1. **Call to order.** The chair called the committee to order at 10:08 a.m.

2. **Present:** Ken Nishita (MB), Ted Anagnoson (LA), Marshall Cates (LA), Len Mathy (Emeriti), John Shields (FR), Rochelle Kellner (PO), Jacinta Amaral (FR), Jeff Obayashi (CSSA), Darlene Yee (SF), Sam Edelman (CH), Luis Arroyo (LB), Keith Boyum (CO).

2. **Approval of the agenda.** M/s/p to approve the agenda with the addition of Supplemental Criteria regarding GE.

3. **Approval of the minutes from the meeting of December 3, 2004.** Approved with the condition that the chair add the list of members present. A list was circulated among the members at this meeting for their notations.

4. **Announcements.** None.

5. **Times certain.** None.

6. **Liaison Reports**

   **Keith Boyum,** Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

   - **Presentation to the Trustees next week on advising issues and facilitating graduation.** The Senate Chair, David McNeil, will participate, along with the Chair of CSSA and two presidents: President Gordon of Fullerton and President Koester of Northridge. They will discuss the facilitating graduation initiatives on their campuses.

   - **Lower Division Transfer Program.** The program is continuing, with half the remaining disciplines meeting on Saturday, January 22, 2005 and the remaining disciplines on Friday, January 28th. The progress is encouraging; there will be staff help available for technical questions. One of the sticky issues has turned out to be American institutions, with some disciplines blending it with GE and others keeping it separately. Total units are a problem in engineering. We are still regarding these as the best judgment of CSU faculty as to how transfer students should be prepared. The students have been discussing the one-for-one offset, that each unit taken on one of these programs should reduce the total units taken for the degree.
     - Question: have we looked at course offering patterns as far as “facilitating graduation” goes?  A: No.

   - **Early Admissions Program** – advisory group was convened January 7th. They spent the day looking at coordination problems, problems in communicating with the public schools. There is still a perception that many teachers and counselors who should know about the program do not as yet.

   - **Joint Doctorate and the Applied Doctorate** – a request to the legislature to seek authorization for offering applied doctorates on our own is part of CSU’s legislative
program this year, pending approval of same by the Board of Trustees next week. After the Trustee meeting in February, they will be interested in accumulating expressions of support from faculty, the community, and various groups.

- Len Mathy recalled that some 37-38 years ago, the special education faculty at UCLA were opposed to the joint doctorate. The Dean of the college instructed that UCLA was going to do it, period.

- Question regarding what the financing of the applied doctorates would be. A: at this point we are thinking of taking the FTE/S (full-time equivalent student) marginal rate and asking the students to pay a special rate somewhat above this level, but not as much as the full-cost of education (an average at this point of some $10,000 to $12,000, depending on how it is calculated). This would be attractive in cost terms compared with other public institutions offering doctorate level work and especially attractive compared with the private institutions offering the degree through distance learning. The program would be regarded as state supported, but with a higher fee. This thinking could change as developments ensue, but at this point, it is thought that each proposal would come with a financing proposal that would be appropriate for it. There is little possibility of obtaining additional dollars at this juncture.

7. Items of business

7.1 Graduate Education.

- The committee revised and amended the resolution submitted by the chair and sent it to the ASCSU floor for further debate.

7.2 EasyText Textbook Pricing Ideas.

- The committee’s feeling is that CSU does not decide such matters on a systemwide basis. Each campus would be the appropriate decision-maker. Several members stated that they did not like reading books on a computer and that they would prefer for their students to have hard copies of books.

- The matter will be referred to Gerry Hanley for any possible systemwide action.

- Discussion of Questia, recommended by Senator Edelman for access to over 50,000 books and over 400,000 other electronic works (information from the Questia www site). Cost is $14.95 per month, $39.95 per quarter, or $109.95 per year. See http://www.questia.com.

7.2A – Supplemental Criteria for General Education.

- Senator Tarjan circulated a one page list of possible supplemental criteria that could be recommended by the General Education Advisory Committee to this committee as additional criteria that campuses could use in evaluating or updating their GE packages. The criteria would also be a way to start discussion of how the GE package should be updated. Issuing the supplemental criteria would not involve revising and updating the relevant Executive Orders (342, 595).
The supplemental criteria, in this first draft, include: human diversity in California, technology, information literacy, ethics, financial planning and preparedness, global/international perspective and understanding.

