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

Visitors: Gary Hammerstrom, Allison Jones

1. Approval of Agenda – approved as drafted

2. Approval of Minutes: approved without modification

3. Announcements: none

4. Time Certain: Allison Jones (OoC) -10:30 re: modifications to System-wide Enrollment Management Policy

5. Items of Business:

   5.1 – Liaisons:

   (a) Ken Nishita steps down and Brent Rushall and Bob Snyder will be recommended as liaisons to the Graduate and Post Baccalaureate Education Task Force.

   (b) CAN liaison to be named after consultation with the Executive Committee (Chair Kegley).

   (c) ATAC – mechanism of reportage raised by MT, given that Chair Kegley is also co-Chair of ATAC.

5.2 - Enrollment Management Policy Discussions:

BR (AA) - Suggested that 2000 Policy has not been field-tested and rather than make wholesale changes to that policy, proposed that just one modification dealing with student access re: when a local campus fails to offer the major of choice, admission to an adjacent campus would be guaranteed, was indicated.

Time Certain: Allison Jones (OoC)

MT (AA) - How will enrollment management committees (Presidential Admission Advisory Groups) be appointed; how will groups be administered… will there be consultation prior to appointments?
GH (OoC) – The intent is to grandfather in existing enrollment Management Committees or Groups on individual campuses. They would be incorporated into the Presidential Advisory Groups contemplated by the modifications to existing system-wide enrollment management policy.

Changes since 9/10 version: page 5, bullet 3 “local, regional, and state” language incorporated;
KK (AA) – Each campus should set up, anew, an enrollment management committee/advisory group, whose makeup would be a matter of consultation with local senates and include faculty… the charge of which would be decided, in consultation with the faculty (i.e., local senates).

MT – What is the contemplated life of these presidentially appointed committees?

RK – When impaction occurs, who has the authority to impose locally decided upon impaction policies?
AJ (OoC) – Communication, usually, is between departments and the administration... i.e., there is local autonomy.

RK – page 5 bullet 4; Enrollment Management Policies must be published 12 months prior to contemplated enrollments… yet impaction declarations have a 10 month lead time... why the inconsistency? Enrollment targets and funding that should, but may not, flow from these estimations, can be delayed by the budgetary process.

GH & AJ (OoC) – In response to a question posed by BR (AA), GH and AJ explained that these changes have been constructed in response to pressure from members of the Assembly… and absent language creating the Presidential Appointed Groups, the legislature was poised to step in and legislate in this area. The language of page 5, bullet 4, was crafted so as to retain authority and autonomy within the CSU and the individual campuses of the CSU, rather than risk legislative action. Community representation was necessary… on an individual campus, once impaction occurs, this group must be in the information loop when existing campus mechanisms (policies) for dealing with the impaction are invoked.

MC (AA) – How many campuses are currently impacted?
AJ (OoC) -San Diego, Long Beach (for freshmen), Chico (for freshmen), and various individual programs across the system.

BS (AA) – what form should a resolution take? Prior resolutions regarding both formulation of enrollment management policy and implementation of those policies exist. Might we simply reference those resolutions, rather than build a new resolution? Language in our earlier resolution(s) called explicitly for both consultation and representation during formulation and implementation of local enrollment management policy and the creation of any associated implementation infrastructure.

MT (AA) - Would there be a problem changing the paragraph that is currently contemplated to include language that “required” faculty consultation and representation?
GH (OoC) - Probably not a good route, since these presidential advisory groups are, primarily, to ensure that information pathways exist… and greater degrees of consultation and representation in the area of enrollment management should (do?) exist than those contemplated by this modification to Board of Trustees policy.

Reference our contemplated resolution: “Modifications of the 2000 California State University Enrollment Management Policies”

The two pre-existing resolutions will be referenced, even though all of the requests
made within these resolutions were not responded to in a positive fashion. With minor changes in wording, and an agreement that both of the pre-existing resolutions should, indeed, be referenced, a final form of the current resolution was crafted.

