

California State University, Stanislaus
University Educational Policies Committee
Meeting Minutes
November 13, 2014

Present: R. Esau (recording), L. Bernardo, L. Bettencourt, B. Carroll, L. French, M. Jaasma, C. Wisniewski (proxy for M. Salameh), J. Sankey, K. Stone, A. Strahm (proxy for M. Grobner), R. Werling, S. Zong

Excused: M. Grobner, V. Leyva, M. Salameh

Guests: K. Brodie, M. Gerson, S. Marshall, E. Peterson, D. Shimek

- I. **Call to Order.** A. Strahm called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.
- II. **Approval of Agenda.** The agenda was approved as distributed.
- III. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes of October 23, 2014, were approved as distributed.
- IV. **Announcements/Reports.** It was reported a great Student Success Spotlight was held on Friday, 11/7/14. Eight presentations were made, new ideas shared, and good responses were received. The Provost is making efforts to meet with staff regarding proposed changes to the Calendar for College Year 2016-2017.
- V. **Subcommittee/Committee Reports.**
 - A. **Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee Minutes (9/16/14).** Minutes were received and approved from the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee (9/16/14).
 - B. **General Education Subcommittee Minutes (9/30/14, 10/14/14).** Minutes were received and reviewed from the General Education Subcommittee. Item 4.a. needs clarification so the minutes are concise and clear to an outside audience. Approval is deferred until revised minutes are forwarded to the UEPC. Minutes were received and approved with a correction to M. Jaasma's working title of Interim Associate Vice President, not Vice President (10/14/14).
 - C. **Graduate Council Minutes (9/18/14).** Minutes were reviewed from the Graduate Council (9/18/14).
 - D. **Technology and Learning Subcommittee Minutes (9/17/14).** Minutes were received and reviewed from the Technology and Learning Subcommittee. Item 6.c. needs clarification so the minutes are concise and clear to an outside audience. Approval is deferred until revised minutes are forwarded to the UEPC.
- VI. **Old Business**
 - A. **Policy for Change of Major, Adding a Second Major, Adding an Additional Minor.** M. Gerson and E. Peterson joined the UEPC to discuss the proposed Academic Change Policy

for 90 Units and Beyond. E. Peterson feels the policy is a mistake and encourages the UEPC to modify the resolution and policy to better fit the stated objectives that students should be sufficiently aware of the requirements and offerings of their selected majors by the time they achieve 90 units, thus if wishing to change or add majors or minors, they should be held accountable and demonstrate their ability to complete their new major or minor within 140 units. E. Peterson contends that the policy, as written, seems to discourage students from following their learning style and passion, making it cumbersome for them to switch majors if they decide that they want to learn something new and different. This institution should be about lifelong learning and encouraging passion for learning instead of discouraging them from exploring different paths to learning. It could very well be that some students figure out late in the process that they don't want to continue in their current major and wish to change paths, making a different choice of career which could result in a quality of life decision. To discourage this change seems to go against the University's mission of providing access and supporting a desire for learning. The UEPC replied that the intention of the policy is not to stop learning, but, rather, it is to help students receive more coaching and advising to decide their path of learning. Students who decide late in their academic careers to make a change will receive more help and advising to develop their path to completion. The UEPC thanked the guests for coming. Discussion will continue once a data set has been provided to the UEPC.

