1. Call to Order
The Chair called the meeting to order at 11:18 a.m.

Present: Bill Eadie (Chair, SDSU), Mary Ann Creadon (HSU), Simone Aloisio (CSUCI), Jim LoCascio (Cal Poly SLO), Catherine Nelson (SSU), Mark Van Selst (SJSU), Rob Collins (SFSU), Darlene Yee-Melilchar (SFSU), Chris Mallon (Chancellor’s Office (CO) Liaison), Jodie Ullman (CSUSB); Absent: Judith Lessow-Hurley (SJSU);

2. Approval of Agenda

Additions to Agenda

- 4.44 Report from Loretta Kensinger ASCSU Representative to Ethnic Studies Taskforce. approx. 12:50pm;
- 4.5 Pending Business from D. Yee-Melichar on Draft Resolution of Commendation Regarding Academic Conference (see her email);
- 6.1 Chancellor’s Office Liaison Chris Mallon will be discussing Revisions for Title V Masters Program Criteria; Ken O’Donnell will phone in at Time Certain 1:30pm;

The agenda was approved as amended.

3. Approval of Minutes (December 2014)

Senator LoCascio asked for the following change to the December 2014 minutes:

- Change “Joe” to “Jim” in the “not present” list.

The committee agreed to the change and approved the December 2014 minutes as amended.

4. Pending Business

4.1 Review of the status of the Community College (CCC) Baccalaureate Pilot Project.

Report (B. Eadie)

Chair Eadie will be attending a 1:00pm meeting with CO staff and the Executive Committee to strategize about what to do next. He updated the committee on the status of the project. The Executive Committee may assign AA something to do regarding CCC BAs. D. Yee-Melichar forwarded a press release to the committee announcing that the CCC Board of Governors had preliminarily designated 15 CCC BA programs. The CSU doesn’t consider consultation on the matter to be finished. The Executive Committee expressed appreciation for the guidelines AA provided regarding the consultation process. They will be taken into account as the Executive Committee provides feedback to the CO.

Discussion

D. Yee-Melichar commented that in the press release the CCC reported on the review process and included faculty from the UC but not CSU, and asked why the CCC didn’t involve the CSU from the get go. Senator VanSelst reported that at the subject was discussed at the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee meeting on Tuesday, 1/20. His analysis is that
politically the CCC wanted to be seen as acting at its January Board of Governors’ meeting, but finessed the item by saying they didn’t actually approve the BAs, just that the degrees were “approved preliminarily.” The press then reports that the CCC “acted on” the degrees. It was a masterful change of conversation. The CCC can report that “these are the 15 degrees we have aced on,” while “those guys” (the CSU) might slow the process down. VanSelst stated that AA is the body to deal with the issue, so it will be useful to get specific questions/issues to Chair Eadie so he can carry them into the 1:00pm meeting.

4.2 Review of items emerging from the January 20 meeting of the General Education Advisory Committee (Bill, Mark).

Give Students A Compass: There will be a conference titled “New Paradigms and Pathways in General Education” February 12-14 at the CSU Sacramento Alumni Center. Individuals are welcome to attend, but there is no funding available.

WICHE (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education) Interstate Passport Project: There is a request for participants in Phase II of the Passport project, which is funded by the Lumina and Gates Foundations. In Phase II faculty members from two- and four-year institutions will develop Passport Learning Outcomes and Proficiency Criteria for the remaining six lower-division general education content areas: physical/natural world; evolving human cultures; critical thinking; creative expression; human society and the individual; teamwork and value systems. The stated intention of the Passport project is that a state-verified “passport” would be accepted to meet any participating institutions’ lower-division general education learning outcomes for those areas identified within the Passport Learning Outcomes. It is not anticipated that the CSU would sign on to such an agreement.

