



**SAN JOSÉ STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

Board of General Studies Committee

November 20, 2014

Minutes

**Present:** Robert Cooper, Andrew Fleck, Robin Love, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan, Birsen Sirkeci Julie Sliva, Matthew Spangler

**Absent:**

**Guest:** Steve Branz, Melinda Jackson, Dennis Jaehne

**Start:** 2:04pm

1. Announcement from AVP Dennis Jaehne Graduate and Undergraduate Programs
  - a. Reorganization in the Graduate and Undergraduate Program office has pulled Steve Branz out of BOGS and GE.
  - b. Bob is chair for Fall and Simon will take over the leadership of BOGS in the Spring.
2. Engl 2 Proposal
  - a. Discussed an email ballot and we did not end up getting that done
  - b. Were there any concerns upon additional review
  - c. Removal of C2 made it a strong case for A3.

**\*\*Action- Approve ENGL 2 for A3-7-Yes 0-No, 0-Abstain**

3. WLL- Damian Bacich (guest)
  - a. They reviewed BOGS comments and have adjusted the syllabi based on comments
  - b. The main changes they addressed were in the specification of word count in Japanese. Addressing great works in Spanish and French, inserted classic poems for French and films for Spanish on works and culture.
4. Comm Studies 45
  - a. Modifications were not easily identifiable
  - b. C2 still did not seem to be addressed, the key concerns we addressed did not seem to be addressed.
  - c. List of readings seemed like a copy and paste from a endnote.
  - d. Concern is this would be the example for an A3/C2 course and we should have it at a high standard so others can compare.
  - e. The real question becomes is it reasonable for a course to incorporate the both of these under a course. Is it feasible?
  - f. Maybe it should be reconceptualized to include the A3/C2
  - g. List readings and how they assist the curriculum in meeting outcomes. They should be in a table format possibly at the end of the greensheet.
  - h. Andrew and Matt will touch base and Matt will tackle issues with department.
  - i. We should maybe strongly encourage this time that she should move forward with A3 and come back for C2 after we get a few more models together.
5. ChAd quick summary on GE review
  - a. broke it down into two parts, closing the cycle on assessment, Continuing certification via greensheets (which were not included).
  - b. Reports are fairly generic. Improvements were resource oriented instead of curricular.

- c. We believe we need to clear up the guidelines to clarify what we are looking for and obtaining assessment data.
  - d. There was an understanding that maybe the summary would include the data. But the policy was created to be vague.
  - e. Let's start thinking about how to revise guidelines, what are we looking for, what do we want to know.
  - f. Some summary assessment data. Looking at class roster and the amount of students who obtained the learning outcomes (via passing grades).
  - g. We can decertify, we would merely request they update greensheets to improve and align with GE.
  - h. Assessment portion we can discuss the missing elements and that they should look at assessing and reviewing that data in the next few years.
  - i. Considering updating Annual GE Assessment report as well.
6. Biol 55 proposal
- a. Greensheet does not clearly indicate GE area B4
  - b. More detail on how it is meeting B4
  - c. The BIOL 1A/B pre-requisite limits who would be able to take the course. Is that intentional.
  - d. If this is created for BOGS it is implicit, but if not it is vague and unclear to students. They should spell out what they are indeed doing in the classroom. (No discussion on how they are doing the math).
  - e. Take content from the certification request and put into syllabus.
  - f. Students should know what group project should be and should have more guidance on what will be expected of them
  - g. Make links to LO's a little more clear.
  - h. Clarify LO1 regarding verbal form. Be more explicit on how that will be covered.

7. Geol 8 proposal
- a. Exemplary proposal. Everything was pretty clear.
  - b. Gives examples to questions without even side noted to explain further.
  - c. Please post to site as example with red note

**\*\*Action- Approve GEOL 008 for B2- 8-Yes 0-No, 0-Abstain**

8. Geol 9 proposal
- a. Accessibility issue with table in syllabus
  - b. Not as clear as GEOL 8 proposal, the linkages between course materials and assignments do not align as well. No discussion on how course discussions would be moderated, examples would be helpful.
  - c. Example of how they will address the SLO's in coursework/classroom experiences.
  - d. Too vague
  - e. Supplemental information to the greensheets
  - f. GE outcomes for B3 are not clearly outlined. (then again the B3 outcomes are not listed in the GE guidelines). Is it that we want programs to address what B3 outcomes will be aligned with (i.e. B2 B3 or B3 B4)
  - g. If Learning outcome are explicit, then the students will know exactly what is going to be learned.
  - h. Example of what a lab assignment would be and how it would meet an outcome.
  - i. Learning objective 1 is explicitly addressed in lab experience, could they do the same for LO 3.

