

## ASCSU Chair Barry Pasternack's Report for November 2007 Plenary

As you are aware, the first edition of the ASCSU Newsletter was sent out in late September. I want to thank co-editors Mark Van Selst and Darlene Yee-Melichar as well as ASCSU staff in putting together a wonderful edition. The theme for the next edition of the newsletter will be funding of the CSU. I also wish to thank Vice-Chair Tarjan for filling in for me when I was recently out of town.

My activities for the past several weeks have been as follows:

**Access to Excellence Stakeholder Meeting** - On September 10<sup>th</sup> I, along with Senators Thobaben and Yee-Melichar; faculty Steering Committee member Rona Halualani; Trustees; campus Presidents; and members of the CO staff, attended a stakeholder meeting in San Francisco. As you may recall, these meetings were designed to give outside stakeholders (specifically those in the education, non-profit, and business communities) an opportunity to give input into the Access to Excellence planning document. I gave a brief presentation regarding the context in which the CSU must plan over the next decade. Discussions focused on how to improve access and affordability, how to build on student success, how CSU can assist business and industry in ensuring the economic well-being of the state, and how we can build the case for the CSU.

**ICAS** - On September 12<sup>th</sup> I, along with other members of the Executive Committee attended a meeting of ICAS in Los Angeles. Among the issues discussed at ICAS were possible modifications to IGETC, including treatment of AP credit, allowing coursework for IGETC to be done at multiple community colleges, writing and reading requirements for such course, and treatment of on-line courses. Also discussed were the ASSIST governance structure, issues related to LDTP implementation, an update of the C-ID project, a new draft from the Michael Brown regarding the CAHSEE (California High School Exit Exam), a possible FIPSE grant to support public health laboratories, regional accreditation and assessment issues, and textbook prices. We shared the results of the CSU Taskforce on Textbook Affordability and ICAS agreed to revisit the issue of textbook prices at an upcoming meeting.

**Executive Committee** - On September 17<sup>th</sup> I attended a meeting of the Executive Committee prior to the Board of Trustee meeting. Minutes of that meeting can be found on page 6 of [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/committees/executive/excm\\_minutes\\_sep2007.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/committees/executive/excm_minutes_sep2007.pdf).

**Board of Trustees** - On September 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> I, along with other members of the Executive Committee attended the Board of Trustee meeting. We distributed ASCSU Resolution AS 2814-07/AA/FGA (Call for Consultation on Professional Fee for Graduate Business Degree – see <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2007-2008/2814.shtml>). Prior to the item being considered by the Committee on Educational Policy it was announced that before the Board takes any action on the issue of additional fees for graduate business programs there would be ample time for interested parties to give input to the Board. I spoke briefly about our resolution and thanked the Committee for agreeing to ensure there would be an opportunity for broad consultation on this issue.

**PTSC (Provosts' Technology Steering Committee)** - On October 4<sup>th</sup> I participated in a meeting of PTSC (Provosts Technology Steering Committee) in San Francisco. Among the items discussed were the Transforming Course Design project (including both the campus based projects that were funded this

past spring as well as the system-wide project on academic transformation (described below under the ATAC meeting report), funding for academic technology given the approximately \$180 million that the CSU may get in this area over the next three years, on-line degrees and certificates, and updates on the system's efforts regarding learning management systems and the digital marketplace.

In terms of funding for academic technology, the principle concern was ensuring that all campuses achieve a baseline level of service to faculty and students while recognizing that there should be recognition that some campuses may have used funds in the past to fund technology but have, as a result of this, shortfalls in other areas. It was decided that a small committee made up of Provosts and CTO's (Chief Technology Officers) would begin working on developing a plan to recommend to PTSC and ATAC. I indicated that there should also be a faculty member on this committee and was subsequently asked to serve on it.

