1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 11:00AM.

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

2. Approval of Agenda

The Agenda was approved.

3. Approval of Minutes (February 2015)

The February 2015 Minutes were approved. Please send editorial corrections to Senator Nelson.

4. Pending Business

4.1 Review of Executive Committee discussion and action regarding CSU involvement in WICHE (time certain: 11am).

The Executive Committee joined AA for a discussion of CSU involvement in WICHE. ASCSU Chair Steven Filling provided a brief history of the Executive Committee’s work on the WICHE matter. The outcome is that Ken O’Donnell and Chair Filling will send letters to WICHE indicating that the CSU is not a signatory nor a formal participant in the group’s Passport Project, along with a request that the ASCSU be removed from website as a participant. Chair Filling reported that WICHE wanted the CSU in room because of the system’s expertise in articulation, and those faculty colleagues who have participated found the exercise useful. AA Committee members were particularly interested in the implications of ASCSU and CSU participation in WICHE Passport Project meetings, given that both entities are not formal parties to the project.

Senator Gubernat indicated that as a member of the Executive Committee, her concern was about the Passport Learning Objectives as an end game. She reported that the Executive Committee was asked to appoint faculty to participate, but that they didn’t know the full purpose of the project or who would benefit. She is concerned that the Gates and Lumina Foundations are funding the project and will be able to pick our brains for their expertise, but she is not sure what are we getting out of it. In her view it is important to make sure that faculty are participating in collegial conversations (which we do all time), but we need to be concerned about the credibility we lend a project.

ASCSU Vice Chair Chris Miller reported that this matter had been on the Executive Committee’s agenda several times. She pointed out that appointees to the project serve as appointees from the ASCSU, but that the ASCSU has not gone on record at any time supporting this particular project. The way out of that tension was to appoint members of the Executive Committee to attend project meetings. Chair Filling added that a lot of time and energy is spend
educating people that the ASCSU Executive Committee makes such appointments.

Senator Nelson raised a concern about the spill over from the Executive Committee making appointments to consultation with ASCSU standing committees about such initiatives. Chair Filling asked if the Executive Committee should refer the whole issue of curricular initiatives to AA.

Senator Creadon asked Senator Collins, who has participated in Passport Project conversations, if he shared any of the sense of distrust that Chair Filling indicated exists on the Executive Committee. Senator Collins responded that there are two issues, whether or not the ASCSU should be involved and the benefits of faculty participation. He argued that the CSU is doing great things with General Education (GE), and that the exchange among colleagues regarding theory to drive curricular/articulation issues is beneficial for out-of-state of colleagues who haven’t been doing assessment. His own benefit was using the experience to help develop student learning outcomes (SLOs) for his campus.

Senator Creadon asked Senator Collins whether, assuming Passport outcomes are standardized and corporations or foundations can use them, is his participation in service of Lumina? Senator Collins answered no; he offered advice on how learning outcomes can be improved according to discipline standards. It is not service to Lumina if he just offered information. Senator Gubernat commented that proficiencies are another agenda for Lumina, that is, rewarding credit for demonstrating proficiency outside of classroom. Senator Collins responded that proficiency boxes us into a discourse that we are failing; we aren’t. We are underfunded. In his view SLOs need to evolve and not stay fixed on what corporations want.

Senator Lessow-Hurley noted that she is not opposed to a passport or proficiency; but she wanted to know why aren’t the committee wasn’t talking to Debra David, Senior Advisor, Liberal Learning Partnerships, CSU. Ms. David is state facilitator for the Passport project. Regarding the Executive Committee’s appointment of two faculty to represent the ASCSU at the next Passport meeting, Senator Hurley remarked that two faculty aren’t sufficiently representative of the 23 campuses. She wanted to know if the CCCs were approached for representatives and if they are in the same bind as the ASCSU. Chair Filling indicated that the Academic Senate CCC is not empowered to make system level statements about curriculum. Filling also commented that the Passport project reflected the commoditization of the curriculum. His experience with these meetings was that he, Senator Van Selst and Senator Baaske were the only faculty in room, and the overriding tone of the discussion was how to get faculty to do this. Most attendees were vice provosts and admissions types. In his view this project chops at the root of the CSU claim that its campuses are unique. Senator Gubernat indicated that she raised the issue of CSU participation in the Passport project with Debra David at the January GEAC meeting. At that time David said CSU participation was to have conversations with other WICHE participants. For Gubernat the issue is not the conversation itself but the endgame her concern. In her view David’s comments are antithetical to what is on the WICHE website. For her the GEAC discussion with David wasn’t satisfactory. Senator Lessow-Hurley suggested that perhaps a conversation with David at AA would be beneficial. Senator Van Selst indicated that GEAC has an interest in looking at proficiency and competency criteria; both are already in the CSU to some extend with credit by exam and similar options.

