Attendees: Bob Cherny, Cristy Jensen, Lynne Cook, Marshelle Thobaben, David McNeil, John Tarjan, Jan Gregory, Marvin Klein, Ted Anagnoson

Visitors: Ann Peacock (ASCSU Ex. Dir.), Kathy Kaiser (Faculty Trustee), and Keith Boyum (CO AA)

1. Chair’s report—related his visit to the UC Executive Council. Issues discussed included:
   a. Security clearances for many employees (related to Los Alamos contract).
   b. Workload
   c. Concern about an “elitist university” label
   d. K-12 relations. The UC has a different perspective. They see their major role as developing and supporting charter schools.
   e. A regent attended the meeting and offered a lot to the discussion.

2. Reports by Standing Committee Chairs
   a. Academic Affairs (Ted Anagnoson)—two new items were added since November.
      i. Applied Doctorates
         1. San Diego may desire to approach this issue differently than the rest of the system.
         2. The administration may support this authorization even in the absence of funding.
         3. Consortium, joint, stand-alone approaches to applied doctorates were discussed.
         4. Self-support is an option that has little support among many senators.
         5. The UC is unlikely to meet the demands of the state for applied doctorates.
         6. Perhaps faculty from programs such as Masters in Audiology could meet with senate leadership, Keith Boyum and someone from the legislature to explore legislation/resources to meet targeted state needs.
         7. Keith Boyum may be working on enabling legislation.
         8. The need for audiologists is more acute among the elderly rather than among school-age children.
         9. Some campuses have already done pre-planning on how they might approach this degree.
      ii. Advising
         1. Campus chairs shared many good ideas yesterday.
         2. Technology may greatly impact this process.
         3. Perhaps we can get a report on best practices from the campuses.
         4. Perhaps CO Academic Affairs can get us some information about campuses/programs that have roadmaps in place.
5. “Advising” includes a spectrum of activities.
6. Why hasn’t the facilitating graduation conference resulted in more information about where the campuses are? Some of this information relates to advising. We will find out what information is available.
7. Sacramento State is developing prototype roadmaps from a variety of disciplines.
8. Campuses may still need to be convinced of the value of developing roadmaps.
9. This issue may be problematic as it may have implications for workload (collective bargaining), etc. If the Senate does not act, the CO may get in front of the issue with an approach that we might not prefer.

iii. CMS petition referred to AA.
iv. AA also has a number of continuing items.

b. Faculty Affairs (Jan Gregory)
i. Jackie McClain will visit and discuss a possible job action by the graduate students (represented UAW).
ii. John Travis may or may not visit depending upon his other commitments.
iii. David Hood will visit to talk about the Task Force on Outside Employment.
   1. Outside employment is a PR problem.
   2. We may want to differentiate between reasons why faculty are not satisfactorily fulfilling their professional responsibilities.
   3. Outside employment by faculty undercuts our argument to reduce the 12 unit-teaching load to support other activities.
iv. Other topics to be discussed:
   1. Self-support MBA programs
   2. Revising the academic freedom resolution/rights resolutions
   3. The lecturer participation in campus senates resolution
   4. MPP hiring
   5. A potential resolution on the Patriot Act
   6. CMS concerns
v. Jan has compiled some information from the campuses on student grievance procedures and policies.

c. TEKR (Marvin Klein)
i. The role of TEKR in teacher education will be the major focus.
ii. A vision statement for TEKR may be developed.
iii. CSET and induction/5th year programs may be discussed.
iv. Would like to meet with AA on EAP over lunch.
v. Drops in teacher education enrollments
   1. We have mainly anecdotal evidence on the issue.
   2. Could the CSU gather some data on enrollments?
   3. District credentialing, private university competition, CSET barriers are all potential contributors to the drop in CSU enrollments.
vi. There is a huge gap in needs vs. graduates in areas such as mathematics.

d. We may want to have an ASCSU group meet with higher education staff in Sacramento to run ideas we are working on by them.