MC (AA) – Posed the question, “Haven’t we gone from a resolution that was designed to state opposition to contemplated changes to BoT enrollment management policy to a resolution that is at cross purposes?”

KK (AA) – What are the actual changes contemplated?
(1) Definition of “local”
(2) Twelve to ten months (enrollment targets) and impaction notification dates
(3) Consolidation of reporting requirements
(4) Creation of presidential advisory committees (…to include community representation)

BR (AA) – Suggests a provisional approach…
MC (AA) – Suggests an affirmation of changes under the proviso that both system-wide and local campus policy changes occur with full faculty consultation…

A straw vote led us to focus our efforts on refining a resolution built upon the MC suggestion.

Three resolve clauses were crafted focusing on (1) acknowledging the contemplated BoT policy changes, (2) clarifying the role of presidential enrollment management advisory groups (including urging that campus presidents be explicitly advised as to the role of these groups by the Office of the Chancellor), and (3) reaffirming the need for faculty consultation at both the system and local campus levels on any contemplated enrollment management policy changes. Draft version approved by the committee.

5.3 The Admissions Advisory Council has recommended a modification to Upper-Division Admission Requirements that would increase transferable units to 60 from the current maximum of 56. Without 60 units at the time of transfer, some sources of financial aid are foreclosed… i.e., junior-class standing is required.

Our working-draft resolution recommends that the BoT amend Title 5, CCR, accordingly, based upon to two concerns… (1) that the CSU work to develop transfer degrees and (2) that CSU campuses and departments be fully involved in the development of any and all transfer degrees.

KK (AA) – Supports change…
JT (AA) – Suggests that supporting the change is a no-brainer…
BS (AA) – In the physical sciences the change might not be beneficial…
JT (AA) – Suggests that so long as the requirement isn’t tied to completion of GE, then there is no problem with this change… in this way hard science majors would be able to complete more under-division mathematics courses, courses which are prerequisite to coursework within the degree, rather than be compelled to take courses satisfying GE requirements.

Alterations included deletion of second paragraph of working draft.
Discussions focused on whether support of the unit change should be subject to transfer degree considerations. Final form of the resolution will not address transfer degree concerns.

6. Discussion Items
6.1 EO 365 and CLEP Exams – waiting on input from OoC.
6.2 Revisions of the CETUS booklet. Mark Thompson will keep us informed on this.
6.3 Budapest Initiative – waiting on input from Bob Cherny.
6.5 Information Competence – MT reiterated concern that Information Competence programs be left to departmental initiation/development, rather than library initiation/development
6.6 Master Plan Report – JT (AA) read a handful of specific recommendations that are pertinent to higher education, generally, and the CSU, specifically.

We will consult with the Executive Committee (Chair Kegley) regarding our role… understanding that as legislative packages are introduced that are designed to address and implement elements of the Master Plan, we must be vigilant and, when indicated, responsive.

6.7 CSU Eligibility and Grade Inflation… BR (AA) – concern exists over school districts that give out high grades, yet their students fail to perform comparably high levels on standardized exams. BR suggested that this problem needs to be addressed. Practical considerations militate against any simple fix to the problem.

Data collection (with an assist from the OoC) is to be undertaken to see to what extent the problem exists.

7. Fine tuning the language of resolutions led to some minor modifications.

8. Reports:

8.1 CAN – KK (AA) – A draft set of changes to the CAN Model of Articulation was distributed. The changes to the model are being proposed by the CAN Board. The new model (to be endorsed by ASCSU) would ensure that discipline faculty, under the authority of their Academic Senates and CAN, would develop course numbers, titles, and descriptions of the competencies to be established in their courses, which reflect clear-cut, adequate preparation of students for upper division work in their majors, regardless of where they received their lower division preparation.

8.2 ELM (MC) – greater student success is now being observed, based upon the newly modified ELM and its initial cut score. The secondary cut score has been adjusted, resulting in fewer students requiring two courses in remediation.

High School Assessment Exam is being modified with the hope that, once modified, this exam too will be an adequate tool for establishing entry level mathematics competencies.