Regarding on-line degrees and certificates, an RFP was developed to get marketing assistance in this area. There was only one bid submitted for this RFP and a subcommittee of ATAC deemed it unacceptable. It was decided that perhaps the scope of the RFP should be revised to focus purely on marketing issues and that CSU Deans of Business should be encouraged to forward the revised RFP to Departments of Marketing in their colleges.

The update on learning management systems focused on the fact that system-wide the campus contracts currently in place with vendors to provide learning management systems will expire at the end of the spring semester 2008. Next steps are being contemplated, but there is no definite news to report. It is hoped that by approaching vendors as a system, our greater buying power could result in reduced costs for this software and resulting services.

**Academic Council** – Following the PTSC meeting, on the afternoon of October 4<sup>th</sup> there was a joint meeting of Academic Council (Provosts and VPAAAs) together with campus Vice Presidents for Student Affairs and campus Senate Chairs. The focus of this meeting was on giving feedback to the Access to Excellence document as well as providing feedback on remediation and proficiency achievement of students in the CSU. There was an opportunity for both an open ended discussion in these areas as well as attendees to give individual written feedback. Hopefully, the comments made regarding the Access to Excellence draft will be incorporated into the next revision. I thought there were a number of creative ideas developed to address the remediation needs of our students.

**Academic Council** – On the morning of October 5<sup>th</sup> a meeting of the Academic Council was held. Topics discussed included a report from PTSC on academic technology (with specific mention of the systemwide academic transformation project and academic technology funding), the voluntary system of accountability project, and LDTP. In terms of the voluntary system of accountability and the CLA (Collegiate Learning Assessment), several provosts indicated they were having difficulties in the administration of this test and had reservations on its value. Regarding LDTP, there was mention made of an effort by the CO to encourage community colleges to offer Transfer AA degrees which would be awarded to students who complete the LDTP course pattern. It is felt that this would encourage more students who wish to transfer to a CSU to follow the LDTP course pattern. A report was also given on a presentation to the Executive Council (campus Presidents and the Executive Staff in the Chancellor's Office) dealing with campus research efforts. I gave a report on the activities of the ASCSU.

ICC (Intersegmental Coordinating Council) – A meeting of the ICC was held on October 10<sup>th</sup> in Sacramento. The meeting began with a report that the state’s budget situation continues to look bleak. Local tax revenue is down and the shortfall may increase from \$5 to \$8 billion. A report on collaborative efforts between P-12 and higher education was presented. The report was based on a survey sent to a broad group of administrative people as well as anyone who attended to a P-16 conference. The report also included brief descriptions of several collaborative. It was agreed that the report should go as a draft before the California Roundtable at their next meeting (currently scheduled for December 20<sup>th</sup>) prior to wide dissemination. It was suggested that a companion document detailing “How to Become a Regional Collaborative” should be developed as a follow up document. This document would include first steps as to how to form a collaborative including issues such as “who to invite”, “how should it be designed”, “potential activities”, etc. The key factors necessary to have a successful collaborative will be a topic of discussion at the January ICC retreat. It is anticipated that collaboration between CSU and UC on teacher education may also be a topic for the Roundtable meeting.

The next item discussed focused on identifying possible interventions that ICC could recommend for middle grade students to increase the percentage going on to higher education. One of the consultants present spoke about the issue of race relative to the achievement gap and indicated the issue not simply economic. There was general agreement that any such plan would focus on resources for students and families, professional development activities for middle school educators, practices dealing with rigorous curriculum so that students have options, and the public policy climate necessary to support this initiative. It was felt that discussions with middle students should be broad and include a focus also on community colleges in addition to four year institutions. Any document developed should not only include ICC efforts, but also present information on efforts being made in this area by the three segments of higher education. Focus should be on access to higher education, in general, and not simply on the higher education segments and outreach to sixth graders should also be included in these efforts. It was mentioned that research shows that students in grades 6 – 8 think about careers and not higher education. Any publication developed should therefore begin by talking about careers and then lead into how college is necessary for those careers. In recognition of this, the ICC Support Programs Committee has been renamed the Middle Grades Initiatives Committee.

