

Multi-campus collaborations launched for 'high impact, low success' CSU courses

February, 2008

Seventeen CSU institutions are collaborating on two multi-campus initiatives in *Transforming Course Design*. Provosts nominated target '**high enrolment, low success**' courses in Fall 07, and a short list prepared by the state-wide Academic Technology Advisory Committee was then circulated to all institutions for input on priorities. The two Design teams will engage in cooperative redesign of new course structures, activities and resources which will be available for incorporation into campus courses. They are supported by Review Teams who can provide evaluations and recommendations to insure that the work products delivered in June 2008 are fully informed by the needs and contexts across the CSU.

Development Mathematics Team

- Joyce Ahlgren, San Bernardino
- Stan Barrick, Sacramento
- Michael Bateman, Long Beach
- Larry Brownson, Long Beach *
- Ted Cluver, Chico
- Tyler Evans, Humboldt *
- George Jennings, Dominguez Hills
- Diane Johnson, Humboldt
- Mike Krebs, Los Angeles *
- Susan McClory, San José *
- Natalia Moore, Stanislaus *
- Bob Musselman, Fresno
- Michael Neubauer, Northridge
- Michael Scott, Monterey Bay
- Viji Sundar, Stanislaus

General Chemistry Team

- Simone Aloisio, CSU Channel Islands
- Susan Crawford, Sacramento
- Danika LeDuc, East Bay
- Karno Ng, San Marcos *
- Taebom Oh, Northridge
- Richard Paselk, Humboldt *
- Lihung (Angel) Po, Dominguez Hills
- James Postma, Chico *
- Herb Silber, San José *
- Ray Trautman, San Francisco *

+ input from colleagues at these & other CSU campuses. (*Design Team members*)

Information: *Tom Carey* tcarey@calstate.edu
Jeff Gold jgold@calstate.edu or project highlights at <http://transform.csuprojects.org>.

Transforming Course Design June 08 Results

1. Analysis

- of current course outcomes and instructional costs;
- of evidence concerning student subgroups and their learning challenges: capability-related, constraint-related, content-related.

2. Synthesis

- of knowledge from within and outside the CSU on enhanced course designs, activities and resources to address the identified learning challenges and to increase the effectiveness of student learning, instructional time and resource use.

3. Design

- of revised course structure, activities and resources to promote more effective student learning activity in your target course(s), suitable for adaptation by other CSU institutions;

4. Adaptation and Development

- of selected activities and resources for each institution's revised course(s);
- documentation of the instructional rationale to aid in reuse and adaptation.

5. Integration

- of application resources and activities developed by other team members into each revised course;

6. Planning

- for **Implementation** and **Evaluation** in subsequent course offerings;
- includes targets for enhanced course outcomes and reduced instructional costs.