Members present: Amaral, Anagnoson, Cates, Kaiser, Kellner, Klein, Nishita, Rohm, Rushall, Snyder, Tarjan, Thompson, Wheeler

Visitors: Gary Hammerstrom, Pauline Abbott

1. Approval of Agenda – agenda modified to include consideration of joint resolution with Faculty Affairs Committee re: Academic Program Suspension/Discontinuation/Dissolution.

2. Approval of Minutes of: approved as submitted

3. Announcements: G.E. Assessment Conference – March 13 & 14; T. Anagnoson will attend and represent AA.

4. Time(s) Certain: 6.1 – January 22, 2003, 1:00 pm, Pauline Abbott, President of the California Council on Gerontology & Geriatrics

5. Items of Business:

5.1 – Facilitating Graduation – ref. documents (1) J. Kegley e-mail (2) Letter from Executive Vice Chancellor Spence, (3) BoT Policy, (4) Northridge Report, (5) L. Roth e-mail

Resolution will be presented that will receive and endorse, in principle, the recommendation and principles included in the report, subject to several caveats. With particularity: (a) consultation, before any further extension of principles currently contained within report by the Board occurs, (b) necessity for campus autonomy vis-à-vis formulation and implementation.

There was general agreement that the consultative processes associated with the generation of this report were both appropriately inclusive and effective.

Local campuses must be in charge of which aspects and elements of the report should/will apply to their local situation.

Fine-tuning of resolution ensued…

5.2 – Course Articulation Numbering System (CAN) Proposal - ref. Documents (1) J. Kegley e-mail, (2) CAN Model Background, (3) CAN Model

AA Briefed on CAN History, current CAN Model, and contemplated changes to the current CAN Model, by former CAN Board member, K. Kaiser. CAN is a cross-referencing course designation system that provides guarantees that courses taken to satisfy under-division preparation within a discipline at one institution will be accepted at the time of transfer to a second institution. Community colleges will now utilize CAN numbering, uniformly, for their transfer-course designation system. A five-year CAN course review cycle will be implemented. New
CAN criteria involving greater course description specificity will be generated by means of a much more broadly inclusive collaboration and consultation process involving colleagues within individual disciplines across systems. CAN descriptors will now be readily accessible via the inter-net.

6. Items of discussion
6.1 – Implementation of Gerontology Legislation - ref. Documents (1) AB 2202, (2) SB 593, (3) J. Kegley e-mail, (4) Conference call report

Focus of discussions… (a) intrusions into curricular concerns by legislative process, and (b) the lack of resources currently available on individual campuses both to develop and teach courses that will be appropriately responsive to the current legislative mandate. Is it not the case that elements necessary to satisfy the legislative mandate may already be embedded across several offerings within the curricula of most campuses?

1:00 Time Certain: Pauline Abbott, Ed.D., CSU Fullerton, representing the California Council On Gerontology & Geriatrics

Dr. Abbott presented an overview of the changes in delivery of gerontology education in higher education (CSU) over the past 10-12 years that provided the impetus for seeking legislative support for ensuring that gerontology education be present within the curricula of the campuses of the CSU. Gerontology, as a discipline, is suffering. Students, lacking awareness of gerontology as a discipline, have not opted to enroll in either courses or programs in gerontology. The Council has pursued a two- pronged approach to bolster gerontology programs that includes (1) mandates for inclusion of gerontology within curricula, and (2) formulation of job descriptions for any of several state jobs that require some background in gerontology as a discipline.

Comments and or questions…

AA – What mandate are campuses of CSU actually under?

PA – Not specifically to develop courses, but to collaborate in ensuring that topics in gerontology are incorporated into curricula.

AA – What if we (campuses) have neither the faculty nor the resources to bring off this inclusion… then what?

PA – Collaborate with folks who are currently involved...

AA – Why didn’t your group use more traditional approaches to curriculum development and reform to further your agenda?