8.3 ASSIST (JT) Articulation agreement database… Private universities
have indicated an interest in participating in ASSIST. The board is in the process of approving policies for including private schools in the database. The ASSIST retreat for articulation officers will be held again this fall.

8.4 Task Force on Facilitating Graduation

(LAX Crowne Plaza 9/6/2002)

The product is a document with philosophy and rationale as well as proposing strategies to campuses and recommendations to Executive Committee & BoT. Also may be for AS and for political use to show state we are addressing this issue. Each campus should produce its own document/model.

Trustee Roberta Achtenberg will work with the task force and VPSA Tomas Morales from Pomona will join. There is a new study on "State Policy and Community College-Baccalaureate Transfer" by National Center for Public Policy in Higher Education by Jane Wellman (those with an AA are more likely to graduate 43% as opposed to 17%).

Is there a difference between focus on graduation rates and focus on time to degree? For example many think that double majors are often some of the best students. Spence's focus in the first meeting was on primarily on degree attainment and secondarily on time to degree.

It is important to think of units to degree as well as time to degree. Factors such as SES are more linked to time than # of units. Also continuous enrollment is an important factor (cohorts and other engagement strategies). This also relates to maintaining ties and communication with students who have been dismissed, e.g. for failure to remediate, but who may come back to the campus and eventually complete a degree.

Important to think about the difference between a full-time student for financial aid and the number of units/term required for a 4-year degree program. The issue is also compounded by the tendency to take enough units to graduate without graduating.

A systemic disincentive is position allocation built on FTE which leads to large GE and large-unit majors.

Policies should be developed through reference to the white paper and consultation and be based on gathered evidence, including that collected from students.

We should also be aware that the "tidal wave will go out" eventually and these policies may look much less interesting.

Interestingly, only about 600 students per year systemwide move from the CSU to the UC.
8.5 ATAC Meeting 9/12/2002

Status of Academic Technology Planning Initiative: There is an emphasis and a commitment by the chancellor to expand and support AT. Spence reported on a meeting, 3 weeks ago, of the Technology Steering Council (6 or 7 presidents) met with 17 provosts with some SWAS leadership. The Steering Committee gave the project over to the provosts and ATAC, along with a sense of urgency focused on the teaching and learning part of the technology strategy. The chancellor is largely concerned with access/capacity, but he did say that he does not want to diminish quality and that he is not intent on a virtual university. Additionally, any development and approval of development will be based on the campuses following normal approval processes. Ernst and Hammerstrom will chair the working group of about 13-15 members. ATAC's involvement will be as the first level of review. Likely that the ATAC principles will be used as a starting point for the workgroup. The goals of the Steering Group are

1. maintaining and improving quality of education in CSU,
2. meeting access requirements (increasing the educational capacity)
3. high levels of student satisfaction
4. opening for faculty to redesign workload (in the workload study, it was clear that faculty want less time spent on administration and teaching and more time spent on development and research)

The system will provide a variety of supports, including faculty development, software, seed money—a menu for a campus to choose from. There is no push for common learning systems, but there is emphasis on scalability and sustainability. There will be policy concerns (FTE/fee sharing etc.) The feedback mechanism will require consultation at every campus via a traveling group to gather practices and needs, likely in close contact with the original AT planning teams. The center of the enterprise is teaching and learning and curricular infusion. Funding will require additional allocation as well as reallocation. There is a $5M request in the current budget request (03-04)--this is the 2nd year that AT has been a line in the budget.

Areas of importance drawn from April 02 ATAC Conference:

1. Technology Fee Policy: Systemwide
2. Faculty workload, incentives, RTP rewards
3. Course articulation across campuses
4. Curriculum approval processes across campuses
5. Purchasing/licensing policies
6. Intellectual property rights
7. Multi-campus sharing policies re: WTU, FTE, budget/revenues,
fees
8. Faculty development, support, and training
9. Reporting mechanisms and policies: standard definitions

Interesting factoid: studies reflect that, online, 85% of the enrollment is in 10% of the courses.

Thanks,

~mt

JA (AA) – implementation of PeopleSoft has been disastrous at Fresno State.