

Academic Affairs Committee Meeting

Thursday, October 13 2022

10-11:30am

BDC 134

<https://csub.zoom.us/j/84286075913>

Minutes

Present: Daisy Alamillo, Janet Armentor, Andreas Gebauer, Debra Jackson, Heidi He, Mary Slaughter, Danielle Solano, Michael Szolowicz, John Tarjan (Chair)

Absent: Maureen Rush

1. Welcome and Introductions

Our meeting start was delayed slightly due to gas leak in BDC. We met on Zoom at 10:25 am.

2. Approval of the Agenda

We approved the agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes of September 29, 2022 (attached and in AAC Box folder)

We approved the minutes with edits.

4. Announcements/Reports

a. GECCo (Andreas)

Andreas Gebauer reported that GECCo received a request form Geology to change a course prefix. However, he noted that the ERM program (who uses the course for its majors) was not consulted and they must make catalog adjustments based on this change. It was agreed that consultation between departments and across schools was important when changing courses and several examples of problems when lack of consultation occurs were shared including resource implications. Janet Armentor pointed out that there is a box on the form that you must check to indicate you have consulted with affected parties when you make changes to a course. But the larger issue is that a program might not be aware who is using their courses. This is particularly an issue across schools. Programs should consult when adding courses outside their school to their majors in addition to when removing/changing courses that affect

other majors. It was unclear if there is a clear avenue for consultation to occur. **John Tarjan proposed that we carry this item over on our agenda to our next meeting.**

b. AB 928 (John, Andreas)

John Tarjan introduced AB 928 which proposes a common lower division general education pathway for transfer students to the UC and CSU (also known as IGETC, or Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum). Currently transfer requirements differ slightly between the UC and CSU so the senates of the systems are charged with coming up with a common admission pattern that would fulfill all lower division GE requirements at CSU or UC. If they cannot come to an agreement, then the presidents decide.

We discussed the issue at length and are very concerned about the loss of oral communication and loss of 3 units in Area C. If Area C is eliminated and our campus retains the American Institutions requirement, then we would lose an Area C course which affect enrollments in Arts & Humanities classes and decrease breadth of student learning. It was clarified that this is a transfer admissions package, not a campus requirement, but there is concern that at every campus may be required to do the same thing, perhaps without appropriate consultation. John Tarjan doubts the UC will change their requirements.

Janet Armentor pointed out how much the demand for Sociology has been reduced due to the changes in Area D. Andreas Gebauer pointed out that we waive Area E (FYS and SELF) for transfers but still require FYS and SELF for native students.

It was clarified that this is a GE transfer pathway, so we could hypothetically keep requirements different for our incoming freshman, but Debra Jackson pointed out issues if our course requirements are different for freshman versus transfers. Daisy Alamillo agreed it would be confusing to students if requirements are different for freshman versus transfers, particularly those who are first generation. (She pointed out that she took community college classes in high school and it be particularly difficult for a high school student to figure out what classes are needed.) Andreas Gebauer clarified that students who transfer in with 30 units or more are not required to take FYS.

In summary, we are concerned about breadth of student learning as well as campus autonomy. We decided that we should include in our feedback that the

IGETC not be mandated for our local coursework. **John Tarjan will draft a response for us to review via email.**

5. Potential Referrals (Materials can be found in AAC Box folder.)
 - a. GVAR Resolution Perfection (attached and in Box)

John Tarjan received an email from Kim Flachmann and she expressed that there was no consultation with her on the GVAR issue. We reviewed the suggestions from AS&SS and there were no objections to the proposed changes.

John Tarjan added a request in the resolution to ask that the policy not go in to effect until 2024-25 Academic Year. There was some discussion as to whether we should include this as the 2020 memo from the Chancellor's Office in indicated that the GVAR requirement be waived in 2020. John Tarjan felt that there was lack of consultation in the 2020 memo. Also, some committee members pointed out that the 2020 memo could be interpreted as being COVID specific. Heidi He agreed that more time should be allowed to make the modifications since our catalog copy for next year is due so quickly...the short turnaround time is unreasonable. **We decided to ask the campuses have the option of not implementing the policy until 2024-25. John Tarjan will update the memo to reflect this.**

John Tarjan feels the Chancellor's Office usurped their authority in this decision. He stressed that only in rare and compelling circumstances should a timetable like this be used. He also noted that Kim Flachmann is no longer our representative on this English council though, so this portion of the memo will need to be edited. **John Tarjan will revise and send an updated draft around.**

6. Open Forum

There were no items for open forum.

7. Adjournment

We adjourned at 11:28 am.