PA – Legislative vehicle was used to mandate Geriatric Education Centers… this pre-dated this legislative intrusion. This intrusion is just the natural extension of that mandate. Dr. Abbott asserts there are no teeth in this piece of legislation, i.e., the so-called mandate is couched in terms of a recommendation.

AA – System-wide standards… how will this work out in non-gerontology programs or non-gerontology courses. What do the guidelines mandate?
PA – Licensure requirements in individual professional programs (e.g., MFCC) will drive the changes needed. References to System-wide standards won’t necessarily dovetail with the curriculum of individual campuses or individual courses. Gerontology Program Directors need to be pro-active to assist in implementing the requirements of the legislation.

OoC – What was the thinking of this group vis-à-vis pushing for standardization of curricula?

PA – Answer given really didn’t address the question.

AA – Who or what has been the driving force behind these efforts… faculty or external professional group(s)? Are any efforts being made to make the implementation process be a faculty driven enterprise?

PA - The faculty have been involved (Northridge Colloquium)… and ideally, the faculty would take the lead.

Discussions continued with the same points being reiterated.

Several possible approaches to addressing the issues raised during discussions were suggested, including drafting letters directed to (1) the Office of the Chancellor (re: We know you are aligned with us on this issue, but we need to redouble our efforts to avoid legislative intrusion) (2) Local Senate Chairs and Provosts (re: absence of mandate and use of normal curricular development processes in implementation),(3) local campuses, outlining the problems attendant with the process that occurred and urging development of protocols for engaging, appropriately, with the legislature.

A resolution will be drafted addressing the legislative intrusion issues associated with both the nursing and the gerontology curricular areas.

A letter to Executive Vice Chancellor Spence will be drafted recommending that he request feedback (data) describing the degrees to which individual campuses are currently responsive to the intent (mandates?) of recent gerontology legislation and suggesting that any curricular responses to the legislation should occur, when necessary, only after a baseline assessment has been completed. CC to campus chairs.

6.2 - Enrollment Management – ref. Document, Draft Report (v. 3.0 1/13/03)… Topic Introduced by a member of the Ad Hoc Committee referencing--- (1-888-288-4427).

Effects of enrollment management decisions on individual campuses…

The Committee concluded that enrollment management policies (and their implementation) clearly have impacts in the classroom and on faculty… to wit: 
  Direct Instructional Effects.
  Indirect Instructional Effects
  Preparedness of Entering Students
  Restrictions on Double Majors and Second Baccalaureates
Course Offerings
Effects on Small Departments
Retention

Committee will recommend to Chair Kegley that she request Executive Vice Chancellor to join with her in sending out a letter to Provosts, and local Senate Chairs, delineating the results of our system-wide inquiry into the impacts of enrollment management policies on students, programs, and institutions, and imploring campuses administrators to work diligently with their faculty to avoid the myriad negative impacts discovered by the survey and described in our report.

6.3 - Enrollment Ceilings – ref. Documents (1) J. Kegley e-mail, (2) November BoT item, (3) Power Point Presentation

Discussions with Gary Hammerstrom centered on efforts underway to develop processes and procedures that will allow for campuses to request increases in their enrollment ceilings in excess of the maximum (25,000) initially established by the California Master Plan for Higher Education. The Office of the Chancellor, at the behest of the Board of Trustees, is centrally involved in this development effort. Committee concerns focused on the importance of, and the need for, faculty/senate involvement in the development process. It was suggested (OoC) that a resolution indicating the importance of faculty/senate involvement and requesting that the Board ensure that faculty/senate inclusion occur, would make sense.

6.4 - Social Science Database Membership – ref. document, e-mail from T. Anagnoson...

Social Science Research and Instructional Council (represented by T. Anagnoson) is asking for advice regarding how continued membership (i.e., funding) in three different databases might be assured (the Roper Center, the Field Institute and the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research)? Committee consensus: A resolution singling out support for this worthwhile goal is, unfortunately, inappropriate.

7. Liaison Reports – to be provided