One publication shared with the committee, “College Making it Happen” is targeted to parents of middle school children. It was noted that of the 15 careers listed, only 5 do not require a baccalaureate degree. One of the issues that was also discussed was math deficiency of students in grades 6 through 8 and how this impacts a student’s ability to go on in higher education.

It was announced that in 2006 the CSA (California Space Authority) received a 3 year WIRED grant. CSA was selected due to the strong aerospace presence in CA. Both industry and higher education will need to be involved as well as the 60 science centers in CA. The goal of this program is to increase number quality and diversity of students involved in STEM. It is anticipated that CSU Deans of Science will be involved in this effort.

It was reported that there is a new look for CaliforniaColleges.edu. There will be statewide ads on cable TV promoting this web site. Web site usage is up 5% so far this year (and was up 50% last year). Account creation is up 92% following a presentation about the website that was made at a counselor conference. The group was also informed that 500 site licenses for “choices” are available for distribution to local schools. Choices gives information about different career paths and information on

this can be found at [www.bridges.com](http://www.bridges.com). It was also announced that Outdoor Media will be putting up free billboards promoting [CaliforniaColleges.edu](http://CaliforniaColleges.edu).

The Student Learning Committee is looking at aligning of assessment and working with multiple pathways. The CCC's are trying to aligning their 109 colleges on assessment. It was reported that UC may be joining CSU with regard to the use of the Early Assessment Program. On October 10<sup>th</sup> I attended a meeting of **ICC** in Sacramento

**Executive Committee** - On October 12<sup>th</sup> I participated in a meeting of the **Executive Committee**.

Minutes of this meeting can be found at:

[http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/Executive/documents/excm\\_minutes\\_oct2007.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/Executive/documents/excm_minutes_oct2007.pdf).

**ERFA** (Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association) - On October 13<sup>th</sup> I attended a meeting in Los Angeles of ERFA in Los Angeles. It was a real pleasure seeing retired colleagues who I had not seen in several years. I gave an update on what happened at the ASCSU September Plenary and mentioned items that the ASCSU will be taking up during this year. Also on the agenda were reports on the ASCSU to be given by Senator Goldwhite and ERFA Representative Kroman, so I think ERFA got a good briefing on the activities of the ASCSU. Len Mathy, the first Chair of the ASCSU was at the meeting so ERFA was able to get a photo of both the first and most recent Chairs of the ASCSU standing beside Donald Dewey, the ERFA President. As LDTP was holding a training meeting next door to the ERFA meeting (perhaps we should formally make the Crowne Plaza our 24<sup>th</sup> campus) I had an opportunity to step in and give my greetings to this group.

**ATAC** (Academic Technology Advisory Committee) - On October 18<sup>th</sup> I attended a meeting of ATAC in San Francisco. The primary focus of this meeting was a discussion of the systemwide academic transformation project. This project will involve two courses which are perceived to be "bottleneck" courses. That is, they are high enrollment courses and there are a high percentage of student grades of D, F, and W. The plan presented to ATAC is for each Provost/VPAA to identify four courses to recommend to EVC Reichard that meet these criteria. Along with the identification of the courses there needs to be department "buy in" and a recommendation of two faculty members from each of the departments offering the course who would be willing to work on this project. Provosts are to consult with local campus Senates in determining the courses selected. The deadline for submitting the course names to EVC Reichard is November 30<sup>th</sup>. From the lists of courses provided, two courses which a large number of campuses identify as bottleneck courses will be chosen. Faculty members who have been recommended by the individual campuses will be either be assigned to be part of a core redesign team or a peer review team. The core redesign team will be initially involved with identifying what currently exists in terms of academic technology tools to assist learning and the identification of gaps that exist. Details on the project can be found at: <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/codedmemos/AA-2007-28.pdf>.

