Present:
Chair Mark Van Selst will be absent for January 25th (first day of instruction at SJSU), Vice Chair Yee will chair Wednesday’s meeting.

Invited Guests:
1. Keith O. Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
   - Item 6.7, accreditation style visits
   - Item 5.d. LDTP
2. Allison G. Jones Assistant Vice Chancellor
   Doug Robinson, Vice President for Student Affairs
   Ray Murillo, staff Student Affairs
   - Disability accommodation (SSDAC / CSU CAM)
   - Time Certain: Wednesday Jan 25th
     - 11:00 AM -11:30 presentation
     - 11:30 - 12:00 follow-up questions.

1. Call to order at 10:15 a.m.

2. Approval of the agenda.

3. Approval of the minutes from the meeting of December 2, 2005.
   Thank you Darlene Yee (SFSU) for recording the minutes.

4. Announcements, information items, general discussion.

5. Liaison reports.
   a. CSSA.
   b. SSDAC. Disability access report & presentation (see end note)
   c. IMPAC. Jan 21st meeting.
   d. GEAC. Final survey submitted to campuses. Addressing the question of who the questionnaire is directed to.
   e. EDD. Discussion site, actions, overview of recommendations.
   f. LDTP.
   g. EAP.
   h. Admissions Advisory Council.
   i. Student Health Services Advisory Council.
   j. ATAC.
6. Items of business

6.1 Faculty housing. 
Follow up to referral to the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee.

6.2 CSU fee structure. 
Follow up to referral to the ASCSU Executive Committee, Fiscal and Government Affairs Committee, and Faculty Affairs Committee.

Supporting a Student Fee Policy that better Educational Outcomes.

Resolved, that the Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU) continues to support initiatives focused on facilitating graduation; and be it further

Resolved, that the ASCSU requests that the Chancellor’s office undertake a study of CSU Student Fee Policy to determine if changes in this policy course serve to facilitate graduation efforts.

Rationale: How the we change the CSU tuition/fee structure to maximize efficiency. “Front-Loading” of fees versus a flat (two-step) function for most campuses. An alternative model is provided by CSU Monterey Bay. It is believed that such structures encourage students from enrolling in courses that do not contribute to meeting graduation requirements.

6.3 Campus review of independent doctoral degree program proposals. 
See item 5C above.

6.4 Additional funding for academic advising in the CSU. 
This item is for further discussion and development of a potential resolution supporting the view that advising be more seriously considered in the implementation of RTP processes, and that commensurately more resources be made available to the increased advising mandate.

6.5 Protecting “Quality” in the CSU 
This item is a follow up to the listserve discussion on the role of faculty as the protective voice to defend the quality of education versus the downward pressures on quality induced by access and reduced degree requirements. Potential items include an admonition to uphold quality standards and thus the credibility and value of the CSU degree. Alternative content could touch on what constitutes a “well-educated person” and actions that campuses and individual faculty might consider in supporting the desired educational outcomes. A potential resolution originally discussed at the December intersession would explicitly address who explains GE to the student, in what context, and how is the student evaluated w.r.t. GE.
6.6 **Accreditation style visits now referred to as “Peer Team Campus Visits”**

Follow up to issues raised at the Dec/05 academic affairs meeting. "An initial group of 12 faculty and administrators will meet in late January for training and coordination and then visit one campus, after which the 12 would divide into 4 teams of 3, add one or two more people to each, and do two more visits each.” Update from Keith Boyum on this topic.

6.7 **Registration priority**

Possible resolution for further discussion. At some campuses, registration priority is determined by number of units completed rather than units to graduation. With the increasing precision of the various degree audit modules, it seems that a change from units completed to units to graduation would seem prudent. This may be more of an implementation, rather than policy, issue and thus may not be pursued further by the committee. A request for campus feedback on how registration priority is established on each campus was sent out in late December.

*On Student Registration Priority*

Resolved, that the Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU) continues to support initiatives focused on facilitating graduation; and be it further

Resolved, That the ASCSU request the Chancellor's Office to undertake a study of how campuses determine course registration priorities. The goal of this study would be to determine if changes in how students are granted registration priority could serve to facilitate graduation efforts.

6.9 **22-points reports**

The campus-based responses to the 22 points request from the Board of Trustees were due earlier in December and are now available via CD. It was determined that a statewide senate overview of where prior resolutions fit within the 22 points seems appropriate as does a discussion of other items identified in the Twenty-First Century Report (and elsewhere) that could also be included within any such response document. The committee will be reviewing the campus responses and will seek additional campus senate input into any such response document additional to the one already produced by the executive committee over the Summer of 2005.

6.10 **Doctorate of audiology**

A coded memo from Keith O. Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, was sent to six campus presidents regarding joint programs with the University of California leading to the Au.D. degree. This memo requested regional discussions and a joint letter of intent, which is due on January 18, 2006.

6.11 **Workload (EDD/graduate faculty)**
Discussion would center on the development of what has been referred to as a “Graduate Faculty” within the context of the Ed.D. (see 5D above).

6.12 21st century report
Arroyo has agreed to coordinate our work on updating the 21st Century report. He will formulate a plan for the work in updating the 21st century report. His goal is to have a draft of the updated report to us for review at the January 2006 meeting.

6.13 CSU one life science, one physical versus any two
UC requires two lab sciences in High School - any lab sciences. CSU requires two lab sciences in High School, but we state explicitly, one life science and one physical science. This is a continued source of confusion for the High School counselors and students. If most students or even all students for all practical purposes take biology/life science, why not drop the specificity and be consistent in this requirement? We may want to confer with the biology faculty/chairs/council. Early feedback suggests retaining the life science requirement.

6.14 Intra-CSU transfer
Several CSUs are using ASSIST to articulate courses between each other. The new T-CSU numbering system could streamline some of the INTRA-CSU issues associated with transfer credit but delves into statewide definitions for course content at the CSU rather than (as is the mantra with the LDTP process) “acceptable to the CSU.” The discussion may center on whether or not this issue should be directly addressed by the senate.

6.15 Referral from English Council on mainstreaming remediation

6.16 Examining the decline in the size (and potential quality) of the Tenure/Tenure-Track Applicant Pools across the CSU.

6.17 Merit Pay.
At the December Meeting, the question of whether to endorse merit pay and whether or not to proactively consider identifying the characteristics of an effective merit pay system were raised and were to be reconsidered at the January committee meeting.

6.18 Campus autonomy
Note the Chancellors Office response to this (November) Resolution. http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/co_response/2005-2006/CO_Response_nov05.pdf -- Is further action on our part warranted?

6.19 Ongoing Efforts to Shape Curricula in Institutions of Learning (AS-2722-05/FA)
M/S Gregory/Kegley First Reading was at the November Plenary.