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

Visitors: Gary Hammerstrom, Leonard Mathy (ASCSU Emeritus Professor), Lester Pincu, Harold Goldwhite

1. Approval of Agenda – approved as drafted

2. Approval of Minutes of 10/11/02:
   
   Ref: section 6.3 (Student Fees): Clarification requested regarding which data were to be accessed to assist in the creation of an accurate student fee profile… (1) Board of Trustees Report (ref: Faculty Trustee Harold Goldwhite’s input) and (2) a Chronicle of Higher Education article on the topic.

   Minutes approved as modified.

3. Announcements: none

4. Time(s) Certain: 6.1 – Jo Service (OoC) 2:00 pm – Upper Division G.E.

5. Items of Business:

   5.1 – AS-2582-02-AA (Modification of Upper-Division Admission Requirements) – final, minor editing suggestions were offered. Attach Section 40805 of Title 5, to rationale.

   5.1 – Nursing Core Alignment Project
   5.1.1 Letter to Nursing colleagues – Suggestions included:
   (1) Delete indication that recommendation would necessitate a change to Title 5.
   (2) Change wording in third paragraph to indicate that requested modifications to nursing curriculum will be subject to review of the G.E. Advisory Committee and its G.E. course review sub-committee… there is a need to reference specific courses (…and implicitly, on all individual campuses) as the basis for content based arguments of breadth sufficiency. (3) Expressly indicate that authority to allow modifications to curricula is fundamentally a campus-level inquiry. It was suggested that a better strategic approach that might be used by Nursing entities would be to develop a model curriculum, then shop it to all campuses for buy-in. (4) Add language to help clarify for nursing folks the 120 unit minimum provision for baccalaureate degrees within the CSU, in light of their apparent misunderstanding of this number (120) being a target, not a mandate.

   Comments offered by members of the committee decried the general notion that schools/disciplines should be encouraged (tacitly or otherwise) to gut degree programs of G.E. breadth requirements through blanket waiver, campus autonomy by-pass approaches.
6. Items of discussion

6.1 Upper Division G.E. – (time certain; Jo Service, OoC)
Is there a requirement for assessment of upper division G.E.?
Should we take on the threshold question, “Should we have upper division G.E.?”

Harold Goldwhite – confided that he has tried to raise this issue repeatedly, in various venues, as an outgrowth of complaints by students that their experience vis-à-vis upper division G.E. has not been positive.

Why does it exist?
Objectives?
Value added?
Is it just providing FTE fodder for certain programs/disciplines?
Are programs on campuses actually doing what they are designed to do?

Jo Service – presented three handouts for background… she noted that till 1980 G.E. requirements could be completed at the lower division.

Comments and/or questions:

(AA) Student dissatisfaction is, unfortunately, not necessarily, tied to faulty or meaningless objectives.

(AA) Students are uninformed consumers; their dissatisfaction is not, necessarily, particularly relevant.

(AA) What’s magical about 9-units?

(AA) Course → objectives → assessment → new course… all of which consumes professor-hours… to what end? “Like Topsy, it growed!”

(OoC) WASC is us… if the CSU decides upper division G.E. is not a worthwhile endeavor, standards related to it in WASC guidelines will go away.

(AA) Is there an efficient way to pose the question regarding the worth of upper division G.E.

(AA) Some G.E. courses on some campuses are clearly FTES generators.

(AA) Linking inquiries to campus Centers for Teaching and Learning could underpin the inquiry…
(Guest Contribution): Nothing really has changed in 30 years.

Committee agreed not to initiate any further inquiries into the fashion in which upper division G.E. functions.

6.2 CETUS Report (guidebook for how faculty should deal with “fair use” issues) AA has been asked to review the document in anticipation of an “acceptance/adoption” of the document by the ASCSU… prior to CETUS taking the document to the Board of Trustees for endorsement. Members of AA are requested to read the report and make recommendations for any changes to a sub-committee comprised of Ted Anagnoson, Jacinta Amaral and Bob Snyder.

6.3 Enrollment Management Survey Update – Results of AA survey presented by Ted Anagnoson. Nine of 23 campuses responded. There appears to be no consistent pattern that emerges with respect to either (a) mechanisms employed or (b) personnel involved in resolving enrollment management problems on campuses of the system.

Discussions focused on the lack of faculty involvement in most campus processes… and the inappropriateness of knee-jerk responses to enrollment pressures that are occurring and that are not considering, carefully, the impacts on students and long-term academic program quality

Follow up will include efforts to secure additional input from non-responding campuses.

Suggestion offered by Gary Hammerstrom (OoC): formation of an ad hoc committee (to include both G.H. and Al Jones (as liaisons) from the OoC) to examine topics related to both system and local campus responses to enrollment management issues. Committee will include Mark, Ted, Gary, Al, and Rochelle… a written report will come back to AA prior to January senate meeting.

6.4 Graduate Task Force Update – task force formed last year (includes Brent Rushall and Bob Snyder from AA) is expecting to complete their inquiry shortly. Draft report of committee’s effort is available for our review; input is requested.

7. Liaison Reports

7.1 Ken Nishita presented a report on the G.E. Course Review Committee – Course review dates for this academic year have been scheduled for Thursday and Friday two-day sessions during February. A new on-line course review template has been crafted and will be tried out next fall; the course review effort will occur utilizing OSCAR (Online Services for Curriculum And Articulation Review).

7.2 Brent Rushall presented a report on ACIP (Academic Council on International Programs) – programs operated under the auspices of ACIP allows for study abroad at the same cost for tuition and fees as one pays locally. Available to all students within the CSU.

7.3 Marshall Cates presented a report on the ongoing efforts of the Office of the
Chancellor to develop a CSU college math readiness exam that will be offered to high school juniors. The political environment surrounding these efforts has compromised development efforts. In the offing is a modification to E.O. 665 that will alter the window available to students in need of mathematics or English remediation… reducing it to two terms, one of which will be the summer term before full-time matriculation. There will probably be two math readiness exams that will be available to high school students, one offered during the junior year, and another (an Algebra II exam) offered during the senior year, for students who complete Algebra II during their junior year.

7.4 Admission Advisory (Rochelle Kellner) – ref: report tendered

(1) Major topics discussed, included: CSU admission application process, enrollment management, CSU admission requirements for transfer students, and the few remaining CSU-UC admissions requirements alignment issues.
(2) Committee reaffirmed its support for increase to 60 units for upper-division CSU transfer status.
(3) Committee is preparing a draft recommendation to require on-line submission of applications for admission.

7.5 4CSU Dual Admissions (a misnomer) Program (John Tarjan) – CCC system representatives (faculty and counselors) were not supportive of the 4CSU effort. During meeting, focus of dialogs shifted to base level inquiry into whether there was actually any real need for this program. 4CSU is really a response to state legislative pressures calling for improved transfer from CCC to CSU. CCC people present want to know how this program will assist student transfer into impacted programs… if this is not an outcome of the effort, they suggested that the value of 4CSU is suspect.