

Academic Planning Committee (APC) Meeting Meeting Notes

September 15, 2008

Sage Hall, Rm 2030, 12:00pm to 1:00pm

Members:	Steve Lefevre Jeanne Grier Phil Hampton Mary Adler Ellie Tayag	Deborah Wylie Andrea Grove Andrew Morris Paul Rivera	Gary Berg Kathy Musashi Nelle Moffitt Betsy Quintero
Guests:	Dr Rush	Dr Neuman	Dr Vaidya

1. Welcome

Steve Lefevre welcomed our guests to the meeting and reviewed the concerns expressed by the Academic Planning Committee in their planning process. He distributed the current Academic Master Plan and Talking points given to our guests.

2. Conversation with Guests

Dr Rush indicated that although the budget has not been released, Channel Islands will be in no worse position that it was last year. He will be attending a Board of Trustees meeting later today and will relate any new news, if applicable. Of the three areas of discretion in the state budget Education has the highest visibility for budget reductions. Currently the CSU is over 10,000 FTES for fall 08 according to Chancellor Reed (P Rivera).

Dr Rush indicated that the following areas should be considered in the review of the Academic Master Plan:

- What is really needed; does the program fit our profile, is it interdisciplinary and also assist other existing programs?
- Affordability and resource dependency
- Innovation. Are we focusing on 21st Century world? Are we meeting state and regional marketplaces

Dr Rush also indicated that Richard West agreed to approximately 400-500 FTES for CSUCI to make the recovery to get back on our original enrollment trajectory. Dr Rush has requested an additional 100 FTES, but has yet to hear from West.

Dr. Rush mentioned the University's strategic plan's focus and its relation to our academic planning. The STEM disciplines are highlighted in the strategic plan, for instance, and this should encourage us to give attention to computer engineering, biomedical engineering, and related areas. Paul Rivera posed the concern that there might be other areas of community interest (like Chicano Studies and Nursing that are not currently represented on the AMP). Dr Rush indicated that both Agriculture, and Wellness and Athletics are of regional and wider interest. Just how such areas could be integrated, innovatively into existing degrees on the plan was not noted, and should be a concern of the committee. He suggested CSUCI include finding niche areas such as food production and safety. He challenged the committee to identify unique and forward-looking programs. Wellness, he said, relates and integrates with Nursing, and other such ways to ties interdisciplinarity. Obesity and nutrition were discussed in relation to Athletics.

Dawn Neuman noted that the term "Health Science" has changed over the past few years, and that the sub-categories within that field should be developed.

Jeanne Grier expressed her concerns about balance among degrees. Steve Lefevre mentioned that a time of low enrollment growth, with less pressure to hit high enrollment targets, may be a good time to set priorities among degrees.

Ashish Vaidya noted that it was unrealistic to rely on the state to fully fund new programs and that business partnerships should be looked into as an alternative way to launch degrees, particularly under the current economic environment. He noted a couple of areas of interest from his Leadership Council: 1) Design and Engineering and 2) Wellness. He also noted that CI should look into software engineering programs, and further exploring possible partnerships to reduce costs. Dr Rush also felt that he could get the funding from private industry for Engineering. Dawn Neuman suggested the MA English could partner with Hollywood Studios. They could possibly set up external cohorts to enroll in the institution.

Nelle Moffett brought up the possible morale issues of moving some of the more traditional degrees around. Look internationally, she said, perhaps possible small business approaches from third world nations that are currently being used globally that have been quite successful and lucrative.

Paul Rivera noted that there were seven (7) master degree plans on the AMP. He wondered how our guests felt about that. Dr Rush supports the continuation of supporting and building graduate level degrees, but suggests that we develop degrees with an “edge” to them. Paul also noted that the current structural hierarchy of Academic Affairs may or may not affect degrees. Where will they be housed?

Mary Adler had concerns on how this information would be disseminated to a wider faculty audience. She observed that it is important to consult widely within the university in reshaping our plan.

Rush and Neuman both expressed that this is a perfect time to revisit items on the plan. Academic Programs should affect the organization and structure, and that should set the course for the budget. Dawn is releasing a common data set in mid-October that will be discussed in a forum format, and will invite the campus to revisit ‘where it’s been’ and ‘where’s it’s going.’ The strategic plans for the University and for Academic Affairs will be reviewed and re-alignment may occur as a result. This re-centering of campus goals should help in the overall understanding of why some degrees will receive more priority than others.

Steve Lefevre agreed to send Dawn some talking points for tomorrow’s senate meeting.