2015-2016 Year-End Committee Report Form

Committee: Board of General Studies

Chair: Simon Rodan	**Chair-Elect for 2016-2017**: Simon Rodan 408-418-8457/95192-0070/simon.rodan@sjsu.edu (Please include phone/zip/email if available)
Number of Meetings held: 16	

Items of Business Completed 2015/2016

1. New GE course proposals: 20 new GE courses were proposed. Of these 6 were approved, 12 were provided with feedback for ways in which the course might be modified to meet the requirements of the GE Guidelines.
2. Continuing certification: Of the 156 courses that were theoretically due for continuing certification review, the Board received materials for 59. All were reviewed. Of these:
   - 17 were recommended for continuing certification based on the submitted materials.
   - 27 were missing materials, required clarification or needed only minor changes before a continuing certification recommendation could be made.
   - 15 needed significant work (mainly in the area of assessment); the Director of Assessment will work with the courses coordinators of these courses to develop a plan by which assessment can be brought back on track. The plans will become part of the department's program plan.
3. Enrollment caps: 19 justifications for writing-intensive courses that exceeded enrolments caps were reviewed; all but one (POSL20) were not considered adequate justifications for exceeding their cap.
4. Survey of faculty and students: As part of the work in the development of a program plan for GE, two surveys were deployed, one of faculty (N=411) and the other of students (N=1,707).

Unfinished Business Items from 2015/2016

1. Final approval: provisional approval were granted for a number of engineering capstones (ENGR 195A/B) and HUM 177A/B. These must now be reviewed attain for full approval as GE courses.

New Business Items for 2016/2017

1. Program Plan: The GE program plan will be completed in the coming academic year.

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee
August 27, 2015
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Stephen Branz (EXO), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Simon Rodan (COB), Matthew Spangler (COSS)
Absent:
Apologies: None
Guest: Melinda Jackson (EXO), Jan English-Lueck, Guna Selvaduray (BME)

Start: 2:05 pm

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Minutes

****Action- Approve Meeting Minutes from May 15, 2015:** 4-Yes, 0-No, 3-Abstain

3. Matters Arising
4. GE Pathways Discussion
    a. Multiple initiatives around the Student experience on campus from advising to extra curricular and GE Pathways. Currently Chico State does a similar program, the SJSU system won't have something as robust.
    b. Plan is to develop a pilot experience through advising via 1 of 3 pathways. Will students find it useful and would faculty find it useful around areas of study, Global Engagement, Sustainability, and Creativity.
        i. Sustainability has quite a few courses identified around campus
        ii. Global Engagement is a bit behind, there are a few courses across campus, but still needs some additional thought behind its development
        iii. Creativity is the one that area that is still a bit behind in development. Mostly because it is not defined as well across campus as the other topics are.
    c. Pathway advising largely done through advising and ENGL 1A.
    d. Structure is that students would take a minimum of 9 GE units as first part of pathway and then 3 units as SJSU studies experiences that would have a division.
        i. Looking at making the more robust pathways culminate into a certificate.
        ii. Looking at how some courses could align in a semester in order to link assignments.
    e. Will these faculty committees work/meet often to ensure that the experience is cohesive? This is hopefully being developed as faculty create these pathway groups.

f. They anticipate there will be additional examples where they see growth in integrating curriculum that will evolve out of this process development.
g. Looking at developing PLO's for each of the pathways.
h. GE Coordinators are already overburdened, and sometimes GE are taught by adjunct. There will need to be incentives to obtain participation. Hoping the compelling piece is that you get work in an interdisciplinary environment with fellow SJSU faculty.
i. Distribution varies around campus. Some areas offer quite a bit of courses to meet the topic however there are other programs where there isn't much to choose from [GE courses] to offer as part of the pathway.
j. Discussing what the Articulation look like for these GE pathway to the major.
k. Ideas and decisions are based on what we offer and what we can implement effectively using current systems. Cohorts and Course sizes are things they have been considering.
l. They will add additional areas, once they see how the pilot will go.

5. "Housekeeping"
    a. all the links Chair includes in agenda can be found in the BOGS folder.
    b. We generally look at the course GE requests, the GE assessment from Program Planning, and the GE guidelines.
    c. Program Planning Review overview
        i. The review process, the three categories (cover letter template)
        ii. Assessment committee will assist in developing a plan to assist departments in approving any courses that are deemed requiring continuing certification due to requiring improvements in assessment. GE Guidelines do not state that the Assessment Coordinators couldn't review and provide feedback on annual assessment.
        iii. Administrative processes, recording and communication
    d. WRC reports to BOGS, a determination about who will vote on the 100W GWAR courses.
6. Biomedical engineering A3 waiver - Guna Selvaduray
    a. ABET approved programs have historically had the A3 waiver from the Chancellor's office, BME is a newer program who did not get grandfathered in to the same A3 waiver as the other engineering programs. This would allow BME to have the same allowances as the other engineering programs.
    b. The program has identified that they do truly meet the requirements of the area A3 from the work that the students do in the program.
    c. Committee members are curious about writing and ensuring it meets the criteria and word count that the GELO's require.

i. BME expressed they definitely meet the word count criteria ranging from papers related to projects to lab assignments and reports. They also have to look at every project with the ethical stance of "Would I allow this device in myself or my family"

ii. They still have to take a 2nd semester composition, currently ENGL 1B still exists to provide majors like Engineering the writing opportunity.

d. The Engineering programs basically prepare students for 40 years of work, and their technical electives allow them to specialize in specific areas in their field.

e. ENGL 1B (Area C2) will mostly be Engineering majors.

