1. **Curriculum Proposals**
   
   a. **MGT 452, 453, 455, 456 459**
      
      The Management Department proposed a set of course changes.
      
      MGT 452 was proposed to change the prerequisite from MGT 350 to MGT 358.
      MGT 453 was proposed to change the course number to MGT 353.
      MGT 455 was proposed to change the prerequisite from MGT 350 to MGT 358.
      MGT 456 was proposed to change the course number to MGT 356 and to remove MGT 350 as a prerequisite.
      MGT 459 was proposed to change the prerequisite from MGT 350 to MGT 358.
      
      These courses are part of the Entrepreneurship offerings. The changes in course numbering/level help to better position them for students. The changes to prerequisites help ensure better preparation for students.
      
      The committee unanimously approved the proposals.

   b. **FIN 496**
      
      The Finance Department proposes to create a FIN 496 (Introduction to Investment Banking) course for Fall 2012. This course would be open to any SDSU student with Junior standing. The course will be taught by a volunteer lecturer. After this course has been taught, Finance will determine if it is appropriate to create a permanent course.
      
      The committee unanimously approved the proposal.

2. **Online Crashing Taskforce**
   
   Easton reported that Jim Lackritz is serving on the online crashing taskforce for the SDSU Senate. SDSU has already made the decision to move to an online crashing system, as in common at many universities. This taskforce is making recommendations about the parameters of how this system will operate.
Lackritz had provided Krentler with some potential priorities for placement when there is an open seat and asked for input from the committee. The suggested priorities are:

Students have met prerequisites and
   Course is in their major, required, Graduating Senior/Total Units
   Course is in their major, elective, Total Units
   Course is in their minor, required, Total Units
   Etc.

The committee was in favor of these proposed priorities.

The committee expressed concerns and had questions related to the following items:
1) If students are already enrolled in another section will they be able to get onto the crashing list of another section or will they need to drop their current section first?
2) How will ALI students be accommodated? Since SDSU is required to give priority to SDSU enrolled students, will ALI students not be allowed to add until after the add/drop period closes to ensure that all SDSU enrolled students are accommodated?
3) Will faculty members be allowed to opt out of this system?
4) Will faculty be able to set a cutoff date for adding (e.g. the end of the first week.) If not, students must be informed that graded work may have already been assigned and they are not entitled to make it up.
5) Will there be any instructor discretion? For example, if an instructor wants to overenroll a class they currently can do this. How could this be accomplished with an automated system?

3. SB 1440 Update
Following our discussion from the 3/7/12 meeting on SB 1440, Williams reported that combining major requirements, upper division GE electives and missing major preparatory requirements the fewest total units required for a CBA major is 64 upper division units. With SB 1440 we are limited to requiring 60 upper division units. In order to comply with SB 1440 the challenge to the CBA is whether we want to have any flexibility in the courses that are “preparation for the major”, or if we would consider any flexibility at Upper Division.

Since there are differences across our majors in terms of the total number of required upper division units, it is possible that some majors could more easily be adapted to meet SB 1440. The Committee will ask Singh to add an agenda item to an upcoming Chairs/Directors meeting to discuss whether they would consider adopting SB 1440 on a major by major basis, or whether we would require all majors to conform.
Easton also noted that she had received feedback that some of the adopted Course Descriptors were different than our current courses. This poses even more complications in terms of “missing” preparation since we no longer evaluate the curriculum if a statewide group determines that a course from a community college meets the descriptor [even if that descriptor is not one that we agree with.]

Easton will contact chairs of affected departments that offer lower division preparation courses. They will be asked to review the approved course descriptors to provide feedback to the committee as to whether this descriptor is acceptable to the CBA.

The committee adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 4, 2012, 9:30 a.m.; Dean’s Conference Room