1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m. 
Present: Rob Collins (SFSU), Mary Ann Creadon (HSU), Darlene Yee-Melichar (SFSU), Jodie Ullman (CSUSB), Joe LoCascio (Cal Poly SLO), Bill Eadie (SDSU), Catherine Nelson (SSU), Mark Van Selst (SJSU), Simone Aloisio (CSUCI); absent Judith Lessow-Hurley (SJSU);

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved.

3. Approval of Minutes (October 2014)

Senator Aloisio asked for the following changes to the minutes:

- October 2014 Minutes: 5.1 second bullet should read: “course match timelines for student approval and registration into Coursematch courses may not easily align with campus registration periods.”
- September 2014 Minutes: 5.2, second bullet, last line should read: “but no one asked that question on the call.”

The committee agreed to the revision to the September 2014 minutes and approved the October 2014 minutes as amended.

4. Pending Business

4.1. Referral from Executive Committee regarding EO 1065 (General Education).

Discussion

Chair Bill Eadie reported on the history of the referral to the Academic Affairs Committee. Draft changes to EO 1065 were shared with the Executive Committee by the administration. The changes were characterized by the administration as non-substantive. The Executive Committee disagreed and referred the matter to AA. AA discussed the matter at its October interim meeting, and referred the matter to GEAC for clarification and evaluation of the changes.

Mark Van Selst, Chair of GEAC, reported back to AA on behalf of GEAC. He indicated that there was nothing in the revisions that GEAC hadn’t discussed before. Specifically, he reported the following: 1. The change to CSU GE to allow modifications for STEM related disciplines is consistent with ASCSU Resolution 3101-12/APEP/AA (Rev). 2. The elimination of subareas in Area D is consistent with current articulation practices. 3. GEAC recommended consulting with discipline faculty about the change in language from
“Performing Arts” to “Fine Arts.” 4. The context for the recommendation for a C- average for the Golden Four (critical thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning) is complicated. Currently a grade of C (2.0) or better in all four courses is required to transfer to the CSU. However, EO 1065 provides that each campus shall establish the minimum grades for satisfactory completion of GE breadth courses. Because each campus can set their own minimum grades for the Golden Four, inconsistencies have arisen among campuses, and on some campuses native students are held to a different standard than transfer students. A complicating factor is that the CCC Senate endorsed a C for transfer degrees, but transfer degrees cannot be held to any standard other than what is in EO 1065 and what majors may require. Van Selst also pointed out that the CCCs don’t use +/- grading, and some CSU faculty use +/- grading and others don’t; in effect the same performance in different classes can result in a different grade. The proposed minimum grade requirement is meant to alleviate these inconsistencies.

At the request of the committee, Ken O’Donnell, Senior Director, Student Engagement and Academic Initiatives and Partnerships, explained the history of the recommendation. The CSU was asked by GEAC to synchronize its policies regarding the Golden Four. The first draft of this change said a C in all Golden Four courses, consistent with AS 3020-11/APEP/AA (Rev). Registrars and deans of undergraduate education said that would make existing inconsistencies in policies across the system worse. Eric Forbes told Ken O'Donnell to change the C to a C-.

Committee Recommendation

After extensive discussion about the legislative history of the proposal, the variability among campus policies and the inconsistencies in systemwide documents, the committee accepted GEAC Chair Van Selst’s assessment that modifications to GE for STEM were consistent with AS 3101-12/APEP/AA (Rev) and that the elimination of subareas in Area D was consistent with current articulation practices. The committee accepted GEAC’s recommendation that discipline faculty be consulted regarding the change from “Performing Arts” to “Fine Arts.” The consensus of the committee was to recommend a C average across the Golden Four for transfer/GE certification (although what the committee "really wants" is a 2.0 in each of the four courses).

4.2. Resolution on the Academic Sustainability Plan (Jodie, Catherine).

Discussion

There was a discussion of the merits of the resolution and the direction it should take. Concerns raised by the committee included:

• There are existing mechanisms for oversight of the CSU with regard to curriculum such as WASC accreditation, program review and SB 1196 and 195. This resolution gives the legislature ammunition to be more intrusive. (DYM, JU)
• The performance measures in AB 94 are based upon a top-down, misplaced definition of student success that forces a conversation between minimizing units vs. student success. (RC)
• In these performance measures, student success just means graduation rates. (JLC)
• Some assessments are fine; we need to ensure that they are meaningful. (DYM)
• The url for the November report on the Trustees’ agenda is: http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/nov14/joint-com-EdPol-Finance.pdf

Committee Recommendation

With amendments, the Committee agreed to move forward with the first reading resolution drafted by Senators Ullman and Nelson.

