

ASCSU Chair Pasternack's Report for January 2008

I hope you had a good holiday break and that the New Year finds you well. Below you will find a write-up of the activities I have been involved in since our last plenary meeting.

On **November 13 and 14, 2007** I, along with other members of the Executive Committee attended the **Board of Trustees** Meeting in Long Beach. Minutes of the Board meeting will be posted at: <http://www.calstate.edu/BOT/Agendas/index.shtml>. At the Board meeting I indicated that the ASCSU had passed a resolution (AS-2815-07/FGA) opposing Proposition 92 and spoke about our resolution on Textbook Affordability (AS-2813-07/AA/FA/FGA/). The budget presented to the Board did take into account the three funding concerns delineated in AS-2812-07/FGA. The majority of the discussion regarding the 2008/09 budget revolved around the proposed 10% student fee increase. The Trustees decided to delay formal approval of this increase until the spring, but made it clear that if funding from the state to cover this amount was not forthcoming, the fee increase would, most likely, reluctantly have to be imposed.

Following the Board of Trustees Meeting, a meeting of the **Access to Excellence Steering Committee** was held at the Chancellor's Office. The Executive Committee was quite pleased that the concerns expressed by the ASCSU in AS-2821-07/EX along with responses from campus Senates and individual Senators were shared with the Steering Committee and will help form the basis of the next draft.

On **November 15** Senator Cates and I along with Al Jones attended a **C-ID meeting** in Sacramento. Notes from this meeting were previously forwarded to the ASCSU.

On **November 19** I attended a meeting of the **Statewide Advisory Board P-12/Community College Leadership Educational Doctorate** at the Chancellor's Office in Long Beach. The meeting began with welcomes and introductions of the participants. This was followed by an update on the Ed.D. Program Implementation.

It was announced that all seven first wave campuses were approved by WASC without major problems. A chart was presented showing enrollment data by program as well as participant ethnicity. Fresno, Long Beach, Sacramento, San Diego, and San Francisco have both P-12 and CC programs. Fullerton and San Bernardino have P-12 only.

In total, there are 142 students in the programs on the seven campuses. Fullerton expects to launch the Community College program in the near future. About 60% of the students are in the P-12 programs, 40% in the Community College programs. San Bernardino has most of the Community College courses developed, but needs additional personnel before the program will go for WASC approval. Of the 12 students at San Bernardino, 3 are male and 9 are female. In total on the seven campuses about 60% of the students in the programs are female. 41% of participants are white, 16% are African American, and 22% are Latino. 11% of students declined to state ethnicity. A new brochure has been created to promote the programs on first wave campuses.

Regarding Wave II, four campuses are scheduled to begin next fall. These include Bakersfield, East Bay, Northridge, and Stanislaus. East Bay will only offer P-12 while the other three campuses will offer both programs. A big concern is attracting needed faculty for these programs.

Discussion then focuses on the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED). Lee Schulman from the Carnegie Foundation is interested in looking at innovative models for the Ed.D. CSU was invited to participate and initially said no, but we have been re-invited and may now participate. Sharon

Brown Welty from the Fresno campus together with one of their students and Bev Young attended the last meeting of this group. CSU has invited all first and second web campuses to participate in the CSU (CPED) program. Two of the joint UC-CSU programs have also requested participation and have gained support from their UC program partners. Each campus will send a faculty or administrative participant as well as a student to such meetings. The meetings will follow the agenda of the nationwide Carnegie meeting. Note that the student participants will be typically be either CC or P-12 administrators.

Presentations were then made from CSU Long Beach and CSU San Bernardino. At Long Beach three departments participate in the Ed.D. Program. The campus admitted 30 students and currently has 27 in the program. They plan to admit 35-36 for next year. Students come from a variety of backgrounds, but have bonded together. One CC Education Professor is in the CC program. Another is a clinical educator at Long Beach Memorial Medical Center. Discussion of student research interests occurred in the first semester.

In the first six months of the Long Beach program several lessons were learned. These have resulted in several program adjustments including an adjustment of writing assignments to recognize student workloads as well as a modification of course schedule. At Long Beach they are trying to build capacity to support student success (i.e. assistance in student writing at the graduate level). In particular, the program is forging linkages with campus resources such as enrollment services and the campus Institutional Review Board (to handle close to 90 dissertations). They are also providing professional development for faculty (e.g. pedagogy for team teaching and teaching with technology) and program faculty are encouraged to participate in this. The campus is also engaged in strategic recruitment efforts and has assigned one person to deal with community colleges to build student demand.

At San Bernardino there is a new College of Education building in which the program will be housed. February 28, 2008 is next application deadline. The mission of the doctorate was presented. The Ed.D. is 94 quarter units. Students have asked about the difference between the Ed.D. and a Ph.D. program. The response given was the focus of the Ed. D. program is on practice and applied research tools. Courses are taught with faculty from across the campus. Seminars are one unit each – five are required. Seminars are C/NC. The Pre K-12 specialization has courses in five areas. The program is a 3 year cohort that meets at least two times a week – it may be one evening and Saturday morning or two evenings a week. Some students want classes to meet only on Saturdays for a full day, but there is concern about student learning success during the Saturday afternoon. Evening classes go from 5 pm to 7 pm. Team teaching is done. One of the programs strength is in the quantitative area. One student is from Compton school district, but the reason for this may be geographical or that the student had done previous degrees at San Bernardino.