Senator VanSelst pointed out that the CSU has special expertise about intercampus transfer because the system has been involved in doing so for long time. We have also participated in developing learning outcomes for the Passport oral, written and quantitative communications initiatives; Bill Eadie (SDSU) and Kevin Baaske’s (CSULA) participation on the oral communication initiative was especially useful. VanSelst anticipates that the Executive Committee will identify which faculty will participate; Rob Collins (SFSU) and Mary Ann Creadon (HSU) have volunteered. VanSelst also pointed to a disconnect between the WICHE Passport and CSU GE. The CSU doesn’t allow systemwide competency approval. It is unusual for us to say to an out-of-state organization, “We trust you but not our internal partners” – we look over the shoulder of our CCC partners before we allow them to certify CSU GE (we certify individual courses for GE and never offer blanket approvals).

Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) Faculty Collaboratives Project: The Faculty Collaboratives project is hoping to streamline and make sense of the many student success and attainment initiatives that are out there. The hope is to have faculty evaluate/make sense of the initiatives and see how they might beneficially interact and/or what the best practices that emerge from each might be. Many of the initiatives are focused on learning outcomes as a means of evaluating effectiveness. For more information see: http://www.aacu.org/faculty

4.3 Review of the Chancellor’s Office Response to ASCSU Actions (Bill)

Chair Eadie suggested that the CO response to the ASCSU performance indicators resolution was troubling; the administration tells us they would welcome input, but then give us a noncommittal response. Eadie reported that some senators had lunch with Ed Sullivan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research/Resources; Sullivan commented on reporting on quality issues. While there are apparently conversations in the CO about the topic, Eadie doesn’t know what they are. He will ask ASCSU Chair Steven Filling to include an update in his report to the plenary tomorrow.
4.4 Subcommittee meetings & reports:

4.41 Access to Excellence project – Active Learning and Student Success (Darlene, Mary Ann, Simone).

The committee discussed high impact practices (HIPs). It was pointed out that data is necessary in order to examine high impact practices. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- High impact practices are being examined; however, more data is needed to proceed.
- Faculty collaboratives may offer insight into where data can be found.
- STEM collaboratives also need to be examined.
- Fullerton, Pomona, San Bernardino, Humboldt, and other campuses are involved in projects that may be of assistance for data on HIPS.

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

There was a discussion of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) test. The test has been administered. Will the assessment report take the CLA into account? The following concerns and questions were raised:

- The administration of the test is conditioned on the SAT scores.
- What implications might test-taking motivations have on the test outcomes?

4.43 Mathematics project – Intermediate Algebra (Mark, Jim).

The intermediate algebra requirement is being examined. A potential report can offer the pros and cons of having intermediate algebra as a requirement. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- What kind of options might students? How might their lived be impacted without command of this math skill?
- Who are we trying to help by not having this requirement?
- Is a report from Academic Affairs necessary?
- Intermediate algebra is defined differently.
- Is it possible to consider how achievement gaps are affected by having this requirement?
- It may be necessary to create a report to engage the university mission, minority access, achievement gaps impacted and barriers to student success created by not having this requirement.

4.44 Ethnic Studies Project: Loretta Kesinger (CSU?), ASCSU representative to the CSU Ethnic Studies Task : Time Certain 12:50p.m.

- Report
  - Committee has had discussions and is in the process of finalization.
  - Have not met since November due to Chair conflict.
  - Committee has 24 members from across CSU.
  - Various Ethnic Studies programs represented.
  - Student representation.
  - Moratorium on cutting programs until the report comes out.
  - Status of Ethnic Studies was discussed overtime.
  - Spring semester was spent developing a survey. Goal was to create campus-based narrative. Sent to campuses at the end of last spring.
  - By November 2014, good response rate.
  - The survey went directly to chairs rather than administration.
Campus presidents were sent letters to encourage their support for the use of these acquired data. Minors, majors, faculty, and staffing concerns were examined overtime. The goal of this was to engage pre-2008 numbers through the present. Qualitative questions asked about GE placements, advising, Masters degrees, staffing, student assistance, program health, program and faculty needs, etc. Program changes were also examined overtime. The committee will meet in the future to discuss these data. The role Ethnic Studies can play in college education will also be examined from these data. The next committee meetings are scheduled on February 6, 2015 and February 13, 2015. The letter to Chancellor will be delivered at a future date.