****Action- Approve BME A3 Waiver moving to Chancellor Office: Unanimous-** 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

7. Program Planning reviews due this semester: LLD, AFAM, Music, MCOM
8. Other BOGS tasks
    a. Provisional course final approval- ENGR S and V packages, HUM 177A/B
    b. Capped class size check on A3 courses under new GE guidelines
9. Assignment of Reviewers for COMM 168AB
10. AOB

Adjourn: 4:00pm

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee
September 10, 2015
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Stephen Branz (EXO), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Simon Rodan (COB), Matthew Spangler (COSS)
Absent:
Apologies: None
Guest: Melinda Jackson (EXO),

Start: 2:00 pm

1. Approval of Minutes
    a. adjust 5.c to state continued certification due to requiring improvements in assessment.

****Action- Approve Meeting Minutes from August 27, 2015 with adjustment:** 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

2. New course proposals
    a. AAS 33A/B
    b. This course has been approved previously for the GE's they are seeking, however GUP is asking departments to allocate the awarding of credit to the proper course or that they properly sequence the courses so one had to be taken prior to the other.
        i. The D1 GELOs are not listed correctly in the syllabi.
        ii. Using GELO 2, 3 and 4 for a specific assignment, and assignments are not clearly outlined to show how all GELO's are being met.
        iii. Word count does not seem to meet the counts for both areas they are seeking.
        iv. Would like to see rubric on assessment, word count issue, more information on assignments, update assessment schedule through 2018.
        v. Review this against the notes given at Program Review so that we can ensure they address the same things.

****Table to future meeting: Provide department feedback for proposal improvement.**

c. KIN 111 (Area V)
    i. The clarity of the GELO's was great,
    ii. the thoughtfulness that went into developing this as a global course, from the assignments to the readings.
    iii. This course will be coming in again in a few months under KIN 111i, for part of the college's International Experience program.

**Action- Approve KIN 111 for GE/SJSU Studies Area V: 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

3. GE program planning reviewing assignments
    a. COMM (letters were drafted last semester for all but COMM 168A/B)
        i. Missing Letters from COMM 20/20N, 40, 41, 96PS 157, 179,
        ii. COMM 21 (A)
        iii. COMM 10 (C)- will redo the letter to include issues found, i.e. GELO's 1-5 list on all the assignments.
        iv. COMM 74/74Q (A)- Need greensheet for 74, would be nice if they called out the LO's for First Year Experience.
        v. COMM 100W-
        vi. COMM 174
        vii. COMM 168AB
    b. Conversation about 100W's in general.....outside of COMM specifically, Writing assessment committee believes someone other than BOGS should be reviewing the 100w courses at very least they should be reviewed by Tom Moriarity (Writing Across the Curriculum Director), or Tom should at least be presented as a resource.
4. Assignment of reviewers for next week
    a. LLD100W
    b. LLD 100WB
    c. AFAM 002A-B
    d. AFAM 100W

Adjourn: 4:06pm

S09-4: Policy on First Year Experiences.

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY
Board of General Studies Committee
September 24, 2015
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Stephen Branz (EXO), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Simon Rodan (COB), Matthew Spangler (COSS)
Absent:
Apologies: None
Guest: Melinda Jackson (EXO),

Start: 2:05 pm

1. Approval of Minutes from September 10th, 2015
    a. Adjustment: 3.b.i COMM courses should be moved under the previous course discussions.

****Action- Approve Meeting Minutes from September 10, 2015 with adjustment:** 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

2. Intensive Music Proposal
    a. They have historically received C1 and C2 in the past and they exemption for that has been removed from their exceptions. They believe they should still receive it and this is package is their solution to still retain these GE modifications.
    b. MUSC 4 A/B will meet the C1 component along with MUSC 12 meeting C2. The issue with full approval last year was that the MUSC 12 course did not contain enough writing to meet the C2 outcomes.
    c. MUSC 12 syllabus update appears to have adjusted it superficially in order to meet the request of BOGS. It only appears that they are attempting to include the additional readings based on request, and the papers do not list word counts and the additional exams does not contain enough writing. The feedback and revisions aspect of C2 is not apparent in the update.
    d. They could move the Concert report earlier so that they could do revision and feedback. They could also put a higher percentage on this assignment.

e. **The exam could have contained more writing questions based on the interesting topics they are including on the exam. Or make one of the essay question off the exam to a paper.**
f. **If they are going to get a C2, they need to put in the official word count and feedback and revision process. Writing 15-20 words in an exam is not an adequate way to meet the 1500 word count.**
g. Give them specifics on what exactly needs to be fixed.
h. Include more about coherence in writing so that they understand how important the writing concepts are.

