

University Educational Policies Committee
Meeting Minutes
February 8, 2018

Present: **M. Thompson (chair)**, B. Eudey (chair-elect), T. Bargetto, L. Bernardo, M. Cuan, C. Davis, L. French, K. Jaycox J. Li, B. Powell, S. Schraeder (recording), S. Young, S. Wooley

Excused: X. Liu, M. Fleming

- I. **Call to Order.** M. Thompson called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.
- II. **Approval of Agenda.** The agenda of February 8, 2018 was approved as distributed.
- III. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes of January 25, 2018 were approved as distributed.
- IV. **Announcements/Reports.** Laura French, Special Collections & Digital Archives Librarian, who has served as a UEPC member for the last four years, announced that she is leaving the University to become a curator of Nineteenth Century Literature at Baylor University in Waco, Texas.
- V. **Subcommittee/Committee Reports.** None to report.
- VI. **Old Business**
 - A. **Certification and Recertification Process for General Education Courses.** M. Thompson shared that the first reading of this item occurred at the January 30, 2018 Academic Senate meeting. Thompson noted that there were no comments or feedback. It was shared that Academic Senate Sense of the Senate associated with the review of the certification and recertification process for General Education course indicates that minor process changes can be made without any subsequent Academic Senate review. The committee discussed what constitutes a “minor change.”
 - B. **General Education Program Assessment Plan.** M. Thompson shared feedback regarding the Academic Senate discussion of the General Education Program Assessment Plan and the committee discussed the feedback.
 - i. **Concern about effect of “unfavorable report” especially for programs.** This is a concern the UEPC has discussed previously, especially for occasions where only one or two programs are “responsible” for a given anchor. The committee stresses:
 1. GE assessment under the plan is formative assessment for program improvement; not intended to be punitive.
 2. Reference the [Principles Assessment of Student Learning](#) approved in 2004, viz.
 - a. P.1 The primary purpose of assessment at California State University, Stanislaus is improving student learning.
 - b. P.7 The results of assessment activities will not be used for the evaluation of individual faculty.
 - c. P.8 Assessment data will not be used to make comparison across programs, departments, or colleges

3. Focus on outcome of the assessment to be a part of the GE academic program review. The aggregate results by area (not program) will not identify specific students, faculty, programs, or colleges. Reports from ORPs will inform needs to strengthen the program by area.
 4. We suspect that the CFA will also offer significant protections should faculty or programs be ill used by the plan or process.
- ii. **Will we be exposing non-problems or missing problems due to small random sample?** This is possible and we should acknowledge the proposed plan will be imperfect. The aggregation of results across an entire area will provide a fair-sized sample, yet we expect adjustments will need to be made.
 - iii. **Should failing students be included?** The availability of artifacts rather than student grade is the primary reason for inclusion. After the initial selection provided, if a selected student has no artifact, the instructor should move to the next student on the roster who does have an artifact for the assignment whether that student has earned a passing grade or not.
 - iv. **Should fewer sections be used with more students selected per section? Should samples be proportional to section size?** The plan is a compromise that will provide a manageable number of samples, amount to a reasonable cost for the ORPs, and provide a broad cross-section of sections.
 - v. **Are FLCs aware that they are developing GE assessment materials and methods?**
Yes.
 - vi. **Isn't the focus on the "at or near graduation" directive from WASC?** It's very important to recognize that, from the outset of the SEC/ Administration's consultation on the charges of the FLCs, there has been recognition that part of the work is responsive to WASC; more importantly, it has also been clear that these groups comprised completely of faculty can focus on what's best for all students at all levels. Yes, WASC wants assessment at or near graduation, but that could be part of UDGE or not part of UDGE.
 - vii. **Will assessment findings be used in GE recertification?** GE recertification has solely to do with submitting a syllabus of some sort that includes an assignment on which students would perform a task related to an anchor outcome the program has chosen in order to fit into a GE area. Once GE sub says "yes" this assignment fits this outcome, that's it, course recertified. It's true the assessment plan will use the anchor outcome(s) for each area for assessment, and it's true that those same outcomes determine whether a course is recertified or certified for a GE area, but that does not mean that assessment interacts with recertification or certification. The recertification process would be the same without any assessment plan before us, and assessment results will not be used in any way in the recertification of courses.
 - viii. **Will GE courses need to be recertified on a regular rotation?** No. GE recertification is a one-time process to certify all existing GE courses conform to the approved GE goals and outcomes (from 2014). The 7-year cycle is for assessment of the core competencies in GE as part of the GE APR and has nothing to do with the certification of a GE course.
- C. Adding Structured Exploratory Emphases.** The committee reviewed concerns shared regarding the addition of Structured Exploratory Emphases.

