Present: Jacinta Amaral, Luis Arroyo, J Vincent Buck, Sam Edelman, Myron Hood, Rochelle Kellner, J Ken Nishita, Barry Pasternack, CE Tapie Rohm, Donn Silvis, Barbara Swerkes, Mark Thompson, Mark Van Selst, Darlene Yee

Guests: Ted Anagnoson, Jim Blackburn, Keith Boyum, Marshall Cates, Mary Cheng, Chris Hanson, Doug Robinson, John Tarjan

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

2. Approval of the agenda.
   Agenda approved with the referral of items 6.11 (Workload, EdD/graduate faculty), 6.16 (Examining the decline in the size (and potential quality) of the tenure/tenure/track applicant pools across the CSU), and 6.17 (Merit Pay) to the ASCSU Faculty Affairs Committee as recommended by ASCSU Executive Committee and agreed upon in the ASCSU Academic Affairs Committee (AAC).

3. Approval of the minutes from the meeting of December 2, 2005.
   Minutes were approved as submitted. Many thanks went to Darlene Yee (SFSU) for recording these comprehensive meeting minutes.

4. Announcements, information items, general discussion.
   Amaral raised concern about the potential lack of effectiveness in the completion of the final General Education (GE) survey submitted to the campuses by the ASCSU Executive Committee. She proposed that the ASCSU Executive Committee withdraw the request to the campuses for completing this survey given the uncertainty of who the survey is directed to and who will complete it. Pasternack indicated that this survey is due in early March 2006; he also shared concerns about the content and process for this survey. Members of the ASCSU AAC agreed that no action was required at this time.

5. Liaison reports.

   a. California State Student Association (CSAA). Hironao Okahana (Systemwide Academic Senate Liaison) sent an e-mail report in his absence. His report included the following 3 items: 1) 22 points: CSAA Board of Directors began its discussion on campus responses. Under the University Affairs Committee, several campus delegates were assigned to analyze responses and report back to the full committee; 2) Academic Advising: Along with 22 points and enrollment management issues, CSAA assigned several campus delegates to study
academic advising structures. They are interested in enhancing academic advising services and if there are any messages that we would like him to relay to CSSA, we should feel free to contact him; and 3) GE Review: GE survey from GEAC has been circulated and will be discussed with CSSA and campus ASIs.

b. **SSDAC.** Doug Robinson (VP for Student Affairs, CSU LB), Mary Cheng (Director, CSU Accessible Technology Initiatives), and Jim Blackburn (CSU Chancellor’s Office) joined us for a presentation and discussion about disability access. Cheng gave an informative PowerPoint presentation which provided background information, the work of the CSU Center for Alternate Media (CAM), and current critical challenge: timeliness in providing alternate formats of instructional materials. Given the important work conducted by CAM, members of the ASCSU AAC voted in favor of a resolution on Provision of E-text materials to the CSU Center for Alternate Media (see item 6.8 below). This item will be presented for a first reading to the January ASCSU plenary.

c. **Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum Project (IMPAC).** Yee reported that IMPAC Northern Region met on January 21, 2006 in Millbrae, CA; the IMPAC Statewide Meeting will meet on May 6, 2006 in Los Angeles, CA. IMPAC is continuing advisory work that may be used by the LDTP discipline groups in writing course descriptors for the systemwide courses as well as campus-specific LDTP courses. IMPAC tentatively plans to move to local area meetings in order to enhance collaborative efforts.

d. **General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC).** Tarjan reported that the campus survey on GE is due on March 1, 2006. Several campuses have indicated that multiple groups will be submitting a response. Campus student leaders have also been given a chance to respond on behalf of the students. The GE Advisory Committee will next meet on March 7, 2006. Analysis of campus responses is the main agenda item.

e. **EDD.** Boyum reported that a task force chaired by David McNeil has developed a set of guidelines and criteria to help guide the initiation of new independent EdD programs. The recommendations from the task force will be used by a newly formed EdD oversight committee chaired by Cristy Jensen. The committee faculty members have a wealth of experience in joint EdD and other doctoral programs. It is anticipated that Chancellor Reed will soon draft a communication outlining a plan for the introduction of new independent EdD programs statewide.

