

University Educational Policies Committee
Meeting Minutes
October 27, 2016

Present: T. Bargetto, M. Fleming, L. French, M. Thomas, M. Thompson, L. French, B. Powell, J. Li, T. Spalding, S. Schraeder (recording), S. Sims, S. Young

Excused: L. Bernardo, G. Wellman

- I. **Call to Order.** M. Thomas called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.
- II. **Approval of Agenda.** The agenda of October 27, 2016 was approved as distributed.
- III. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes of October 13, 2016 were approved as distributed.
- IV. **Announcements/Reports.** M. Thomas reported that the Senate Executive Committee will ask the UEPC to review the Policy for [Online & Technology Mediated \(OTM\) Courses and Programs](#). Speaker Sims announced that when Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) review of the policy is completed, SEC will forward the policy for UEPC review. The committee discussed examples of other CSU campus issues relating to the approval process for online and technology mediated courses. UEPC's review will focus on ensuring that faculty maintain control of curriculum while also confirming that the approval for online and technology mediated courses is approved by the faculty. It was noted that this is increasingly important because system-wide responses to bottleneck issues include the development of online and technology mediated courses.

M. Thompson noted the Information Literacy Faculty Learning Community met last spring and will meet tomorrow, October 28, 2016. Thompson indicated that the group will approach programs to determine their definitions of information literacy. Information Literacy is one of the core competencies addressed in the institutional report for the University's WASC reaffirmation of accreditation. The charge of the faculty learning committee is to define information literacy and review assessment practices and rubrics. It was noted that faculty learning communities often review assessment of learning. Thompson noted that information literacy is embedded in a variety of programs across campus.

- V. **Subcommittee/Committee Reports**
 - A. **Graduate Council Minutes.** The Graduate Council minutes of September 15, 2016 were reviewed.
- VI. **Old Business**
 - A. **Policy for Change of Major, Adding a Second Major, Adding an Additional Minor.** Deferred.
 - B. **Charge of the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee.** Deferred.

C. Certification and Recertification Process for General Education Courses. M.

Thomas welcomed S. Davis, Faculty Director for General Education. Davis was invited to attend the UEPC meeting to clarify to members of the UEPC the process for the certification and recertification for general education courses as required per the 2011 [Executive Order 1065](#) (EO 1065).

Davis shared the revised General Education goals and outcomes, which were approved in spring 2015. How the campus would implement aligning existing GE courses with the new goals and outcomes was relegated to the ad hoc General Education Committee. Based on the recommendations of the ad hoc General Education Committee (May 20, 2015), the GE Assessment Council (GEAC) was created. The committee's charge was reviewed and approved by SEC. For the one-year (three semester) term, the GE Assessment Council was tasked the following items: "work to develop an assessment plan for General Education based on the recently approved General Education Goals and Outcomes; design a process for GE course certification and recertification; and complete the GE Academic Program Review (APR) Self-Study report."

On July 5, 2016, GEAC shared an initial draft process with the UEPC and other committees, and informed faculty governance about GEAC's work relating to the assessment plan for GE and provided information regarding the certification of GE courses, which per the process would be sent to departments for review and their approval. To clarify the process further, on October 6, 2016, GEAC submitted a more detailed draft certification and recertification process to the UEPC.

Davis noted that GEAC reviewed the October 2012 Department Chair's Survey regarding GE Outcomes and developed a table mapping to the 2015 approved GE outcomes. The table allowed GEAC to map the new outcomes to GE courses. The newly identified GE outcomes list will be shared with departments for review, revision, and affirmation. Davis highlighted that during subsequent department Academic Program Reviews (APR), departments should include the updated information regarding GE courses.

During the following discussion the following items were addressed. Each item came from questions by committee members.

1. Davis clarified that articulation of courses with community colleges and other universities is not affected by the new goals and outcomes and the certification/recertification process because the intent when the new GE goals and outcomes were developed was to write and officially approve GE goals and outcomes that align with EO 1065, which community colleges and other

universities are already using. Outcomes for courses can be in excess of the new GE goals and outcomes.

2. Davis explained that GE instructors should pay attention to the affirmation of GE outcomes process. It is hoped that the departments will consult the instructors teaching GE when outcomes are revised, if necessary, and affirmed. Davis also noted that the work required should not be excessive. It should be clear upon review of a syllabus which GE outcomes are addressed in the course.
3. A discussion occurred regarding the new GE goals and outcomes and how the language of instruction is affected by them. Davis noted that the language of EO 1065 does not address any requirements regarding the language of instruction.
4. The goal is to ensure that all of the GE outcomes are addressed by the entire GE program, so that student participating in Stanislaus State's GE program will experience the GE outcomes multiple times. It was asked if the review of the old GE outcomes to the new GE outcomes through the cross-comparison identified any courses that would be removed from the GE curriculum. Davis indicated that this did not appear to be the case upon GEAC's review. Davis clarified that the original campus GE goal implementation deliberately excluded existing GE courses from review, but new courses were required to make declarations. Therefore, the current review and recertification needs to review GE courses that have not been reviewed in some time. Davis maintained that the deferment created some extra work today, but what GEAC is requesting should already exist for most courses as most of the information would be a part of the course syllabus.
5. A discussion occurred regarding the question if the certification and recertification process defines specific outcomes for specific GE areas and if a course can proclaim different areas based on its goals and outcomes. Davis indicated that the process would identify a certain subset of GE courses to outcomes, and this would then define the goals and outcomes of an area. Davis noted that the broader interest is to get the GE goals managed and ensure that we assess the goals. It was suggested by some UEPC members that the specifications of GE outcomes to GE areas requires approval from faculty governance and that consulting departments should not be considered faculty approval.

M. Thomas will forward a request to Speaker Sims and SEC to review to what extent, if any, the process for GE certification and recertification requires further review and approval from faculty governance. Specifically, the request for

review by SEC will seek clarification if faculty governance approval in addition to UEPC's review is required for the defining of specific outcomes to specific GE areas. Feedback from SEC will be discussed at the next scheduled UEPC meeting.

D. Campus Space Management. The committee did not identify any further feedback to share regarding the Campus Space Management Guidelines and charge for a campus-wide Campus Master Plan Committee. The item will be removed from the UEPC agenda.

VII. New Business

A. Active Learning Classrooms. Deferred.

VIII. Other (information only). The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 10, 2016 from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., in MSR 200.

IX. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Schraeder, Recording Secretary