- i. **Shouldn't we let the GE revision happen first, then think about SEEs?** The resolution endorses the implementation of a pathways program option, not a required path through GE.
 - ii. **Would the availability of yet another emphasis raise confusion for students as they are reviewing course options (or trying to follow the roadmaps)?** Faculty Fellows have this type of advising as part of their charge. Confusion also creates an opportunity to guide students to catalog and advisers.
 - iii. **Why aren't SEEs or pathways more widely adopted at other CSUs?** About one third of campuses have adopted some form of pathways. Other campuses are considering, but it takes time to enact change.
 - iv. **How would SEEs fit into the MAP (my academic planner)?** Currently, SEEs would not as non-degree programs aren't coded.
 - v. **Would SEEs take away from a broader GE experience?** This is debatable; based on a student's choices, following a SEE could provide a broader or narrower GE experience. A SEE is one possible path students can move in and out of.
 - vi. **If we are putting resources toward advising students about SEEs, where are the resources being taken away (like GE advising, or other advising)?** SEE advising is a minimal time commitment about a curricular option with advising through the ASC, much of it via Fellow Fellows. Faculty are not required to provide SEE advising.
 - vii. **How will student progress and graduation rates be measured or tracked with SEEs?** This can be done. IR is developing a student success program dashboard that could include SEEs.
 - viii. **What are the learning outcomes and assessment of SEEs?** GE courses may be modified to include additional SEE learning outcomes. Additional learning outcome and assessment information are addressed in the documents distributed.
 - ix. **How do the SEEs align with or contribute to GREAT and the Graduation 2025 initiative?** SEE preexisted GREAT; it is not one of the GREAT projects. The design supports a cohort-based program which is a marker of some HIPS, but cohorts are not fully structured into the program.
 - x. **Will and how will articulation with the community colleges occur?** Since SEEs lead to no degree, minor, certificate, &c, no articulation is necessary. The program will acknowledge work done at CCCs in an ADT program.
 - xi. **As we are advising our major (or other) students, are we also supposed to advise for SEEs (which we may not be trained to do, or know each particular SEE)?** There is no requirement for program faculty to provide such advising.
 - xii. **Can students mix and match courses, do they face restrictions or other requirements?** The SEE program as presented is very flexible and imposes no new requirements on students. A SEE provides a path of interest through an interdisciplinary set of GE courses without conferring a certificate, minor, &c.
- D. New Subprogram Proposal: B.A. in Liberal Studies Integrated Teacher Education Track.** After further discussion of the proposal, B. Eudey moved, T. Bargetto seconded and the committee approved unanimously the new Liberal Integrated Teacher Education Track, the program revisions for the B.A. in Liberal Studies, and the new option of Social Sciences in the Teacher Education Preparation Track in the Liberal Studies B.A.

- E. **Active Learning / Technology Enhanced Classrooms.** The committee reviewed the [January 25, 2018](#) UEPC meeting minutes. The committee discussed the scheduling practice of a new technology and that more information is required to make a decision in order to support moving forward with purchasing furniture. Concerns include the budget for developing the room, scheduling of the room, and which entities will have room use priority. The committee discussed creating guidelines and criteria for an institutional process for dedicating classrooms. It would need to be identified who is involved in the decision making, where the funding is coming from, etc. so that a thorough process exists. M. Thompson will draft a memo of the committee's concern to share with Provost Greer and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs Myers.
- F. **Review Online and Technology Mediated (OTM) Courses and Programs Policy.** Deferred.
- G. **Instructional Materials Accessibility Policy Report.** Deferred.
- H. **EO1110 "Assessment of Academic Preparation and Placement in First-Year General Education Written Communication and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Courses".** Deferred.
- I. **EO1100 "General Education Breadth Requirements – Revised".** Deferred.
- J. **Review of Learning Management Systems (e.g., D2L, Canvas, BlackBoard, Moodle, Classroom.** Deferred.
- K. **Selection of Campus Learning Management System – Academic Technology Support.** Deferred.

VII. New Business

- A. **Program Revision: B.S. in Biological Sciences.** S. Schraeder briefly introduced the program revision proposal. Members of the UEPC will review the proposal by the next scheduled meeting.
- B. **Program Revision: B.A. in Biological Sciences.** S. Schraeder briefly introduced the program revision proposal. Members of the UEPC will review the proposal by the next scheduled meeting.
- C. **Program Revision: B.S. in Business Administration.** S. Schraeder reviewed the proposal and shared that the change adds CIS 2000 to the prerequisites for the Business Administration major. CIS 2000 also meets GE requirement EI. CIS 2000 is already specified as a prerequisite in the course catalog description of at least one core course, CIS 3700, and at least one concentration course, ACC 4160. Therefore, it is already integrated into the CBA roadmaps and advising forms and is enforced as a prerequisite at enrollment. The need for students to take this course will be clarified by listing it with the other prerequisites to the major. The committee discussed the proposal. B. Eudey motioned, T. Bargetto seconded, and the committee voted unanimously to approve the program revision for the B.S. in Business Administration.

D. Recommendation to Discontinue French B.A. Program. Deferred.

E. Barnes & Noble Contract/Bookstore Advisory Committee. Deferred.

VIII. Referred

A. Active Learning Classrooms. Referred to TLS.

B. Review of Learning Management Systems (e.g., D2L, Canvas, BlackBoard, Moodle, Classroom). Referred to TLS.

IX. Other (information only). The next UEPC meeting is scheduled Thursday, February 22, 2018 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. in the MSR 260.

X. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 3:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MT:ss

Sarah Schraeder, Recording