

# Academic Affairs Committee Meeting

Thursday, November 14, 2024

Dezember Leadership Center – Room 409-411

## Meeting Minutes

Attendees: E. Adams, J. Deal, C. Dell'Amico, H. He, M. Herman, T. Holiwell, E. Montoya, K. Szick, M. Szolowicz, J. Wang,

Absent: R. Korba

### **The meeting began as a Joint AAC-FAC meeting to discuss Handbook changes for SOCIs**

1. Minutes
  - a. Approval of minutes from 10/31/24 deferred to next week's meeting on 11/21/24.
  - b. Volunteer for minutes for today's meeting: C. Dell'Amico
2. Announcements

John Deal announced that the AAC would meet in the same room (DLC 409-411) following the joint FAC-AAC meeting
3. Discussion of Handbook Changes for SOCI
  - a. With respect to the verbiage on reviewing SOCI questions at least every five years, J. Deal suggested that the Executive Committee be alerted that it's time for a review since the last time the questions were looked at was 2015.
  - b. Z. Zenko (chair, FAC) said that he would send a memo to that effect to the Executive Committee.
  - c. It was suggested that, ideally, a taskforce would be formed to do the SOCI questions review; it was also suggested that bias be of special concern to those reviewing the questions.
  - d. In response to a question from a FAC member, it was agreed that the handbook language about a review of SOCI questions every five years did not mean that a review could not take place earlier than five years if the need arose.
  - e. H. He led efforts to edit the draft language so that it was clear that professors require each individual student's quantitative feedback to be matched to their qualitative feedback on both online and paper SOCI.
  - f. K. Szick introduced the AAC's point that the draft language needed further clarity on quantitative feedback being deleted when a SOCI is removed for biased qualitative content. The edit was made to everyone's satisfaction.

- g. The question of whether SOCI reports could be amended after the fact or after a deletion led to a discussion of whether SOCI data is stored long term, and the answer was that faculty can find past SOCI reports in their PAFs, which are housed in their dean's office.
- h. The handbook language on how long and when SOCI should be made available to students was next discussed, with the understanding that the question initially arose because of summer session students still having access to SOCIs during finals week. Following the discussion, Z. Zenko thought it best to create a new Handbook section on distribution procedure: *305.4.5 SOCI Distribution Period*. Fall/Spring processes were clearly distinguished from those of Summer/Winter, as were paper procedures from online. For SOCI for 2 ½-week winter sessions, it was agreed that no perfect distribution solution is possible; the courses are simply too short.
- i. H. He brought up the issue of low response rates for online SOCI. The idea was for professors to receive a link that they could then share with students in class on a day when students would be given time to complete their SOCI. It was pointed out that each student received their own one-time link, were reminded many times via email to fill out the SOCI and, in addition, were alerted on Canvas about SOCI being available. It was suggested that the best solution to the problem for now was not further changes to SOCI procedure but for professors to also remind students or, with advance warning, provide time in class for students to access their online SOCI.
- j. About low response rates and online SOCI, H. He made the point that that was a good reason to do away with paper SOCI. With no other choice, students and faculty would be more likely to get online SOCI done.
- k. J. Deal and Z. Zenko raised the question of bias in SOCI, and C. Dell'Amico suggested that this pointed to the need for a section in the handbook on RTP Committee protocol.
- l. J. Wang brought up a concern in connection to the last line of the handbook language: in connection to SOCI, which are named as such, faculty are referred to the Collective Bargaining Agreement, but the agreement does not use this CSUB-specific term, SOCI. Following discussion, it was agreed that since the handbook is for CSUB faculty only, it was best to be consistent and refer to the opinion surveys as "SOCIs" throughout.
- m. J. Deal suggested that C. Dell'Amico send a memo to M. Danforth regarding the possibility of handbook language on RTP committee responsibilities/protocol, an idea supported by H. He.
- n. J. Deal made the motion to approve the new handbook language on SOCI, A. Stokes seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

2. With the members of the FAC having left the room, the AAC moved to the Academic Master Plan, a time-sensitive matter: the plan needs to get to the senate by Dec 6.

- a. E. Adams reminded the committee that putting something like a new degree on the Academic Master Plan does not mean that that degree proposal has been or will be approved; it merely alerts the chancellor's office of plans afoot.
- b. E. Adams's second point was that, once an item is on the plan, the university has five years to follow through; after that, the item must be removed or an extension filed.

- c. E. Adams then presented the changes to the plan that need to be approved by the AAC:
  - i) terminology change from “schools” to “colleges”
  - ii) Applied Analytics MS; removed from plan (will be added again soon).
  - iii) Accountancy MA: removed from plan.
  - iv) Mechanical Engineering BS: date change/an extension is being filed.
  - v) Geology BS: date change/an extension is being filed.
  - vi) Doctorate in Nursing Practice (DNP): is now a degree.
  - vii) Latinx BA: leave on plan despite time having run out; see what chancellor’s office does.

d. The plans that Ethnic Studies and WGSS have for degree elevations do not have to go on the Master Plan since we already have concentrations in those areas.

e. H. He noted that years (2029) for Honors had to be fixed.

f. J. Deal asked whether we need worry about exact dates or extensions for program reviews, and the answer was no need to worry about being exact there.

g. J. Wang asked about the Accountancy MA and it was learned that there had not been departmental/school consensus regarding the degree so it was off the table for now.

h. E. Adams pointed out that, one, master plan extension/proposal paperwork was just a short form and, two, the chancellor’s office usually approves again that which it approved before.

i. E. Montoya asked about Anthropology GE courses now that the degree was being discontinued; the GE courses would still be offered.

j. J. Deal reminded the committee to be prepared for a final review of the Academic Master Plan in the next meeting.

#### Open Forum

a. E. Adams reminded us that the AAC would soon be considering a Mechanical Engineering degree proposal.

b. J. Deal and H. He said the AAC would soon receive a proposal from Nursing.

c. E. Adams said the AAC might be reviewing the Ethnic Studies elevation proposal soon.

d. T. Holiwell said that the BPC was reviewing time blocks and he would report on that soon.

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Approved 1/23/25