MINUTES

Members Present: Darlene Yee-Melichar (San Francisco), John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Ted Anagnoson (Los Angeles), Vince Buck (Fullerton), Myron Hood (San Luis Obispo), Marvin Klein (Pomona), Ken Nishita (Monterey Bay), Tapie Rohm (San Bernardino), Steven Stepanek (Northridge)

Guests Present: Allison Jones (CSU Chancellor’s Office), Jim Blackburn (CSU Chancellor’s Office), David Backues (CSSA—Humboldt)

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:00am.

2. The agenda was approved as amended (two items added to items of business).

3. The minutes from the meeting of September 2006 were approved with a minor editorial change. Grateful appreciation was extended to John Tarjan for his outstanding work in recording these comprehensive and timely meeting minutes.

4. Chair’s Report: Darlene Yee-Melichar
   a. Keith Boyum, Chris Hanson and Barry Pasternack are busy with other obligations and regret not being able to attend our meeting.
   b. The details of the upcoming academic conference were reviewed.
   c. Tapie Rohm has been appointed to the ATAC subcommittee on on-line courses and distance learning.
   d. The chair participated in an LDTP conference call dealing with the operational details of course reviews. There will be 3 cycles of review each year. Reviewers will have 1-2 year terms. Reviewers will receive $1000 per year to do approximately 100 reviews. Review coordinators will have 2 year terms. They will do reviews also and will be compensated $1500 per year.
   e. The extended Executive Committee was invited to offer suggestions to the Provost’s work group on graduate education.
   f. Chris Hanson is putting together a work group to address the review of American Institution courses as guided by EO 365.
   g. Chris Hanson also has raised the issue of language of instruction in GE courses. This will be on the GEAC agenda next month.
h. Mary Chen is the director of ATI (Assisted Technology Instruction) and has invited the chair to attend the ATI Executive Sponsors meeting on October 31, 2006.

i. IMPAC has proposed a January meeting to discuss articulation between systems. Topics of interest will include LDTP, UC streamlining majors and the CCC C-ID (course numbering system).

j. Jo Service thanked the committee for the get well card and box of chocolates.

5. Visitor Presentations

a. 10:30am--Chancellor’s Office: Jim Blackburn, Associate Director, Enrollment Management Services, Student Academic Support
   i. EAP continues to move forward. More students are taking the tests. We have not seen great results yet.
   ii. We are discussing A-G HS courses and the role of CTE courses (as per pending legislation).
   iii. System enrollment looks good. All but 4 of the semester campuses (quarter campus data unavailable) are likely to meet their targets this year. Six did not make last year. We are likely to be 1 to 1.5% above target for the system this year. Last year we were .6% over, a very narrow margin. Approximately half of the campuses have record freshman enrollment. Credential enrollments are continuing to diminish.
   iv. Graduate student targets are being re-benched so that FTES will be calculated on a 12 unit rather than a 15 unit bases. The state will reimburse NEW system graduate enrollments on this basis.
   v. New out of state students will not be allowed to be counted for FTEs purposes starting this year. There are several exceptions to this policy.
   vi. 07-08 enrollment targets will begin to be set in November.
   vii. Concerns were expressed by the committee of the impact of the new target/reimbursement rules on small campuses. The impact may be devastating to some smaller campuses. Also, not considering headcount may pose burdens on campuses that need to provide services to many part-time students.

b. 11:00am--David Backues, VP of Legislative Affairs, Associated Students, Humboldt State University, CSSA Representative
   i. David reviewed the financial straits at HSU. The Academic Affairs Division seems to be suffering. SFR and section sizes have been increasing. Communications are a problem across the campus. Faculty Trustee Craig Smith will be visiting the campus next week.
   ii. CSSA is continuing the process of developing goals for this year. They are likely to focus on best practices in student advising. Service learning is a priority.

c. 11:30am--Chancellor’s Office: Allison G. Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Student Academic Support
   i. Impaction and selectivity in the CSU was explained and discussed. Impaction is an acknowledgement of the realities of supply and
demand. The CSU has an obligation to admit all eligible students who have applied by the priority deadline. Campuses who have not yet met their enrollment targets may continue admitting students past the deadline. Campuses which cannot accommodate all the students who apply by the deadline have several enrollment management tools including additional required transfer and/or freshman admission units/courses. Higher GPAs or test scores can only be required after declaring “impaction” a year in advance. Impaction can be declared (with permission from the system) at either the campus or major level. Permission for declaration of impaction is based upon data concerning demand and capacity. Impaction criteria must be published in August (prior to a November 30 deadline). They continue to be in effect only if actual demand justifies them. Some campuses have declared impaction, but continue to admit students past their deadlines because of inaccurate demand forecasts. This year San Marcos rescinded impaction for first time freshman and Long Beach for some categories of upper-division transfer students. Major impaction across all majors at SLO guarantees that the campus will continue to have a polytechnic focus. At SDSU, traditional impaction criteria for freshman would have meant a largely out of area class. This would have had devastating effects on the many local place-bound students. In this case, “local” students are admitted under CSU criteria while out of area students are admitted under more stringent criteria.

ii. We expected continued increased funding for nursing education capacity. We do not currently have funding above the compact amount on a continuing basis. Nursing is the only major that is impacted system-wide.

