

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Minutes
22 January 2009

(Approved 2/5/09)

Present: T. Boone, M. Dhada, A. Gebauer, M. Moe (late!), J. Pratt, J. Stark, M. Baker (for M. Vivian), T. Van Reusen, L. Lavender

Absent:

Called to order 9:35am

Minutes of 20 November 2008 approved

Discussion of committee membership: It was noted that Section IV.B.1.a. of the Academic Senate Bylaws lists the “Dean of Academic Programs” as an *ex officio* member. At CSUB, we do not have a Dean of Academic Programs; instead we have an Associate Dean of Academic Programs. After a bit of discussion, it became clear that it doesn’t really matter whether the Associate Vice President of Academic Programs (Dhada) or the Associate Dean of Academic Programs (Dirkse) attend the AAC meetings. Often, the Office of Academic Programs has scheduling difficulty and one or the other may attend AAC meetings depending on their schedules. We decided that the intent of the membership was to have representation from the Office of Academic Programs. A resolution to modify the Bylaws will be prepared.

Old Business:

1. EdD proposal (from last year) - waiting for SOE response.
2. Liberal Studies proposed 2009-11 Catalog Revision - waiting for reply
3. CARS. We finalized our discussion of CARS. According to the resolution passed by the Academic Senate on Sept. 21, 2006, we are to decide on the continuation of CARS as well as make any recommendations concerning curriculum coordination and oversight. After weeks of discussions and consultations with CARS, we reviewed our final draft document. Discussions focused on the proposal to have School Curriculum Committees report to AAC. The major concern was the implication that the AAC would have administrative authority over the School Curriculum Committees. There was consensus that this is not an attempt to give the AAC any administrative authority, nor is it an attempt to require that the School Curriculum Committees seek approval of their actions. Instead, the intent is to provide transparency and general oversight to insure adherence to School Curriculum Committee standards and procedures and that the outcomes are aligned with university standards and mission. Wording in the document will be edited to reflect this. The document “University Curriculum Committees: Responsibilities and Structures,” as well as a draft Resolution will be forwarded to Faculty Affairs so that a joint resolution may be prepared.

New Business:

1. Oversight of ERM. Discussion concerning Dean Emory’s memo requesting BPA Curriculum Committee oversight of ERM focused on the definitions of “interdisciplinary” and “interschool.” It was noted that these are inconsistently used in the Catalog, Handbook and Senate Bylaws. There are many “interdisciplinary” programs in that they require

courses outside the department, but within the School, in which the program resides, Examples include Biology (requires Chemistry), Chemistry (requires Physics), Chicano Studies Minor (requires History and Spanish), and many others. In fact, the section in the Catalog listing interdisciplinary programs (p. 110) includes programs mostly requiring courses within a School. Clearly AAC (as the University Curriculum Committee) oversight of these programs is not appropriate. Sections 202.3.1 and 203.1 use the term “interschool” when referring to AAC oversight. It became clear that the intent of the term “interdisciplinary” in Section IV.B.1.c in the Bylaws was “interschool.” We also decided that an interschool program is a program with required courses (i.e., not electives) for the major and/or minor from more than one school. A resolution to modify the Bylaws will be prepared.

A memo will be sent to Dean Emory explaining that the AAC considered his request but was unable to make a recommendation because of these confusions regarding the definition of “interdisciplinary.”

2. Academic Plan/Program Review schedule (added at the last minute). With so little time to discuss this, we only came to a general “leaning” regarding the proposed Program Review Schedule. Because of the implementation of Program Scans as well as the workload burden on the UPRC, we are leaning towards a different time schedule for Program Reviews. We are seriously considering a schedule that would have reviews spread out over more years for most programs. We see that there are three programs very close to concluding their reviews due to efforts in fulfilling outside accreditation requirements, and it may be that these program could be persuaded to volunteer to conclude their program reviews this year. Reviews of all other programs will be spread out over seven years, thereby giving the UPRC ample time to carefully consider about 5 programs per year. Attached is a draft of what we are likely to propose.

Meeting adjourned at 11:05am