Adjourn 3:55pm



Board of General Studies Committee  
December 4, 2014  
Minutes

**Present:** Robert Cooper, Andrew Fleck, Robin Love, Peggy Plato, Birsen Sirkeci, Matthew Spangler

**Absent:** Simon Rodan, Julie Sliva,

**Guest:** Melinda Jackson, Damian Bacich

**Start:** 2:05pm

1. Approve Meeting [Minutes from November 20, 2014](#)

**\*\*Action- Approve Meeting Minutes from 11/20/14: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

2. Comm Studies 45 Update

- a. Matt and Andy met to discuss the feedback they should provide to Stephanie about making this a C2 course. They want to know if she is truly serious about still including it so they can spend the time setting up their notes to send over to COMM
- b. An email was sent suggesting they go forward with A3, then come back for C2 later. However they plan to resubmit.
- c. Send more detail feedback so they can make appropriate judgement about whether or not to include C2. Bob will send out on behalf of the “sub-committee”

3. WLL- Damian Bacich guest

- a. CHIN 1A- Assessment language and schedule was issue last time it appears it was addressed.

**\*\*Action- Approve CHIN 1A for C2: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

- b. CHIN 1B- issues we had seem to have been addressed. Assessment seems to be addressed.

**\*\*Action- Approve CHIN 1B for C2: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

- c. JPN 1A- Assessment looks good. Additional discussion on cultural work is better than it was.

**\*\*Action- Approve JPN 1A for C2: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

- d. JPN 1B- No issues.

**\*\*Action- Approve JPN 1B for C2: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

- e. SPAN 1A-

- i. GLO 1 is assessed with 2 and 3, it is a bit light for GLO 1. Should work on including more assessment of GLO 1 through multiple assignments or other area during semester.
- ii. Confusing when they list 3 content areas together with GLO’s and then list GLO’s and content objectives later. It is confusing on greensheet and may also be confusing come assessment.

**\*\*Action- Approve SPAN 1A for C2: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

- f. SPAN 1B- Has same GLO Assessment issues as 1A

**\*\*Action- Approve SPAN 1B for C2: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

- g. FREN 1A-

- i. GLO and Content Objectives confusion like Spanish, 2-3GLO’s mixed in with content objectives.

- ii. Too many lists of outcomes, some seem similar could they be condensed. Have GE list next to GLO.

**\*\*Action- Approve FREN 1A for C2: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

- h. FREN 1B- Labeling of GLO, Content Objectives and GE assessment schedules.

**\*\*Action- Approve FREN 1B for C2: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

4. GEOL 9

- a. Revisions are a lot more clearer.

**\*\*Action- Approve GEOL 009 for B1, B2, B3: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

5. BIOL 55

- a. Group project is clearer and addresses how it will support GLO's
- b. Supporting documents were quite helpful in looking/reviewing overall proposal.

**\*\*Action- Approve BIOL 55 for B4: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

6. ChAd GE Review

- a. Assessment is set at either very developed or highly developed.
- b. Rubrics and signature assignments were great and considered highly developed. Clearly designed course content and rubrics.
- c. Developing a plan for additional follow up on changes found, needs to be raised a bit more to very developed.

7. SISS quick summary on GE review

- a. Used to offer 20 GE courses, now offer 17-18 across both Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social Sciences.
- b. Assessment schedules seem to be confusing for GE review. Old assessment form used to not link to program planning, the new form does now.
- c. There were variations in the GE Offerings. Some were quite good in meeting outcomes and there were some that have a few issues.
- d. GLO's not clearly stated on some Greensheets. Links on assessment did not seem to be consistent, they state they plan to work on that, so we should look at that in five years.
- e. AAS 33A/B they didn't have all the correct GLO's. There was no official set of assessment outcomes at time of their preparation for this review.

8. ENGL Proposal

- a. ENGL 2 was approved for A3, this course will be the additional level of 2nd semester composition.
- b. ENGL 1A is proposing to be ENGL 1, will be A2.
- c. This proposal is only C2, a page in the proposal still lists A3. The GE Area at top of greensheet and in course description still list A3, probably just a typographical error.
- d. This course was actually proposed as 2E to address the engineering (or A3 waiver programs and transfers) who need 2nd semester composition, and have already completed an A3.
- e. Clearly meets C2 content and GLO's
- f. C2 content vs. COMM 45 and this is more comprehensive
- g. A meeting between ENGL Chair Shannon Miller, Writing Program Administrator Richard McNabb, Noelle Brada-Williams (ENGL Faculty), H&A Dean Leadership, AVP Jaehne, Articulation Director Terri Eden and other UGS representative to determine appropriate numbering and plan to change numbering (if determined).

**\*\*Action- Approve ENGL 1B (possibly named 2E) for C2: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

Adjourn 3:20pm



**SAN JOSÉ STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

Board of General Studies Committee  
February 5, 2015  
Minutes

**Present:** Andrew Fleck, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan, Birsen Sirkeci, Jon Hendricks, Matthew Spangler

**Absent:** Robin Love,

**Guest:** Dennis Jaehne, Melinda Jackson, Nicole Loeser

**Start:** 2:04pm

1. Plans for BOGS Spring Items
  - a. Back log of GE Program Reviews
  - b. Back log of GE Reviews and formal feedback
  - c. Prepare for WASC visit
  - d. Any new courses
  - e. Agendas will be sent out a week before with links to necessary documents for meetings. All items must be submitted a week before meeting to be considered.

