

**UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES
MEETING #12, March 20, 2007**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brown, Burges, Chesbro, Crawford, Everett, Hurlbut, Itin, Kornreich, Moore, Powell, Sonntag, Van Duzer

MEMBERS ABSENT: Grazul

VISITORS PRESENT: Rees Hughes, Student Affairs; Mary Kay, Library; Ginny Kelly, AIR Center; Judy Little, Assessment Coordinator; Tina Manos, Kinesiology; Harry Wells, AHSS

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. The chair announced the following:

1. the next UCC meeting is to begin at 10:30.
2. the GE Rigor Survey data will be on the web and available for review by the end of the week. He will deliver the Executive Summary to the UCC. It will also be available on-line.

II. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

In formal session, M/Crawford, S/Brown to approve the minutes of Meeting #9, 1/30/07, with the following corrections: 1) under "Visitors Present" change COPS to PS; 2) on page two, Item II.B. , second paragraph, third sentence, change the word "can" to "will"; 3) in the last sentence of the same paragraph insert the following: ". . . consider requesting reports run from Banner . . ." 4) on page three, second paragraph, second to last sentence, delete entire sentence. The motion passed unanimously.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Articulation for International Baccalaureate Credits

In informal session, Mr. Kornreich introduced Ms. Tina Manos, a member of the Academic Senate Educational Policies Committee. Ms. Manos distributed two handouts: (1) A Guide to the IB Diploma Programme for Universities and Colleges; (2) International Baccalaureate Program, UCC - March 20, 2007. She explained that the Educational Policies Committee has been involved with this issue for about a month, noting that within recent years McKinleyville High School has created an IB program and they have developed advanced coursework to prepare students to sit for the IP and AP exams. She said that the Educational Policies Committee is inclined to accept the IB exam test scores for college credit. This effort was particularly prompted by two students who completed the McKinleyville High program. Ms. Manos explained that one of these students went on to attend UCLA and received more college credit for their IB work than the student who attended HSU. She alerted the UCC that the California Department of Education is also very interested in seeing articulation agreements established statewide, and would like to have a blanket policy, since presently there is a variance between campuses. She said that McKinleyville High would like HSU to expand the current number of IB units for which we presently articulate college credit. They have requested that those students successfully completing the IB program and the associated exams be granted 20 semester units of credit at HSU. This would be comparable to the UC system's IB articulation. She said that they have not requested that students must score 30 or above on the exam to receive this credit, as is required by the UC system.

Continuing informally, Ms. Manos said that there are six different exams, scored on a skill level of 1 - 7. Many colleges and universities are accepting a score of four (good) and above. The problem, she explained, is trying to translate IB scoring with AP scoring. She noted that part of the CSU effort has been to build

databases to better understand the equivalencies between the two. Mr. Powell said that there is still some disagreement as to whether HSU's policy of accepting a score of three on AP exams is a good idea. Ms. Manos explained that the data she is providing is from the IB organization, noting that very little external data exists. It is her understanding that the courses offered by McKinleyville High are quite rigorous as are the IB exams. According to Ms. Manos, McKinleyville High has asked that we accept both HL (high level) and SL (Standard level) courses. In response to Mr. Eldridge's query, Ms. Manos said she would ask the representative from the Department of Education who is coming to discuss IB, whether Title 5 speaks to IB articulation. In response to Mr. Itin's query, Ms. Manos said that Lewis and Clark College requires a score of five and above on IB exams. She noted that Oregon State and Oxford also require a score of five and above. She added that CSU Chico, Sacramento and Sonoma all require a score of 4 or above on the higher level exams.

Informally, the chair asked for a short series of questions of what needs to be answered to facilitate a broader conversation at a later time. In response to Ms. Hurlbut's query, Ms. Manos said she believes AP exam scores were abandoned in favor of IB exam scores due to national dissatisfaction with AP. Ms. Manos invited interested UCC members to attend next Tuesday's IB meeting with the California Department of Education representative. Mr. Kornreich said that he will order IB exams for the UCC to review.