The following questions were raised:

1. What are some campus-based models that actually work?
2. To what extent is student interest waning in the Ethnic Studies? Interest is campus-based.
3. It has been proposed that umbrella departments be created to house programs with low enrollments. Where is the committee on this issue? Is the possibility of a compromise being discussed? Is it too onerous to consider that possibility that some departments may shrink, as has occurred with engineering?
4. Has the committee looked at program review?
5. What roles should Academic Affairs play in this process? What are we doing? Are there any possible heads-up issues that this committee should be concerned with? How can this committee assist with the process?
6. Would it be helpful for us to be to wait and see the report?
7. It is important to take back to the committee that it might be a good idea for an objective analysis. What recommendations might be different from the “protect all small programs” group? This will further engage how universities deal with small programs.
8. Is there anything that can come to us by our interim meeting in February?

Responses were as follows (Note: Numbers related to the questions asked.):

1. GE concerns, adequate staffing, financial commitments, etc. have been raised.
2. It is important to the health and well being that the courses be offered.
3. The reports will speak to this. At the core of these considerations is the question of whether or not these fields are vital to student education.
4. The data that was asked for related to this concern will be part of the qualitative section of the report.
5. The dissemination of the draft resolution versus the final version will be asked of the committee.
6. A Resolution and its usefulness will be discussed with the committee.

4.5 Draft Commendation Regarding Academic Conference (Darlene)

The intent to of the resolution is to commend contributions to the CSU Academic Conference and create institutional memory. Advice included naming the specific organizers and participants being thanked, and adding their names latter to the distribution list.

4.6 Institutional Research Board Policy (Mark)
Senator VanSelst asked for guidance regarding an Institutional Research Board (IRB) question related to student research in a methods course. If student research involves humans, faculty teaching the course have considered IRB because the research is a course requirement. If the does go through IRB review, it is ok for publication. It appears to be the practice in some cases that an undergraduate research methods class is using observational human research without IRB review. Does the committee have any guidance around that? The committee offered the following comments:

1. Senator Ullman: Federal regulations govern. The research can be done as a class exercise but it can’t be disseminated.
2. Senator VanSelst: There is an IRB forum where the practice is defined as a non-exemplary practice. There are classes disseminating research without IRB approval. Another issue is that the regulations only apply to federal funds, unless you check the box that says treat all funds as federal funds. Advice would be don’t check that box and clarify curricular processes around IRB regulations. Perhaps we should ask if have campuses have policies about this?
3. Senator Yee-Melichar: Take topic to the Institute for Teaching and Learning Advisory Board or faculty development consideration. It is not clear to all faculty on how to move forward with the IRB process, so request a “how to” program which could help faculty new to research.

5. Chair’s Report (Bill)

Report

There was a 1:00pm meeting with the Executive Committee, Lars Walton, the CO Chief of Staff and Chris Mallon to work on how to go about providing feedback to the chancellor that he can communicate to the CCC chancellor about the duplication of programs in the proposed CCC BA. Chair Filling will report to plenary tomorrow.

Discussion

Senator Ullman asked if the CSU has the ability to say no to the degrees. Eadie responded that there is still the opportunity for us to be advising about duplicative programs; in the consultative process local campus senate chairs will be asked to identify discipline faculty to look at the proposals. See Chair Filling’s email for the link to Dropbox for the full proposals. The CSU can comment on duplication, not quality or other matters, and the law doesn’t allow for a regional argument for a CCC BA.

Senator Ullman responded that the legislature is creating a two-tier system, a hierarchy that will disadvantage the students we least want to disadvantage, which is the hallmark of our access. Our ability to comment on that is over.