Senator Lessow-Hurley added that in her view the addition of the ASCSU as a participant to the WICHE Passport website is an attempt to develop the level of legitimacy of the project on the website; the latter makes it look like the whole state of California has signed on. Senator Van Selst clarified that the original participants from California were Sacramento State and a local CCC. So the discussion started with individual CSU and CCC campuses, though they were not
the appropriate entity to talk to. They were swapped out for senates on the website three years ago.

Vice Chair Miller indicated that any guidance from standing committees about ASCSU participation in initiatives is always welcome. She suggested that committees don’t have to rely on the Executive Committee to give referrals to follow up. Ken O’Donnell is the liaison to AA, so the committee should talk to him and then give feedback to the Executive Committee. Jim LoCascio commented that the whole project seems to want to make everything more homogeneous, and result in students paying out of state tuition. His department is more than 40% out of state students.

Senator Van Selst asked when the Executive Committee is going to ask AA for AA related input on the Passport project. He pointed out that assuming Ken O’Donnell in his presentation to the Senate Friday about the Passport Project says the CSU has no intention of signing off as a Passport state, but faculty will be present for conversations, and the ASCSU mirrors O’Donnell’s approach, the Executive Committee will have one faculty member present for each of the upcoming sessions. That colleague will in effect observe three CCC faculty. In his view, if the Executive Committee is going to send faculty they should be active participants in the Passport conversations or we should not participate. Senator Eadie commented that if we aren’t in the room, he would be concerned that something will happen that we might have to respond to down the road. Eadie also pointed out that Chair Filling doesn’t want to raise this to a formal statement from the ASCSU yet; he wants to wait and see what outcomes are to the letters before pushing it up the line.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked if the larger issue is that the CSU wants to endorse the Passport project. She questioned whether Debra David had marching orders from somewhere, or whether an agreement has been made further up the chain. Senator Collins argued that the CSU is at a disadvantage if we are not in the room. He agrees with the issues raised about Executive Committee transparency and the problem with the WICHE webpage, but he is concerned about the consequences if we are not part of conversation. Specifically, he pointed out that what it means to talk about evolving human cultures changed because he was in the room. Senator Eadie pointed out that Ken O’Donnell and Debra David see their jobs as staying in contact with whatever is going on nationally and regionally.

Senator Van Selst summarized the discussion. The Executive Committee acts for the senate when the full senate can’t act. We have a clear statement here that we don’t plan to be a signatory to the Passport project because the project holds out of state institutions less responsible than in-state institutions, and we have concerns about other things, such as proficiency criteria, that are of ongoing interest. When there is a statewide project like this, the senate reserves the right to sign off on it. An option here is for the ASCSU to declare its intention not to sign off on the WICHE Passport.

4.2 Consideration of a resolution regarding CSU participation in WICHE (Mark).

Senator Van Selst will draft a resolution reflecting the committee’s concerns about the Passport project.

4.3 Continuing discussion of the proposed CSU minor in Sustainability (Simone).

Senator Aloisio will report on the Sustainability minor at the plenary.

4.4 Update on possible Title 5 changes to graduate degree requirements (Chris Mallon,
Mary Ann – see communication from Humboldt State faculty in dropbox).