****Action- Conditional Approval for Intensive Music Package upon re-submission of syllabi:** 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

3. New Course Proposals
    a. PERS 1A/B-
        i. The courses have been running as experimental, form is for a minor course change not a new course proposal.
        ii. The course seems to cover the outcomes in C2 area.
        iii. Not impressed with greensheet. **Would like more detail on how they are addressing the GELO's in the assignments.**
        iv. Duplicated GELO statements.
    b. GERM 1A/B-
        i. The course seems to cover the outcomes in C2 area.
        ii. Concerns over whether or not a student would comprehend the literature if they have a basic level of language skill.
        iii. Not impressed with greensheet. **Would like more detail on how they are addressing the GELO's in the assignments.**
        iv. If they are interpreting texts, the only textbook is the language text no additional writings have been included.
        v. An example of the essay question
4. S02-7 Administrative Structure for BOGS
    a. This policy mandates that course coordinators for GE proposals be invited to all BOGS meetings that will look at discussing their proposal.
    b. The policy should be adjusted to invite course coordinators at a second reading if applicable.
    c. Not including the coordinators may be seen as not being transparent.

d. Seems like a waste of time to invite them to every meeting instead of making it worth their time by inviting them to a specific meeting.
e. Just because the meeting is open to the general public does not mean they have a right to speak in the meeting.
f. We could invite them when course is on agenda, but request them to notify us if they are so we can place them at a time certain.
g. We could have a preliminary review and vote without coordinator, and then ask them to the next meeting in which you hold an official vote.
h. New verbiage on course coordinator inclusion will be created and bring to the next meeting for review before sending on to O&G.

5. GE Program Review- Self Study
    a. Not much about BOGS was brought up in the report from WASC. It was noted that a review has not been done on BOGS in many years.
    b. It must have come out in the interview with WASC members that we did not know when the last review had been conducted.
    c. Simon, Melinda and Brandon White (PPC Chair) met over summer to review current program plan template and what parts could be addressed by BOGS.
        i. How good is our GE program and by what standards (LEAP)
            1. is it how it's offered, who offers it?
            2. how well are the learning outcomes being met?
            3. The variation in how involved the course coordinators are with the courses in their programs
            4. They are more than likely taught by an adjunct.
            5. The uncontrollable variables in course offerings and how they are taken.
        ii. What does our policy and process look like, is the structure a good fit.
        iii. What is the process for quality control.
    d. An external reviewer, PPC letter to the Provost and Action Plan to wrap up the cycle.
    e. This is a good opportunity for us to look at process and improve on it, from guidelines to including the GE Pathways as a radical change (of course requiring senate approval).
    f. Good time to ask for necessary resources, committee membership, etc.
    g. Currently no mechanism to manage quality control.

6. PPC GE Reviews
    a. MUSC 010A
    b. MUSC 010B
    c. MUSC/ASIA 019
    d. MUSC 120
    e. DANC 010
    f. DANC 102

Adjourn: 4:00pm

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee
October 8, 2015
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Simon Rodan (COB), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Melinda Jackson (EXO), Stephen Branz (EXO)
Absent: None
Apologies: None
Guest: Romey Sabalius (WLL-German), Damian Bacich (Chair, WLL), Jinny Rhee (AD, UGRD COE), Pat Baker (COE), Maureen Smith (CHAD)

Start: 2:05 pm

1. Approval of Minutes from September 24th, 2015

****Action- Approve Meeting Minutes from September 24, 2015 with adjustment:** 6-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

2. GERM 1A/B
    a. How will the assignments align to the GELO's for C2.
        i. They now engage in cultural reflection.
        ii. Essays revolve around architecture, culture this can be done in English
        iii. Some assignments are written in German.
        iv. The main writing assignment is written in English requires 500 words.
    b. The language courses have been attempting to get C2 because they are articulated with community colleges and some students who take it at the CC get C2 credit whereas students who take the language course at SJSU do not.
    c. The German courses were redeveloped per the adjustments requested and made to the other language courses that were submitted AND approved last year by BOGS.
    d. We need to look at more than just print literacy, as long as we focus on the language "literature" when reviewing C2 proposals.
    e. The goal of this course (or any language course) is to teach students the language, the culture and engaging them at a global level.

f. S01-14 - There is a line in these guidelines that states that C2 could incorporate the foreign languages (elementary or intermediate). The whereas' were cut out when the policy was rescinded under the new guidelines.
g. It appears that the committee has agreed this is possible, we just needed more information about how they students will meet the outcomes in assignments.
h. More structure in syllabus linking assignments with assessment.

3. Time restraints in reviewing, presentations, and how often we allow revisions before we ask them to resubmit after a specified time.
4. ENGR 60SL
    a. Not required of majors
    b. students would take one section at 1 unit, another at 2 and when student completes 3 units total they get Area A1
    c. This is hard to program, as the course would be tagged as A1, it could do it if it was set up in a sequential type manner.
    d. The oral communication portion of the A1 does not appear it will be met properly.
    e. Ethics: how it is assessed is not outlined; the proposal only makes a statement that it will be learned via websites.
    f. It is possible to create an oral communication outline without engaging with audience, as per the GELO
    g. 15% of grade is oral presentation when A1 is focused on oral communication. The guidelines say it should be at least 50%.
    h. The weights on assignments is a bit off considering the GELO's that should be addressed.
    i. If this course is going to be held at same time as the other courses, is the expectation that the student in this course would do all the oral presentations?
        i. No the intent is that they wouldn't because the higher level students would have more knowledge about some of the project concepts that would be discussed.
    j. Work with COMM studies as they have a similar course that might be able to help develop the communication portion of the course.
    k. Does this or will this meet the Service Learning outcomes that our part of the curricular guide with GUP.

****TABLE-** Return to department for update of syllabus. Per comments given to Jinny Rhee.

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY
Board of General Studies Committee
October 22, 2015
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Simon Rodan (COB), Melinda Jackson (EXO), Stephen Branz (EXO)
Apologies: Matthew Spangler (COSS)
Absent: None

Start: 2:05 pm

1. Approval of Minutes from October 8th, 2015

****Action- Approve October 8th, 2015 Minutes with adjustment:** (6,0,0)

2. Matter arising

   The purpose of word counts, aimed at requiring an amount of writing in different styles and genres rather than a vehicle for GELO assessment was discussed. The committee's consensus was that the writing requirements for a course fulfilling multiple GE areas would be the sum of the individual GE area writing requirements. The exception to this is US institutions; combining fulfillment of a US institutions requirement with another GE area will not increase the required word count over the GE for the area.

