIPs crowd out other things when looking at the A2E Commitment for Active Learning. The STEM Collaboratives contain some of those other projects that go beyond HIPs. He also said that Summer Arts could count as part of active learning, as well as work being done on redesigning gateway courses. A lot has been invested in this project, including redesign involving peer teaching and supplemental instruction. He said we could get in touch with Judy Botelho, Director for Community Engagement, to get more data on service learning and its contribution to student
learning, especially when blended inextricably with coursework. He also said that we could get in touch with Wayne Tikkanen or Emily Daniel Magruder, Interim Director, Institute for Teaching and Learning, to see what’s happening with ITL and faculty development that could be part of a report on active learning. He said that the CO couldn’t quite yet make assertions about successful outcomes for HIPs and active learning, but that we certainly need to get there. He also agreed that it would be good if the reporting they eventually do did not concentrate solely on course completion rates to determine success.

4.4 Assessment project - Compare Institutional Learning Outcomes (Jodie, Rob)

Senator Collins indicated he is working on a resolution that will be a call to senates to encourage campus administrations to offer faculty development to ensure student success. He’s working from AS-2939-10/AA Use and Implementation of the Collegiate Learning Assessment. He wants the resolution to focus on what had been done since that resolution, then what should be done now. The resolution should be ready for AA’s next meeting. Senator Van Selst suggested that a report or white paper has a longer lasting impact than a resolution. The resolution could be used to commend the authors of the report/white paper. Collins thanked the committee for the feedback and indicated he would return with something for the committee to discuss in March.

4.5 Ethnic Studies Project - possible update on the task force report (Catherine, Judith)

Chair Eadie contacted Senator Loretta Kensinger, ASCSU representative to the Ethnic Studies Task Force for an update on the task force’s January meeting. Kensigner told AA that task force members are reluctant to talk about the directions the task force is going until the members had agreed on those directions. The report he got back was a report of the process the task force is using to gather and review data. Eadie thinks that the full report will be available in April, so this committee can’t do anything unless it is a resolution on waiver for urgency reasons in May. Perhaps the committee would want to do a commendation resolution. Senator Creadon reminded the committee of the CO’s systemwide moratorium on changes to Ethnic Studies programs until the task force finishes its report. She assumes the CO is ok with continuing the moratorium until the report is out. She asked Chair Eadie if there is any movement in the CO on the latter. He responded that Creadon is probably right, but that he hasn’t heard anything. It was an issue last year because legislators were pushing it. Eadie said the item won’t be on the March agenda; the committee can bring it forward if need be.

5. Chair’s Report (no separate report)

5.1 Schedule for committee business during the Spring 2015 semester.
6. Liaison and Systemwide Committee and Task Force Reports

6.1. Chancellor’s Office Liaisons: Chris Mallon, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development; Ken O’Donnell, Senior Director, Student Engagement and Academic Initiatives and Partnerships (times certain tbd)

Mallon Report

*Revision of Title V Masters Degree Requirements:* AVC Mallon indicated that nothing else happened since the January ASCSU plenary. She is waiting for a resolution from the Senate after AA discussions. She received the letter from Humboldt State regarding the potential negative effects of proposed revisions on small graduate programs. There is not enough time this year to take proposed revisions through the approval process.

*California Community Colleges (CCC) BA Degrees:* Mallon reported that Chancellor White would talk to CCC Chancellor Harris about the consultation process. The CCC Board of Governors gave initial approval to 15 degrees in January; the initially approved degrees will go to the board for final action in March. In the interim, the internal CSU consultation process involved a request for separate reports (to make sure there isn’t any coercion) from campus administrations and local senate chairs. Both reports were compared. There are a couple of cases where the faculty and administration responses are not identical; in those cases the faculty responses are more protective of the CSU curriculum than the administration. For example, the administration would say a proposed CCC BA was ok, but the faculty would say there was duplication. If this happened in 3 or 4 cases, it is enough to say the degree needs to be looked at. Overall the consultation process looks like it worked really well. There were a couple of cases where there was a discrepancy between administration and faculty; those may be where the two may not have worked together. The criteria used by the CO to review the proposed degrees were: 1. degree ok; 2. concern about the degree; 3. more information needed; 4. outright duplication. Mallon provided the chancellor with comments to back up the CSU recommendations.