4.3. Advice to the Chancellor on Handling Consultation with the Community Colleges Regarding Pilot Projects that Result from the Implementation of SB 850 (Community College Baccalaureates).

Chair Eadie introduced the agenda item. The Chancellor asked the Executive Committee for advice on the process that the CSU will use to review community college (CCC) pilot baccalaureate degrees created under SB 850. The Executive Committee referred the matter to the Academic Affairs Committee. Under SB 850 the community colleges can establish 15 pilot bachelor’s degrees, with no more than 1 degree per CCC district. The pilot degrees can’t be the same as an existing degree offered by any campus of the UC or CSU. The community colleges must consult with the UC and CSU in the process of developing the pilot degrees. The CCCs (local and statewide) are in the process of developing their processes for the creation and approval of the degrees. After the CCCs select specific degree, they then go to the CSU/UC for review.

Discussion

• At a minimum the title of the degree and a description of its content should be required, and the ASCSU and CCC Statewide Senate should be aware and involved in vetting process (MVS)
• It is not clear whether or not the CSU has veto power over the degrees, or when the CSU enters the process.
• There should be faculty with relevant disciplinary expertise involved in the CSU review. (CN)
• CSU faculty with related expertise might be able to give advice as the degrees are developed. (SA)
• In AS 3163-14/AA (Rev) the ASCSU asserted that the CCC’s should give us first right of refusal, do a cost/benefit analysis, provide us with the elements of each degree, and have the relevant fiscal, student services and other resources in place to offer the degree. Can we reformulate as the resolution as advice to the CCCs? (RC)
• The CCC Statewide Senate has spoken against BAs at CCCs because they are a form of mission creep. (MVS)
• Depending upon the nature of the degree, the CO staff could perhaps do the initial review. (JLC, MVS)

Committee Recommendation

The committee created a draft list of principles for the CSU review process to include:

• The review should be done by a committee constituted at the Chancellor's Office, under the auspices of the ASCSU. The review committee should include appropriate discipline faculty, and should consult with local CSU campus faculty.
• Review criteria should include title, structure of the degree (requirements) and course content, qualifications of faculty, space management issues (where will the program be housed?), internship placements and their impact on CSU programs, geography/location (the impact on the local CSU), and evidence that the program is needed (workforce needs).
• A substantive review should be triggered when the CCC BA undergoes substantive change.
• The CSU review should be prior to the program going to the CCC Board of Governors for final approval.
• The committee also recommends a detailed letter from the Executive Committee to the chancellor rather than a resolution. The committee will finalize its recommendation at its December Interim meeting.

4.4. Commendation for Wayne Tikkanen (Darlene).

Please see AS-3195-14/AA.

4.5 Access to Excellence project – Active Learning and Student Success (Darlene). No report.
4.7. Ethnic Studies project – to be determined following the task force report (Rob, Catherine, Judith). No report.

5. Chair’s Report

5.1. Chancellor’s consideration of program requests to exceed the 120/180 unit limit for bachelor’s degrees. Place Holder, Miller Resolution

The Committee discussed a draft resolution regarding the 120/180 unit limit for bachelor’s degrees that referenced the Freedom of Information Act Report provided to the California Faculty Association by the CSU. The committee decided not to move ahead with the resolution.

6. Liaison and Systemwide Committee and Task Force Reports

6.1. Chancellor’s Office Liaisons:
• Chris Mallon (will be absent and will possibly send a substitute). No report.
• Ken O'Donnell Time certain: 1:30pm. The conversation with Ken O'Donnell was primarily about the referral from the Executive Committee regarding EO 1065 (General Education). See 4.1 above for details.

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

• Planning for the Academic Conference is on track.
• Appointments to search committees for a new ITL Director and Associate Director for Academic Research/Policy: Members of the Executive Committee stepped in to serve because no other senators volunteered.
• The Academic Sustainability Model task force is looking at revamping CSU resource allocation mechanisms. They will submit 2 midway status reports. Their deliberations confidential.
• The Executive Committee met with the chancellor on October 6. They are working on scheduling more face-to-face meetings with him.
• The Faculty Trustee Selection Committee chair will report to the full Senate tomorrow. Chair Pasternack will send out the call for nominations.
• SB 850: The committee gave Senator Soni a list of our draft principles and notified him that we will defer a final decision until December. Senator Soni reported that when the Executive Committee met with the chancellor, he was talking about using faculty, but that the chancellor’s office would do the first screening, then turn to faculty if the decision was not black and white. The chancellor also talked about review of course content and sequence being the job of faculty. Senator Creadon asked whether the CSU really has a “no”.

6.3 Academic Conference Implementation Committee (Catherine/Darlene)

There was a lunchtime meeting on 11/5/14. The conference is coming along according to plan. DYM is examining the assessment tool. Speakers are lined up and posters have been scheduled. Logistics are being finalized.

