AARC meeting minutes
1:30-3:10pm Feb 25, 2014
Fillipi conference room

0. Update on Modern Languages second language report.
L Spicher provided a written response to AARC’s questions. Modern Languages is
undertaking a more substantial report, in response to AARC and other College offices.

1. Double major policy.
AARC considered the Senate action, comments recorded in the Senate’s October minutes,
data of present and past double majors at the College provided by the Registrar, and some
eamples of double majors with significant course overlap (for example, Bus Ad and Accounting, or Biology and Allied Health Sciences).
The number of students who are presently undertaking a double major or have completed a
double major in the past suggest that this is not a critical concern.
One member of the AARC recognizes the desire for a more rigid set of guidelines.
AARC holds as its opinion that a major is defined by the curriculum, as set out in the catalog.
The department faculty should rely on their expertise and discipline-specific norms to
determine whether a particular set of overlapping courses is fine in completing a double
major, to suggest alternative courses, or to suggest that a double major might not be
appropriate and that it may be a minor. In the case of split majors, double majoring in the
split is not appropriate. In the case of interdisciplinary majors, the dean or relevant
interdisciplinary program chair is responsible.
M Rosario will write some language to reflect this and circulate it via email.

2. Core Curriculum questions – not enough time, so moved to the next meeting.

3. Course Evaluation Policy.
Chris Procello was present for questions.
AARC appreciates the changes made from the December draft to the present draft. The
AARC would like the opportunity to respond to the policies and procedures after they have
been developed further. The conversation touched on:
(1) If there is a target response rate, it's important to identify effective methods to achieve the target. What are the possible methods so far?

(2) Questions regarding access emerged. If students can fill this out online, how can we guarantee that the person filling it out *is* a student in that class?

(3) Confidentiality and security questions also developed. What does the College mean by confidentiality? How will the College keep this information secure? Given the nature of electronic documents, even small mishaps in handling can lead to this information quickly becoming public.

(4) Would it be constructive to allow for faculty to briefly comment/reflect on their class experience as regular part of the process? At present, there is no way of doing so, except perhaps in the Form A in the Rank and Tenure process or as part of a grievance, both particularly formal venues.

(5) Validity checks. Are there simple ways to identify and correct when if a student applies the scale in reverse, or fills out the form for a different instructor?

4. BALOS Seminar requirements.

BALOS requires students to complete 38 semester units through 12 courses. This is equivalent to 10.86 TUG courses. BALOS requests that the program include 1 Collegiate Seminar, and requests a waiver of a 2nd Seminar course. Annalee Lamoreaux was present for questions, and outlined the program requirements (credits and courses).

The conversation centered on the BALOS general course format: its online aspect uses asynchronous discussion, face-to-face meetings occur 3-4 times/class, and students take one class at a time. SEM 163 Critical Perspectives follows this format. The committee also noted that the traditional SMC undergraduate degree, under the current calendar, requires approximately 126 units (or credit hours) for completion and that BALOS is presently at 120 units.

A poll of committee members shows that 2 of 5 would grant the waiver; 3 of 5 would not grant the waiver; 4 of 5 recommend that BALOS consider lengthening the current SEM 163 course to adjust for the 10.86 TUG courses (approx 1.21 FTE). The committee will forward this response back to BALOS.