Discussion

The committee continued its ongoing discussion of possible changes to Title 5 graduate degree requirements. Humboldt State’s College of Natural Resources and Sciences (CNRS) faculty sent a letter to AA objecting to the proposed changes. One particular item of concern mentioned in the letter was the change from “Not less that one-half of the units required for the degree shall be in courses organized primarily for graduate students,” to “As of Fall 2017, at least 50 percent of the units required shall be in stand-alone graduate-level courses...” Senator Creadon, who represents Humboldt State, indicated that for science faculty classes have been dual listed, that is offering undergraduate courses to be offered simultaneously with graduate-level courses. It is a way to recruit for the graduate program, and undergraduate students are more successful in such courses. The course syllabus offers two different outcomes, one for each level of the course. In addition, the dean will cancel a course if doesn’t have certain enrollment; courses will run if undergraduates are allowed to register. CNRS faculty and the dean sent letters to Chris Mallon, who indicated the letters, will be included in documentation when the process gears up again. Creadon reported that the Humboldt graduate dean says she hasn’t heard about the issue of course rigor that prompted the suggested change. In her view the problem is with the transcript and recording of courses.

CO Liaison Chris Mallon indicated that as she shops the proposed changes around to relevant constituencies there is no sense of urgency because there is already a policy in place. The change to “stand alone graduate courses” was brought up because of people’s concern about rigor. Mallon commented that tinkering with the policy language may not be the right way to go. The Humboldt letter made her realize the effort should start from principles, not a set policy. She asked AA to send to the Executive Committee a request for AA to develop specific guidelines regarding what a Masters degree should be about, similar to the 2004 report on graduate education, or decades ago the similar effort regarding the Bachelor’s degree. She is interested in determining if the current policy serves the interests of what we think a MA should be (or MS of MFA) regarding coursework and a culminating experience. Senator Van Selst noted that the current revision ran into a problem because of the higher standard; one or more campuses rejected it. Colleagues want standards with teeth, but don’t want anyone disadvantaged by it. Senator LoCascio asked whether there are graduate department lead faculty the committee can reach out to. He commented that at San Luis Obispo the 4+1 option lets students declare they will be a graduate student; they complete extra units and earn a BA and MA after at the end of an extra year.

Action

After much discussion, the committee agreed to draft a document that defines what distinguishes a Masters degree from a Bachelors degree in the CSU.

4.4 Discussion of Chancellor’s response regarding overlap of CSU coursework with California Community Colleges (CCC) bachelor’s degree proposals. (See resolution from San Jose State in the dropbox).

See 6.1 Mallon Report.

4.5 Subcommittee meetings & reports

4.51 Access to Excellence project – Active Learning and Student Success (Darlene, Mary
See Subcommittee Report in Dropbox. In addition, Senator Yee-Melichar reminded the committee via her 3/10/15 email that during the February 20 AA conference call she asked Ken O’Donnell for clarification on the A2E strategic plan goal on “active learning.” Yee-Melichar reported that in working with Senators Creadon and Aloisio, she was interested in learning about all that active learning entailed, and what assessments (evidence-based data) of active learning might be available to us. Ken O’Donnell indicated that active learning included and went beyond high-impact practices (HIPs) and suggested that the subcommittee might wish to look at related:

1) Information on service learning strategies (Judy Botelho);
2) information on bottleneck solutions-course redesign (Gerry Hanley); and
3) information on the STEM collaborative (Dawn Digrious).

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

Senator Collins drafted a resolution regarding assessment to be presented to the plenary as a first reading item.

4.53 Mathematics project – intermediate algebra (Mark, Jim). No report.

4.54 Ethnic Studies project. On hold.

5. Chair’s Report

5.1 Priorities for ASCSU Advocacy Day, April 14.

5.2 Planning for the May plenary.

6. Liaison and Systemwide Committee and Task Force Reports


Report

_Institute for Teaching and Learning Director Position_ (C. Mallon): The Pre-Doctoral Program and Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) Director positions are full time management positions. For the ITL position someone is needed that has expertise in faculty development and can provide long term direction and planning. These qualifications will professionalize the position. A Faculty Fellow program is coming.

_CCC BA_ (C. Mallon): Mallon recapped the consultation requirements for the CCC BA programs, and the consultation that had occurred prior to the Chancellor communicating his recommendations to the CCCs. She saw press releases that claimed that in meetings with the CSU, the CCCs reached out to individual faculty and administrators and provided a template for a letter of support for their BA programs. Where the CCCs said they had support from CSU faculty, those campuses said there was a conflict between proposed CCC BA programs and CSU programs. Among campus responses, faculty are more protective of the curriculum than administrators. Chancellor White is dealing with a political environment; his information is that there would be long term consequences for campuses, programs if all of the CCC BA programs were deemed duplicative of CSU programs. The CCC Board of Governors approved everything.
except the two programs Chancellor White said duplicated CSU programs, the automotive technology and interactive design degrees. The Department of Finance and Legislative Analyst will write an evaluation report if the pilot program. They have to check in with the CSU when they write the reports.

