

Academic Affairs Committee Meeting

Thursday, November 17, 2022

10-11:30am

BDC 134

<https://csub.zoom.us/j/82023848713>

Meeting Minutes

Present: Janet Armentor, Andreas Gebauer (ex officio), Heidi He, Debra Jackson (ex officio), Maureen Rush, Mary Slaughter, Danielle Solano, John Tarjan (Chair)

Absent: Daisy Alamillo, Michael Szolowicz

Guests: Kim Flachmann (writing), Andrea Lopez (from Public Health)

1. Welcome and Introductions

We introduced our guests.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

3. Approval of Minutes of November 10, 2022 (attached and in AAC Box folder)

The minutes were approved. **John Tarjan will forward the minutes for posting.**

4. AAC as GECCo Appeals Committee

a. FYS for Business Majors (3 units) Proposal (attached)

A 3 unit FYS course for business majors was proposed which includes financial literacy and a SELF component. The course was sent to GEECo (which approved the course) but, as it adds units to the FYS requirement, GECCo sent the issue to senate to ensure they were not exceeding their authority in approving the course.

Debra Jackson pointed out that Senior Capstone is only a 1 unit requirement, but many of the senior capstone courses are a larger number of units. We discussed whether the 3-unit FYS course follows the approved

GE structure. We agreed that it did not raise any issues in terms of compliance.

5. Potential Referrals (Materials can be found in AAC Box folder.)

a. Minor in Public Health (attached)

Andrea Lopez introduced the minor in Public Health. The minor uses only courses already required for the major in Public Health. We agreed that it addressed a need in the community. **John Tarjan will write up a resolution in support of the minor in Public Health.**

b. Minor in Environmental Sustainability (attached)

John Tarjan introduced the Minor in Environmental Sustainability which was put forward by the Department of Economics.

Andreas Gebaeur pointed out that there is already a thematic minor in Sustainability & Justice within the GE program and expressed concern that the proposed minor might duplicate an existing program on campus. He also pointed out that there has been no discussion with the GE program about this new minor and was concerned about the lack of consultation.

We discussed how the minor proposal came about and it was developed by a subcommittee of the Faculty Sustainability Committee (which is an interdisciplinary committee of volunteers).

Janet Armentor expressed concern about the lack of consultation regarding the Sociology courses listed on the minor (e.g., appropriateness of the course content, resource implications, etc.). Andreas Gebauer pointed out that the GE courses that are part of the thematic minor must be approved by GECCo and thus must have appropriate sustainability content.

After discussion, there were also concerns raised about the structure of the minor as there are so many possible courses that students can take to fulfill the requirements. It was also unclear how each course meets the learning outcomes for the minor.

We decided that John Tarjan will email Aaron Hegde to ask the following:

- Clarify differences between the proposed minor and the thematic minor offered by the GE program to ensure it is not replicating an existing program

- Ensure consultation with GEECo & departments offering the courses has occurred (e.g., appropriateness of the course content, resource implications, etc.)
- Clarify the structure of the minor (e.g., show how the program learning outcomes map to the courses)

c. GWAR Committee Structure (attached)

As discussed at our last meeting, we must define the role of the GWAR committee and the relationship between GWAR and GECCo. The GWAR committee currently is working on a solution for students to fulfill the GWAR. Challenge exams for courses are allowed, even though the GWAR cannot be offered as a stand-alone requirement. The GWAR exam is still being offered but is now a challenge exam that provides units for the course. This will work if it is a challenge exam for one course that does not fulfill major requirements or the JYDR requirement.

Mary Slaughter suggested that GWAR act as the curriculum committee for writing courses and answer to Academic Programs, not GECCo. Andreas Gebauer stressed that some central organization is needed to coordinate learning outcomes and other issues. He suggested that one of the representatives on GECCo from A&H come from the writing program as this is the policy for used in NSME for Area B courses. Kim Flachmann pointed out that GWAR requirement is different from other GE areas as it due to a Chancellor's Office mandate. It was suggested that GWAR courses also require approval from the GWAR committee. Andreas Gebauer expressed concern at having two separate approval processes and recommended a broader discussion across campus.

We need to develop a resolution that addresses the composition of the committee, role of committee members, approval/review process for GWAR courses, oversight of GWAR learning outcomes, and the appeals process for denied courses. **This will be carried forward to our next meeting.**

6. AAC as Interschool Curriculum Committee?

a. Feedback on WASC Draft Report (in Box) (referral pending)

Debra Jackson asked for feedback on the WASC Draft report. WSCUC identified seven areas during their last accreditation visit that the university should be working on and will return in March for a special visit to check in on our progress. A report on our progress has been prepared for the spring visit and is due to WSCUC on Jan 4th; this document is available in box to provide

feedback, and there have also been two open forums held to provide feedback. The report has been shared with several groups including ASI, department chairs, and other faculty groups. Debra Jackson hopes the Senate will endorse the document. In particular, Debra Jackson would like to ask our committee to look at and provide feedback on the section on Program Review.

Janet Armentor suggested discussing how has the pandemic affected DWF rates (Recommendation 4, Priority 5: Promote Equitable Learning Practices and Reduce DFW Rates) and to include a discussion of the work Student Affairs has done in this area.

Committee members are requested to read the document and provide feedback to Debra Jackson by December 15th (via email to wscucirfeedback@csub.edu).

7. Continuing Discussion

a. Communication Across Schools When Changing Curricula

This will be carried forward to our next meeting.

8. Announcements/Reports

a. Pending Referral on Definitions of Concentration and Emphasis and Their Implementation (John)

We have not received a referral yet, but the issue of concentration versus emphasis came up at Senate Executive Committee. Currently we are not in compliance with our campus definitions and the definitions may need to be revisited. The issue was first raised in the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry where some “concentrations” are technically emphases and whether they should be changed to emphases. (If the core of the common major requirements is small, they are concentrations. If the core of common major requirements is larger, those are emphases.) Debra Jackson stated that this must be addressed as there are data problems due to differences in the catalog, PeopleSoft, etc. and this is a critical step in cleaning up the data. There was some debate as to whether we should be able to just apply the policy to correct these issues or if changing concentrations to emphases must go through curriculum committees. **This will be carried forward to our next meeting.**

b. GECCo (Andreas)

Andreas Gebauer gave a brief update on GECCo. He reported three new GEAR courses approved, and one request pending. He noted that while some courses go through GEECo smoothly, others take a while. He also noted that he has not received the documentation from Geology that was agreed upon at our previous meeting.

9. Open Forum

There were no open forum items.

10. Adjournment

We adjourned at 11:27 am.