Senator LoCascio disadvantaging those that don’t have anything; MLV AA issue proliferation of upper division courses, CSUs have protected programs by moving content to upper division; if CCCs offer entire suite of (ex) upper division psych courses, all meet GE, see proportion of courses increase, make articulation difficult, don’t articulate lower to upper division; General discussion of implications of pilot; impact of Obama free CCC degree; faculty drain to CCCs; quality of curriculum; unit minimums;

Senator VanSelst asked if AA would talk about the difference between upper and lower division courses. Eadie asked Van Selst to research and report at the interim meeting to see if the committee wants to proceed further.

5.1 AA/APEP reception January 22

The committee agreed to join APEP in sponsoring the plenary reception Thursday, 1/22.

6. Liaison and Systemwide Committee and Task Force Reports
6.1. Chancellor’s Office Liaisons: Chris Mallon, Ken O’Donnell (time certain: 1:30pm)

Title V Masters (C. Mallon) – Mallon reported on the ongoing effort to revise Title V masters degree requirements (see handouts). She was told by some that the suggested revisions don’t go far enough. The new requirements are more rigorous, but implementation has been stopped so smaller programs have sufficient notice that they have to comply with the new criteria. Mallon has talked to the presidents and provosts, and a tension has emerged between strong requirements and a desire not to close down programs at small/developing campuses. She has no clear direction about how to proceed right now. Title V may be left as is, with any changes left to campus specific policies.

Proposed changed to Title 5 requirements under discussion include:

1. Section 2: currently requires 30 semester units for a masters degree – everyone agrees on this.
2. Section 2A: currently requires not less than 21 semester units (32 quarter units) completed in residence. The proposed change is to a fixed proportion of 70% of units required in residency after matriculation into a program;
3. Section 2B: currently requires that not less than one half of units required for the degree be in courses organized primarily for graduate students. The “organized for graduate students” language is seen as too ambiguous. The proposed change is to require that as of fall 2017, at least 50% of units be in stand-alone graduate level courses (those not scheduled to meet at the same time and in the same place as an undergraduate course).
4. Section 2C: This section would increase the percentage of units required in stand-alone graduate level courses. It requires that as of fall 2019, at least 60% of units required for the
5. Section 2D: This section currently states that not more than six semester units shall be required for a thesis or project. The proposed change is to provide that not more than six semester units shall be required for a thesis or project.

Campus Graduate Studies representatives have been surveyed; five campuses have yet to respond. If Mallon gets a clear answer from everyone right away, an information item would to the Trustees in March or May. If not, the proposal may be or scrapped.

Discussion

Senator VanSelst raised a concern about the 60% stand alone 2019 and its impact on the status of concurrent courses. Mallon responded that it is more difficult to uphold campus standards/expectations that tend to be stricter with the current language. Graduate deans want to support what campuses are doing, not impose a systemwide attempt to control graduate education.

Senator Creadon commented that the proposed revisions would have a negative impact on her campus science programs, which are smaller programs.

Senator Yee-Melichar had a concern about the specification that 70% of required courses must be completed in residence required “after being matriculated into the program.” This is problematic because some students/programs draw upon graduate courses to finish their BA, then move into graduate level courses, where they can apply 6 units of grad courses. If those 6 units don’t count for BA, they can be applied to the MA. So students who are admitted on a conditional basis because of the GRE writing proficiency and/or other prerequisites won’t know whether those 6 units count toward the MA or not. This requirement (“after being matriculated into the program”) may not be fair for undergraduates who want to go into a graduate program on the same campus. Yee-Melichar suggested replacing “matriculated” with “admitted.”
VanSelst suggested dropping “matriculated” or dropping “into program.”

Senator VanSelst raised the issue of students who switch from one program to another (i.e. more or less rigorous), and in Section 2A, the issue of the appropriate person who can give students who have coursework and show up and say “give me a degree.”

Senator Aloisio asked if the 2B definition of graduate level courses (not at the same time and same place as an undergraduate course) would apply to online education.

