# Academic Affairs Committee Meeting

Thursday, October 19th, 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

### Approval of Minutes October 5th, 2023

<https://csub.box.com/s/vh6n89g5y4b45494377c8b0np5edqa99>

They are approved.

### Resolutions

1. **RES 232404 (Referral 2023-2024 #18) - Posthumous Degree Policy**
<https://csub.box.com/s/w924t4ty1ey00t2hum0lun2202y0vgy9>

First reading occurred at the last senate meeting…we need to rework the last two sections of the policy (“Presentation of the Degree” and “Honors at Graduation”). Other suggestions Dani received included specific language addressing the ability of the family/family representative to petition the President for exceptional conferral of the posthumous degree and changing the language for the graduate coordinator to include directors.

The idea was brought up that Honors may be confusing. Larry suggested to just get rid of the Honors section to avoid confusion. We added that if students were a participant of the Helen Louise Hawk Honors program, they would be awarded. There was discussion about adding in options for other honors programs. We added language to try to be vague enough to encompass multiple honors programs.

We discussed ways to give the President an option to award the degree. The language in the commencement ceremony says, “upon the recommendation of the faculty,” so we didn’t want to eliminate the process.

To fit the need for families to have the option to appeal to the President, we added new language stating that appeals may be made to the President. We wanted to be sure that faculty showed up in the people who would recommend these individuals, so we changed the language to degree program faculty. Tommy brought up the fact that that there should only be one appeal allowed to avoid being overwhelmed.

To avoid the formal nature of an appeal, it was suggested to change the language to:

In the event the student does not meet the above requirements, a request may be made to the President.

Tiffany suggested that we only outline the power of the President and avoid the language of appeals entirely. This would allow it to be flexible.

It was suggested to eliminate all discussion and change the language to “The president may confer a posthumous degree regardless of completion of the above requirements. “

The idea that was brought up was the idea that there may be people who are super close to the requirements, or possibly got sick and dropped below GPA.

We are trying to remove language that indicates there must be some formal process. We are trying to allow for multiple entry points to appeal to the president without having to define it.

1. **RES 232405 (Referral 2023-2024 #10) - Standing Committee — Bylaws Changes**
<https://csub.box.com/s/f4sfe02y9qiwgiqpa9u3rkzn5ags6hp7>

We need to discuss the referral put forth by FAC and decide if we want to propose any changes.

* + - We discussed suggesting one week ahead of time to account for voting processes for an immediately elected senator, but ultimately decided the suggested two weeks was fine.
		- The only potential issue would be if a newly elected senator who did want to be the chair of a committee in the next year, did not have availability to show up due to scheduling.
		- Tommy brought up the wording of “speak” thinking that this is not ADA compliant. We discussed changing express their interest.
		- Ultimately, we figured expected means it is not a requirement, so it will account for schedules that have not yet been adjusted for service the following year.

### Pending Referrals

1. **Performance Review of Existing Degree Major Programs (D. Jackson)**

No formal referral yet, but the Board of Trustees is requesting action by January 5th, so we need to have a resolution to the Senate for first reading by the November 9th Senate meeting (second reading on December 7th). Dr. Jackson will provide background on this item, so we are prepared to develop something at our next meeting.

Debra sent the FAQ to Dani which Dani forwarded to the committee and shared on the screen.