6.4. Student Mental Health Services Advisory Committee (Jodie, Jim)

The Red Folder Project was discussed. It contains three parts: Where to call, icon on all computers, and app that will roll out soon. The app will change according to location. A survey will be circulated on the efficacy of mental health services within the system. Students on most campuses fund mental health services. Strategies are being investigated for reaching out to faculty on how to meet student mental health needs. The following concerns and questions were raised:

• To what extent should counselors be classified different from other faculty?
• To what extent will “The Red Folder” help?
• What are the mandated reporting requirements for students?
6.5. Sustainability - Campus as a Living Lab (Darlene, Simone)

DYM provided notes on the CSU Sustainability/Campus As Living Lab (CALL) meeting, November 2-4, 2014; Annapolis, Maryland.

- The National Socio-Economic Synthesis Center (SESYNC) convened a meeting of delegates from five states: California, Colorado, Maine, Maryland, and New Mexico. The purpose of the meeting was to help representatives from each of the five states determine what had been accomplished and next steps in relation to sustainability- campus as living lab (CALL) efforts. Please see attached powerpoint presentation for the CSU CALL report by AVC Elvyra San Juan and Meaghan Smith.

- Reports on what each team had accomplished during the project to date included the following elements:
  --- What was originally planned? Why were these approaches selected at that time?
  --- What work was actually done and what influenced any different choices in focus?
  --- What changes in either internal or external conditions, priorities or expectations affected the project and what impacts did those changes produce?
  --- What have you learned from this project that will influence your future work on the improvement of undergraduate STEM Education? Based on your experiences over the past three years, what advice would you offer people who are beginning this process in your states or other states? Does a focus on state-level policy serve as an appropriate or adequate lever?

- Based on lessons learned during the past three years, advice each team had for others who may want to enrich STEM education with themes such as sustainability or for those who specifically want to incorporate sustainability into an integrated STEM curriculum either for science literacy purposes (e.g., general education) or to prepare students for careers in STEM related fields was discussed.

- Discussion about what should be done with the lessons learned during the past three years to inform future work within and across the states which have participated and for others who may be just starting down this path took place. How can these efforts be strategically tied to other education efforts either for higher education or for grades K-12 (e.g., Common Core State Standards, Next Generation Science Standards)? What should be the tangible outcomes of this initiative to inform future aspects of our own work and future initiatives about other levers to incorporate sustainability into undergraduate STEM courses?
  -- Publications?
  -- Presentations, workshops, etc.?
  -- To whom should they be addressed (audiences)?
  -- Who will contribute to their preparation and delivery?

- What might happen next? Is there interest and momentum for continuing our work together? Is there local support for doing so?
  -- What is the source of the momentum?
-- If there is interest, what direction might your project take in the future?
-- If there is no interest in continuing the work, why not?

- A general discussion on: What steps might we take to continue this work and move to the next stage in development of the capacity for incorporating sustainability themes into STEM education using state teams to guide the effort? What questions might shape that effort? What might the next stages look like? What would we hope to accomplish in each state and how might the teams support each other?
  --- if the NSF proposal is funded
  --- if the NSF proposal is not funded
This discussion informed the work of small breakout groups.

- See DYM’s Wednesday, 11/5/14 for the CSU’s PowerPoint presentation.

DYM also reported that last year, CSU Facilities Management funded the Campus As Living Lab (CALL) initiative with $250,000 designated for faculty course redesign proposals to include collaborative, sustainability efforts. This year, EVC of Academic Affairs Ephraim Smith has further funded the CALL initiative with $250,000 designated for similar faculty proposals. A new RFP will be available early in the spring 2015 semester with proposals due mid-spring 2015 semester. Please be on the look out for it, and share with your campus constituents.

6.6. Other

**ITL Advisory Board**: See J. Ullman’s notes for details on the latest meeting. JU suggested that AA or AA and FA might want to draft a resolution about the status of faculty development directors in the CSU. Directors across the system are funded/paid at different levels, the scope of responsibilities varies greatly and who serves as director does as well. There is high turnover and reduced morale. A beneficial resolution would ask campus senate chairs or other appropriate individuals for information regarding the status of faculty development on each campus and best practices regarding how programs are implemented, funded and staffed. JU will send the chair questions, and he will distribute them.

7. Member Items/Campus Reports/Potential New Projects

7.1. Course classification for team-based learning (Jim)
JLC reported that C. Mallon reports efforts are underway in the chancellor’s office with Edward Sullivan, the new Institutional Research Director.

8. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:07pm.

Respectfully submitted by Catherine Nelson, with thanks to Rob Collins for his significant contribution to the minutes.