Discussion

Senator Van Selst commented that there will be blow back against the ITL Director position being at the MPP level; it will be perceived as “another damn administrative position.”

Senator LoCascio asked if the Cal Poly SLO Mechanical Engineering program would receive a 120 unit waiver for 198 units. He asked for a yes or no answer. He explained that the process is that the CO approves or disapproves waivers as written. His dean or provost modified the total units in the SLO Mechanical Engineering request for waiver from 198 down to 196. Modifications are not in the rules. The accreditation body ABET reported a deficiency; 1 unit could have fixed the problem. The Mechanical Engineering department’s hands are tied for 2 units out of 198.

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

Report

Chancellor White appointed Rolland Richmond as Acting President at CSU Chico.

The Executive Committee met with Chancellor White regarding his recommendation to the CCCs about their proposed BA degrees. In that meeting the Chancellor indicated that the CCCs don’t need our approval, but had to consult with the CSU. In his view the glass is half full. Four of the proposed degrees need work. He decided that there was “sufficient separation of programs for the nine that there was no objection to.” When asked if the CCC programs being offered are a challenge to the sovereignty of the CSU and its programs, he responded that there is a political reality involved. Too much push back could have resulted in more legislation and more harm to the CSU. He mentioned the CSU request for a doctorate of audiology, and our existing nursing and physical therapy graduate programs. The UC complained that we are doing same thing as we are saying the CCCs are doing to the CSU. The programs will be tracked to see if there is a negative impact on the UC. Regarding the issue of the duplication of degrees, the Chancellor commented that duplication is not dichotomous, but rather a gradient. He asserted that all programs are duplicative at the lower division level, largely in GE. The Executive Committee wants to know what the implications of CCC BAs are for the CSU nine units of upper division GE requirement, especially with regard to the transferability of upper division GE units. We would lose resources to offer those courses. AA should think about the definition of duplication, and review EO 1100 with the CCC BA in mind.

The Executive Committee is asking FA for campus hiring plans and retirements for tenure track faculty this year and next to get at the net increase in faculty hires in the system. As an aside, Soni indicated that his president said the CO gave presidents marching orders to increase tenure density.

The Academic Conference Planning Committee had a debrief session Wednesday morning. A web site will be set up website with related material. The Executive Committee is working on a one-page summary of the conference, what we learned from the survey data, and how useful the conference is as we move forward.
The Learning Management System contract is expiring. Faculty are needed to review RFPs for a new contract. Faculty will also be needed for the Institute for Teaching and Learning Director search committee (the position will be at the MPP level).

Trustee Norton is scheduled to visit the plenary at 1:00pm Thursday.

Discussion

Senator Van Selst pointed out that upper division GE is treated as part of the signature of CSU campuses, which could conflict with CCC upper division GE courses offered as part of their BA programs. So this is where we need to define upper division GE. EO 1100 maintains the old version that GE is transferable, but didn’t anticipate upper division GE transfer.

Senator Creadon asked about the four CCC BA programs the CO expressed concern about. Senator Eadie responded that the CCCs committed to consulting with the CSU as the programs move forward.

Senator LoCascio asked about the cost per diploma per school, and how the CSU can plan anything without that data. Soni responded that the CSU did the study but the data is not available.

6.3. Other

Faculty Affairs request for co-sponsorship of resolution on tenure density: The Committee declined to co-sponsor the FA resolution. It does not involve/cross over into AA’s jurisdiction.

Resolution to define upper division General Education: Senator Van Selst is drafting the first reading resolution for the March plenary. It will be on the AA April Interim Agenda.

7. Member Items/Campus Reports/Potential New Projects

7.1 CUNY’s ASAP program and student success (Darlene). Deferred.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

Respectfully submitted by Catherine Nelson, with thanks to Rob Collins for his contributions.