   1.

2. New course proposals
   a. METR 115 (Area R)

      5-Year Assessment Schedule was missing. Word count should be specified for each assignment (current explicit total is less than the area requirement). Change SLOs (bottom of page 1) to CLOs and Area R SLOs (table on page 2) to GELOs. Clarification on specifics of assignments, especially the media assignment related to GELO 2.

   b. SCI 75 (Area E)

      The course proposal is for SCI 75 but the greensheet is titled SCI90.The course seemed more oriented towards professional/career development, rather than adapting/learning to learn while at SJSU (Area E GELO 3 and to some degree, GELO4). Overall the Board did not think that the course in its current form

sufficiently addressed the Area E GE learning outcomes. Word counts should be provided for significant writing assignments - Area E requires 1,500 words in total. Some concern was expressed about ensuring appropriate instructor qualifications. Additional information on this would be important moving forward. Finally there were concerns about the amount of face to face instruction. Base on the greensheet instructors will spend 9 hours with students; the lecture component (2 units) requires 21 hours). Is the remainder made up of on-line interaction? If so, a description of this is needed.

c. ENGR 60SL (Area A1)

Matt Spangler has met with Jinny Rhee to discuss the Board's concerns raised at the last meeting. These were: administrative limitations making the 3 x 1 unit course structure hard to track for GE requirement completion; the significant challenges of putting freshmen (taking the course for A1) into teams with seniors who are fulfilling S and V for which there is far less emphasis (if any) on oral communication. -- NOTE (12/5/15) course was subsequently withdrawn by Engineering.

3. Continuing certification

The new continuing certification tracking system was reviewed. Programs scheduled for program planning are added to the tracking workbook; the program's GE courses are added automatically. Courses are checked for completeness and when they are, they are added to a rolling working list. Reviews are completed by two reviewers, randomly assigned, and their scores are compared in a summary of differences sheet (compiled automatically). Courses on which there is complete agreement are deemed complete, added to the next agenda for ratification. Courses for which two reviewers do not agree are reviewed by a third BOGS member. A majority agreement creates a recommendation for ratification at the next meeting. Courses on which three reviewers do not agree are slated for discussion at the next meeting.

Three course reviews were completed:

1. BIOL 21 : recommended for continuing certification (6,0,0)
2. BIOL 10: recommended for continuing certification (6,0,0)

   Both BIOL 10 and 21 had done little or no assessment; however in the program planning there was a clear road map for assessment moving forward.
3. BIOL 54: recommended for BOGS review (6,0,0)

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee
November 05, 2015
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Simon Rodan (COB), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Melinda Jackson (EXO)
Apologies: Stephen Branz (EXO)
Absent: None

1. Approval of Minutes from October 22nd, 2015

****Action- Approval tabled until next meeting (7,0,0)**

2. New course proposals
   a. GERM 1A / GERM 1B

****Approved, contingent on the use of something other than class participation as a way of assessing GELO 1. Vote: 7-0-0**

   b. HS 135i (Area S)

The Board did not consider the course, in its current form, to be appropriate for an Area S course. Area S is titled "Self, Society and Equality *in the US*"[emphasis added]. GELOs 2, 3 and 4 explicitly note that the context should be the US. The greensheet shows no indication that equality and inequality were addressed in the course, nor was there any indication that these were to be considered in the US. Finally the course would have been far easier to comment on had the readings been included rather than noted as TBD. A vote was tabled until feedback has been passed to the course proposer and clarification solicited.

   c. NUFS 139i (Area R)

Overall the syllabus was too vague as to the content or the assessed activities that addressed Area R learning outcomes. It was unclear whether GELO #2 (distinguishing science from pseudoscience was addressed at all. The Board would like to see how students are engaging GELO #2 and a clearer articulation of how the journal assignment, research paper, and community learning assignments map onto each of the three GELOs. As these assignments are currently worded, it is not clear that they each map onto all three of the area R GELOs. Sample assignments or grading rubrics could help here, as would a list of required and recommended readings.

d. NUFS 144i (Area V)

The Board noted that Area V required comparisons with more than one culture or country outside the US. It appeared from the greensheet that the only comparison to be made was to Hong Kong. The Board would also like to see what the required and recommended reading will be; this would help to see how the learning outcomes were being addressed. The Board would also like to see more precision with regard to how the assignments map onto the GELOs, particularly the self-evaluation assignment (GELO 1), the journal assignment (GELO 2), and the food culture research paper (GELO 2).

2. Continuing certification

BIOL 20, BIOL 100W, BIOL 110, BIOL 101

The Board considered these courses and recommended they be referred back to Program Planning. PP will develop an appropriate short term assessment roadmap and the result submitted to BOGS in due course. The Board also suggested including the three courses discussed at its previous meeting (BIOL 10, 21 and 54) in this process so that all the Biology GE courses be treated as a package.

3. Program Planning template

The committee discussed the GE program planning self-study template.

