



**ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
AUGUST 14, 2012**

Approved 8-28-12

11:30 AM - 1:00 PM

MH-141

Present: Balderas (for Bedell), Brusckke, Dabirian Guerin, Matz, Mead (for Pasternack), Randall, Stambough, Walker

I. CALL TO ORDER

Secretary Walker called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM.

II. URGENT BUSINESS

(Walker) A copy of page 15 of the registration guide was distributed for discussion at the request of Senator Stang who pointed out the lack of clarity for scheduling final exams for online classes. Executive Committee members agreed that interpretation could be a problem for faculty teaching online classes. Page 15 of the final exam schedule (taken from UPS 300.005 Final Examinations) should be referred to Academic Standards Committee to consider clarifying language. ASC should invite a representative from the Scheduling Office to the meeting when this topic is agendaized in fall 2012.

(Guerin) Some CSU departments are not planning to admit CA residents for spring 2013 but are considering taking out-of-state graduate students. Senator Guerin questioned what position CSUF plans to take to address graduate student admissions mid-year. No one in attendance knew the answer.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 4.1 EC Minutes (Draft) 7-24-12
M/S/P (Matz/Dabirian) Approved as submitted.
- 4.2 EC Minutes (Draft) 8-7-12
M/S/P (Guerin/Matz) Approved as edited.

V. TIME CERTAIN

12:30 PM

Topic: Assessment Follow-up to WASC Report

Discussant: Gerald Patton, Ph.D., Director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness

Executive Committee members discussed the draft document members put together outlining goals for guiding the process of assessment. Dr. Patton was given the one-page draft prior to this meeting. The "Charge" document, with preamble, captures requirements found in the final WASC *action letter*. The WASC definition of "assessment" was read aloud to the group – 4 items to be specifically addressed and reported back to the Academic Senate by December 6, 2012.

Senator Walker welcomed Dr. Patton to the meeting at 12:30 PM. He pointed out to members that in 2007, the Academic Senate voted *down* a standing committee for assessment. Dr. Patton continued. In order to develop an assessment infrastructure that brings together college, department and institutional assessment, an advisory council has been approved by the Council of Deans. The Assessment and Educational Effectiveness Advisory Council will be made up of a faculty liaison from each college. Both the College of Education and Mihaylo College of Business and Economics have assessment programs set up for accreditation by outside agencies. Some departments in the college of HSS began to develop assessment and outcomes tied to institutional assessment during a past semester when the Dean authorized release time. It would be beneficial for HSS to continue on this path, but resources are not available. A single person can make an impact on a department/college outlook toward assessment activities.

UPS 300.022 Assessment of Student Learning at California State University, Fullerton [8-16-00] is out-of-date. A large and difficult task is to have faculty within each discipline to be involved in guiding assessment.

Secretary Walker asked Dr. Patton what the Academic Senate could do to facilitate student assessment toward the WASC goals outlined in the 7-3-12 letter to President García.

Dr. Patton suggested support of the infrastructure resources for faculty liaisons in each college for assessment activities and mentoring other faculty. We must keep doing what we have started. We are on the right path. We need to focus on what we are doing well. Resources are needed to encourage department and faculty interest in assessment – faculty mentoring faculty. Deans have accepted this model.

Several Executive Committee members agreed that moving forward toward an institutional commitment would be important. Choosing faculty willing to commit to a 2-3 year relationship toward development of and involvement in assessment activities would mean continuity toward the goal. Additional resources toward “professional development” could support faculty *and* student assessment goals.

Added 9-4-12 NB: In response to the discussion and input from Dr. Patton, the following information is being added to approved EC minutes 9-14-12.

- Proposed new A.S. Standing Committee—Committee on Assessment and Educational Effectiveness (ASD 07-187) was reconsidered on A.S. agenda 2-21-08 (ASD 08-35 A.S. Minutes). Vote was not unanimous; therefore, a Constitutional Amendment was presented to constituents in the All University Elections, Spring 2008. All University Election Results (ASD 08-91):

Shall UPS 100.000 be amended to create the Committee on Assessment and Educational Effectiveness?

223 46%	In Favor of amendment	266 54%	Against the amendment
---------	-----------------------	---------	-----------------------

- The Assessment Liaison proposal has been presented to the Council of Deans and is awaiting action.

VI. CHAIR’S REPORT

None.

VII. STAFF REPORT

None.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8.1 Faculty Committee Assignments - 2012-13 – Finalize Standing + Miscellaneous Boards/Committees
Faculty names were discussed to complete the standing committees as well as miscellaneous boards/committees.

8.2 AA/AS Retreat, M, 8-20-12 Update

Secretary Walker gave an overview of events over the past week. Location for the retreat has been changed to SGMH-1502 to accommodate increasing numbers of faculty and staff interested in attending.

Questions were discussed to ask the students on the panel.

Secretary Walker asked for volunteers to facilitate the five (5) breakout sessions. There should be 2-3 recommendations forthcoming from the breakout groups.

- Strengths of Campus Advisement: What is Working Well?
- Weaknesses of Campus Advisement Practices: What Needs to be Changed?
- What Technological Improvements Can Advance the Effectiveness of Campus Advisement Practices?
- What is our vision of academic advising at CSUF?
- How should advising be assessed?

There was discussion on the follow-up needed after gathering information from this day-long retreat. A committee should be formed – co-chaired by Academic Affairs, Academic Senate, and Student Affairs to review data and ideas with a report back of recommendations to the Academic Senate by November 1, 2012. Report content can be momentum for a new model - spring 2013.

8.3 Task Force re Assessment Follow-up - Draft Charge [see Time Certain]

The following items will be moved to the next Executive Committee agenda.

8.4 Strategic Plan

IX. NEW BUSINESS

8.5 Goals and Priorities for Academic Senate 2012-13

8.6 Presidential Selection *Proposed New UPS*

8.7 Action Items from Statements-of-Opinion (ASD 12-96) [All University Election Results 2012]

8.8 New UPS re Visiting Scholars from U.S. [Rev. UPS 108.000 Visiting Scholars from Abroad, effective 5-11-12]

8.9 UPS 420.103 Protection of Human Participants [7-7-06] [Source: IRB]

8.10 UPS 320.020 University Writing Requirements [5-25-12] re Writing Board Composition

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 1:15 PM.