California Predoctoral Program: Mallon reported that there is a $100,000 increase from the lottery budget for scholarship money for the California Predoctoral Program. The CSU is finding increased interest in summer research at other universities; this makes students stronger candidates for PhD programs. As the program is expanded, more money is needed to fund the research. There is currently a rotating faculty director position. The problem is that just as students are headed out to do research in the summer, no one is available to advise them. The CSU is looking at a 12-month position CO position, with a job title of Program Director. The position is currently posted online in CO employment opportunities. The director would help with strategic planning during the summer and spend more time with grant writing (diversity in professorate, mentoring practices, alternative career paths). Senator VanSelst pointed out that in the last few days tension had arisen around the expectation that faculty assigned time for CO responsibilities go to faculty that are in area. Mallon indicated that the expectation is the same with the Institute for Teaching and Learning.

ITL Director Search: The search for ITL director failed. The search will be started again soon. An interim director was put in for Spring 2015 because of EVC Ephraim Smith leaving in June. The interim director is now a lecturer to illuminate the active roles that they play in Teaching and Learning and their contribution to teaching system-wide.

The following concerns and questions were raised:

Is it possible to have representation from Northern campuses for the Director of ITL?
- It is vital that the individual is in Long Beach.
- Files and materials need to be shared fluidly. This cannot always occur with people working remotely.

Minority targeted programs. Is it possible that outreach in terms of prep can be looked into?
- M. Merryfield runs the program and should be consulted.

On page 2 of the handout there seems to be an area of concern. Do CCs have the first right to offer a program if a CSU campus is interested? The CCs will have new revenues to offer new programs. Where do we stand?
- The CCs do not have first right.
- Campuses can continue with plans that may overlap.
- The funding argument has been made.

Ken O’Donnell, Time certain 1:30p.m.

- Reporting from the AAC&U.
- Leaders from higher education have been invited to talk about the bigger picture.
- Chancellor White addressed campus heads and faculty. His talk engaged the following:
  - How high impact practices as part of student experiences and success.
- How engaged learning as an agent of closing achievement gaps.
- How learning communities at Chico as a way to reduce barriers to achievement.
- How engagement and high quality learning were centerpieces of the talk.

- The new EVC that has been named comes from a background of student success and engaged learning based in degree completion.
- Prospective proposals from the "Irvine Foundation" to develop examples – through collaboration between faculty and business world - of proficiency that show advanced learning in various fields.
- Invitations would be extended to faculty teaching upper division Capstone courses.

The following questions were asked and concerns were raised:

1. Have there been any discussions of male and female student success?
2. In working with students on academic probation, it seems that many students are experiencing depression. Is anything being done to examine this phenomenon?
3. To what extent are we doing a disservice to students – particularly those on academic probation - in this pressure to complete their degrees?
4. Faculty often find it difficult to confront students and fellow colleagues that are experiencing problems. One cannot make them get help; however, enabling mechanisms for getting help are needed.
5. Are there any heads-up concerns that we should be aware of?

6.2. Executive Committee Liaison: Praveen Soni Time certain: 3:30pm.

Report

Chair Filling will talk about CCC BAs at the plenary tomorrow. A joint letter is likely from the Chair of the Senate and the EVC Academic Affairs to campuses asking for comment upon the duplication of programs in the proposals. Campus presidents/provosts and senate chairs will respond after communicating with appropriate discipline faculty about the proposed programs. The time frame is short; responses are needed back by mid February. If a campus administration and senate want to provide one response, that is fine.

New AVC Lauren Blanchard approved at the next Board Of Trustees meeting (next week). Chancellor White wants Chair Filling and Vice Chair Miller to meet with him.

The Executive Committee is looking to see if a call for catastrophic leave donations can go out throughout system. The inquiry was precipitated by the circumstances of our colleague Shane Frielich. The current limit on donations is 40 hours per year.

Appointments to the WICHE Passport Project task force will be in the Chair’s report to the plenary.

The analysis of data from the Academic Conference survey results is underway. The conference committee is considering how to communicate to internal/external audiences, and power points, pictures and media will be posted on the website. The committee will have another meeting in a month or so.

Chancellor White will give the State of the CSU speech at the Board Of Trustees meeting next Tuesday at 12:30pm. The Wang Excellence awards will be announced at 3:15pm.