f. **LDTP.** Cates reported that an oversight committee was recently formed to guide the project and has met twice already. It is chaired by John Tarjan and includes 5 other senators from a variety of disciplines. Tarjan reported that some very important policy and procedural issues are before this committee. There are some very aggressive deadlines contained in the legislation mandating the program (SB 1785). This committee will next meet on February 9, 2006. More information on this committee and its agenda can be accessed on the ASCSU
website under committees. Cates agreed to send us a current list of LDTP campus contacts.

g. Early Assessment Project (EAP). Yee indicated that a resolution on the “Commendation for the Early Assessment Project” praises what promises to be a program of great value to our entering students.

h. Admissions Advisory Council. As a follow-up to her earlier report, Kellner forwarded us the official meeting minutes from the CSU Admissions Advisory Council for our reference.

i. Student Health Services Advisory Council. Yee reported that as a follow-up to coded memorandum AA-2005-48, a spreadsheet with campus responses to the status of student usage of the Ortho Evra birth control patch was available as of December 13, 2005. This committee will next meet on March 16, 10am - 3pm, in the CSU Chancellor’s Office.

j. ATAC. No new report at this time.

k. Keith O. Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs. See items 5e above, and items 6.3, 6.5, 6.6, and 6.10 below.

6. Items of business

6.1. Faculty housing.
We are waiting to hear back from the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee. Members of the ASCSU AAC agreed that no further action was required at this time.

6.2 CSU fee structure.
We re-sent the proposed resolution to Fiscal and Government Affairs Committee for their input. We are waiting to hear back from the ASCSU Executive Committee, Fiscal and Government Affairs Committee, and Faculty Affairs Committee. Members of the ASCSU AAC agreed that no further action was required at this time.

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

6.4. Additional support for academic advising in the CSU.
It appears that policies do not translate to practice in the serious consideration of faculty advising students in the retention, tenure and promotion processes. Members of the ASCSU AAC agreed that no further action was required on this item.
6.5 Protecting “Quality” in the CSU
Boyum introduced Christine Hanson, Associate Dean, Academic Program Planning, CSU Chancellor’s Office. Members of the ASCSU AAC welcomed Chris to our meeting. During our discussion about protecting “quality” in the CSU, we asked Chris to serve as our liaison with CSU Academic Affairs to let them know and act on inviting the Legislators, Board of Trustees, and Chancellor’s Office administrators in key budgeting positions to the Fall 2006 conference for sharing ideas related to Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation (CAFG). We agreed that a resolution was not required on this item.

6.6 Campus Peer Review Visitation Team Visits
Boyum reported that as part of the CSU’s Facilitating Graduation initiative, core members of the Campus Peer Review Visitation Teams met on January 24, 2006 for an initial orientation meeting. During this training, Gary Hammerstrom gave an overview of the campus team visits, Mick McBride gave an overview of CMS, and Sandra Sutphen led a discussion on how to be an effective campus visitor. Kathy Kaiser, Sandra Sutphen, Harold Goldwhite and Ted Anagnoson are the four team leaders and they each spoke about campus best practices. Boyum and Hammerstrom both emphasized that there will be no written reports and that comments will focus on campus best practices in facilitating graduation and student success. All members will visit CSU Northridge on March 22, 2006 then divide into 4 teams and do two more visits each within the next year.

6.7 Registration priority
Members of the ASCSU AAC agreed that a study of how campuses determine course registration priorities was not required; but that a study of the effectiveness of campus registration priorities may be useful if feasible. Van Selst will forward a summary of the initial campus responses produced by the December request to the campus chairs from AA (via Thobaben).

6.8 Provision of E-Text material to the CSU Center for Alternate Media
Members of the ASCSU AAC approved a resolution drafted by Pasternack that addressed the morning presentation from the SSDAC. The resolution spoke to the need to provide e-text materials to the CSU Center for Alternate Media. The rationale is that it is not uncommon for students with disabilities to wait up to 5 weeks to receive alternative media for course textbooks. By having e-text material available before the start of a course, students with disabilities will be immediately able to get a full learning experience from the course. It was estimated by the director of the CAM that the average cost of developing learning materials for a disabled student exceeds $650. By having publishers provide e-text materials, there would be significant cost savings to the CSU.

6.9 22-points reports
Since the campus peer review visitation teams will be studying the campus actions to facilitate graduation, members of the ASCSU AAC agreed that no further action was required on this item.
6.10 Doctorate of Audiology
Boyum reported that as a follow-up to coded memorandum AA-2005-47, 4 campuses indicated interested in joint programs with the University of California leading to the Au.D. degree. It is anticipated that Chancellor Reed will soon draft a communication outlining a plan for the introduction of new joint Au.D. programs statewide.

6.11 Workload (EDD/graduate faculty)
This item was referred to the CSU Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration.

6.12 21st century report
Arroyo facilitated our discussion about revising and updating the 21st century report. He initiated the discussion by asking if we wanted to tweak the current report or if we wanted to write a new report. Members of the ASCSU AAC agreed that we would benefit from tweaking the current report with insertions of new information (EAP, LDTP, 22 points, etc) as needed. Based on the outline provided, members of ASCSU AAC volunteered to review and update the 21st century report as follows:

1) Volunteers:
   * Sam Edelman: Graduation Education (infuse new information where appropriate in the report; perhaps draft a separate sub-section)
   * Darlene Yee: Introduction; The Evolving Missions of Public Higher Education in California
   * Mark Thompson: The Role of Faculty in Curricular Development
   * Barry Pasternack & Barbara Swerkes: Changing Patterns of Faculty Hiring & The Crisis of Faculty Hiring: Many More Students and Many More Retirements
   * Mark Van Selst: Lower-Division Transfer Project (infuse new information where appropriate in the report; perhaps draft a separate sub-section)
   * Myron Hood: Enrollment Projections (including information drawn from the Governor's Compact and addressing marginal cost issues)

2) Possible Additional Volunteers:
   * Donn Silvis: Possibly University College and Extension Services
   * Luis Arroyo:
   * Ted Anagnoson:
   * Remaining committee members should review the 21st century report before selecting a section/sub-section to revise.

6.13 CSU one life science, one physical versus any two
Given the importance for consistent information in student advising, members of the ASCSU AAC voted in favor of dropping the specificity of one life science and one physical science – and going with two lab sciences (any lab sciences). However, we also felt it was important to seek official input from the biology
faculty/chairs council; we should invite a response before our next meeting so they may present their position (data would be helpful). We may need to draft a resolution to drop specificity if that is what we decide to do.

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 centered on whether or not this issue should be directly addressed by the senate. Members of the ASCSU AAC agreed that no further action was required at this time.

6.15 Referral from English Council on mainstreaming remediation
Thompson provided context for an item from the English Council on mainstreaming remediation. He indicated that the English Council calls it other then remediation and that they are flexible in placement. Members of the ASCSU AAC agreed that no further action was required.

6.16 Examining the decline in the size (and potential quality) of the Tenure/Tenure-Track Applicant Pools across the CSU.
This item was referred to the CSU Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration.

6.17 Merit Pay.
Given that this item was recently addressed by the Senate (AS-2714-05/FA Re-affirmation of Prior Actions and Statements on Merit Pay), no further action is warranted at this time.

6.18 Campus autonomy
Members of the ASCSU AAC agreed that no further action was required to the Chancellor’s Office response which reads: “The Academic senate is very clear about its interest in campus autonomy in the matter of academic calendars. It would be good if the Senate were also to show interest in using campus facilities well, especially during January inter/winter-sessions, thus facilitating time to graduation in state-supported terms”

6.19 Ongoing Efforts to Shape Curricula in Institutions of Learning
This resolution helps to reaffirm our support of the AAUP statement on academic freedom and tenure and expresses concern about attempts by citizen and legislative groups to change or insert curriculum content.

Respectfully submitted,
Darlene Yee, EdD, CHES