

Academic Affairs Committee Minutes

September 4, 2013

(Approved September 18, 2013)

1. Roll Call (3:05 pm) Members Present: Donna Woodford-Gormley, Warren Lail, Cheryl Zebrowski, Ruthy Watson, Craig Conley, Cristina Duran Carmen Vidal-Lieberman, Seonsook Park, Jesus Rivas, Kerry Loewen

Also in Attendance: Michael Raine

Absent: Andre Garcia-Nuthmann, Gregg Turner, Margot Geagon

2. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved. (Conley, Watson)

3. Approval of the Minutes

Minutes of August 21st were approved. (Lail, Watson)

4. Report from Associate VP of Academic Affairs

a. Not in attendance

5. Report from Registrar

a. 780 degrees awarded so far this year.

b. 169 students were disenrolled by the business office for non-payment.

c. The registrar's office was only able to withdraw 1 student for non-attendance, since not every instructor submitted the non-attendance report. It is the student's responsibility to withdraw or drop. Instructors can't withdraw a student for non-attendance.

6. Report from Faculty Senate

a. Professor Loewen will be the liaison from Faculty Senate. He reported that the Faculty Senate voted to support the arbitration over Dean Search procedures that are being pursued by the Faculty Association.

b. Donna has a list of policies/issues we should be examining. Can AAC approved policies be saved somewhere? (Michael Raine suggested looking at UC Berkeley academic senate webpage.)

7. Reports from Subcommittees

a. Undergrad appeals: Addition of Dr. Vidal Lieberman to committee. There are 3 appeals which will be looked at next week. There will be a SharePoint folder set-up.

b. Graduate appeals Addition of Professor Loewen to committee. No appeals received.

c. Ballen Endowment. Nothing to report.

8. Course proposal cover – action item

- a. ITS needs to update all campus computers to Acrobat 11 so that the form may be completed and saved. It might be possible to have electronic signatures. (Echo Sign – free software).
 - i. Motion made to accept the form with a change to “Syllabus not required for deletions”, and a space for comments. (Rivas/Conley)
 - ii. A discussion ensued regarding the need for a different form for revised courses since different questions need to be answered. Motion made to create two forms, one for new and one for revisions/deletions, with the addition of “Processed by registrar’s office” at bottom of each form. Motion passed unanimously. (Vidal-Liebermann/Rivas)
 - iii. It was also suggested that “Processed by registrar’s office” be added to the bottom of forms.
 - iv. The forms will continue to be revised, and final forms will be brought to the next meeting. Suggestions and comments for the form revisions should be forwarded to Dr. Lail.

- b. Program proposal cover will be tackled next.

9. Duties of AAC

- a. What should departments be submitting to AAC? Some issues which were discussed:
 - i. New courses and programs.
 - ii. What level of changes should be submitted?
 - iii. We are an oversight committee – so even a course name should at least be reviewed.
 - iv. The registrar would be happier if everything comes from one place.
 - v. Should make sure that the title, description and syllabus match.
 - vi. Motion made to require that any changes to courses or programs, other than overall description of the overall program, or when the course is to be offered be sent to AAC. Motion passed unanimously. (Lail/Watson)

10. Program review schedule and procedures

- a. Schedule
 - i. It was proposed that each school be reviewed in individual years: Business, Social Work, and Education. The College of Arts and Sciences programs would be split between 2 years.
 - ii. Programs up for accreditation should let us know when they are due.
 - 1. Social Work every 7 years

- b. Procedures
 - i. Accept an executive summary of an accreditation report.
 - ii. The process the last time the committee conducted program reviews was that we collected information, met with the program dean or department chair, wrote up a response/recommendation, and sent to VPAA.
 - iii. Are department strategic plans being done and what happens to them?

- iv. The strategic plan and an executive summary could be accepted for the program review.
- v. The review should be a self-assessment leading to a strategic plan. Perhaps, even change the name to Program Assessment.
- vi. The document formulated a few years ago was reviewed.

11. Late Arrivals - none

12. Meeting adjourned at 4:50