6. Liaison Reports
   a. General Education Advisory Committee (John Tarjan)
      Items on November meeting agenda:
      i. Service Learning and GE
      ii. Continuing Analysis of the Campus Surveys
      iii. Potential Revisions to EO 595 (structure of GE)
      iv. Alignment of GE-Breadth and IGETC
      v. SciGETC Implementation
      vi. Language of Instruction in GE
      vii. Review of GE Course Review Guidelines
   b. Facilitating Graduation Campus Peer Review Visits (Ted Anagnoson)
      i. The visits are going well and are of much value.
      ii. Ten campuses slated for visits during Fall 2006: Humboldt; Long Beach; Sacramento; Sonoma; San Marcos; Pomona; San Bernardino; Los Angeles; Cal Maritime; and Chico

7. Items of business
   a. Resolution on Laboratory Science Requirements for Freshman Admission
i. TEKR will be added as a co-sponsor of the resolution.

ii. The inclusion of geological sciences was discussed. It is an issue more properly addressed by Admissions Advisory Council and UC BOARS.

iii. The current language may not reflect the intent of the committee in terms of the possibility of the lab courses coming from elective area G, etc.

iv. Myron Hood and Jim Blackburn drafted a revised resolution which more accurately reflects the intent of the council. The committee agreed to the revised language.

b. Principles to Guide the Application of the T-CSU Numbering System for CSU System-wide Articulation

i. John Tarjan shared a revision to the original draft resolution which reflects the input from the LDTP Steering Committee and the reasons why this resolution may be appropriate.

ii. Allison Jones reinforced the arguments in favor of the resolution.

iii. Parts of the resolution were changed to improve clarity.

iv. The committee agreed to put the resolution forward.

c. Resolution on Support of the a-g Curriculum as California’s High School Graduation Course Requirements

i. There was a lengthy discussion of this item. Many expressed reservations about the resolution and the effect it would have on students who may struggle with portions of a-g yet be deserving of a high school diploma which would allow them to participate in more sectors of the world of work.

ii. There is a hope that more disadvantaged students will chose/be able to participate in a rigorous HS curriculum.

iii. The resolution was revised to support a-g as the PRIMARY HS graduation requirements.

iv. The resolution was shared with TEKR for potential co-sponsorship and revision.

d. Resolution on Response to SB 1543 (Alarcon): High School Curriculum; High School Coursework Requirements

i. The resolution spurred a discussion about rigor and the resolution on support for the a-g curriculum.

ii. We need to move quickly on this issue to respond to deadlines in the legislation.

iii. The resolution was shared with TEKR for potential co-sponsorship and revision.

e. Resolution on Supporting a Student Fee Policy that Betters Educational Outcomes

i. The resolution only calls for a study of the impact of the current fee structure.

ii. A number of unintended consequences of the current policy were included in the resolution.

iii. FGA declined to co-sponsor.
f. Resolution on Library Support Needs for the Independent EdD Degree Programs in the CSU
   i. The resolution was amended to deal with both overall support and support for libraries.
   ii. We referenced but did not endorse the COLD document which called for specific levels of funding.

g. Discussion of 21st Century Report update and how we might contribute to this essential effort
   i. We discussed some possible directions for this report.
   ii. We will need to discuss further.

h. Discussion of Planning Beyond Cornerstones and how we might contribute to this important activity
   i. There was concern that the items dealing with faculty and graduate education in Cornerstones have not been addressed to date.
   ii. We hope to see drafts of the committee’s work and offer feedback as the project progresses. The steering committee will be meeting again in November before our next AAC meeting.

i. Prioritize the following items for discussion at future meetings as needed (* system where * is high priority and *** is low priority):
   i. Campus autonomy in setting academic calendars***
   ii. Information competency as an area of CSU-wide assessment/instruction***
   iii. Differentiating lower from upper division coursework and masters level from doctoral level coursework**
   iv. Alternatives to FTEs based-funding*
   v. Remediation*

j. GE Courses and On-Line Courses (deferred to next meeting).
   i. This issue is broader than GE. It applies to LDTP course reviews as well.

k. Potential Resolution of Beyond Cornerstones (continued for next meeting)
   i. Possible Priorities—Myron Hood will draft a resolution by next week.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 3:52pm.