# Academic Affairs Committee Meeting

Thursday, April 4th, 2024

10-11:30am

Education 123 Conference Room

Meeting ID: 859 8694 2698

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

## Meeting Minutes

**Attendees:** D. Solano, A. Hays, J. Wang, M. Szolowicz, E. Montoya, J. Deal, T. Holiwell, H. He, D. Jackson

**Absent:** T. Tsantsoulas

### Approval of the Agenda:

Approved

### Approval of Minutes March 14th, 2024 <https://csub.box.com/s/egzi7f3s24coe9g9qdbal2ivcqkpxexd>

Approved

### Resolutions

1. **RES 232416 (Referral 2023-2024 #23) New Degree Program Proposal – Bachelor of Music in Music Education**

Still waiting on clarification of the correct program name before it goes to full senate.

1. **2023-2024 #26 New Department Proposal – Public Health**

Still waiting on FAC and BPC. Assume they will discuss today.

1. **RES 232419 (Referral 2023-2024 #28) Proposal for a New Minor – Human Resource Management**

Approved at the 3/21 Senate meeting.

1. **RES 232420 Discontinuation of BS in Natural Sciences & RES 232421 Discontinuation of ITEP Programs (Referral 2023-2024 #34 Program Discontinuations)**

First reading occurred at 3/21 Senate meeting. (No comments, so will hopefully go through.)

### Referrals

1. **2023-2024 #29 Proposal to add New Minors – Ethnic Studies, Feminist Ethnic Studies, Queer Ethnic Studies**

Referral link: <https://csub.box.com/s/ktbicfrj35ap0cngxdcxqx7bg96b68tq>

Eduardo followed up with Dr. Salisbury twice on the 14th about the anticipated submission dates for the ETHS 4980 course proposal, revised ETHS 1408 syllabus, and ETHS 1008 Area F course proposal but has not heard anything yet.

Eduardo suggested that maybe they move forward with Senior Sem, but don’t make it a capstone. Also, he suggested focusing on Area courses for next year as the year is quickly ending. Only 2 meetings left.

1. **2023-2024 #20 Proposal for ACS Biochemistry Degree**

<https://csub.box.com/s/cecg04a1i35nn8puwgh4wdrt9r3frcmg>

Still waiting on the updated proposal…most recent update on 3/22 was that it was waiting for the Provost’s consent to be forwarded to the Senate for review.

1. **2023-2024 #30 Academic Integrity Policies - Graduate and Undergraduate**  
   Referral link: <https://csub.box.com/s/r3jhr2qi8lvvicra6az62on5nxht99ro>

The recommendation is to move forward with a resolution for the graduate policy, but simply draft a memo for the revised undergraduate policy since that policy has been approved by Senate already.

Need to draft memo for undergrad. We reviewed policy language, and feel it still represents what we want it to say. We added the word “explicit” and added syllabus language.

We pulled up the AS&SS memo for both. We were unsure what the grievance process is for students, so Tommy pulled up the process from the catalog. (Search grievances in catalog.) Our suggestion will be to follow the grievance process in the catalog as opposed to include the actual information in case it changes. We added a section on the Grievance Process in our recommendation. Additionally, we added information to the syllabus language directing students to the graduate section of the catalog.

Dani will send the memo for undergraduate, and the new revised policy for graduates.

1. **2023-2024 #33 Academic Prioritization**

Referral link: <https://csub.box.com/s/d5q18o194cvobf0g37efx6d0cwmve91u>

Debra is recommending that we accept the suggestions from the task force. Currently, there is no requirement that departments are doing these self-evaluations in their own reports. In thinking about processes that we already have in place, if we said the annual report process needs to be re-instituted, and every program needs to include a report that responds to this data, and it needs to be done by specific dates, and Deans should respond by a particular date, and then suggest moratoriums vs. action plans etc. The report process and annual review has not been implemented consistently. There is already a reporting process in place, that is not consistently getting followed.

John thinks that every year may not be necessary due to fluctuations, so perhaps time frames ought to be a little longer to look at these annual reports, but this might be a good place to start.

Tommy asked if all programs are supposed to do this. Debra responded that every department is supposed to do an annual report, however not everyone has done this. The idea is that when you go to do your program review self-study you already have everything.

John thinks that now that we have data, we ought to be able to get it done. Debra brought up the idea that many chairs were doing the work and getting no response from the Dean, so they felt like they were speaking into the void. Who is looking at those reports? The Dean is supposed to be giving feedback on departments. (It is supposed to be in Taskstream. It is all built, and then there is a response for the Deans report as well. It just hasn’t been implemented.)

One change would be adding the quantitative data to the reports. IRPA has built dashboards that have the department data. It will show some information. May not do Full time FTES or Student Faculty Ratio (SFR), however. That will not be metrics that we can get without a ton of labor.