2. Approve Meeting Minutes from December 4, 2014

**\*\*Action- Approve Meeting Minutes from December 4th:** 5-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain

3. COMM 45 for A3 only
  - a. Was originally supposed to be approved for A3 or C2, a discussion with Stephanie Coopman was had over the break regarding the issues with proposal, and she decided to just have it approved for A3.
  - b. Assessment of oral presentations online is questionable. How do they plan to do so? Could we ask them to clarify how they plan to assess (some sort of grading model), since they are breaking ground. This is part of content not GE, so do we have a right to ask them to clarify and ensure there is assessment done?

**\*\*Action- Approve COMM 45 for Area A3:** 5-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain

4. HIST/POLS 15A/B for Areas US1 & D2 and US2, US3 & D3
  - a. They were asked to add the designations to A and B so students could walk away from the course with some portion of the GE's.
  - b. The departments decided to rework the course when they attempted to meet this request, which now needs BOGS blessing to move forward.
  - c. Under this new adjustment the curriculum content was able to be adjusted and allow the departments to offer the courses more often (A and B in the same semester), as well as adjust their assessment schedule.

**\*\*Action- Approve HIST/POLS 15 A/B GE designation split adjustments:** 6-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

5. Recommendation to appoint Assessment Director as an ex-officio member of BOGS
  - a. Due to the workload and need for continuity and communication with Assessment between Program Planning and BOGS.

**\*\*Action- Approve Recommendation moving forward to Curriculum and Research: 6-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

6. GE program review

***ACTION ITEM: Simon will develop a memo to deans encouraging the GE Self-Study GE review submissions. Nicole will clean up the worksheet with what is actually submitted.***

- a. Worksheet discussion
  - i. Nicole will update
  - ii. Assessment schedule should be included
  - iii. Closing the loop- Measure something, Identify what needs to be adjusted for improvement, adjust it and measure again.
  - iv. The above practice should/would be included as part of their assessment schedule.
  - v. Continuing certification should be done during annual review.
    1. When they do not submit all the required information or we need them to adjust/update their greensheet how do we request and allow that submission? Annual Assessment is perfect time to do so. We will need a staff member in GUP to track for accountability.
    2. What is our communication method to departments?
      - a. We will track on spreadsheet, reviewers will also fill out a “template” document that outlines issues with a course. These documents will be sent to the Chair and Associate Dean from the BOGS Chair.
      - b. Simon and Nicole will develop a form template for members to use. Then all comments will come into an excel document.
- b. Hold review for next meeting

7. Any other business

Adjourn: 3:47pm

Future meeting dates this semester: Feb 19th, Mar 5th, 19th, Apr 2nd, 16th, 30th, May 14th





**SAN JOSÉ STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

Board of General Studies Committee  
February 19, 2015  
Minutes

**Present:** Robin Love, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan, Birsen Sirkeci, Jon Hendricks, Matthew Spangler

**Absent:** Andrew Fleck,

**Guest:** Dennis Jaehne, Melinda Jackson, Nicole Loeser

**Start:** 2:00pm

**1. Approval of Minutes**

**\*\*Action- Approve Meeting Minutes from February 5th: 4-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain**

**2. Matters arising**

**a. The Missing Backlog**

- i. We need letters to ECON and BIOL regarding their GE Program Review documents are due to BOGS by April 1st. So they have one month to submit.
- ii. We have 4 programs that are held up from last semester, we have some that need feedback from 4 years past. We should go back to our Colleges and find out what they need feedback for or feel they were not given in order to successfully move forward. This way we can correlate what we have and attempt to provide feedback responses to support departments.

**3. Program Review feedback process**

- a. Using the Google form.
- b. We want the typically (always coming up) questions added.
- c. There has been a question about Qualitative vs. Quantitative responses to their assessment data. Some departments don't feel like they should have to provide numbers, others do. What if we ask for "evidence" instead of "data". Asking for a general sense of what has occurred in their assessment.
- d. Has there been a "process of reflection" question added to assessment report.
- e. Capture reviewer name for archival purposes.
- f. We have a sort of 3 prong process for how reviews will get to departments
  - i. Letter to Provost- Documents were sent in at same time as Program Plan and therefore the BOGS review will be included as an attachment to the Letter to the Provost. 1-2 Month turn around.
  - ii. Action Plan Meeting- Documents were sent to BOGS after the Program Review was submitted, it has missed the Letter to the Provost send off and will now be provided no later than a week before the scheduled Action Plan Meeting so it can be discussed.

- iii. Post Action Plan- Department does not provide GE Review documents, it becomes part of their Action Plan items to complete before next review by a specific date outlined in Plan. Once submitted and completed the letter from BOGS will be sent directly to department chair and copied to the Program Planning chair and GUP for archiving.
    - g. Trusting the Qualitative responses with no data to support.
    - h. Every learning outcome needs to be linked to assessment activities
    - i. Promote Course Coordinator responsibility handout (webpage?) to coordinators so they can begin to manage/assess their courses appropriately.
      - i. GUP Staff will begin working on pulling that information together.
- 4. Program Review ('breakout session')
  - a. Child and Adolescent Development (CHAD) (Simon & John)
    - 1. We will review this letter offline to ensure it gets to CHAD before their March 2 Action Plan Meeting.
  - b. World languages (WLL) (Robin and Birsen)
    - i. This group will work on a new form that will auto fill a form letter to simplify process.
    - ii. We will review this letter at our next meeting
  - c. Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social Sciences (SISS) (Matthew and Peggy)
    - i. We will review this letter at our next meeting
- 5. Process Review
  - a. Formal letters (standard inclusions?) text.
    - i. Comments come directly from form.
    - ii. Start with a positive instead of a critical start before going into suggestions for improvement.
      - 1. You did great at...
      - 2. Lack of evidence on....
      - 3. We are looking for reflection on.....
  - b. Informal communication process
    - 1. Maybe if we have a sense that the department would prefer we talk before sending letter, if not just steer clear and send letter.
    - 2. Keep invitation open for discussion after the letter goes out. We are here to help improve your assessment.
- 6. Any Other Business
  - a. We will begin posting our meeting minutes into our webpage. Clean up of minutes will occur at approval.