It is worth noting that the programs on the seven campuses were initially similar (to facilitate WASC approval), but will become dissimilar over time. Programs should look at how many of the students had previously studied at a CSU. Teaching Commons have been developed with assistance from Gerry Hanley. On-line journals can be accessed from this list. (For CSU Teaching Commons website see: <http://teachingcommons.cdl.edu/edleadership/index.html>). It was emphasized that the programs' ultimate goal is to improve the learning of California's students. The meeting concluded with a discussion of assessment measures for Ed.D. Programs and the need for the state to develop assessment tools.

Also on **November 19th** I participated in a conference call regarding the **Academic Technology Framework Assessment (ATAF)** effort. A follow up conference call was held on November 30.

On the evening of **November 30** I attended the **CFA Board meeting** in Sacramento. Notes from that meeting were previously sent to the ASCSU.

On **December 5th** I, along with members of the Executive Committee, attended an **ICAS meeting** in San Francisco. At this meeting we discussed the state's budget situation and the possible impacts it would have on public higher education. Members agreed that we should play more of a role in publicizing the need for adequate funding of public higher education and this will be a topic of a future ICAS meeting. Along these lines, we firmed up plans for ICAS to hold a Lobbying Day in Sacramento in the spring. We also discussed the issue of textbook affordability and the idea of making textbooks exempt from sales tax (CCC's seemed to be in favor of this, but UC had some concerns). We discussed transfer issues and got updates on the C-ID project and IGETC standards. We did inform the CCC Senate leadership of our opposition to Proposition 92 and indicated to the UC Senate leadership that while we had not formally revisited the issue of the CAHSEE this year, it was doubtful that we would take a position in opposition of this graduation requirement.

On **December 6** I attended a meeting of the **Provost's Technology Steering Committee (PTSC)** and the **Academic Council (AC)** in Los Angeles. At PTSC the meeting began with a discussion of the Academic Technology Assessment Framework (ATAF). A committee has been formed to work on developing a framework for assessing campus academic technology. This will include hardware, software, and training. Once a model is developed, deployment will be looked at. Initially, there will be trial in which CO staff will assist campus staff in completing the report on-line. It was noted that perhaps these efforts should start from the users' perspective. Questions may vary based on campus, but standards should be developed.

The goal is to develop template that will give campuses some flexibility in terms of technology funding. A couple of completed assessments will also be sent out to help guide campuses in this effort. It was noted that it is important to look at the expectations of new faculty and new students relative to technology and faculty development is of extreme importance. While technology monies can be used for assigned time, it is unclear how such assigned time would be reflected in the template. One time versus recurring costs should also be delineated. It was also noted that assessment should align with any technology plan developed. Given the current state budget situation, while money may likely not be coming next year, there was agreement that campuses should be ready for this if and when the money becomes available. Of particular concern is how smaller campuses will cope without these funds.

Regarding the Transforming Course Design initiative, it was reported that the eight campuses which did not participate last academic year will be asked to submit proposals (\$5K to \$10K of funding may be available per campus). For the systemwide initiative, science classes (biology, physics) that have high failure rates would be good candidates. Classes in history, political science, and economics may also be candidates. Presentation of the courses recommended by campuses will be made at the upcoming ATAC meeting and ATAC will recommend candidate courses to Gary. Four to six faculty will be selected per course. Discussion took place as to how faculty and courses will be selected. Information on faculty background should be provided. Data that will be made public will be limited.

Online degree programs – The question of how will campuses be designated to be the lead in each area was posed. Keith Boyum passed out a listing of majors. There will be a push to have more undergraduate on-line degree programs and these might use the community colleges to offer lower division general education. ATAC will be charged with defining major policy questions – incentives, duplication, training needs, etc. One suggestion was for the CSU to look at other state systems to see how on-line degrees are handled. The CO is not interested in a Cal State Teach model for on-line learning. Someone in Gerry Hanley's organization is doing an environmental survey to see what resources are needed for such programs e.g. registration. East Bay reported on a marketing analysis they undertook. The University of Phoenix was cited as having an approach that used learning models and accountability. However, their focus is on money, while ours is on serving the citizens of California on an affordable basis.

Regan Caruthers made a presentation on Academic Technology Services (ATS) communications and marketing. Of prime importance is how ATS can better serve faculty and students. Regan will head up MERLOT for the CSU. Gerry reported that there are 42 people working in ATS directly, but 100's more work indirectly through MERLOT. While the issue of Learning Management Systems (LMS) was on the agenda, the group did not have time to discuss this issue. There will be a call for each Provost/VPAA to send a representative to a meeting on this issue.

At the Academic Council meeting there was a discussion regarding the budget outlook and the fact that the CSU may not receive funding for student enrollment above the Compact. There was a desire expressed on the part of attendees to work with CFA and other unions in lobbying efforts to ensure that the CSU receive adequate funding. Updates were given regarding LDTP and the idea of the Transfer AA, the Troops to College initiative, a proposed articulation agreement with the University of Maryland, and the Access to Excellence planning initiative. I gave a report on resolutions that were passed at our November Plenary as well as some of the first reading items that were discussed at the November Plenary. The day concluded with a report from Human Resources where it was noted that a staff focus group indicated that they sometimes feel underappreciated by faculty.

On **December 7th** I participated in the interim meeting of the **Executive Committee**. Minutes of this meeting can be found at:

http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/Executive/excm_minutes_dec2007.pdf.

On **December 12th** I participated in a conference call regarding the planning **for the WASC Conference** in San Diego this spring.

On **December 13th** I co-chaired a meeting of **ATAC** in Los Angeles. Notes from this meeting compiled by Senator Benavides were previously sent out.