- B. Consultation Between Programs on Co-developing Language.** A. Strahm sent a request to each college curriculum committee chair to find out what policies and processes are in place at the college level when it comes to consultation and contestation with regard to new programs, program revisions, and new/modified course proposals. To date, many of the college committees do not take formal meeting minutes, which is problematic when considering the responsibility given to the colleges regarding consultation. The UEPC charge indicates "Upon proper constitution of the curriculum committees within the colleges, the UEPC may delegate any of its powers to those committees. The curriculum committee of each college shall inform the committees of the other colleges of matters which may impact their respective curricula through the distribution of their minutes. If no objections are expressed within fifteen (15) working days from distribution, the proposed changes will become effective and will be reported to the Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Analysis." A. Strahm and B. Carroll will bring this to the Senate Executive Committee for discussion. The UEPC will continue discussions at the next scheduled meeting.
- C. Academic Program Review: Cognitive Studies (BA).** Deferred until a Special Review Committee Report is received.
- D. Fall 2016 Registration Policy.** Deferred.
- E. Review of the Two-Pass Registration System.** Deferred.
- F. Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee – University-wide Baccalaureate Program Learning Goals.** Deferred.
- G. General Education Goals.** S. Marshall joined the UEPC to discuss the General Education Goals and Outcomes and the strategy for moving them through the approval process. The Goals and Outcomes were approved by the UEPC two years ago. They went to the

Academic Senate, but were not received well. There was much discussion regarding the Mission Statement that was included with the Goals and Outcomes. There was also much discussion concerning the process in which the Goals and Outcomes were developed. It was decided that a General Education Ad Hoc Committee be formed and charged with the task of making sure there is wide consultation concerning the Goals and Outcomes. The General Education Ad Hoc Committee revised the General Education Mission Statement and that has since been approved by the Academic Senate. It is now time to proceed with the approval of the General Education Goals and Outcomes. Following the approval of the Goals and Outcomes, the General Education Ad Hoc Committee will develop an assessment and recertification process for all general education courses. For clarification, the General Education Goals and Outcomes will be met by the entire General Education Program, not by each individual general education course. It was suggested that the following statement be placed on the General Education Goals and Outcomes document: "When proposing a General Education Course, choose the goal that is most central to your course and identify a minimum of two (2) corresponding learning outcomes that can be achieved in your course." Following discussion, a motion was made by K. Stone to approve the resolution with the addition of the General Education Ad Hoc Committee noted in the rationale. The motion was seconded by S. Zong. The motion passed with 8 yes votes and 2 abstentions. The General Education Goals and Outcomes document will be discussed further by the UEPC members via email with the goal of moving it to the Senate Executive Committee to be placed on the Academic Senate agenda for January 27, 2015.

VII. New Business.

A. CSU Stanislaus Diversity Statement. K. Brodie and D. Shimek joined the UEPC to discuss further the CSU Stanislaus Diversity Statement and possible action plans for ensuring diversity in the curriculum. The Affirmative Action and Diversity Committee felt it best to seek the UEPC's advice for making the first diversity statement real for our campus – offering courses that are centered on or incorporate material for our diverse student, faculty, and staff populations, as well as educating us about one another. It was suggested to seek input from the Faculty Development Center to offer workshops, discussions, projects, funding to develop a course or modify a course to include diversity. M. Jaasma asked if this topic is the same as globalizing the curriculum, which was an initiative several years ago spearheaded by L. Bunney-Sarhad and the Office of Global Affairs (now the Office of International Education led by M. Lamadanie). K. Stone recalled there was a good model in globalizing the curriculum that could be used as a starting point. R. Esau will research the archives to find the proposal and implementation plan developed by the UEPC Task Force on the Globalization of the Campus and forward documents to D. Shimek and K. Brodie. D. Shimek would like to return to the Academic Senate and have a discussion with the entire Senate body, sharing all of the activities that are part of each bullet point of the Diversity Statement. The action plans will be shared as soon as they are ready. It was suggested that the action plans be introduced as the beginning of a campus conversation instead of as a final result from the Affirmative Action and Diversity Committee. It was also suggested that many courses already include diversity in its course syllabi. Perhaps a call for syllabi which reflects diversity in its curriculum can go out to the campus community in order to collect samples and establish best practices for including diversity content. The UEPC thanked the guests for coming. Discussion will continue at the next scheduled UEPC meeting.

VIII. Other (information only). The next UEPC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 11, 2014, from 2:00-4:00 p.m., in MSR 200.

IX. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randi Esau, Recording Secretary

:rle