****The template was Approved (7,0,0)**

4. Enrollment caps

The Board felt that, with the exception of POLS 20, which explained its intent to revert to enrollments of 25 students, none of the justifications provided were adequately clear and none of these courses (ARTH 193A, BIOL 101, ENGL22, ENGL 117A, SOCI 001, TECH 198) should be recommended for continuing GE certification based on current information. The Board looks forward to further clarification.

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee
November 19, 2015
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Simon Rodan (COB), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Melinda Jackson (EXO)
Apologies: Stephen Branz (EXO)
Absent: None

1. Approval of minutes from October 22nd, 2015 and November 5th 2015

****Action- Approval tabled until next meeting (7,0,0)**

2. Matters arising
    a. Enrollment caps

    While the board didn't feel that the justifications it had seen so far were sufficiently detailed to put to rest concerns regarding writing in classes that had and are planning to exceed the enrollment caps, it is seeking input from the WRC and the campus WAC director before making any recommendation.

3. Continuing Certification
    a. These three courses were unanimously approved for continuing certification (7,0,0): COMM 021, HIST 015A, JS 100W
    b. Additional information and minor revisions were requested based on the reviews of COMM 100W. The reviews will be sent to the course coordinator who will be asked to respond to BOGS, at latest by the end of next semester; the Chair review the updated material and make a recommendation to BOGS regarding continuing certification. (7,0,0)
    c. Based on the reviews of COMM 174, the Board recommended these course be referred back to PPC so that a plan of action could be formulated.

4. New course proposals
    1. HS 135i (Area S)

    Van M. Ta Park, Course coordinator and Pamela Richardson, Associate Dean, CASA, answered questions regarding the proposed course. The Board made a number of suggestions for bringing the course to a more US centric focus on

equality. A new syllabus will be developed incorporating those at which point the Board will make its decision.

2. BUS5 16 - first reading

   The Board recommended that there be greater clarity in the greensheet on how the assignments link to the GELOs. The notion of 'historical' leadership needed some elaboration. The Board wanted to know how writing, in particular with practice and feedback will be handled in large sections. The use of 'catchall' assessments is troubling; more targeted assessment activities would be preferable.

Meeting was adjourned at 16:15

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee
December 03, 2015
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Simon Rodan (COB), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Melinda Jackson (EXO), Stephen Branz (EXO)
Apologies: None
Absent: None

1. Approval of minutes: October 22nd, 2015, November 5th 2015, and November 19th 2015

****Action- Approved (7,0,0)**

2. Matters arising

   None

3. New Course Proposals
   a. METR 115 **was approved unanimously for area R (7,0,0)**
   b. SCI 90 Elaine Collins, explained the proposed changes to the course. The Board felt that in its current form the course was not yet sufficiently aligned with Area E for it to be approved. It will be modified and re-presented in the spring.
   c. NUFS 115i

      The Board did not feel that the course in its current form was suited as an Area R GE course. The Board wanted to see assignments that were more closely focused on the GE learning outcomes so that the results of assessment would be clearer. Relatedly, it asked for a tighter connection between the learning outcomes and the assignments in which they were to be assessed. Finally, the Board did not think that the assignment on pseudo science was appropriate. Lay articles that interpret other primary scientific courses may not be primary source, but they are not pseudo science either; this term is reserved for attempts to dress up unscientific data and present with the trappings of science to give it a false legitimacy. The current assignment does not capture this.

   d. HUM 010

      The Board liked the course and considered it appropriate as an Area C2 course.There was some suggestion that the assignments might be more closely linked to particular GELOs, but in a C2 course, since all three GELOs are

relatively closely related, this was not seen as a problem by all. **The Board voted unanimously to approve HUM 10 as a C2 course (7,0,0).**

e. BUS5 040

The Board did not feel that the course, in its current form, was suited as an Area E GE course. The Board wanted to see assignments that were more closely focused on the GE learning outcomes so that the results of assessment would be clearer. Relatedly, it asked for a tighter connection between the learning outcomes and the assignments in which they were to be assessed. The GE learning outcomes were not presented in the syllabus as per the Guidelines.

4. Continuing Certification

   a. **JS 100W was approved unanimously for continuing certification (7,0,0).**

   b. Additional information and minor revisions were requested based on the materials submitted for JS 132 and JS 136. The reviews will be sent to the course coordinator who will be asked to respond to BOGS, at latest by the end of next semester; the Chair will review the updated material and make a recommendation to BOGS regarding continuing certification. **(7,0,0)**

   c. **Based on the TA 127, the Board recommended these course be referred back to PPC so that a plan of action could be formulated (7,0,0).**

Meeting was adjourned at 16:15

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee
February 04, 2016
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Melinda Jackson (EXO), Stephen Branz (EXO)
Apologies: Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA),Matthew Spangler (COSS)
Absent: None

1. Approval of minutes: December 3, 2015

****Action- Approved (7,0,0)**

2. Matters arising
    a. Program Planning self-study

    Simon Rodan, Melinda Jackson will meet bi-weekly between BOGS meetings to develop the self study document.
    Questionnaires will be developed and tested and then sent to students and GE-involved faculty. The Board suggested questions for students relating to advising, and their perception as to whether GE was accomplishing its objectives.

3. International courses

The board considered the question as to whether an international version of a course with the same number should be designated as "equivalent". The board did not feel that an international variant of the course which did fulfill the same GE outcome requirements as its non GE counterpart should be considered equivalent. UGS will require international courses which are not equivalent (including meeting GE requirements) to a different course number.

4. CE continuing certification course review (5,0,0)
    a. Recommended for continuing certification:
        i. PSYC 100W
        ii. TA 013
        iii. TA 100W
    b. Additional information requested:
        i. POLS 015B
        ii. PHIL 110

c. Referred to Program Planning:
    i. TA 127
d. Discussion deferred for PHIL 133, PHIL 160 and MUSC 019.

Meeting was adjourned at 16:20

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee
February 18, 2016
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Melinda Jackson (EXO), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA),Matthew Spangler (COSS), Stephen Branz (EXO)
Absent: None

1. Approval of minutes: February 4, 2016

****Action- Approved (4,0,2)**

2. Matters arising

It was agreed that even in cases where linkages between assignments and GELOs were clear from assessment reports, the Board still wants to see these set out in the greensheets, since these become the institutional memory for the course.

While the Board understands that applying numeric measures to some kinds of assignment through which learning outcomes are assessed is difficult, and is happy for faculty to make value judgements (e.g. relating to a student's appreciation of issues of enduring human concern of responses to great works of intellect and imagination), the Board would like to see the proportions that met in the instructor's judgement, different levels of achievement.

3. CE continuing certification course review (5,0,0)
   a. Recommended for continuing certification:
      i. PHIL 010 (summary) A
      ii. PHIL 012 (summary) A
      iii. RTVF 010 (summary) A (revised assessment)
      iv. PHIL 160 (summary) A
   b. Additional information requested:
      i. KIN 101 (one big document with many courses) (summary) B
      ii. PHIL 057 (summary) B
      iii. PHIL 070A (summary) B
      iv. PHIL 070B (summary) B
      v. PHIL 066 (summary) no greensheets
   c. Referred to Program Planning:
      i. MUSC 019 (summary) C

ii. PHIL 061 (summary) C
iii. PHIL 133 (summary) C
iv. PSYC 191 (one big document) C
v. RTVF 110 (summary) C

Meeting was adjourned at 16:15

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee
March 03, 2016
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Melinda Jackson (EXO), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA),Matthew Spangler (COSS), Stephen Branz (EXO)
Absent: None

1. Approval of minutes: February 18, 2016

****Action- Approved (7,0,0)**

2. Matters arising

   It was agreed that different variants of an international (previously the 'i' suffix, now designated by "ITL") course need not come to BOGS for approval once the first 'ITL' suffix course has been approved. However the Board requested that all variants of the "ITL' suffix course greensheet be submitted with the continuing certification package. If there are multiple ITL versions of a GE course, GUP recommends considering separate PeopleSoft "subtitles" (as is commonly done with special topics courses whether repeatable for credit or not).

3. CE continuing certification course review (7,0,0)
   a. Recommended for continuing certification: None
   b. Additional information requested:
      i. LLD 100W
      ii. LLD 100WB
      iii. PSYC 001
      iv. TA 010
      v. RTVF 111
   c. Referred to Program Planning:
      i. PHIL 133
      ii. PSYC 191
      iii. TA 048
      iv. RTVF 110
      v. RTVF 111

RTVF 111 is the first instance for which information should be returned directly to BOGS and which needs to be passed back to Program Planning to work on assessment related issues.

4. Program Planning Self-study

   The Board was asked to review two surveys, one of faculty, one of students before the next meeting and provide comments to Melinda Jackson. The Board rejected a suggestion that assessment report data be aggregated to the Area level for inclusion in the self study. The data were felt to be unreliable and incommensurate. It was suggested instead that moving forward, course coordinators for each area meet possibly to agree on a common assessment rubric or to carry out sampled assessment as was done in 2011 for Area S.

Meeting was adjourned at 16:15

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee
March 17, 2016
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Melinda Jackson (EXO), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA),Matthew Spangler (COSS), Stephen Branz (EXO)
Absent: None

1. Approval of minutes: March 3, 2016

****Action - Approved (7,0,0)**

2. New course proposals
    a. BUS5 040

BOGS voted 6-0-1 not to approve the course in its current form, though the committee is willing to consider the course again, once some modifications have been made. The board would like to see additional readings or assignments that more directly meet the GE Learning Objectives (GELOs). Of particular concern is GELO 1, which asks students to "recognize the physiological, social/cultural, and psychological influences on their well being." The instructors of the course propose to meet GELO 1 with an assignment in which students will interview an entrepreneur about a number of health related issues, such as the sleep, work, or dietary habits of that entrepreneur. The committee feels that this assignment would more directly map onto GELO 1 with some additional reading that directly addresses physiological influences on well-being. A single interview with an entrepreneur, in itself, is not necessarily going to reveal an accurate relationship between physiological factors and well-being: the entrepreneur could say, for example, "I do great on three hours of sleep per night," when, in fact, most data would indicate otherwise. To be clear: it is not our recommendation to do away with the interview assignment all together, but rather, to supplement it with some short scientific readings on the relationship between physiological influences and well being that would serve to place the interview responses within a broader scientific framework. The interview questions provided on the syllabus already indicate what some of these readings might address: the

relationship between well-being and diet, sleep, recreational activities, or work habits, for example.

The committee has a similar comment with regard to GELO 2. The GELO asks students to "recognize the interrelation of the physiological, social/cultural, and psychological factors on their development across the lifespan" that the instructors of the course propose to meet with a resume assignment in which students imagine their future selves and describe the role that physiological, social/cultural, and psychological factors played in creating that future self. The committee feels that this assignment should be accompanied by readings that directly address the role of physiological, social/cultural, and psychological factors across one's lifespan, and ask the students to craft their future resume in light of these readings.