Discussion
Senator VanSelst asked if the appointment process to WICHE was smooth process? Soni: Yes.

Senator LoCoscio asked about the Brown-Napolitano exchange about UC tuition increases. Someone in the CSU said if the CSU gets screwed we’d fix it. How? Our salaries? VanSelst: fewer students? Soni: There is only a few percent increase in target.

Senator VanSelst commented that AA is potentially defining what defines an upper division course.

Senator Yee-Melichar asked if funds provided by senators that would have gone to the November social could be contributed to the Shane Freliech contribute health fund.

6.3. Summer Arts Advisory Board (Bill Eadie). See Dropbox;

6.4. Other

**Academic Conference Implementation Committee (D. Yee-Melichar)**
The ASCSU Extended Executive Committee and Senators Baaske, Kaiser, Nelson and Yee-Melichar will meet on Wednesday, January 21 at 10am in the Munitz Room to review conference outcome materials. According to the meeting agenda, these include the survey results (quantitative, qualitative); break-out session notes; panel Q&A questions; videos of keynote speakers and panel; and photographs. Dissemination (conference webpage, proceedings, other?) and assessment will also be discussed.

**CSU Search Committees (D. Yee-Melichar)**
As you know, Dr. Andrew (Zed) Mason has joined the Chancellors Office as the interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Research and Partnerships on December 1, 2014 for one year. In addition, Dr. Emily Magruder has joined the Chancellor's Office as the interim Faculty Director of the CSU Institute of Teaching and Learning during Spring 2015. AVC Mallon, Senators Lessow-Hurley, Ullman and Yee-Melichar will continue to represent AA committee on the ITL Advisory Board and provide updates as warranted.

**CSU Sustainability- Campus As Living Lab Committee (D. Yee-Melichar)**
This committee is scheduled to meet on Wednesday, January 21 at 5pm in the Chancellor's Office. Senators Aloisio and Yee-Melichar will attend and represent the ASCSU at this meeting. We will discuss next steps for this initiative in terms of grant funding, meeting in Sacramento, and curriculum planning for sustainability.

**GEAC Report (M. VanSelst)**
- The central points of the reports were as follows:
  - The committee engaged the discussion that the nature of what GE is must be examined. A sub-committee has been created to examine the nature of upper GE system-wide.
  - Two separate pieces of information will be engaged:
    - What does Title V tell us about GE?
    - What are campus-based approached to GE?
  - Example: If GWAR gets placed in GE and through Course Match the course is completed, then does it count?
  - This approach will enable the CSU to offer Community Colleges models for doing upper division GE.
  - A broad sample of successful and unsuccessful practices needs to be examined.
  - GE coordinators will be consulted.
  - This review should be partially ready by March.
Private institutions participating in GE were also discussed.
- Heald College and FIDM GE can be used to transfer to CSU.

Music skills course were also discussed.
- There are tensions between record outline and what happens in the classroom.
- It is not clear whether or not GE requirements are being met.
- Faculty that can show that they are using GE in their courses can be approved.
- It is important to see how learning outcomes were explained during the GE review process.

Expansion on STATWAY and were also discussed.
- STATWAY has been approved for meeting quantitative GE.
- WICHE conference during the second week of February will occur.
- Faculty are encouraged to attend.
- Funding sources include Lumina and Gates Foundation.
- Intercampus transfer is already a strength of the CSU.
- The Executive Committee will decide on who will participate in the conference.
- The AAC&U faculty collaborative project is looking for faculty to examine best practices in baccalaureate teaching.

The following questions were asked and concerns were raised:

1. To what extent is money driving academic standards?
2. To what extent are faculty following their course outlines?
3. It is important to know whether or not students succeed in courses.
4. It is important for the faculty to show how students met the assigned learning objectives.
5. What is the goal of the inter-state passport?

7. Member Items/ Campus Reports/Potential New Projects

8. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

Respectfully submitted by Catherine Nelson and Rob Collins