Mallon provided further information on campuses responses. A question arose from SJSU about potential problems arising under Title V. Title V currently has no language regarding upper division CCC courses, because up until this point, the CCCs didn’t teach upper division courses. There is language though that says that the CSU will not offer upper division credit for courses taught at CCCs (because no courses at the CCCs up until this point were upper division). Now the CCCs will have upper division courses, so the question arises whether we should change Title 5 or issue an executive order to address the situation. If the CSU proposed to change Title V to say upper division credit can only be earned at the CSU campus awarding a degree, it will have to be heard over two meetings.
Governor Brown will be there, and he wants to see more transferability of the curriculum throughout public higher education in California. The CSU can’t look hostile to the CCCs. In Mallon’s view the CSU should start working on standards for upper division credit; there currently are none for General Education or BA level courses. The CSU has established regulations to support Coursematch. If we were to do the same for upper division credit, it would look like an organic process to serve students and promote graduation, while not excluding CCC credit at the upper division.

According to Mallon there was only one proposed degree that was not labeled a duplication, mortuary science. Bakersfield had an objection to the dental hygiene degrees (Foothill College, West Los Angeles College), but it was a concern that people who get degrees would come to them and finish another degree. The interaction design degree proposed at Santa Monica College caused the greatest concern; four or five CSUs offer the same degree under a different title, but the content is the same (faculty put in required courses side by side). The best-defended case of overlap at the upper division level was regarding the proposed automotive technology degree at Rio Hondo College.

Another issue came up was degree completion and duplication. The argument is that the CSU BA functions as degree completion for CCC transfer students. For example, before the CCCs were authorized to offer BAs, a student with an AA in dental hygiene who wanted to pursue a BA would come into a CSU health related program and complete their degree. The question then, is: If students will no longer do that because they are finishing up a dental hygiene degree at a CCC, does that mean there is duplication of a CSU degree? Two or three campus responses say this duplicates a major at the upper division. Mallon doesn’t know how far we can get with that argument if we don’t train dental hygienists and if three campuses say a dental hygiene degree does duplicate a CSU degree and all three of those campuses offer different related degrees. It will be up to the CCC to determine if this is a legitimate point.

Discussion

Senator Van Selst commented that using the leverage the CSU has to define upper division credit makes sense, buy it may open up the possibility that CCC courses will all be upper division GE. The issue for us may be the proliferation of “upper division GE courses” in anything someone wants to teach at the upper division level (i.e., if a course is labeled GE, then by definition it is upper division). We also have to deal with campus autonomy issue, but it’s probably time for that anyway. Mallon pointed to a past Senate paper on appropriate BA/Masters level courses, arguing that to do the same in this situation seems organic and should have done before. She said that there is a lot the CSU won’t be able to control here as community college BAs are a growing trend across the country. There is also concern that if the CCCs get these 15 pilots, faculty will move to CCCs
where requirements for service and research won’t be as high. If we are going to make a claim about CSU quality, we need something to stand on.

Senator Creadon asked if it was Mallon’s opinion that nothing will happen this year regarding changes to Title V Masters degree requirements. Mallon responded yes. The process is slow; getting the perspective of all the groups involved will take time. Mallon thinks it would be a good idea if the CO had a resolution from the Senate. She suggested senators reach out to their colleagues on campuses so they can be heard. Humboldt is the only campus that sent a letter. Anything else she has heard has been in meetings.