Finally, GELO 3 asks students to engage with diversity. The course instructors propose to meet this GELO by having the students in the course work on team projects. But one wonders: would a random sample of students working together in the course always produce a diverse group? Certainly not likely in terms of age. Maybe ethnicity or gender, though probably not always. Again, the committee feels this GELO could be met with some targeted readings on diversity in group settings, and asking students to situate their own experiences of diversity in this class assignment within the broader scope of these readings.

****Action - Not approved (0,6,1)**

3. GE Continuing Certification course review
    a. Recommended for continuing certification:
    LING 129
    b. Additional information requested:
    LING 020
    LING 021
    LING 022
    LING 122

LING 123

c. Referred to Program Planning: none

Meeting was adjourned at 15:50

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee
April 7, 2016
Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA),Matthew Spangler (COSS)

Apologies for Absence: Stephen Branz (EXO), Melinda Jackson (EXO)

1. Approval of minutes: March 17, 2016

****Action - Approved (7,0,0)**

2. New course proposals

   a. EDAD 160

   The Board did not see the course in its current form as being well suited to the requirements of a GE Areas S course. For instance, while the courses is aimed at helping students deal with their own potential future educational issues, the approach does not seem to address "historical, social, political, and economic processes producing diversity, equality, and structured inequalities in the U.S." (GELO 2) or "social actions which have led to greater equality and social justice in the U.S. (i.e. religious, gender, ethnic, racial, class, sexual orientation, disability, and/or age)" (GELO 3). The board was concerned that a focus on students' own particular concerns might detract from the area's objective of broadening their perspectives to those of others in society.

   b. PHYS 023

   The Board was concerned that this course did not, in its current form, fully meet the goals of an Area B1 course. While the use of Canvas is commendably, the Board would like to see a formal syllabus. From what could be gleaned from the links to Canvas, the Board had three concerns. First, there was nothing relating to the Area B1 GE learning outcomes. Second, the course did not seem to address at all GELO 2 ("demonstrate ways in which science influences and is influenced by complex societies, including political and moral issues;"), not did it seem well suited to GELO 1 ("use the methods of science and knowledge derived from current scientific inquiry in life or physical science to question existing explanations").

   c. PHYS 100W

   The Board was broadly happy with the course as presented in the submitted greensheet. It had two minor concerns. First, while the course clearly does a thorough job helping students write for a professional audience, there was a sense that a little more might be done to help them communicate scientific ideas

to a non-professional audience. Finally, a small typo: "SLOs" (middle of page 2) should be "GELOs".

****Action - Approved (7,0,0)**

3. GE Continuing Certification course review
   a. Recommended for continuing certification:
      none
   b. Additional information requested:
      KIN 100W
      STAT 95
      PHIL 066 (no greensheets were submitted)
   c. Referred to Program Planning:
      none

Meeting was adjourned at 16:10

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee

April 21st, 2016

Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Stephen Branz (EXO), Melinda Jackson (EXO)

Apologies for Absence: Simon Rodan (COB)

1. Approval of minutes: from April 7, 2016

With one addition/change to then minutes: In the EDAD 160 course, Robin Love requested that the minutes substitute the phrase "hiring issues" for "future educational goals." The change to the minutes was made in the meeting.

****Action - Approved (7,0,0)**

2. Announcements

a. From Steve Branz

- Steve reminded board members whose terms are coming to an end at the end of the spring 2016 semester to either step down or indicate a desire to continue to serve on BOGS to the appropriate college associate dean. This applies to **Martina Bremer (COS), Peggy Plato (CASA), and Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA).**

- Steve led discussion on the following issue: Based on a directive (Coded Memorandum) from the Chancellor's Office, Basic Skills courses (A1, A2, A3, & B4) for purposes of both admission and graduation, will need only a C- minimum grade (rather than the current "C or Better"). We must~~MUST~~ honor the C- in Basic Skills for both admissions and graduation. BOGS has a right to comment on related matters but not these CSU level mandates. BOGS~~--We~~ does have the right

and responsibility to weigh in about other university level requirements that are related: (1) Intensive Math (I recommended that this modification remain "C or Better"), (2) A1 and A2 prereqs for A3 (I recommended changing from C or better to C- or better), (3) WST prereq (I recommended changing from C or better to C- or better), & (4) the 100W prereq (I recommended changing from C or better to C- or better). ~~- Steve led discussion on the following issue: Based on a directive (Coded Memorandum) from the Chancellor's Office, Basic Skills courses (A1, A2, A3, & B4) for purposes of both admission and graduation, will need only a C- minimum grade (rather than the current "C or Better"). It was resolved that BOGS members would discuss this issue with the appropriate departments in their respective colleges that teach a large number of A1, A2, A3, & B4 courses, and report back at the next BOGS meeting (May 5). At that point (May 5), BOGS may take a vote on whether or not to support the change of minimum grade requirement from C to C-.~~

- Steve led a discussion about the ~~(~~temporary~~?)~~ need to permit A1 (currently a prereq for A3 along with A2) to change from a prereq to a coreq for A3. Examples were given for the need for this change. Specific wording was not discussed, but the intent to permit the co-req but continue to strongly recommend A1 as a prereq. BOGS will discuss at the next meeting.

b. From Melinda Jackson

- Melinda reminded the committee that the core competencies conference would be on Friday, April 22.
- Melinda also gave a brief, initial report on the GE survey that was distributed to faculty and students earlier in the semester. The survey received 2256 student responses and 480 faculty responses. The plan is to have the data from the survey available by Friday, April 29.

