Members present: Amaral, Anagnason, Kaiser, Kellner, Klein, Nishita, Rushall, Snyder, Tarjan, Thompson, Wheeler

Visitors: Gary Hammerstrom

1. Approval of Agenda: Approved without modification

2. Approval of Minutes: Approved as edited

3. Announcements: well wishes to Drs. Cherny, Charnofsky, and Hood.

4. Times Certain: none

5. Items of Business:

5.1 – Modification of Upper Division Admission Requirement:
AS-2582-02/AA

Resolution in progress recommends that the number of units required for transfer to the CSU as an upper-division transfer with an attendant junior level standing be modified from the current level of 56 to 60.

Arguments in support of this increase from 56 to 60 include the fact that financial aid availability often requires junior level standing... and 56 units does not satisfy the definition of junior-level standing presently employed within the CSU. Additionally, registration preference, on most campuses, is given to those with junior level standing which entails the completion of a minimum of 60 units. Students who have completed 56 units do not qualify for junior level standing.

Arguments against this modification included the suggestion that, absent effective advising, students might not be efficient in the ways they use the additional four units required for transfer... effectively lengthening the time to degree. Additionally, some community college campuses do not offer many, if any, courses within certain disciplines, and thus students would not be able to start under-division major requirements and would be foreclosed from using the additional units to make progress within their anticipated major.

Gary Hammerstrom, AA liaison from the Office of the Chancellor, indicated that special admit status is available to transferring students when course are not available at the community college they attend.

Committee voted retain current resolve clause and to modify language in rationale, with modifications to be sent to committee members for editorial input.

6. Items of Discussion:
6.1 – Nursing Core Alignment Project:

Documents referenced include the recommendations of the CSU Nursing Alignment Taskforce, alignment document from IMPAC, and Assembly Bill 2314, Chapter 1093 (recently signed into law by Governor Davis).

Members of AA voiced major concerns with both the substance of the Nursing Alignment Taskforce’s recommendations and the tactics employed by members of the nursing education community to compel segments of California higher education to adopt recommendations developed in conjunction with core alignment efforts. Of particular concern to members of AA were a series of recommendations related to modifications in the General Education coursework that would be required of baccalaureate nursing degree aspirants under the plan articulated by the Nursing Alignment Taskforce. It was noted that suggestions presented by the Task Force would require a modification to Title V of the Education Code.

Our committee agreed that a letter, under the signature of the Chair of our Senate (Dr. Kegley), should be sent to the Chair of the Task Force (cc. The Office of the Chancellor), addressing the following topics:

(a) Lack of course specificity appearing in the descriptions of Task Force recommendations
(b) The de facto attack on the philosophical underpinnings of General Education
(c) Appropriate avenues and mechanisms for both program and course approval, including the General Education Advisory Committee and their General Education course review sub-committee
(d) The need to respect the rights of individual campuses to deal autonomously with the curricula of programs on their campuses

6.2 Enrollment Management:

Documents referenced included a memo from Vice Chancellor Spence to campus presidents and a survey/questionnaire being crafted by AA to seek input regarding the degree of faculty involvement in the processes being employed by individual campuses to address enrollment management issues.

The Academic Affairs division of the Office of the Chancellor requested an emergency meeting of the Admissions Advisory Council to discuss the impending enrollment crisis for the spring of 2003, because many CSU campuses are already over enrolled. The Office of the Chancellor has urged campuses to follow the guidelines laid out in Title V vis-à-vis impaction, to address the issues of equity that will arise as campuses deal with here-to-fore un-encountered enrollment problems. Recommendations to campuses included:

(a) No special admits
(b) Limit re-admits
(c) Provide incentives for efficient completion of degree requirements

Our liaison to the Admission Advisory Council reported on an emergency meeting of the Council. Topics addressed at this meeting included:

(a) Redirection – in the face of impending system-wide impaction, redirection loses
its efficacy...
(b) UC/CSU science admission requirements and the lack of parallelism...
(c) Executive Order 167
(d) Executive Order 365 (AP course credit)
(e) Modification of upper division admission requirements $56 \rightarrow 60$, currently being contemplated...

Gary Hammerstrom indicated that the Office of the Chancellor is expecting to carry, as an information item to the next meeting of the Board of Trustees, the $56 \rightarrow 60$ increase.

Committee discussed sending a *high priority* letter to local Senate Chairs, cc. to Provosts and Presidents, informing the chairs of the enrollment management memo that Vice Chancellor Spence has distributed that discussed enrollment management options.

The committee agreed that, with minor modifications, the survey/questionnaire requesting input regarding faculty involvement in local campus efforts to address enrollment management issues should be sent to just local Senate Chairs.

6.3 Student fees:

Discussions included query as to why CPEC was the agency requested to examine area of fee structures and possible fee increases. Comments offered by members of the committee included the admonition that the total fee profile for students on individual campuses must be considered, and that an endorsement of a set of guidelines and principles should, ultimately, occur.

6.4 Library Funding: No action...

7. Liaison Reports:

7.1 Gary Hammerstrom re: San Diego State and California State University – Fullerton are approaching their current enrollment ceilings.

A 20,000 (later increased to 25,000) ceiling was placed on individual campus enrollments in the original 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. The ceiling was placed on campuses based upon notions of what the maximum size of a campus could be that would allow for efficient allocation of campus resources. The Office of the Chancellor will go to the Board of Trustees with a resolution requesting that campuses be allowed to exceed the current 25,000 ceiling.