**\*\*Action- Approve posting our Meeting Minutes to website: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

Adjourn: 3:42pm

Future meeting dates this semester: Mar 5th, 19th, Apr 2nd, 16th, 30th, May 14th



**SAN JOSÉ STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

Board of General Studies Committee

March 5, 2015

Minutes (Internal committee use only)

**Present:** Andrew Fleck, Robin Love, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan, Birsen Sirkeci, Jon Hendricks, Matthew Spangler

**Absent:**

**Guest:** Dennis Jaehne, Melinda Jackson, Nicole Loeser

**Start:** 2:00pm

**1. Approval of Minutes**

**\*\*Action- Approve Meeting Minutes from February 19th: 6-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain**

**2. Matters arising**

- a. CHAD follow up- Thankful for write up. Discussed how they resubmit to realign their course with the GELO's.
- b. So what is process for a course that is not deemed to continue certification?
  - i. We'll add process to letter
  - ii. Department updates and submits to BOGS to review.

**3. Fall 14 Remaining GE Requests**

- a. ENGL 20
  - i. The content meets the learning outcomes, being able to offer once they would be able to find where to strengthen their course content and will be able to improve on content/readings/etc.
  - ii. How does Graphic Novel fit into the idea of students reading the right amount of work, since these books are typically smaller. Will they be looking at the storyline, etc. What is the added thing that will make this University level, considering most readers of graphic novels are youth.
  - iii. What are the lenses in which they are reviewing the writings.
  - iv. Fixes:
    1. Greensheet schedule is a bit weak to address the issues of how they are evaluating the work.
    2. Clearly address learning outcomes
    3. Objectives, don't use program goals (The italicized info right before the actual course/gelo outcome statements).
    4. Course assignment detail. Assignments are reasonable, but some of the assignments could use a little more detail to show how the outcomes are being met.
    5. The linkages are not there like we have seen in other courses.
    6. Number of typos, delete the extra erroneous text,
    7. the CS factor does not align with the C2 seat restriction.

- 8. GELO 2 talks about personal responses, but does not see a direct assignment with it.
- v. Syllabus update required and resubmit.
- b. ENGL 21
  - i. Same as 20 remove the GE outcomes and just the specific ones for the course.
  - ii. They include a few areas that list out how the assignment matches the GELO. There is a research paper that seems to be missing.
  - iii. Please add a few more sentences on the assignment.
  - iv. Course goals and learning objectives has a duplication on the second page.
  - v. Statement on how they are addressing personal response to works on the GELO2
  - vi. Discuss how course will be taught, per guidelines
  - vii. It is pretty close to approval, with these adjustments

**\*\*We should highlight the GE guidelines with the content that needs to be included**

**\*\*Inviting people to come in?- They could come and talk with committee at resubmit time.**

#### 4. Program Review Letters

- a. WLL
  - i. It appears we have the wrong link to review correctly
- b. SISS
  - i. a bit of the comment language is missing.
  - ii. On 138, how can they provide assessment data when it doesn't exist? So we should provide an explanation about what happened and provide an assessment plan for future. This can be included as an Action Item in their Official report with PPC. Assessment schedule due by October 1st, 2015, by October 1st 2016 we want to see data included in your annual GE assessment report. Greensheet updated as soon as possible.
- c. We will adjust the form and process a bit since we have found little errors and such.

#### 5. Greensheet wording 'flexibility'

**\*\*Table**

6. NUFS - Simon and Andrew will start reviewing.

7. COMM

**\*\*Table**

8. AOB

- a. BOGS Tools web page

**\*\*Table**

Adjourn: 4:05pm

Future meeting dates this semester: 19th, Apr 2nd, 16th, 30th, May 14th



**SAN JOSÉ STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

Board of General Studies Committee  
March 19, 2015

Minutes (Internal committee use only)

**Present:** Andrew Fleck, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan, Birsen Sirkeci, Jon Hendricks, Matthew Spangler

**Apologies:** Robin Love

**Guest:** Melinda Jackson

**Start:** 2:05pm

1. Approval of Minutes

**\*\*Action- Approve Meeting Minutes with adjustments from March 5th:** 6-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

2. Matters arising

- a. Are we editing/preparing the reviews in the most effective way?
- b. Letters reviewed in advance of meeting with group editing/discussion occurring during meetings for overall approval from committee.
- c. COMM studies GE package needs follow up so we can review