ATAC also discussed the on-line degree program initiative. Specific attention was focused on guiding principles. Two which were articulated were respect for campus autonomy and the need to honor the CBA. A brief report was made on the discussion of the Academic Technology Fund Workgroup that was recommended by the PTSC. Additional meeting details can be found on the excellent notes prepared by Senator Soni that were recently forwarded to you.

**CCC Academic Senate Plenary Meeting** - On November 1<sup>st</sup> I attended the California Community Colleges Fall 2007 Plenary Meeting in Anaheim. I attended breakout sessions titled "Proposed Changes

in Title 5”, “Transforming our Classroom for our Changing Students”, and “Varying Pathways – Transfer Hot Topics”. I also attended general session talks on the CCC Ballot Initiative (Proposition 92) and Untapped Opportunities: Designing Policies to Increase Student Success (a talk by Nancy Shulock).

In the “Proposed Changes in Title 5” session several proposed changes were presented. These include limiting the number of times a student can withdraw from a specific class to four (with some exceptions), changes in the process for students gaining credit for a non-credit course taken, changes in the adult high school diploma program to have greater alignment with AA requirements, modifications in the policy on the number of times a student may repeat a co-operative education class, and changes in the language dealing with program enrollment limitations to bring policy in line with state law.

In the “Transforming our Classroom for our Changing Students” session the focus was on the need to be cognizant of the changing demographics of the classroom and the need to be respectful of multiculturalism and diversity. It was also noted that the Basic Skills Initiative is being renamed to be the Student Success Initiative. The presenters gave an interesting quiz asking questions dealing with pop culture that all of the students could answer but few of the academics could. There was general agreement that a digital divide still existed among students.

In the “Varying Pathways – Transfer Hot Topics” session Michelle Pilati (CCC Academic Senate Treasurer) gave an overview of the LDTP program and mentioned the modifications that the CSU has recently agreed to make in the governance and review structure. Several members of the audience cited difficulties that they had had with LDTP, but I sensed a willingness to continue working with the CSU on this project. Jane Patton (CCC Academic Senate Vice President) and Kate Clark (former CCC Academic Senate President) both told me how well they thought the last meeting of the LDTP Steering Committee went and were appreciative of the changes in the governance and review structure that will result in CCC faculty playing a greater role in this endeavor. There was also a presentation made on the proposed changes in IGETC and a discussion of possible legislative changes that the CCC’s may put forward to improve student transfer.

Not surprisingly, the presentation on the CCC Ballot Initiative was well received. Nancy Shulock’s talk was also well received and a number of audience members expressed their thanks to her for helping to articulate some of the policy issues facing the CCC’s.

In addition to the meetings I attended, I also participated in a number of conference calls including the following:

On September 14<sup>th</sup> I participated in a conference call of a subcommittee of ATAC to evaluate contract proposals regarding an RFP for doing a market analysis for on-line degree programs. There was only one bid submitted and the subcommittee decided not to recommend it for funding. It was suggested that the scope of the RFP be refined to focus on the determination of the market potential for various new on-line degree programs and that colleges of business be solicited to work on this project.

On September 27<sup>th</sup> and October 3<sup>rd</sup> I participated in conference calls of ATAC members to review drafts of a proposal dealing with Academic Transformation.

On October 25<sup>th</sup> I participated in a conference call dealing with planning for the WASC ARC (Academic Resource Conference) to be held April 16 – 19 in San Diego. For a variety of reasons (including the fires

in San Diego) not everyone who is on the conference organizing committee was able to participate in the conference call. The focus of the call was to begin the identification of plenary speakers for the conference.

On October 27<sup>th</sup> the **Executive Committee** had a conference call to discuss several items including the CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee, LDTP (including the future of the project, the composition of the Steering Committee, a recommended change in the composition of the Advisory Committee, and the distribution of the latest Progress Report), treatment of comments/feedback on the Access to Excellence draft, an update on the Academic Transformation project, and the modifications of EO 595 that have been suggested by GEAC.