To accommodate the "time certain" item, the agenda was addressed in the following order:

IV. NEW BUSINESS

FIG Annual Report

In informal session, Mr. Hughes distributed next year's FIG brochure, noting that there are over twenty FIG options available to Freshmen next year, including two GE Pilot offerings, Humboldt Connections. He explained that many FIGs include the required ENGL 100 or 100I courses as well as foundational majors' classes. He noted that we are anticipating approximately 1100 new students in the Fall, and it is expected about half of these students will enroll in FIGs. Mr. Hughes said that many FIGs are directed at students in need of English or Math remediation, noting that for the third year we are offering a Math Confidence FIG. In addition, Mr. Hughes said that this year a two unit seminar is being offered tailored to students coming to HSU with AP credit. He explained that we anticipate 200 students coming to HSU in the Fall through the WUE program and many of these students tend to be at a higher level academically than the average entering Freshman. Adding this two unit seminar is an effort to help insure the retention of these students.

Continuing informally, Mr. Hughes distributed the second promotional piece, explaining that this was sent to all admitted Freshmen. This will be followed up by an email reminder to these same students about the FIG opportunities. He explained that for several years they have reviewed the satisfaction and retention FIG data, adding that there has always been a positive difference in terms of retention for FIG versus non-FIG participants. In terms of academic performance, Mr. Hughes said they continue to learn new information and attempt to adjust the FIGs in response, if needed. In terms of satisfaction, Mr. Hughes distributed student evaluation results from last Fall, noting that it is not inclusive of all FIG participants. He said that, in general, the satisfaction level is fairly highly rated, but the weakest link is the one unit seminar, emphasizing that this year they received a \$7000 grant to create a more concentrated training experience for faculty teaching the seminars.

Mr. Hughes noted, informally, that this year there were three FIGs that were not well received. In the absence of these poor student satisfaction ratings for these three FIGs, there was an 80% positive rating that students would repeat this experience. Mr. Van Duzer suggested that they examine whether some of the

student dissatisfaction responses might be linked to the failure ratios in the courses. Mr. Hughes was grateful for the suggestion and responded that their focus has been more of a triage approach and they have not necessarily examined as closely as they might those best practices that they know work well.

B. WASC Outcomes Update

Informally, Mr. Van Duzer distributed the proposed university wide outcomes. Mr. Powell, as a member of the WASC Theme 1 Action Team involved in developing these outcomes, said that we should remind ourselves of how much feedback already provided to the Theme 1 team in order to arrive at these draft outcomes, noting that this add this very feedback has resulted in substantial change to the original draft outcomes. He said that all of the feedback they received has been posted on the WASC website, adding that after reading this feedback it will be evident to anyone that there are different strong themes running throughout, and it is very evident how the Action Team arrived at the final proposed outcomes reflect through these strong themes. The chair asked who will be involved in the effort to deconstruct these themes for assessment purposes. Mr. Powell said that the Action Team kept this in mind all the way through the process, and will shepard along this process, asking for advise in order to gain more insights, sharing the various drafts throughout the process.

In informal discussion, there was some concern expressed about the missing emphasis on math skills. Ms. Sonntag suggested rephrasing outcome B to read “critical and creative thinking skills as well as quantitative reasoning skills” Additional discussion included the need to examine the use of the GWPE as a tool for determining our students’ critical analysis skills, and working with the President to assure that this occurs. Ms. Little noted that the GWPE is considered a very weak assessment tool and presently consideration is being given to using a portfolio assessment method. Ms. Little added that the Action Team is moving next in the direction of determining how to assess these outcomes more holistically, rather than parsing them out. They will also need to address the question of who has the responsibility for assessing these outcomes. Ms. Little said that there is some discussion about how this assessment might be incorporated into the program review process. She added that once these outcomes are adopted the matter of assessment will come back to the UCC and the colleges in order to achieve consistency and mutual support for future assessment planning. Ms. Sonntag pointed out that an easy statistic to be utilized for assessment of item G is to determine how many students are signing the graduation pledge. Ms. Hurlbut added that the wording “graduates are prepared to:” does not indicate that we would follow-up with students after they have graduated. She suggested rewording to “graduates will:” Mr. Wells said that the Action Team was deliberate about this wording because it indicates that students will be prepared to succeed. He noted that considerable conversation occurred about what can be demonstrated and what students are prepared for. Ms. Burges explained that the wording “graduates are prepared to” was selected by the Action Team because it conveyed both the expectation that students would have an adequate background and the expectation that they also have a certain level of intention.

Ms. Kelly questioned, informally, the statement under item E, that “HSU graduates are prepared to succeed . . . in advanced study”, pointing out that the minimum gpa for graduates is a 2.0 and standard graduate programs require a gpa of 2.5. She asked how we would be able to justify that all of our graduates are prepared for advanced study. Mr. Van Duzer noted that it would be a very expensive proposition for the University to track students after they graduate and he suggested one possibility would be to have the academic programs take responsibility for student surveying, with the goal of a 50% response rate. Mr. Itin felt that an effort such as this would fail if delegated to the departments.