3. Fall 14 Remaining GE Requests

- a. ENGL 20
  - i. The linkages between research assignments and GELO 1 are not strong enough. Concern is 2 assessment schedules and greensheets, it appears they do not understand the assessment schedule concept.  
CLARIFICATION: The documents are apparently updated versions.
  - ii. Assessment plan statement is the same as ENGL 21, original version had more language directed at 20 unlike newer version. Suggest going back to prior version.
  - iii. Not all changes suggested at last meeting have been implemented: but readings have changed for the better.
  - iv. Class Schedule was much improved, though assessment schedule is not as strong as it was before.
  - v. Description of what the assignments might be will alleviate the concerns we have about linkage to GELOs. Key thing is how students will be assessed to meet these outcomes (papers, tests?).
  - vi. Spirit of the class is definitely something the committee appreciates.
  - vii. CS number still needs to be adjusted.
- b. ENGL 21
  - i. Should there be info on how GELO 1 is getting assessed? Asking them to add more isn't requesting a lot.

**\*\*Action Item:** Start getting permission to post the course syllabi the committee thinks are exemplary to post as “Sample” syllabi for each area to support others as they develop new proposals.

4. Spring GE Request

a. LING24

i. Clarify/Clean up:

1. Greensheet says AND, Proposal Memo says OR
2. Acronyms are either incorrect or spelled wrong
3. Remove erroneous material “(optional)” under various policy notices
4. Qualify statement on “C or better” statement since D1 does not have to be passed with C or better, although A3 does.
5. Classroom protocol area either needs to be removed or add the expectations.

ii. Syllabus should be what student sees, additional information the proposer wants the committee to see should either be via a review comment or highlighted in color.

**\*\*Action- Approve LING 24 for Area A3 OR D1: 6-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

5. Greensheets

- a. Maybe a task force should be developed to look at what students are actually looking at on a greensheet
- b. Develop a policy website that all syllabi and canvas shells can link to.

6. GE approvals/requests, what is valid?

- a. Can we offer both A3 and D1 as a 3-unit course, won't this become a overall GE count issue? Shouldn't we be making it an OR?
- b. Should we be offering 2 or more GE's for limited units (like 3 units)?
- c. There is a new GE pathways streamlining, a block advising that allows students to take a group of GE based on an area of interest. Which would allow students to complete GE under limited units under a specific umbrella.
- d. We should approach 2 GE areas like a venn diagram. If there is definite intersection and is looking to offer more than 3 units that we could review and approve a proposal of that concept.

7. Greensheet wording 'flexibility'

- a. We expect all language of the GE Learning Outcome verbatim from GE guidelines in the greensheets
- b. Faculty should then align those outcomes with what the course is doing to meet those LO's.
- c. The assessment will then be able to tie the outcomes to the assignments?

8. NUFS, KIN, HUM

- a. NUFS- Andy and Simon have started preparing the letters. They will review the ones they didn't write and prepare them for committee review.

- b. KIN and HUM are final backlog, we will do those after we finish NUFFS, SISS and WLL.
9. LOI statement
- a. WASC is coming to campus and this is part of the report that BOGS will have to respond and address with the WASC visit in April.
  - b. Remove statement that University perception is that BOGS is the GE police.
  - c. The PPC Chair, Assessment Director and BOGS Chair all agreed to develop a program planning review process for the BOGS committee. This will probably happen in Fall.
10. AOB
- a. What process looks like after Review is complete? Let's nail down what departments will need to do to keep course certified (i.e. resubmit updating greensheet, assessment schedule.
  - b. Providing a statement to the GE proposal process, that it is much like a journal, many revisions to get to the great offering.

Adjourn: 4:05pm

Future meeting dates this semester: Apr 2nd, 16th, 30th, May 14th



**SAN JOSÉ STATE**  
UNIVERSITY  
Board of General Studies Committee  
April 2, 2015  
Minutes

**Present:** Robin Love, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan, Birsen Sirkeci, Jon Hendricks, Matthew Spangler  
**Apologies:** Andrew Fleck,  
**Guest:** Melinda Jackson

**Start:** 2:05pm

1. Approval of Minutes

**\*\*Action- Approve Meeting Minutes with adjustments from March 19th:** 5-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain

2. Matters arising

a. Document location is getting difficult. Want to make sure notes are located.

3. GE Program Review process and language

- a. A and B courses were reviewed on the same report. We should be asking them to review each separately, in order to provide the assessment data for each.
- b. Clean slate, starting from here forward develop a schedule and plan for assessing going forward.
- c. We might want to consider bringing department into the discussion at some point as we tend to make assumptions based on the documents we are given, which is not always the true story.
- d. New process- Review materials, meet with department chair to discuss possible slip ups (if necessary), then prepare official letter and process for continued certification.
  - i. Add to our review form, check box for whether a meeting is required with department before letter dissemination. Meeting would be slightly informal with the Department Chair and course coordinator and/or assessment coordinator and one to two BOGS members.

4. WLL

- a. Will ask for updated syllabi by Fall
- b. Submit Assessment Schedule
- c. Request additional assessment data in next report
- d. German program is an issue, but if they are discontinuing program it is not a large issue.