3. Visit from Keith Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
   a. ATAC—There is some concern about the advisability of having a conference this year as the vehicle to disseminate information.
   b. Technology RFPs are being reviewed.
   c. LDTP was discussed. Could we use this project as a way to gather information, opinions on other matters of concern to the faculty?
   d. Accountability Area 10
      i. The provosts are interested in doing something on accountability in graduate education.
      ii. There was a previous committee that never met.
      iii. The faculty will be supportive of this.
      iv. Perhaps it could be tied to program review.
      v. We addressed this in our November Executive Committee meeting.
   e. Applied doctorate
      i. Has been discussed with UC administrative counterparts.
      ii. We cannot ask for more money to do this.
      iii. UC will probably oppose the potential authorization less vigorously than private universities.
      iv. Apparently, the CSU is the only current place for audiology programs in the state.
      v. SDSU and UCSD have a joint program in audiology.
      vi. Joint EdD programs with the UC have not worked well—the UC faculty do not view them as a priority.
      vii. Self-support for graduate programs does not have a lot of support in the building—perhaps a self-support doctoral program could be built upon existing state-support masters programs in audiology.
      viii. Perhaps we can work for a richer funding formula for these programs.
      ix. Perhaps a blend of self and state and grant support could be developed. A variety of funding models could be explored.
      x. The Senate could be involved in reviewing programs proposed for addition. AA (CO) would provide state support for this type of oversight.
      xi. One of the criteria in the Boyum document is that the program would not take away from existing resources. Would this just result in every interested campus “fudging” on the resource issue?
      xii. How can you staff these programs on soft money (self or grant support)? Tenure track faculty need to be hired to offer the programs but…
      xiii. These programs may be offered on a regional CSU basis. Some type of coordination mechanisms will need to be developed.
      xiv. The Senate needs to be involved in drafting legislation that impacts upon curricular matters. Keith is supportive of including the Senate in these discussions.
Because audiology and physical therapy are so clinically oriented, their issues are very different from those of other programs.

This is on the legislative plan. It is unclear what will be the ultimate disposition of this proposal. It is complicated by the looming situation in audiology.

Advising

Progress reports on facilitating graduation on the campuses were shared.

Are the reasons for poor student success due to advising or factors outside of our control? The reports look good but the student results do not.

Pomona has had some success in advising initiatives. Perhaps that would be a good place to start in looking at best practices.

4. Other Discussion Items

Trustee selection process—applications are slowly coming in. The committee is complete.

Advising issues—referred to Academic Affairs.

Outside Employment Task Force—discussed in FAC report above.

CAN and IMPAC reports—briefly discussed.

ICAS agenda (appended below)

Kate (Chair ASCCC) and George (Chair, UC Assembly) will be invited to our senate plenary meetings.

Potential additional agenda items were discussed. We may add items until meeting time.

David will inquire about item X. (transfer and student preparation) on the agenda—what are the action items?

Graduate education should be added—UC has a statement on the importance of graduate education.

Legislative Issues

1. Morrow bill/student rights issues
2. Other transfer issues—working together
3. Funding for higher education

Admission Advisory Council update

What do we need to do to make sure meetings are scheduled so the liaison can attend?

Why is testing not aligned between systems when course patterns are?

Coordinating with CO Academic Affairs

Perhaps David can meet with Keith on a more regular basis to keep up on potential/actual items of interest to both groups.

Keeping the Executive Committee up to date on issues, calendar, etc.

Perhaps we can implement some type of electronic “tickler file” to keep our focus on issues that need follow-up. Bolded items in the notes can be a main source of these items.

We will roll over bolded items as “Old Business” in the agenda from now on.

Ann will track and communicate the meeting schedules a selected subgroup for committee/task force/council meetings.

Jensen to replace Monteiro on Commission of Extended University.
j. January Plenary
   i. Trustee invitee—Ann will report on success, some names discussed.
   ii. Additional invitees—George Blumenthal, Kate Clark
   iii. Academic Affairs to host the social.
   iv. Chancellor Reed – time certain, 11:00 am, Thursday, January 20 (to be confirmed).
   v. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence – time certain, 1:00 pm, Thursday, January 20.
   vi. Faculty Trustee Kaiser
   vii. CFA President Travis
   viii. Academic Senate Liaison Obayashi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Needed</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>I. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kate Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>IV. REPORTS FROM SENATE CHAIRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Blumenthal, Chair, Academic UC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kate Clark, President, Academic Senate CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David McNeil, Chair, Academic Senate CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>V. CalPASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enclosure 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representatives of the CalPASS project will present information and a demonstration of the project’s intersegmental uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>VI. WASC REVIEW PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enclosure 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members will discuss the WASC Review Process and discussions underway in UC to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion VII.</td>
<td>ICC PROPOSED 2005-07 WORKPLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members will review the proposed 2005–07 ICC workplan and discuss the implementation of the recommendation to form a broad-based group to identify and recommend changes to facilitate transfer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion VIII.</th>
<th>CAN DISCUSSION</th>
<th>Enclosure 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members will continue discussion on the CAN New Model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion IX.</th>
<th>LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Enclosure 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members will continue discussion on future strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Preemptive activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Student grievance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Coordination of legislative efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action X.</th>
<th>TRANSFER AND PREPARATION ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Enclosure 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICAS will continue discussing ongoing issues regarding transfer and preparation. The following items will be discussed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. IMPAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. SciGETC Approvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. LDTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Competency Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other</td>
<td>Information for Item X. D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE Content Standards for History-Social Science and for Science can be accessed from <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>