Ms. Hurlbut said they attempted to survey the graduates in her department, but the effort was never completed as the task became too overwhelming given the many other departmental demands. Ms. Little stated that there is clear opportunity for partnering with the efforts of those in the office of Vice President Gunsalus since he has been discussing the importance of developing an on-going connection between our graduates and the University. Ms. Botzler said it will be important to define the role of the Alumni Association in this type of effort, as well as better bolster our office of institutional data and research.

Continuing informally, Mr. Crawford suggested that Item F (“graduates are prepared to take responsibility for developing personal goals and practicing life long learning”) may allow us to focus on what we are directly teaching and what students are picking up by osmosis. He said he was not sure that we have a way for students to identify personal goals. Ms. Burges responded that the idea that students be self actualizing was expressed very strongly in many arenas. Mr. Wells added that it is really wonderful that through this process we are becoming more clear in realizing who we are and where we are going. Ms. Kelly pointed out the connections between the goals of GE Area E, Human Integration, and Item F, noting that there may be opportunity to assess this outcome through assessment of Area E. Ms. Hurlbut stated that what is really key to her is the goal of students’ taking responsibility for life long learning. She said that these outcomes are significantly vague, noting that what she considers “good writing” and what the University considers “good writing” might be very different. She emphasized that she is hopeful that the assessment piece will shed light on how to address these potential differences.

Further discussion included concerns about Item G (“graduates are prepared to pursue social justice, promote environmental responsibility, and improve economic conditions in their workplace and communities”). Ms. Burges explained that this outcome primarily arose from student voices, but that many faculty also were in support. Ms. Moore pointed out that ten years ago these types of ideas were embraced by this campus, but presently she feels changes have occurred and now the balance is more 60/40 with 40% of our students not caring at all about the ideas expressed in this outcome. Mr. Itin noted that there is a great deal of room for interpretation in this outcome and that there is not necessarily agreement between this outcome and what is being said in prior outcomes. Ms. Burges responded that this very point was discussed by the Action Team. Ms. Little noted that one of the purposes for developing these outcomes is to widely communicate this information to future students. Mr. Crawford added that Item E (HSU graduates are prepared to succeed in the workforce and in advanced study) does not mean that our graduates are ready to go out into the world and do this but, instead, that they have received adequate background to do this. It was announced that the deadline for additional feedback is April 2.

V. Brief Discussion

Evaluating Changes to GE

Informally, the chair stated that as a result of the budget crisis this past year GE class sizes increased 16% and there were 15% fewer GE sections. He explained that CNRS and AHSS took two differing approaches when addressing savings associated with GE sections. AHSS increased many class sections by a few seats, and combined multiple sections into fewer larger sections. CRNS eliminated entire sections and dramatically increased the size of other sections. It was noted that the Institutions section sizes now range from 45 - 75 students, with one section enrolling 150 students. Mr. Van Duzer said that if we run the GE rigor survey again we would be able to see how these changes are reflected in terms of pedagogy and student learning. He said that he was somewhat concerned with the elimination of courses over the past few years, although this trend

seems to have stemmed somewhat recently. He noted that the Provost perceives that the next round of cuts will affect majors courses more than GE, adding that he learned from the Provost that, in terms of the UCC's oversight for GE we may have moved too far in the opposite direction from the previous era when tighter oversight was exercised by the former Undergraduate Dean, Whitney Buck. The chair expressed concern about GE oversight for some of the breadth areas that reside solely in the colleges in which their direction and focus might be more aligned with their majors. Mr. Van Duzer asked that the UCC consider the role it should play to productively partner with the colleges in making the best decisions for the entire GE program. Mr. Crawford noted that in CNRS they recognize that different departments have different relationships to the GE program, adding that the biggest struggle is deciding how to divide the resources to allow programs to flourish as much as possible during such tight budgetary times. The other issue, according to Mr. Crawford, is that we are presently under the onus of meeting SFR targets and scrambling to find efficiencies. He added that it is hoped that in another year something other than SFR will be used to define how departments are operating efficiently. The chair suggested that the UCC could consider proposing more involvement in the processing of GE curriculum forms, in order to become more informed and possibly apply a more holistic level of integrity for the GE program as a whole. He asked that UCC members give some thought to the best approach in preparation for discussion at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned.