

Academic Affairs Committee Meeting

Thursday, April 27, 2023

10-11:30am

BDC 134

<https://csub.zoom.us/j/85417621808>

Meeting Minutes

Present: Andreas Gebauer (ex officio), Larry Gonzales, Heidi He, Maureen Rush, Danielle Solano, Mary Slaughter, Michael Szolowicz, John Tarjan (Chair)

Absent: Janet Armentor, Debra Jackson (ex officio)

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approval of the Agenda

We approved the agenda with the addition of a Discussion on Elevation of Schools to Colleges Resolution as item 5a.

3. Approval of Minutes April 13, 2023 (attached and in AAC Box folder)

We approved the minutes. **John Tarjan will forward the minutes for posting.**

4. Announcements/Reports
 - a. Graduate Studies Committee resolution in second reading—no feedback received.
 - b. Resolution on Environmental Studies resolution in second reading—no feedback received (question on UD coursework)

We briefly discussed how advising would occur (it would formally occur through the Economics Department...informally faculty on the Sustainability Committee would also participate in advising).

5. Potential Resolutions for the Senate (Materials can be found in AAC Box folder.)
 - a. Discussion on Elevation of Schools to Colleges Resolution

Aaron Hegde asked our committee to comment on the Elevation of Schools to Colleges resolution. We decided to comment on each of the arguments in favor as submitted by the taskforce:

- Improved image as metropolitan university – No data/evidence to support this claim
- Consistency with other CSU campuses – No evidence that consistency is a benefit to CSUB
- Budget benefits (donor sponsorship of naming opportunities) – Schools can be named; it is unclear why this is improved with colleges
- Opportunity for organized growth by adding Schools as part of existing structure – We already have the opportunity for organized growth; we do not need Colleges to add more Schools
- Opportunity to locate Doctoral programs in Schools – We don't understand why this can't be done already
- Opportunity for programming synergy and efficiency Schools – We don't understand this argument
- Alignment with accreditation expectations – This argument makes no sense based on currently accredited programs with the current structure

Some committee members expressed concern that this was a “vanity project” of the administration. Another issue raised was that elevation of schools to colleges will happen anyway...do we want to support the resolution to ensure that the Senate will be involved in the future development of colleges? There was also concern expressed about the potential for administrative bloat. **John Tarjan will forward our comments to the Senate Executive Committee.**

b. Referral on Definitions of Concentration and Emphasis and Their Implementation

We discussed the current draft of the resolution that currently lists a concentration as 12 units or more and an emphasis as 7-11 units. We clarified that this was for undergraduate programs (not graduate programs). There was discussion as to whether we should include the emphasis option in addition to the definition for concentrations. We discussed at length and decided to leave both concentrations and emphases as possibilities.

We added a resolved indicating that the Office of Academic Programs should work with existing departments and programs to ensure alignment with this policy. **John Tarjan will forward this resolution to the Senate Executive Committee.**

c. Bylaws Changes—Standing Committee Chairs (in Box, referred to all 4 standing committees)

We discussed whether two years on the Academic Senate was necessary and thought only one year should be required. We also agreed that someone should have served at least one year on the standing committee for which they want to chair.

We discussed the statement of interest from candidates for sub-committee chairs. One idea was that the onus should be on the nominator instead of the nominee. Mary Slaughter asked if self-nominations were an option; we were not aware of this being disallowed. We also discussed the possibility of calling for nominations prior to the organizational meeting. **John Tarjan will forward our ideas to the Senate Executive Committee.**

6. Open Forum

We discussed the process of nominating a new committee chair as John Tarjan will not be continuing on the Senate. At the organizational meeting, the outgoing senators are excused, and then the incoming senators sit at the table. The standing committee chairs are then nominated/elected by the new senate.

The committee thanked John Tarjan for his service as committee chair and Dani Solano for taking the minutes.

7. Adjournment

We adjourned at 11:22am.