Chair Eadie asked if Mallon was talking to groups other than graduate deans. Mallon indicated she has gotten feedback from the presidents, the provosts and AVPs. She also forwarded the proposed revisions to Eric Forbes for distribution to registrars/admissions folks and to Dean Culier for feedback on financial aid considerations. She has not sent the suggested revisions to discipline deans. Eadie asked if there were systematic differences in opinion from groups. Mallon responded that in general there is a misunderstanding on campuses about what Title 5 means. The original request from graduate deans was for clarification about what it means to say that at least 50% of Masters level courses shall be “organized primarily for graduate students;” there are different interpretations on different campuses and the provision has been enforced inconsistently/unfairly across programs and campuses. Then provosts, unfamiliar with Title 5, were appalled that a MA degree can have 50% undergraduate courses. As she goes through the consultation process, there is more and more discussion about what a graduate experience is, and how being with only graduate students changes the education process itself. There is also concern about the costs associated with increasing the percentage of graduate level courses required for a MA degree. Mallon has surveyed campuses about how many graduate/undergraduate courses are required in graduate programs. Clarification is necessary; co-listed courses are not undergraduate courses and there are stand-alone undergraduate courses that can be allowed. Mallon indicated that provosts are not alone in their concern. We may end up with simply clarification of the original Title 5 language.

6.2 Executive Committee Liaison (Praveen Soni) 12:00pm TC

Report

2015 Advocacy Day: ASCSU Advocacy Day is April 14. Standing Committee chairs have been asked to join members of Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA) and the Executive Committee in Sacramento. April 13 is the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) legislative day. FGA will hold an orientation during lunch Friday at the March plenary. The ASCSU is a signatory on the overall CSU advocacy effort. ASCSU Chair Filling attends those meetings.
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE): Ken O’Donnell will address the March plenary about WICHE. The Executive Committee discussed the appointment of faculty representatives to WICHE Passport Project discipline committees; the decision is to Exec send one Executive Committee member to the March 12 WICHE meeting.

Search for new Senior Director Human Resources: Tom Norman, Dominguez Hills has been appointed to the search committee for a new Senior Director of Human Resources.

Academic Freedom: The Executive Committee met with Chancellor White in January and he seemed amendable to the creation of a task force on academic freedom. Staff didn’t agree. Campus senate chairs will ask for a new systemwide policy on academic freedom, and they will work with their local senates to pass resolutions asking for the same thing.

Veterans Affairs: Jay Swartz has been appointed ASCSU Liaison with the CSU Veterans Affairs Office. Patrick O’Rourke, Director, CSU Office of Active Duty and Veterans Affairs, will speak to the ASCSU in the fall.

Human Resources: Chair Steven Filling will forward Vice Chancellor, Human Resources Lori Lamb’s response to the issues raised during her visit to the ASCSU in January.

Discussion

Senator Van Selst asked if the Executive Committee would send a representative to the March Academic Affairs meeting to present their concerns about WICHE to Academic Affairs. Senator Soni responded that the Executive Committee had invited Ken O’Donnell to the March plenary and members of Academic Affairs will be in the room. Van Selst asked if the Executive Committee was sending one of its own members to the two disciplinary groups meeting shortly. Senator Nelson raised the issue of the Academic Affairs Committee’s role in the discussion of concerns about ASCSU participation in the WICHE Passport Project. Senator Van Selst suggested that there is concern on AA about the Executive Committee overreaching. Senator Nelson commented that given that the Executive Committee is pursuing an initiative that is within the direct purview of AA, they should be talking to AA on an ongoing basis. Senator Yee-Melichar stated that she was not sure that AA and the Executive Committee are on the same page on the issue; AA doesn’t have the same information as the Executive Committee. So it is important to get together and talk; she agrees with Van Selst and Nelson. Van Selst stated that there is there an overlap of responsibilities between the two committees and suggested that the Executive Committee may not have consulted with the appropriate group.
Senator Yee-Melichar asked what the hot topics were among the three segments at ICAS. Senator Soni said he didn’t have his notes with him, but he will send us what the UC and CCC concerns are, and what ICAS says about CCC BAs.

6.3. GEAC Matters (Mark)

6.3.1. Conference call on upper division GE in the CSU.

Senator Van Selst indicated there was no report. He commented that the process is still unfolding, including unpacking Executive Orders, especially EO 1100 (the new GE EO). There is some ambiguity about the transferability of upper division GE. Van Selst suggested that it makes sense for the ASCSU to consider a resolution declaring that upper division GE should be a campus signature experience, and that campuses exercise their autonomy to make it a meaningful, campus specific experience. The ASCSU should say what it wants upper division GE to be rather than what current policy requires, then see if we need to modify anything to make that happen. Van Selst indicated that there is haste on defining upper division because the CCCs asked for advice on what it is. They are building it into their BA curriculum. According to Van Selst some CCC BA proposals had basic foundational courses as upper division GE, and were based upon a misunderstanding of what GE is. Van Selst commented that even a draft resolution could be used by the CCCs to define upper division GE. In his view the ASCSU also needs to have it; because of CCC BAs and upper division course transferability from CourseMatch, campuses may be forced to accept upper division GE transfer courses, so now is the time to say what we expect. Van Selst will work on a resolution for March with Senator Baaske, who has been pushing to figure out what Title V requires on the subject. Senator Nelson suggested involving GEAC. Van Selst agreed.

6.3.2. WICHE - report on February 11 meeting

Report

Senator Van Selst explained the context for his report. The ASCSU Executive Committee has expressed discomfort with the Passport Project because of Gates sponsorship of the project and its explicit intent to facilitate the interstate transferability of GE. The difficulty if that if an institution signs the agreement, that institution is obligated to accept everything the Passport is supposed to include. The CSU is not interested in doing that; we don’t do it for our own in state partners. So why is the CSU involved? According to Van Selst, it is a chance for the CSU to take advantage of the potential curricular expertise of sister institutions, change the focus of evaluating GE to learning outcomes, and share the CSU’s longstanding experience with articulation processes with other participants.
On February 3 the physical/natural sciences group met at San Jose State. Three CSU and three CCC faculty agreed on the overall scope of learning outcomes for their discipline; in particular there was a good discussion on the reason for a lab requirement. On February 11 a member from each of those groups went to Denver, where representatives from 7 states took each state’s output and produced draft learning outcomes for the natural sciences and human cultures disciplines. The discipline groups for the next two discipline areas of the project will meet at SJSU. Representatives from seven states will meet in April to finalize the critical thinking/creative expression learning outcomes.

According to Van Selst, a potential problem with CSU faculty participation is that a legislator might get ahold of this and say, “This is what you will do.” The ASCSU Executive Committee is pushing back, and asking why the committee should appoint faculty to the discipline groups if we are risking harming ourselves by potentially being forced to accept the project results by legislation or by default.

Discussion

Senator Nelson asked if the CSU is not already buying in to the project by participating and changing our outcomes. Van Selst responded that an example of the benefits is that the discipline discussion of oral communication unpacked expectations for the area and allowed the CSU to have a specific definition that could be applied to oral communication in a different learning mode, i.e., online instead of in person. Van Selst sent a letter to ASCSU Chair Filling that the Executive Committee will discuss. In his view the CSU needs a place where we say we won’t participate in Passport Project outcomes.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked who has the ultimate authority to decide whether the CSU should participate, the Chancellor’s Office? Van Selst responded that every time the topic comes up, someone mentions that the Gates foundation is involved. But the CSU used the results of the Compass project. The point is to use Gates money to help other states avoid the problems the CSU has solved around articulation. The CSU could also use the results of the Passport Project to define learning outcomes at a system level in a way we haven’t done before. GEAC, the CO or the Senate needs to make it explicit that we won’t forego our ability to evaluate/accept transfer courses from other institutions.

Senator Nelson asked if defining outcomes at the system level infringes on campus autonomy. Van Selst responded that value rubrics and outcomes don’t line up very well; individual campuses will still have a lot of autonomy to define what they do. Van Selst indicated that multiple national efforts are influencing what is being done, so it is not accurate to say we will revise what we will be doing based on solely our participation in a WICHE project. Nelson asked for an extended conversation with the Executive Committee in March to clarify the situation, and what doing that committee is doing regarding a public statement.
about the CSU refusal to sign on. Nelson said AA should weigh in given its charge.

Action

GEAC Chair Van Selst and AA Chair Eadie will make sure the topic is on the March agenda of their respective committees.

6.3.3. Discipline Councils conference call

Van Selst reported that the initiative is waiting on Gerry Hanley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Technology Services. Participants talked about various interpretations of the idea of discipline councils, and ended up with the concept of a principally chairs discussion group, and a parallel GE affinity group. If faculty are interested they could subscribe to an affiliated list. The group is waiting for Hanley to provide a list of options. The plan is to use three disciplines as a pilot in 2015-16.

6.3.4. WICHE - need for faculty representing critical thinking and creative expression for March 12 meeting: See Agenda Item 6.2 above.

6.4. Other: no additional GEAC matters

7. Member Items/Campus Reports/Potential New Projects

Sustainability Group: Senator Aloisio reported on the Sustainability Group that grew out of the Campus As a Living Lab Initiative (http://www.calstate.edu/cce/stem/initiatives/livinglab/index.shtml). Jim Postma, CSU Chico put the informal group together and faculty from several campuses are participating. The group discussed the possibility of a systemwide sustainability minor. Aloisio asked for feedback from the committee.

Senator Van Selst pointed out that campuses award minors; systemwide learning objectives could be provided then campuses could design the degree around those. Senator Nelson expressed concern about how systemwide learning objectives would affect campus autonomy to establish criteria for a degree. Van Selst indicated that this effort would be a coalition of the willing. We know that thematic pathways increase engagement and student retention. There might be local situations where campuses have transferability that could lead to a minor; for example if students took three of five courses at a CCC, then two upper division capstone experiences at a CSU, that might lead to a system minor. It would be up to each campus to decide if they wanted to offer the degree. If they do, the degree would have to meet the expectations of the consortium. It might be labeled minor in California sustainability. The point would be to find a term not used by anyone else that would allow local issues to be featured. Aloisio commented that there is nothing precluding a campus from offering sustainability
Senator Yee-Melichar suggested a parallel in the SFSU Masters in Recreation Leisure Studies. AVC Mallon indicated that the SFSU example is a case where campuses have separate degree programs and titles; the same with applied biotechnology degrees. In consortium with other CSUs, campuses identify transferable courses. Students go to another campus to take the course.

**CO Response to ASCSU Resolutions:** Chair Eadie will send the response to the committee. Eadie reported that the Executive Committee was disappointed; the CO responses were fairly neutral and didn’t promise anything. The Executive Committee interpreted the CO response regarding an academic freedom task force as “you’ll hear after the end of year.”

**Advocacy Day Talking Points Relevant to Academic Affairs:** Senator Yee-Melichar suggested that FGA and the Executive Committee share Advocacy Day talking points pertaining to AA with the committee so AA can help develop the material. Chair Eadie commented that in the Extended Executive Committee meeting FGA Chair Krabacher indicated it is a light year for higher education, with most relevant legislation on the budget. Yee-Melichar also asked if the systemwide Admissions Committee had met, as she hasn’t heard anything. AVC Mallon responded that the Executive Committee talked to the CO about this a few weeks ago and the CO took it to Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support. There is a problem not having a president/provost on the committee. The CO knows it is a priority, and is doing what it can to get the committee staffed so it can meet.

**State University Grants (SUGs):** Senator LoCascio asked if the Academic Sustainability Taskforce expects action on SUGs, or just a presentation. Chair Eadie indicated that the committee hasn’t issued a report yet. LoCascio asked that during Advocacy Day, that our ASCSU colleagues tell the state education budget people to fix the SUG problem. Eadie responded that he would take that up in the development of talking points. Senator Yee-Melichar commented that when Faculty Trustee Stepanek visited SFSU two weeks ago, he indicated that right after he left he was going to participate in an online meeting of the taskforce, and that one of topics is SUGs.

8. **Adjournment**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 1:05p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Catherine Nelson and Mary Ann Creadon.