Minutes
Steering Committee
9/15/2006

Meeting convened with Baker, DeNoble, Doran, Saghafi, Salehizadeh, Toole; Ex-officio: Lackritz present.

Minutes of 8/25/2006 were approved.

Jim Lackritz updated the committee on his gathering of information in relation to the AQ (Academic Qualification)/PQ (Professional Qualification) standards in place at other universities. He also updated the committee concerning SDSU’s aspirant and peer schools to be used in AACSB reaffirmation. The intent of the Steering Committee is to have an open faculty meeting soon to discuss the AP/PQ standards and to appoint an ad-hoc committee to develop standards for the college.

Jim Lackritz brought language to amend the CBA Policy File on student evaluation of faculty to clarify student evaluation policy in the Summer. The language requires lecturers to have all of their classes evaluated and is optional for probationary and tenured faculty. The motion passed. This and all future policy file amendments will be voted on in the Spring Semester.

The committee had an extensive discussion of the Global Entrepreneurship MBA program. In concept the Steering Committee supports the Global Entrepreneurship MBA. Jim, representing the CBA administration, presented to the committee certain arguments in favor of the academic merits as well as the financial benefits of the proposed Global Entrepreneurship MBA program. Several objections were raised including (1) the program may be inappropriate as a basis for positioning the CBA and may contradict the positioning outlined in the CBA’s Strategic Plan, (2) the program did not proceed through proper channels in the CBA prior to the plans to formally launch it in November, (3) the press conference launching the program in New York conspicuously omits the inclusion of SDSU faculty, although it does include faculty from other institutions.

Following a lengthy debate and discussion, the committee decided on the following two points. First, the Graduate Committee, the International Programs Committee, and the Steering Committee will receive from Jim curriculum content, faculty and staffing, corporate sponsorships and financial projections on the proposed program. Specifically, what courses constitute the program; how will faculty be chosen to participate in the program; what corporations have formally committed to the program and what is the nature of their commitment; and what is the project pro forma for the program? Based on the submitted material, each committee is then expected to make a decision as to whether the GE program is acceptable.

Second, the Steering Committee, as the highest-level non-RTP representative body (and a voice) of the CBA faculty, voted unanimously to convey to the CBA administration the
following: henceforth, any proposed new program (or existing program where significant changes in staffing, method of delivery, place of delivery, etc.), undergraduate or graduate, shall be moved through a bottom up, rather than a top down, process whereby key CBA committees, Chairs, and, when necessary, individual faculty members will be involved in the academic formulation, articulation, and finalization of the program. Absent the implementation of such a process, the Steering Committee *may* withhold its endorsement/approval of any new program.

The Committee then discussed the relation of the CBA to the HTM program. It is the view of the Steering Committee that the relationship between the CBA and HTM needs to be reviewed. This review will include, among others, benefits to the CBA of being associated with the HTM program, processes in place to ensure the academic integrity of the HTM program, governance of HTM, and other issues that may arise.

The Committee deferred to the next meeting a discussion of the overall role and agenda for the Steering Committee for the 2006-7 academic year.