**\*\*Action- Approve letters for World Languages-** 6-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

5. SISS

- a.



6. NUFS
7. HUM Distribution
8. AOB

**Adjourn: 4:05pm**

**Future meeting dates this semester: Apr 16th, 30th, May 14th**



**SAN JOSÉ STATE**  
UNIVERSITY  
Board of General Studies Committee  
April 16, 2015  
Minutes

**Present:** Andrew Fleck, Robin Love, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan, Birsen Sirkeci, Jon Hendricks, Matthew Spangler

**Apologies:**

**Guest:** Melinda Jackson

**Start:** 2:05pm

1. Approval of Minutes

**\*\*Action- Approve Meeting Minutes with adjustments from April 2nd:** 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

2. Matters arising

- a. Andrew will be leaving BOGS at the end of the Spring 15 semester.
- b. A discussion regarding what we do when we find delinquent courses
  - i. Suggestion is that we merely commentate on what issues we see with the courses and leave to Program Planning to determine what the department needs to do to as part of their Action Plan.
  - ii. We'll gather all the committee chairs responsible for decertification and develop a plan to move forward with in the next Academic Year.
- c. Ratings- A: No Issues, B: Ok, Needs Clean up, C: DeCertify

3. SISS Letters

- a. AAS 33AB-(B)- Greensheet with Links to GELO (no greensheet for B), Revised Assessment Schedule
- b. AAS 175- (B)- Greensheet with links to Assessment Activities, and better assessment data on future.
- c. SOCI 1- (C)-Recommend decertification too many issues with course from content and assessment data to enrollment size.
- d. SOCI 100W-(A)
- e. SOCI 15-(A)-
- f. SOCI 162-(A)
- g. SOCI 57-(B)- Assessment Data
- h. SOCI 80- (B)- Correct Greensheet
- i. SOCS 100W-(A)
- j. SOCS 138-(C)- Content (assignments) connected to GELO's, Assessment schedule,
- k. SOCI 139-(C) - Needs to use Accessible syllabus, linkage issues,
- l. WOMS 10-(A)
- m. WOMS 101-(B)- Missing Assessment Schedule and student focused data

- n. WOMS 102-(B)- Student focused data
  - o. WOMS 20-(B)- Number of words on research assignment,
  - p. WOMS 5Q-(B)- Including a rubric would be helpful on the assessment schedule, the GELO's need to be as written in the Syllabus, wrong LO's assessed
4. Music Intensive Package
- a. Hesitant to approve due to lack of writing related to C2.
- \*\*Action- Approve Intensive Music Package for C1/C2: 0-Yes, 7-No, 0-Abstain**
5. Moving rest of agenda to next meeting.
6. We may need to hold an additional meeting or two to wrap up the backlog on May 7th.

Adjourn: 4:30pm



**SAN JOSÉ STATE**  
UNIVERSITY  
Board of General Studies Committee  
April 30, 2015  
Minutes

**Present:** Andrew Fleck, Robin Love, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan, Birsen Sirkeci, Jon Hendricks, Matthew Spangler

**Apologies:** None

**Guest:** Melinda Jackson, Fred Cohen (Chair, Music and Dance)

**Start:** 2:00 pm

1. Approval of Minutes

**\*\*Action- Approve Meeting Minutes with adjustments from April 16th: 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

2. Matters arising

a. The committee chair met with Program Planning Chair Brandon White to discuss how the BOGS review will be included in the Program Review process. BOGS will send its letters to the PPC Chair at least 2 weeks before the scheduled Action Plan meeting so that they can be discussed and included in the final Action Plan for the department. We have been asked to include recommendations and suggestions to the PPC so they can make the appropriate decisions in moving forward.

3. ENGL 20 and ENGL 21

- a. Andrew Fleck had re-written the syllabi on behalf of the department since he is part of the department. He used the last received document and included updates per our last round of review.
- b. Assessment schedule was included and deemed acceptable
- c. Two recommendations: to update a section title based on how they list the goals and outcomes (content before GELOS); Page 4 table please update table to say GELO instead of just GE (Same on ENGL 21, but reversed, not on table but in list)

**\*\*Action- Approve ENGL 20 and ENGL 21 for C2: 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

4. Intensive Music

a. This is back on our agenda because since we reviewed it, it was brought to the committee's attention that the program could qualify for a category 2 waiver which allows intensive program packages a greater degree of flexibility on assessment reporting and less rigorous greensheet criteria. The policy still requires that all GE areas are "largely met" through the course package which the waiver is being requested.

