

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
Turlock, California

University Educational Policies Committee
May 7, 1998

Present: R. Asher, J. Borba, D. Demetrulias, W. Doraz, C. Floyd, R. Floyd, C. Morgan,
A. Petrosky, and R. Weikart
Excused: J. Elliott, K. Potts, and I. Rumayor

I. *Call to Order.* W. Doraz called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m.

II. *Approval of Agenda.* The agenda was approved as distributed.

III. *Approval of Minutes.* The minutes of April 30 were approved as distributed.

IV. *Old Business*

- A. *Student Retention at CSUS.* Trend factors were discussed. The consensus of the committee was to study the questionnaire and the documents over the summer and return to a more complete discussion during the fall 1998 semester. The following issues were raised as points of interest: faculty quality, advisability, accessibility, program delivery, academic quality issues, general education questions, student perceptions of research and courses, and identification of student roadblocks to retention.

The committee agreed that a more complete analysis needs to be conducted on the Noel Levitz data and D. Keymer and K. Mendonca will be requested to provide this information. Given her expertise in the area of retention, the committee hopes that K. Mendonca will provide a more complete analysis and recommendations for the faculty role in retention efforts. Part of the analysis may deal with the faculty role, specifically the knowledge of the issues and areas for recommended improvement by faculty in retention. The hope is to have this data analysis completed so that the question of student assessment and retention may be discussed at the first UEPC meeting in September.

- B. *Assessment Plan.* R. Asher developed a draft of the assessment plan which incorporated previous discussions of the committee. The committee recognized that control for academic assessment clearly falls within the purview of the faculty, including programmatic, curricular, and student learning. A distinction was made between institutional needs and concerns for outcomes assessment and programmatic, curricular and student learning from the point of view of the faculty. This was based upon the Task Force on Assessment recommendations that were taken into account when making this judgment.

Issues related to classroom assessment and classroom research were discussed. As part of the mission statement related to teacher/scholar, action reviews of individual faculty members was also discussed.

Elements in the document relating to the Master Academic Plan were revised. The committee recognized that there were seven accredited programs for which exit reviews were conducted related to Education, Business, and Social Work. Priority recommendations by the committee were noted as they related to accreditation.

For future consideration the committee recognized that one methodology could be selected which was external reviewers of programs—not students. The consideration for the Task Force on Assessment recommended that funding for budgeting issues be considered, particularly for the assessment effort. The committee felt that a minimum of \$10,000 per year for five consecutive years would seem to be a reasonable start.

Time permitting, discussion of the assessment plan may continue at the May 14 meeting. R. Asher is to incorporate changes into the document.

- C. *Master Academic Plan*. Deferred.
- D. *Program Review: History (BA and MA)*. Deferred.
- V. *New Business*
 - A. *Program Review Timeline*. Deferred.
 - B. *Program Review: Computer Science*. Deferred.
 - C. *Program Review: Honors Program*. Deferred.
 - D. *Institute Review: Institute for the Study of Pension Systems*. Deferred.
- VI. *Committee Liaison and Subcommittee Reports*
- VII. *Announcements/Reports*. None.
- VIII. *Other*.
- IX. *Adjournment*. The meeting adjourned at 2:15.

Respectfully Submitted,

W. Doraz, Chair
University Educational Policies Committee