

California State University, Stanislaus

**University Educational Policies Committee
March 25, 1999**

Present: M. Aronson, R. Asher, J. Borba, D. Demetrulias, J. Elliott, C. Floyd, R. Floyd,
A. Petrosky, K. Potts, and R. Weikart
Guests: G. Pallotta, B. Potter, and J. Tuedio
Excused: B. Redford

- I. ***Call to Order.*** R. Asher called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m.
- II. ***Approval of Agenda.*** The agenda was approved with the addition of item V.E. Year Round Operations.
- III. ***Approval of Minutes:*** The minutes of March 11, 1999 were approved as distributed.
- IV. ***Old Business***
 - A. ***Student Retention at CSU Stanislaus.*** Deferred.
 - B. ***Master Academic Plan.*** Deferred.
 - C. ***CODEC—Weekend Use.*** A time certain of 2:30 p.m. for today's UEPC meeting was announced in the March 11, 1999 UEPC minutes to give department chairs an opportunity to provide any concerns or identify any academic plans for use of CODEC on the weekends during the next three years. There were no concerns identified at the meeting or in response to correspondences from S. Oppenheim.

It was moved by J. Borba, seconded by R. Weikart, and voted unanimously that as long as courses that are currently being taught on CODEC on the weekends are not pre-empted, and that this commitment is for a period of 3 years, UEPC supports the offer from University Extended Education to pay for completion and operations of the CODEC system in Stockton in exchange for priority scheduling on the weekends. This arrangement will be reviewed at the end of the 3-year cycle.
 - D. ***Class Time Modules.*** Deferred.
 - E. ***Institutional Review Board Workload.*** G. Pallotta (representing the Graduate Council) and B. Potter (representing the Department of Psychology) were present to discuss the need to efficiently move student and faculty projects through the IRB review process. During the March 11 UEPC meeting D. Blankinship was in attendance to discuss the workload of the Institutional Review Board and the serious overload of proposals that the IRB is receiving. At that time D. Blankinship proposed the idea of the addition of department/unit-specific boards.

The Psychology Department supports the addition of a Psychology Department-specific IRB to conduct reviews within the Department. This would allow for an efficient turnaround time for the review of proposals. The Graduate Council is concerned about the IRB process for thesis students and would like to see the current process and required paperwork expedited.

The UEPC recommends clarification of language in the document provided by D. Blankinship (dated March 11, 1999) regarding the governance process for the IRB and suggested that an organizational chart would help define the role and relationship of the department/unit boards to the IRB.

Following discussion it was moved by M. Aronson, seconded by R. Weikart, and voted unanimously that "UEPC authorize the Executive Secretary of the IRB, in consultation with the Research Policy Committee and the affected departments or units, to appoint additional Boards for the protection of human subjects; and that these additional Boards function in accordance with CSU Stanislaus' policy on the protection of human subjects; and that these additional Boards be composed of five members reflecting a composition that meets current federal regulations. The IRB Executive Secretary, with the Research Policy Committee, shall establish a training, oversight, and review process."

F. *Revision: Academic Program Review Subcommittee Charge.* The revised item #1 of the charge for the APR subcommittee was discussed, amended, and approved. The revised charge becomes effective immediately. J. Elliott will forward the revised charge to the chair of the Academic Program Review subcommittee.

V. *New Business*

- A. *Response to Program Reviews.* Deferred.
- B. *Syllabi for 4000 Level Courses.* Deferred.
- C. *Student/Faculty Ratios.* Deferred.
- D. *Globalization Draft.* The committee reviewed the draft Proposal for Campus Globalization. A discussion of the draft produced the following comments and concerns.
 - The language throughout the document should indicate that this is a working document that describes what has been done to date after extensive work by the Task Force within a limited time frame. The text should be clarified to reflect that these ideas and plans would require further discussion and planning at a campus-wide level. In particular, items that address specific curricular decisions or that have implications for resources will require much additional campus-wide discussion.

- Paragraph 5 under Roman numeral I. should be clarified to avoid interpretation that the university expects all graduates to be able to demonstrate all items within each bulleted statement in the areas of knowledge, values, and skills or that students should take a class in each area. This section should reflect that being globally aware does not require every one of these learnings.
- The second bullet under "Skills that demonstrate" should include the ability to *read*, in addition to speak and understand a language other than English.
- Remove all references to the RPT process.
- Remove reference to hiring priorities.
- The assessment section should reflect that assessment processes will be determined as further refinement of the implementation plan occurs.

R. Asher is to convey the committee's concerns to L. Bunney-Sarhad and ask that the transmittal to the Chancellor's Office make clear the document is a working draft and has not yet received full campus review.

- E. ***Year Round Operations (YRO)***. M. Aronson and D. Demetrulias are members of the newly-formed Year Round Operations committee. The purpose of the committee is to draft a document detailing the issues and effects of the possible implementation of year round operations at CSU Stanislaus and to propose possible alternatives to year round operations. The committee is attempting to complete its work by the end of the academic year. If further steps then need to be taken, a different committee will be formed next year.

M. Aronson distributed a memo to the committee listing questions that she felt the university needs to address. She requested that the committee review the list and provide her with comments/additional items.

- VI. ***Subcommittee Reports***. Minutes of the February 18, 1999 Graduate Council were received, along with the University Writing Committee minutes of December 8, 1998, February 25, 1999, and March 9, 1999.

- VII. ***Announcements/Reports***. None.

- VIII. ***Other—Information Items***. None.

- IX. ***Adjournment***. The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeanne Elliott
Recording Secretary

:je