You look at this every year, but you don’t make a judgment on any one year. What they are looking for is trends. Is it downward, upward, stable? Then decisions would be made. We are just trying to establish a process to evaluate programs. (Heidi is suggesting not discussing the consequences but emphasizing the process.) Heidi doesn’t think it is realistic to try to include the FTES in this report.

Dani is wondering how it might be incorporated every year. If we have the UPRC to look at every 7 years, so would a committee be developed to look at these reviews every year? Debra suggests that it should be done within the school/college. Maybe DCLC within each school, or school curriculum committee. (These bodies are already doing this type of work anyway.)

The thought was brought up that some programs might do service courses for other programs/majors, so that could be problematic to focus only on majors (i.e., philosophy). This should not fall on faculty members to do this.

Heidi proposes that we adopt the existing policy, and then adding it to the existing process. John brought up the idea of bringing this report to the Department Chairs. Debra brought up the idea that this could also positively contribute to hiring decisions, as well.

Want this to be addressed in annual reports. Do we recommend that all programs do this annually, bi-annually, or just at-risk programs since 1971? John feels everyone should do it. Dani asked if the annual report in Taskstream already has these questions? We discussed making the current annual report a fillable form that asks specific questions (MOUAP = Memorandum of understanding and action plan).

Dani asked what should be included in the resolution. Reaffirming report, clarify the questions or the Annual Report Process (Update the Taskstream and format of report), Create a template? Make sure that they are reviewed annually by Dean and Department Chairs. So maybe recommendation is that maybe we develop a new Annual Report Task Force to implement these policies into the Task Stream.

Dani will take these notes to Senate Exec on Tuesday and try to come up with something collaboratively with them.

1. **2023-2024 #37 ITS Software Retention Policies**

Referral link: <https://csub.box.com/s/heozdz0hrj65fvgjlpoeq328h53vosrw>

Storage is an issue. They want to delete videos after 3 years. Debra suggested an alert letting people know when things will be gone. But people must check their junk/clutter information. Everything that was stored on Zoom is automatically copied over to Panopto, but zoom is deleted. Debra is asking that they incorporate some alert, but otherwise, it’s fine.

We can’t find the original policy, but we are okay with this new policy if there is a notification that occurs. We want to review the previous policy to create the new one. The default will be that the video will be deleted after 3 years of no use, unless faculty explicitly request to keep it. (Or play the video, so it resets the clock.)

1. **2023-2024 #38 Review of Programs Offered Through Extended Education**

Referral link: <https://csub.box.com/s/jhdx2z1oiee94sscw8vgiwwi412itvri>

The certificate programs are not reviewed for either stateside or extended ed, and information on a certificate program was included in a report, but no other information was included. We have no official record or any awarded certificates through the registrar’s office.

There is no official record of an awarded certificate. These are often given to them by their department and doesn’t exist beyond the piece of paper they were given at a program. WASC requires campuses to report academic credit bearing certificates.

Approval, Review, and Awarding of certificates…it should specify that it is for credit-bearing certificates. (This would apply for state side and extended ed.) CPR training, for example would not be credit bearing, but Computer Science Authorization is.

Debra is requesting that we also address the reporting side of certificates, and work on the infrastructure necessary so students have more documentation of their certificates. Debra will send Dani the policy regarding needing review for credit bearing as well.

Tommy needs to create program codes for any certificate that exists (i.e., certified nurse educator). A student would declare that they are pursuing a certificate, the same way they would declare a minor/major etc. We would have to decide of that should be listed on transcript, and if we want to issue something equivalent to a diploma. Thinks that certificate proposal could follow the minor proposal and get it approved on our campus, and include WASC authorization etc., but not necessary to go through Chancellor’s Office.

Do we require periodic review of certificate programs the same way we do as a degree? So, every 7 years. What do we do with existing certificate programs? Do they go through these procedures to get recognized? The thinking is yes.

1. **2023-2024 #35 Administering SOCIs**

Referral link: <https://csub.box.com/s/xb0c5lvdgl9f53hvlexpfoyu6cdmewe9>

We addressed shortening the time frame for students to submit online evaluations and linkage between quantitative and qualitative data in online SOCIs at our last meeting with a memo. If time allows, we should decide if additional action is needed.

Debra wants to contribute one thing here: the cost is something the campus should be aware of. It cost $6,000 for paper SOCIs for this semester. Additionally, they must be scanned for RTP purposes, and they hire someone specifically to manually scan the forms. Also, the machine we use is no longer made.

### Other Discussion Items

1. **GECCo Response to CalGETC**Update from Eduardo regarding GE proposal – didn’t get to this.

### Open Forum

11:27am - Meeting concluded.