# Academic Affairs Committee Meeting

Thursday, September 21, 2023

10-11:30am

Education 123 Conference Room

Meeting ID: 859 8694 2698

<https://csub.zoom.us/j/85986942698>

## Meeting Minutes

In attendance: Danielle Solano; Alice Hays; Eduardo Montoya; Heidi He; Jing Wang; John Deal; Michael Szolowicz; Tiffany Tsantsoulas; Tommy Holiwell; Larry Gonzales

### Approval of the Agenda

All approved.

### Approval of Minutes September 7, 2023

<https://csub.box.com/s/pry8vgn8io6842cn7zyibcpb6nvjn1x5>

Minutes are officially approved.

### 

### Announcements/Reports

* 1. AB 928 (informational only, no referral yet)

AB 928 open for discussion…a singular GE pathway for CSU and UC transfer.

Eduardo said that GECCo will make a recommendation, which will likely then be sent to us.

In proposing a common transfer pathway, there will be some changes in the GE requirements at the CC level. Dani said that at the campus level, we don’t have to change our GE, but we may want to change our GE to match the lower division pathway.

How do we address this? Area C3 (History or government)- used to be a CSU requirement and were folded into the GEs.

Larry said that no other CSUs have acted yet.

Wanted to give everyone a heads up. It is a tight timeline.

We will need to get it done within a semester so faculty can implement the courses for 2024-2025 catalogue copy.

### Resolutions

1. RES 232403 - Definitions of Undergraduate Concentrations and Emphases

<https://csub.box.com/s/y7loh1rvkdqvglowl3hrgxsew51kipk1>

General consensus is that we should keep things the same as they originally were.

We are adding AVP of enrollment management to the distribution list here.

### Referrals

1. 2023-2024 #05 - Academic Integrity Campaign - Ombudsperson and CPR **(WITHDRAWN)**
2. 2023-2024 #10 - Bylaws Changes—Standing Committee Chairs  
   <https://csub.box.com/s/ug9hg1kcidjkvxzsbb2wccimgcee4o3c>

Current process is fast. There is no discussion about why the person should or should not become the chair of the committee. The proposal is that we should have a bit more information on the candidate so that we can have more information.

The current term is one year. John brought up the idea that if someone had served, it may not be necessary to provide a statement. Tiffany is questioning whether it might become a popularity contest if there were more than two people nominated if we did not include a statement. It feels as though it may not be necessary to provide a statement, but it also isn’t particularly burdensome.

The idea that the standing committee chair nominees should have served at least one year on the senate and committee in question to be eligible for nomination seems to be accepted.

Mike discusses the idea that it wouldn’t be a bad idea to have the nominator state why they believe their nominee would be appropriate to chair that standing committee.

Dani will forward the second bullet, and the final sentence from the proposal onto the Senate.

At the bottom of the template, we must add a distribution list to resolutions. If there is anyone else that we should add to the list, we need to let Dani know.

1. 2023-2024 #18 - Posthumous Degree Policy  
   <https://csub.box.com/s/w924t4ty1ey00t2hum0lun2202y0vgy9>

This doesn’t happen often, but it does, and we want to come up with a standard policy. Do we want to propose edits to the document. If we are good with it, we can draft a resolution and call it done.

We discussed the idea that only 70 units are transferrable. Additionally, we discussed the idea of reversing it to be “within 30 units of completing desired degree”.

To ensure that students did attend CSUB at some point, we added language to ensure that students completed 20 units at CSUB.

For the master’s program, we increased the percentage for obtaining this degree to 75% to align with the bachelor’s degree.

Additionally, we deleted the “no grade lower than a C” since we have the GPA requirement.

We discussed the thesis track vs. non-thesis track. We were unsure about whether there were different course work expectations. We also discussed how much ought to be done, and if it should be time bound for thesis work?

Tommi brought up the idea of what came up at the Chancellor’s office discussion. We discussed that it was more honorary, and maybe have an appeal for why the family could get it. Something that might allow them to get the president to award the degree.

Larry wondered if there was conduct standards or solely academic standards.

John brought up the possibility to let the president ultimately decide. We want to ensure that there is some wiggle room with this.

We deleted the line about exceptional situations, and just left it at the President’s discretion.

We did not align the verbiage because there is so much variation in graduate programs across the university.

We discussed whether we should move it to 75-80%. We ultimately landed on 75% for graduate programs.

Dani asked for people to check in with various programs. BPA, and other programs that might do a thesis. The consensus was that each graduate program could easily identify 75% worth of completion for the degree. We will follow up to make sure that those programs who do have thesis or projects are okay with this percentage.

The resolutions would just say, we adopt the attached policy.

For our next meeting, we will consult with programs that have theses and research projects, and then Dani will draft a resolution.

### Open Forum

We got through everything today! It is open forum.

Tommi asked the registrar about the units, and she said it sounds good.

Question: With the GE stuff, at the beginning, is that for 24-25? We must get it done by Spring 24, so by Fall 2025-2026 it is in the catalog appropriately!

10:53AM conclude.