~~c. Steve and the AVP of Undergraduate Studies plan to draft a memo allowing A3 courses to serve as co-requisites along with A1 courses. He will defer this issue until the next meeting.~~

3. Approval of GE Continuing Certification Letters

a. Currently, there is no letter for RTVF 10. Or, more accurately, there *may be* a letter for RTVF 10, but it does not appear in the on-line toolbox the committee has been using. Matt Spangler will let Simon know with the intention of getting a letter for the committee to review before the next BOGS meeting.

b. The committee resolved internal inconsistencies in the following course letters:
- Comm 10. The committee gave the course a B grade and would like to see the syllabus again (by Sept 1, 2016), as the committee feels a number of the course assignments, as currently described in the syllabus, do not adequately satisfy the D1 Area GELOs.

- Comm 168A/B. The committee gave the course a B grade and would like to see the syllabus again (by Sept 1, 2016). The committee feels the course assignments, as currently described in the syllabus, do not adequately satisfy the Area V and S GELOS.

- HIST 15 A. Found a duplicate letter and deleted it.

- Phil 009. The committee requested to see this syllabus again by September 1, 2016.

- RTVF 110. In effect, the committee gave the course a B *and* C grade, requesting that the RTVF department re-submit the syllabus (by September 1, 2016) with revised assignment descriptions that more adequately satisfy the Area S GELOS. The course has also been referred to the Director of Assessment to discuss how future assessment of the course might be done in a more effective manner.

- PSYC 191. The course has been referred to the Director of Assessment to discuss how future assessment of the course might be done in a more effective manner, relying less on student grades and more on what percentage of students did or did not meet the GE learning objectives.

- BIOL 21. The committee changed the rating from a C to an A. The course seems to meet the GELOs and assessment seems to be satisfactory.

4. Two requests of Simon:
- That we change the date on which programs are requested to re-submit materials to BOGS (B grades) from August 1 to September 1, 2016.

- That Simon refrain from sending out the course continuing certification letters until after the next BOGS meeting (May 5), so that committee members have a chance to identify any other letters with internal contradictions.

5. For our next meeting, BOGS members will review the continuing certification letters that each member was initially assigned with an eye toward internal contradictions in the letters. Our goal is to fix any remaining internal contradictions and send the letters out after the May 5 meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee

May 5th, 2016

Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Stephen Branz (EXO), Melinda Jackson (EXO), Simon Rodan (COB)

Apologies for Absence: None

1. Approval of minutes: from April 21, 2016

****Action - Approved with correction (6,0,0)**

2. Matters Arising

Discussion on the C- requirement for basic skills. Majors may still require CE courses that are also major courses to be passed with a C, but discussions with ADs are in progress to "harmonize" to C-.

3. Continuing Certification

Melinda gave a short overview of the survey data.

4. Continuing Certification

- BIOL 101 changed from (C - refer back to program planning for action plan) to (B - additional information requested).
- COMM 10 changed from (A - no issues) to (B - additional information requested)
- The committee made correction to a number or letters in which the wording was seemingly inconsistent with the Board's consensus.

Meeting was adjourned at 4pm.

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

Board of General Studies Committee

May 19th, 2016

Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Stephen Branz (EXO), Thalia Anagnos (AVP UGS), Melinda Jackson (EXO), Simon Rodan (COB), Carl Kemnitz (Deputy Provost)

Apologies for Absence: None

1. Approval of minutes: from May 05, 2016

****Action - Approved with correction (5,0,0)**

2. Matters Arising

Feedback from Communications Studies faculty is that A1 need not be a prerequisite to A3 courses. It is not coded in CMS and is seldom enforced by A3 instructors.

3. Election of chair

Simon Rodan was re-elected as chair (4,0,0)

4. GE Pathways Liaison

Robin Love was proposed as the liaison between the GE Pathways Steering Committee and the Board of General Sstudies. The committee endorsed her in this role (5,0,0)

5, Discussion of GE for program planning

Carl Kemnitz presented an overview of the new CSU Bakersfield GE program. All GE courses were re-submitted for GE approval when Bakersfield transitioned from a quarter to a semester system. New course proposals had to be themed (Quality of life, Revolutionary ideas and innovation, or Sustainability), and had to provide interdisciplinary integration. A committee reviewed 290 new course proposals and approved 190. Areas were coordinated by a Faculty

Learning Community Coordinator. All GE Faculty were required to attend at least one of the learning community meetings each semester. It must be clear to a "reasonable observer" that courses were and remain themed. Faculty were provided stipends for the learning community meetings during the summer and were paid for new course development only when~~once~~ the course was approved. The program has a 1 unit capstone and two 1 unit freshmen courses and a 3 unit junior reflection course. Money for the transition came from a Title V grant for Hispanic student success. Although courses were themed, students didn't have to follow that theme. Before and after the redesign, assessment was/-is being carried out using commensurate protocols and grading rubrics. The changes was carried out using a sequence of different committees, and included two day-long faculty wide consultation events. Theming applied also to the "Golden 4" (WASC core competencies). All courses must contextualize content and reinforce skills. Themes can be extended by one course to a themed minor.

The preliminary results of the student and faculty surveys were presented. A shared Google doc will be set up for additional exploratory questions to be suggested by BOGS members.
Some suggestions at the meeting were:

- Tabulate advising question by colleges that have mandatory advising.
- Tabulate logistics questions by whether students had ever used advising of any kind.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40pm.