- b. The committee still had some concerns with the degree to which Area C2 would be met. After an explanation from Professor Fred Cohen, chair of the Music department, and further deliberation, the committee did not feel that the syllabi as presented contained sufficient evidence that Area C2 learning objectives were clearly embedded in MUS 12, the course in which purportedly the C2 learning outcomes were to be met.
5. NUFS Letters
- a. After some discussion of two of the NUFS courses it became apparent that the initial reviews had not considered some of the annual assessment report data included in the appendix. Consequently the courses will be reviewed again and discussion was tabled until the next meeting
  - b. Reviewing
    - i. Peggy: NUFS 01A, NUFS 9, NUFS 139
    - ii. Robin: NUFS 016, NUFS 9, NUFS 144
    - iii. Birsen: NUFS 016, NUFS 115, NUFS 139, NUFS 163
    - iv. Andy: NUFS 016, NUFS 9, NUFS 144
    - v. Simon: NUFS 01A, NUFS 115, NUFS 163
    - vi. Jon: NUFS 115, NUFS 139, NUFS 144
    - vii. Matt: NUFS 01A, NUFS 163

**\*\*Action Item:** post GEOL 8 and ENGL 20/21 as Good Examples for Syllabi on the GUP website.

Adjourn: 4:00pm



**SAN JOSÉ STATE**  
UNIVERSITY  
Board of General Studies Committee  
May 7, 2015  
Minutes

**Present:** Andrew Fleck, Robin Love, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan, Birsen Sirkeci, Jon Hendricks, Matthew Spangler

**Apologies:** None

**Guest:** Melinda Jackson

**Start:** 2:07 pm

1. Approval of Minutes

**\*\*Action- Approve Meeting Minutes with adjustments from April 30th:** 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

2. Matters arising

a. No issues

3. NUFS

a. NUFS 1A- (A)

b. NUFS 16- (A)

c. NUFS 9- (C)

d. NUFS 115- (C)

e. NUFS 139- (C)

f. NUFS/KIN 163-(A)

g. NUFS 144- (B)

**\*\*Action- Approve NUFS Letters:** 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

4. Status of Previous (SISS and WLL)

a. WLL were done and ready to go

b. SISS please review before next week so we can confirm these are done.

5. HUM series courses (1A/B, 2A/B)-

a. have each member review a specific GE area for the one course.

6. AOB

a. GEOL 9 only request B1 and B3, BOGS approved B2. With this in mind GEOL will only be tagged as such (B1/B3) on the GE Schedule and catalog. No assessment for B2 will be required.

**Adjourn:** 4:00pm



**SAN JOSÉ STATE**  
UNIVERSITY  
Board of General Studies Committee  
May 14, 2015  
Minutes

**Present:** Andrew Fleck, Robin Love, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan, Birsen Sirkeci, Jon Hendricks, Matthew Spangler

**Apologies:** None

**Guest:** Melinda Jackson

**Start:** 2:10 pm

1. Approval of Minutes

**\*\*Action- Approve Meeting Minutes from May 7th:** 6-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

2. Matters arising

- a. Jon Hendricks will be taking a leave of absence next year, so a replacement from College of Science will need to be assigned.

3. HUM Review

- a. AMS 1A- (B) Accessible syllabus is needed.
- b. AMS 1B- Same issues as AMS 1A, so the letters will be merged for these courses they are part of a sequence anyways.
- c. HUM 1-2A/B- (C) 27,500 words (110 pages) in 4 semesters (HUM 1A/B and 2 A/B) is that something we should ensure they do considering they cover multiple GE areas with specific word count requirements. We should ensure they are explicit about the word count requirements on their assignments by this Fall and that they contain the GELO's and/or map of GE requirements on syllabi by end of Fall in order to properly inform students.
- d. RELS 70B- (B/C) Assessment Intervention
- e. RELS 191- (C) Assessment Intervention
- f. RELS 70A- (A) with updated suggestions
- g. AMS/HUM 169- (A)
- h. HUM 128- (B) clean up the flow of the syllabus and add GELOs
- i. RELS 99-(C)
- j. AMS 159- (A)- Greensheets should include GELO information and ensure everyone contributes assessment information.

4. If a course has multiple GE areas the individual area word requirements are added together and this total will be required of such multiple-area courses.

**\*\*ACTION:** BOGS will require that programs with multiple GE areas , meet requirements for each of those GE Area GELO outcomes, especially word counts.

**Adjourn:** 4:20pm



**SAN JOSÉ STATE**  
UNIVERSITY  
Board of General Studies Committee  
May 19, 2015  
Minutes

**Present:** Andrew Fleck, Robin Love, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan, Birsen Sirkeci, Jon Hendricks, Matthew Spangler

**Apologies:** None

**Guest:** Melinda Jackson

**Start:** 2:05 pm

1. Approval of Minutes

**\*\*Action- Approve Meeting Minutes from May 14th:** 6-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain

2. HUM Review

- a. RELS 90- (C)- Update Syllabus, needs to be accessible also looks like it hasn't changed since, it lists area E when it is a C2 course. The objectives should match for the appropriate GE Area.
- b. RELS 122- (B)- Greensheet
- c. RELS 162- (C) - Greensheet work needed.
- d. RELS 145- (C)- Assignment Issues.
- e. HUM 100W- (A)- Please update to reflect new GELOs (2014)
- f. HUM 114 - (B)-Greensheet
- g. CA 100W-(C)- Greensheet and 2014 GELOs, linking word count to assignments.
- h. CA 172- (B)- No linkage from GELO to assessment. No linkage between assignments and GELO. Work to improving mapping between the two.
- i. CA 173- (B)- spell out (express clearly) writing assignments in relation to word count as well as how the blog post may contribute to the overall writing assignment requirements.

