

# Academic Affairs Committee Meeting

Thursday, February 9, 2023

10-11:30am

BDC 134

<https://csub.zoom.us/j/83139880389?pwd=Q1hTTjhmUk5KdkQwSGZJUkl3cmdpZz09&from=addon>

## Meeting Minutes

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

Guests: Kim Flachmann

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approval of the Agenda

Approved (after with moving “Pending Referral on Definitions of Concentration and Emphasis and Their Implementation” up on the agenda).

3. Approval of Minutes of January 26, 2023 (attached and in AAC Box folder)

Approved with minor edit. **John Tarjan will write the report and forward it on for posting. He will also ensure that the minutes are posted.**

4. Announcements/Reports
  - a. Pending Referral on Definitions of Concentration and Emphasis and Their Implementation (John)

John Tarjan is expecting a referral, but there was no Senate Executive committee meeting this week.

Debra Jackson provided some background on the issue; the Senate passed resolution 027 on concentration and emphases in 2011 that clarified we do not use the terms track or specialization anymore (just concentration & emphasis). The differences between concentrations and emphases has to do with the number of courses in common with the major (core). A BA requires 24 units, so if core is 24 units or fewer, it is a concentration (if the core is greater, then it is an emphasis). A BS requires

36 units, so 36 units or fewer is a concentration, greater than 36 units is an emphasis.

There is an executive order that gives campuses the authority to define these terms (concentrations and emphasis) themselves.

Andreas Gebaeur suggested a plan that requires the minimum number of changes to programs.

Maureen Rush asked how clearly the core is defined by programs. Debra Jackson responded that some programs define the core and the “branches” in the catalog. Others do not use this approach. It was suggested that maybe we could ask departments to clearly look at their catalog/curriculum.

5. Potential Resolutions for the Senate (Materials can be found in AAC Box folder.)
  - a. Minor in Environmental Sustainability (awaiting clarification from department)
  - b. GWAR Committee Structure (draft resolution forthcoming)

John Tarjan and Mary Slaughter put together a draft resolution that would pull responsibility for GWAR from GE and have them report to Academic Programs.

Andreas Gebauer pointed out that this referral does not clarify how GWAR relates to GECCo and asked how courses that fulfill both GWAR and other GE requirements would be handled. Mary Slaughter argued that GWAR was not part of GE. This led to a debate whether GWAR should be a subcommittee under GEECo or a separate committee. The GWAR committee wants to ensure that writing faculty have final approval of GWAR courses. Maureen Rush liked the idea of a subcommittee to keep lines of communication open. Dani Solano suggested GWAR as a subcommittee of GECCo, with GWAR representation on GECCo to determine when courses need to be sent to subcommittee. Mary Slaughter expressed concern that with only one faculty member on GEECo, they would not have voting power. However, it was suggested that we could clarify in the resolution that GWAR has the authority to approve GWAR courses even though they are a subcommittee.

John Tarjan called for a vote to see if the committee preferred GWAR as a subcommittee or reporting to Academic Programs. A majority of the committee members preferred the subcommittee option; the vote was not unanimous.

We also discussed committee composition extensively. Some committee members suggested an elected committee rather than an appointed committee. Mary Slaughter noted that many Senate Committees were appointed. We decided that

requirements for the GWAR committee should include that members have recently taught a GWAR course. Ideally this would include representation from each school, but it was noted that SSE does not have a GWAR course. It was also suggested that this should include a mix of faculty that teach GWAR courses as well as subject matter experts. After discussion, most committee members seemed to lean towards a Senate-appointed committee.

Other items that need to be updated in the resolution include:

- We need to add something regarding the appeals process; appeals go to AAC.
- Debra Jackson asked that we rephrase “GWAR challenge exams” to challenge exams that fulfill the GWAR requirement.

We discussed composition of the committee. We debated if the committee composition should include elected and appointed members. We decided that requirements should include a requirement that members have recently taught a GWAR course. Ideally this would include representation from each school, but it was noted that SSE does not have a GWAR course. It was suggested that the committee should include a mix of faculty that teach GWAR courses as well as subject matter experts. **John Tarjan will update the draft resolution and have a new version for us to discuss at our next meeting.**

## 6. AAC as Interschool Curriculum Committee (in Box folder)

There were no items.

## 7. Continuing Discussion

- a. Communication Across Schools When Changing Curricula

We did not get to this.

## 8. Announcements/Reports

- a. GECCo (Andreas) (reports in Box folder)

Andreas Gebauer summarized the report that was emailed out to all AAC members. It addressed the issues listed in the GE resolution including: summary of course approvals, listing of changes to course goals & learning outcomes, summary of assessment activities, summary of grant-related activities, listing of faculty development activities related to GE, and summary of course review activities/results. He noted that the assigned time for the GE director had been decreased and is currently insufficient to pursue grant-related activities. Some committee members agreed that it may not be

appropriate for the GE director to be expected to write grants...grants are reserved for novel curricular proposals.

Andreas Gebauer also provided a report on syllabus review which noted that there are many syllabi missing and/or not meeting the requirements for GE courses (e.g., not listing GE learning outcomes.

John Tarjan expressed disappointment that the university is not committing the required resources to GECCo.

## 9. Open Forum

There were no open forum items.

## 10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35am.