

California State University, Stanislaus
University Educational Policies Committee
March 23, 2000

Present: M. Aronson, J. Elliott, C. Floyd, A. Karr, A. Petrosky, K. Potts, M. Thompson, and R. Weikart
Excused: B. Betts, D. Demetrulias, and R. Floyd
Guests: D. Keymer, J. Klein, R. Noble, and J. Tuedio

- I. **Call to Order.** M. Aronson called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m.
- II. **Approval of Agenda.** The agenda was approved as revised (item VI.B., add “time certain 1:30 p.m., J. Tuedio”).
- III. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes of March 9, 2000 were approved with the following clarification: item IV, second sentence, “...attended the *SEC* meeting to discuss...”

IV. **Announcements/Reports**

M. Aronson reported that at the most recent SEC meeting a document was distributed that provided an accounting of the Mary Stuart Rogers Foundation monies. Also, the FMI FAR procedures and guidelines are being discussed.

V. **Old Business**

- A. **Student Retention at CSU Stanislaus.** D. Keymer previously met with R. Floyd and D. Hopkins regarding retention. During that meeting D. Hopkins shared that there were no retention concerns from the student government, so any action from UEPC in that regard has been dismissed. D. Keymer recommends deferring the retention issue until the Office of Institutional Research conducts the next Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory that will provide comparative and longitudinal data. The original Noel Levitz SSI was done in 1996 (for WASC reaccreditation).

The university is aware of the need for data, despite the fact that more data is available now than in previous years. D. Keymer will submit a proposal to the SEC requesting that it consider establishing a standing Senate committee whose charge would be to review and advise on student service and quality of campus life/campus climate issues. This review of services would be conducted on a yearly basis.

Following discussion the UEPC agreed that a once-a-year UEPC visit from Student Services should be established.

- B. **Master Academic Plan.** J. Klein reported that the MAP committee has not met since the last UEPC meeting.
- C. **CSU Accountability Plan—Campus Accountability Report Format.** Because the campus-specific indicators for performance area 10 (quality of graduate and post-baccalaureate programs) is due to the Chancellor’s Office April 14, 2000, the committee discussed the possible indicators as stated on page 8 of The CSU Accountability Process document (dated November 9, 1999). The UEPC’s comments follow:
- *Student outcomes assessment for graduate programs.* M. Aronson will check with I. Bowers to determine specifically what this statement means.
 - *External reviews of graduate programs.* Okay as written.
 - *Students’ evaluation of their graduate and postgraduate experience.* Okay as written.

- *Employer evaluations.* Okay as written.
- *Graduates qualifying for professional licenses and certificates.* Okay as written.
- *Graduates engaged in holding faculty positions at colleges and universities.* Okay as written.
- *Graduates admitted to and earning degrees from doctoral and professional schools.* The word “doctoral” should be changed to “graduate.”
- *The range of continuing education programs offered.* Okay as written.

The committee clarified that each program should select, from the above bulleted list, what is most applicable to a specific program or most appropriate to a specific discipline.

It was moved by M. Thompson, seconded by R. Weikart, and voted unanimously to recommend the inclusion of the following categories as campus-specific indicators for performance area 10:

- *Are we attracting and maintaining quality faculty?*
- *Are quality searches being performed and are these searches successful?*
- *What are the recruitment and retention indicators?*

- D. **MA/MS Interdisciplinary Studies Program (memo from APR Subcommittee).** At the request of the UEPC, the APR Subcommittee reconsidered the original recommendations made in the five-year program review final report for the MA/MS Interdisciplinary Studies program. The subcommittee agreed to revise items number 1 and 2 under the heading “Areas for Improvement.” Item number 1 addressed the GRE. Following discussion the UEPC requested that C. Floyd research the effectiveness of the GRE as a measure and what its limitations may be for certain students (e.g., those students whose first language is not English).

VI. **New Business.**

- A. **Program Review: Gerontology Minor (memo from APR subcommittee).** Deferred.
- B. **Program Revision: Liberal Studies Concentration in Applied Philosophy.** J. Tuedio attended the meeting and described the rationale for the proposed changes in the concentration. Following discussion it was moved by R. Weikart, seconded by A. Petrosky, and voted unanimously to approve the program revision for the liberal Studies Concentration in Applied Philosophy effective fall 2000.

VII. **Subcommittee Reports.**

The committee deferred review of the following minutes: General Education Subcommittee (3/1/00), Off-Campus/Distance learning Subcommittee (11/30/99), and the University Writing Committee (2/24/00).

VIII. **Other—Information Items.**

1. California School of Professional Psychology. Deferred.
2. Proposed Title 5 Revisions: Admission Criteria. Deferred.

IX. **Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 3:21 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeanne Elliott
Recording Secretary