* + Every year the Chancellor’s office puts out a request to campus presidents asking for updates regarding our Academic Master Plan (AMP).
	+ The document includes a list of projected degree programs, accreditation, moratoriums on programs. The chancellor’s office has added an extra layer to it.
	+ At September Board of Trustee’s meeting, they passed a resolution that reaffirmed a 1971 communication regarding program review. Universities should regularly review low degree conferring programs to decide if the program should be discontinued consolidated with other degree programs, or if it meets certain exceptions that make it worthy.
	+ A low degree conferring program is defined as a program that graduates fewer than 10 undergrads in a year, or for grad programs, graduates fewer than 5 in a year.
	+ Exceptions: 1) Degree program is expected to dramatically increase its grads next year. 2) There has been a temporary fluctuation in the number of grads for that program that is expected to recover, not be a downward trend. 3) Degree program is servicing other degree programs or general education to such a level that it’s not going to do anything to eliminate the degree because you need the program anyway. For example, Physics is required for engineering, Philosophy is a critical part of general education. 4) Degree program is critical to offer for regional needs, or state needs, or workforce needs, AND is not available at another institution. Essential offering not available at other State Colleges.
	+ CSU Board of Trustees is saying, we’ve got to do this. They are asking for two things in January- They want us to identify the qualitative and quantitative measures that we already use to evaluate credit bearing programs, and using those metrics identify which programs need improvement. By May, we must provide an action plan to improve those programs (i.e., new program development policies, program review etc.).
	+ Debra has the list for the programs, and it include 6 years of data. If low enrollment happened in any one of those 6 years it is on the list. They also only pulled first major only. The second major was not credited to that program. They define program by sub-program. So, for Economics that has concentrations, each concentration is showing up as different degrees.
	+ A lot of programs on the list have already been discontinued, or are on moratorium, or are brand new, so the data is dirty. Debra has a long meeting scheduled with Institutional Research and is going to pull out the dirty data.
	+ Debra will start working on the narrative to explain why programs might count as one of the exceptions. We should make the argument to not focus just on the concentrations, but instead the anchor degree. Also identify programs that are servicing other majors or general education requirements.
	+ Debra will start this and run it by the department chairs. She also needs to talk to Deans.
	+ We may end up eliminating some of the programs though. Debra will not be making that decision, but it may occur. Maybe changing things from major to minor.
	+ What else does our institution need to be doing? It might be worth thinking about what kind of qual and quant metrics make sense for us in the future. Should we create a mechanism for this annual review? We do have program review.
	+ We do have an annual report that goes to the Deans, so maybe we add questions into that report for those who have lower graduating numbers.
	+ This is coming because CSU enrollments have tanked, and we are needing to deliver cost savings. So we can be sure to deliver the work force needs that the state needs.
	+ Dani asked about AAC’s role in the process. Debra is asking us to come up with a recommendation to the senate to develop a program for these reviews. If we have an action plan that shows a review plan and process moving forward, that would be helpful for our May deadline.
	+ By Jan. 4th, we just need the AMP. Debra will send a request to senate regarding AMP. That is review of all projected degree programs. There are 7 programs that are in cue to fall off the AMP. They were not implemented after being approved by Board of Trustees.
	+ If a program has been approved, but not implemented within 5 years, they lose the approval.
	+ We have a Master of Accounting and Analytics master’s program that have not been started yet. Another one for Finance, and Supply Chain Logistics. Also, the Latinx studies Baccalaureate program...need an extension.
	+ There are a few programs that would like to add to the AMP, and we would review those projected degree proposals. Ultimately, we just need to approve the AMP at our next meeting.
	+ Concentrations that are being elevated to degree programs do not have to be on the AMP.
	+ There are 21 degrees/concentrations in 15 majors and 3 graduate degrees that are affected.

Discussion:

Tiffany summarized that they want data and us to have a plan. There are not currently any specific ramifications to these low enrollment programs, but we need to be prepared to have a story. Debra said that we need to think through the potential response that we could offer things online. We need to come up with the arguments about why things need to be done face to face potentially as well. (Although the virtual space could work for or against us ultimately.)

We liked the idea that the department chair writes a justification in the annual report for those low-enrollment programs every year. Collect it every year and create compelling reasons for why these things happen. Debra wants to make sure that it doesn’t become a full report but is easy enough to do each year.

Tommy asked who is reviewing the programs? Will it be subjective or objective? Who should be looking at these degrees. Who owns the portfolio of degrees?

Larry brought up understanding the idea of needing to ensure we are spending money wisely, but wanting to be for sure that we are not punishing programs for an off year.

At this point, we are just being asked what our process is, and if we have a good process, they are less likely to come in with a hammer.

Tommy asked if we have any services for program reviews. Precision Campus helps with gathering information for the programs. Debra responded that we do have a Program Review Committee that is elected. Data comes from Institutional Research. The data that we lack is alumni data.

### Open Forum

Debra asked about the DNP. Heidi asked where it was at. It just got sent to executive committee, then it goes to BPC (Budget/Planning Committee) and AAC. Heidi doesn’t know if it is possible to have a joint meeting. Heidi would be happy to provide background again. Dani will ask Di (BPC Chair) if he thinks it would be appropriate to have a joint meeting since we would be looking at different things. Debra brought up that there usually is a joint meeting to finalize things. Dani suggested having Heidi go present at the BPC since we discuss at AAC already. Heidi reminded us that the DNP is planning to start in the Fall of 2025.

We will also invite Joel Haney to talk about the bachelor’s in music degree as well.

11:18am- Meeting concluded