ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
3/05-07/03

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

Visitors: Gary Hammerstrom, Paul Spear, Rolland Hauser (Professor Emeritus – CSU, Chico), Les Pincu, Marshelle Thobaben

1. Approval of Agenda – agenda approved as presented.

2. Approval of Minutes of 2-14-03 - Approved, subject to correction of language in (5.2) 2-14-03, Enrollment Ceilings: to wit, replace last line with… “The item will be introduced at the March Plenary.”

3. Announcements:

   (1) The budget crisis has apparently resulted in some Deans renaming lines in their budgets and labeling them as “expended.”

   (2) David Spence and Jackie Kegley sent a memorandum (dated February 24th 2003) to campus Senate Chairs and Provosts noting that campus enrollment targets and all options for dealing with enrollment management issues are appropriate for consultation.

   (3) There continues to be a need for clarification from the Office of the Chancellor to be directed to campus Provosts, Presidents, Deans, Department Chairs, Curriculum Committees, and faculty that the 120 unit requirement associated with CSU baccalaureate degrees is a minimum unit requirement.

4. Time(s) Certain: Paul Spear 2:30 05/03

5. Items of Business:

   5.1 – Campus Support for Lower Division Major Initiatives – ref. documents - (1) J. Kegley Letter to be sent to Campus Senate Chairs

   Letter, as revised will be forwarded to Chair Kegley/Executive Committee for action. Revisions will include letter being sent to both campus Senate Chairs and campus Provosts… with the request that Senate Chairs distribute the letter, electronically, to Curriculum Committee Chairs, Department Chairs and the general Faculty.

   5.2 – Campus Enrollment (physical capacity) Ceilings- ref. Documents - (1) Items from 1-22-03 Agenda: BoT Item, Power Point Presentation (2) Two DRAFT Resolutions on System Maximum on Enrollment Ceilings.

   This issue, apparently, will be addressed as an action item on the agenda of the CSU Board of Trustees at their next meeting.
Fine-tuning of resolutions ensued.

With respect to the DRAFT Resolutions on System Maximum on Enrollment Ceilings, discussions focused on whether the notion of a campus enrollment ceiling continues to have merit. Clarification vis-à-vis physical capacity based enrollment ceilings vs. “enrollment ceilings.” Additionally, the Committee supports the philosophical notion that an absolute maximum size or ceiling based upon issues related to the quality of campus learning environment should adhere. The final form of the resolution developed addressed both of these issues.

With respect to the DRAFT Resolution on Adjusting Enrollment Ceilings for Individual Campuses, discussions raised several concerns. The committee agreed that a search of BoT Policy should be completed to ascertain whether language currently exists related to the elements of change our DRAFT Resolution proposes to augment or modify.

5.3 - Legislative Involvement in CSU Curriculum – ref. Documents – (1) Revised Draft Resolution, (2) Relevant California Code Sections

Fine-tuning DRAFT Resolution ensued; both the title and last paragraph of rationale were revised.


Faculty Affairs has indicated that they are interested in co-sponsoring this resolution. Discussions, with input from both Paul Spear and Rolland Hauser, suggested that a second resolution might be indicated. The second resolution would address the need for an ongoing, system-wide intellectual property program that would provide regularly updated information, required by both faculty and students, to stay current in this area. Something as simple as a help-desk or a topically current web site, accessible through the Office of the Chancellor, might suffice. Once the final form of the current DRAFT Document (imminently) is available, we will urge the CSU to publish it.

Fine-tuning of DRAFT Resolution ensued, with input from Faculty Affairs provided by a Faculty Affairs Committee representative.

6. Items of discussion -

6.1 – Foreign Language - ref. Documents (1) Letter to CCC and CSU Foreign Language Councils, (2) CCC Foreign Language Council Response, (3) CSU Foreign Language Council Response, (4) E-mail from Gretchen Angelo

After extensive discussion the committee agreed that two letters should be drafted… one to the CSU General Education Advisory Committee and one to the several Foreign Language Councils. The first letter will recommend that the G.E. Advisory Committee Course Review sub-committee be staffed with representatives from all five major G.E.
Breadth Areas with staggered terms. The second letter will inform Foreign Language Councils that, at this time, the General Education Advisory Council will not request that first year language courses be excluded from those that could conceivably satisfy the C2 Humanities General Education-Breadth requirement.

6.2 The committee drafted a short letter to be sent to Executive Vice-Chancellor David Spence, asking him to send a communication to all campus Provosts clarifying that the 120-unit minimum is, just that, a minimum and not a maximum as seems to be the misperception of many within the CSU.

7. Liaison Reports.

7.1 – Academic Council of International Programs  
REPORT TO ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
CSU ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY PLANNING PROJECT  
At San Diego State University, March 4, 2003  
Brent S. Rushall

Two meetings of the ATPP were attended. The first (N = 25) was a presentation of the group’s Final Draft Initiatives (January 20, 2003). The initiatives are posted on the project’s web site at http://its.calstate.edu/academic_technology/atpc.shtml

Four goals and nine initiatives were presented.

**Goal 1** Maintaining and improving the high quality of education provided by the CSU.
- Initiative 1 Transform the dynamic of learning environments.
- Initiative 2 Promote pedagogically sound and innovative applications of academic technology.
- Initiative 3 Enable faculty, staff, and students to develop skills and knowledge for successful teaching and learning.

**Goal 2** Meeting the access requirements of California residents eligible for admission to the CSU.
- Initiative 4 Increase access and support through innovation in academic technology.
- Initiative 5 Provide learning without boundaries of time and place.

**Goal 3** Providing high levels of student satisfaction with both the education they receive and the student services that support instruction.
- Initiative 6 Promoted student success at all stages of a student’s career.
- Initiative 7 Simplify students’ use of services.

**Goal 4** Providing mechanisms by which CSU faculty, both individually and collectively, can redesign their workload.
- Initiative 8 Improve faculty effectiveness and satisfaction through flexible workload practices.
- Initiative 9 Strengthen support for teaching.

The general implication of the initiatives seems to be to alter and replace much of the traditional lecture form of instructional practice.

- The initiatives are generally based upon the following factors.
- Individual learning styles and their varied needs.
- 50% of Californians do not live within 20 miles of a CSU campus.
• Individual life styles (work families, etc) require more flexible access.
• A need to alter relationships between teacher, learners, and content.
• A means to faster degree completion.
• Accommodate student services for 92% of students who do not live on campus.

The discussion that followed covered a litany of problems and limitations in the CSU but mainly as they are manifested at SDSU.

The second meeting was a smaller group (N = 10). It sought feedback on the effect on the SDSU campus of the January Conference on Academic Technology Planning Project. One person offered an opinion. The rest of the meeting focused on the draft initiatives and their implications for SDSU and in some cases, for the CSU.

7.2 – Subcommittee for GE Course Review

**Subcommittee for GE Course Review (3/2/03)**
Approximately 800 courses were submitted this year for GE course review. Six members of the Subcommittee for GE Course Review met three days and completed the faculty reviews on February 12. This year’s course review was facilitated by three factors: (1) the quality of the CCC course submissions have improved and a streamlined staff review process is now in place, (2) six faculty reviewers were available for the review dates compared to 2-3 reviewers in past years, and (3) experienced faculty reviewers representing multiple disciplines were present at the same time; including arts/performing arts, chemistry, communication studies, history, mathematics, and social sciences. It was recommended to the GE Advisory Committee that two-year, staggered appointments to the GE Course Review Subcommittee would help to continue the efficiency of the faculty GE course review process.