Committee members offered the following considerations and feedback:
- The campuses could use these criteria in their reviews of GE.
- Some campuses have found the review of GE difficult as it is.
- Diversity and other criteria are not explicit in the existing criteria; sending a supplementary letter with these items in it would be a way to expand on and further explicate the criteria we have, without going through the process of revising an Executive Order.
- On the other hand, at least one member voiced a concern that avoiding the process of revising the executive order was exactly what we should not do; that the procedures involved in doing such revisions were there for a reason.
- Diversity and global understanding could well be enhancements of existing items in the GE package. Information literacy has been a priority of the system for some time, with some campuses having policies on it and others not. Financial planning is involved already in the “math for poets” classes that some campuses have as a way of meeting the GE math requirements.
- How would these requirements affect the community colleges?
- Financial planning, at Fresno, was introduced into Area E on a tie-breaking vote; it has ultimately been very successful.
- Might want to wait until the LDTP is finished, so that the CCs don’t have new requirements coming at them from all sides at once.
- Timing – most likely nothing would happen for at least a year.

7.3 Advisement issues
- The question here is what the current state of advisement is on the campuses and what we as a Senate might do at this juncture.
- Comments offered included the following:
  - Ultimately, the comments from the student trustee are anecdotal and not a systematic, comprehensive understanding of where advisement is in the CSU. In the 1980s, we did a snapshot of advising in the CSU, based on self-studies from the campuses. We could consider doing this again. In many senses, the campuses have changed – fewer are residential, there are more commuting students, there are more and a greater proportion of minority students.
  - Another option is to collect best practices in advising – we don’t need a conference to do that, and these could go on a www site.
  - Resources are an issue that you face no matter what you are going to do in this area.
  - We have impressive reports about advising already from the campuses through the reports on Facilitating Graduation, some of which are being presented to the Trustees.
  - Attention should be directed to faculty rewards and the use of technology. Degree audits have been promised on the non-Banner campuses for years, and they are not functional as yet; in fact, some of the technology that used to be available to faculty for advising has deteriorated because of problems in implementing the PeopleSoft student system. Why do report after report when the problems are self evident?
First, the promised technology is still not available.

Second, we have continued to add students without adding advisors (tenured and tenure-track faculty) for them, so much so that the ratio of students to advisors has increased 25% to 33% in the last 10-15 years.

Third, we have decreased advising to pay for classes all over the system by canceling assigned time being used for departmental principal undergraduate and graduate advisors, many of which now receive no assigned time or very little for doing an extraordinary amount of work.

The payoff in the RTP system for advising is still not present; why would junior faculty learn how to be effective advisors when on many campuses this sort of work will not earn one tenure and promotion? This is an old problem, on which nothing has been done.

- A survey is not likely to yield good quality information, in the view of some.
- Most campuses have regular times when students are advised: when they enter the University, at some point on lower division GE, on choosing a major and/or minor, and graduation check.
- Discussion of SFSU’s 1995 policy, available at www.sfsu.edu/senate/policies/S95-191. The SFSU policy has several pages of responsibilities for all concerned.
- Some problems are student problems. It would be good to have the road maps done and operating. One problem is that students often do not take advantage of the written documentation that already exists, particularly catalogs.
- We don’t want to say that all CSUs should have mandatory first year advising and then find out that everyone already does it. We shouldn’t be saying the obvious.
- Some students don’t graduate on time – a small number – volitionally. They don’t want to repay their student loans, they changed their major late to be more marketable, etc.
- Discussion of the lack of reward for good advising in the RTP process. How can the process be changed to reward good advising?

7.3 Lower division core project
- Update provided above.

7.4 Flexibility in General Education Courses for Upper Division Transfers (Nursing, SCIGETC)
- The committee confirmed the resolution re-written and edited at the December meeting.

7.5 Remedial programs
- Deferred until the February and March meetings because of the absence of the author, Senator Thompson.

7.6 Required Community Service.
- The committee revised the resolution from the November meeting and voted to send it to the floor.

7.7 Faculty Role in Intercollegiate Athletics
Senator Shields report on current developments and had a draft of a resolution that we might offer.

The resolution reads as follows:

**Resolution**

**on**

The Framework for Comprehensive Intercollegiate Athletics Reform

by

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA)

(2003)

Resolved that the CSU Academic Senate endorse in principle the *Framework for Comprehensive Intercollegiate Athletics Reform* developed by the faculty-based coalition of University Academic Senates in schools fielding intercollegiate sports teams at the Division IA level according to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA); and

Resolved that the CSU Academic Senate notify the Academic Senates of all CSU campuses of its endorsement of the *framework*; and

Resolved that the CSU academic senate urge eligible CSU campuses to become members of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics by also endorsing the framework and employing its guidelines on Academic Integrity, Athlete Welfare, Governance, Finances, and Over-commercialization in examining the state of athletics on their respective campuses.

The committee voted to delete the second Resolve and encouraged the author to provide a rationale for the February meeting.

7.8 Maintaining the Quality of Faculty Who Teach in the Extended University

The committee confirmed its decision to withdraw the resolution.

8. Information items. None.

9. Liaison Reports. None other than the above.

Adjournment – at 3:30 p.m.

J. T. Anagnoson
Scribe