**\*\*Action- Approve Humanities Letters:** 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

3. SISS Letters Review Approval

**\*\*Action- Approve SISS Letters:** 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

4. COMM Letter Review

- a. COMM 21-(A)- Exemplary Assessment Review, we will add this to our Examples
- b. COMM 10-(X)

Adjourn: 4:00pm







**SAN JOSÉ STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

Board of General Studies Committee

November 6, 2014

Minutes

**Present:** Steve Branz, Andrew Fleck, Robin Love, Peggy Plato, Simon Rodan,  
Birsen Sirkeci Julie Sliva, Matthew Spangler

**Absent:** Jon Hendricks

1. COMM 45: Area A3 or C2 Proposal
  - a. Reading partial essays that are more engaging than offering the full works from specific authors
    - i. want to challenge but not overwhelm students with workload. Definitely willing to include sonnets, films, etc as appropriate to content.
  - b. C2 allows them to have readings that wouldn't typically be in an A3 course.
  - c. Is purpose of developing class as A3/C2 a response to meeting the need or that you truly want to offer in this manner, given the additional work required to meet both areas.
    - i. COMM saw it as a way to garner more interest in course via the writings and essays being offered.
    - ii. The student will get one or the other, not both. They will either get A3 OR C2.
    - iii. If the community colleges are doing this well, then we can definitely set ourselves up to be as well.
    - iv. C2 content does not seem to be there in the assignments, adding minimal readings and films won't meet the humanities portion of outcomes.
  - d. On campus syllabus looks fine, concern over online specifically regarding the "Oral" portion of course.
    - i. Currently a faculty offers to have students meet in an online community (such as Zoom) to do online presentations.
    - ii. How will this portion be evaluated in an online format, when visual presence is important to the assessment. Will time be spent on how to give a good online oral presentation (i.e. lighting, movement, etc).
  - e. Bob will ask Stephanie to make revisions to syllabi and submit at least a week before our next meeting (11/20).
    - i. Stephanie asked that if BOGS members have readings that might be interesting to include in the "significant works" area, please forward those on to her as possible inclusions.
    - ii. Primary works of humanities in syllabus, fine if reading essays, but will need to engage with culture or literature or film in helping students obtain a view from that cultural lens
    - iii. Need to deal with these materials in context of women and ethnic groups as well as their contributions to the humanities.
    - iv. We could approve for A3 now, and if they want to adjust and come back from C2 they can, then they can move forward with just A3. Do not change A3 content, as that in its current form is approvable, if a lot changes to meet C2, the A3 items might get lost.

2. ENGL 2- Area A3 Proposal

- a. No formal vote was taken on this course, after last meeting. Only discussion about whether C2 was to be included.
- b. This proposal should be voted upon as soon as possible as its outcome affects majors preparing their program requirements for 15-16, due December 20th.
- c. We should approve as the area requirement they are looking for, and if they want C2 then they can come back to this.
- d. Do we feel we have had enough discussion on A3 portion to go ahead and vote, or do we need to discuss this more/

**\*\*Action Item:** We will need to review and have any questions raised by next thursday so we have time to alert department of changes we are requesting, before we have a final conversation on Thursday the 20th.

3. WRC Membership

- a. Proposal that comes to BOGs and if approved we forward it to Organization & Governance committee (O&G).
- b. Change to overall membership and student membership. We tend to have a hard time finding students who can meet the requirements.
- c. 2 individuals who would be named by position (Writing Program Admin (WPA) and Writing Across Curriculum (WAC))who have skillsets in area. This might be difficult for O&G to approve, but the expertise lies within the Humanities.
- d. Stephen Branz stated that the additional members might not be voting members.
  - i. Non-voting members devalues their purpose of being on the committee
- e. Don't see issue with having expertise on the committee, that is their domain.

**\*\*Action:** Approve WRC change in membership moving forward to O&G. **Unanimous** 9-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

4. Amend WST Pre-requisite Policy Proposal

- a. Would amend current policy regarding WST prerequisite that would address issues with transfer students and specifically AA-T (Associate Transfer Degree). Transfers typically make up 80% of our population.
- b. If passed it moves forward to C&R
- c. Students have to take WST and pass will take 2nd composition class.

**\*\*Action:** Approve moving WST Prerequisite amendment to Policy S14-5 to C&R. **Unanimous** 9-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

5. GE program review of CHAD

- a. Last time we found missing assessment documents. We still have not located them.
- b. Do we want to move forward with what we have?
- c. Melinda recommended that we complete this reviews like Program Planning Committee in which we determine who is to be reviewed, a "Team" is assigned to review and prepare a summary before the meeting at which the committee at large reviews, edits and approves.
- d. Bob agrees that is probably the best method and approved Assignments
  - i. CHAD- Simon and Julie (Due 11/20)
  - ii. SISS- Matthew and Peggy (Due 12/4)
  - iii. WLL- Robin and Birsen (Due 12/4)
- e. Most important is that they are doing their annual assessments, are they reflecting on it or just clicking boxes?
- f. Use the GE Program Review guidelines to do your assessment. The WASC rubric gives you an idea of how to talk about the items you are reviewing.

- g. Highlight the good first, then bring up any issues identified.
- h. Request to email (or post to folder) what the assignment entails and due date.