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

Apologies for Absence: None

1. Approval of minutes: from May 19, 2016
   **Action - Approved with correction (7,0,0)**

2. Matters Arising
   When sending BOGS continuing certification feedback to course coordinators for major changes, ‘category (C)’, department chairs should be copied.

3. Engineering 195 A/B
   Coordination between the 195/AB faculty and the engineering faculty teaching the S and V integrated capstone is an issue that needs to be addressed. Engineering have requested a 1 year extension to their provisional status for these courses. **Engineering will be invited to a BOGS meeting in the fall to present their new plan.**

4. Humanities 177 A/B
   Area R was the committee’s concern at the list presentation of this course. The committee’s last request for information and adjustments will be resent.

5. AOB
   Two courses originally marked as ‘major change’ courses were reclassified. BIOL 010 was marked as ‘clean’ and BIOL 54 as ‘minor changes’.
Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Chris Tseng (EXO), Simon Rodan (COB),

Apologies for Absence: Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Wendy Ng (EXO)

1. Approval of minutes: from August 25, 2016
   **Action - Approved (4,0,0)**

2. Matters Arising
   None

3. Engineering 195 A/B

Jinny Rhee (Associate Dean, CoE) and Pat Backer (Course Coordinator ENGR 195 A/B) presented a review of the implementation of ENGR 195 A/B and these courses integration with the Engineering capstone classes designed to jointly meet Areas S and V, the plans for the coming year, and requested an extension of the offerings provisional status. Given the importance of the ENGR 195 A/B - capstone S+V project both the Engineering and to the GE program, the Board decided to table the decision on an extension until the full Board was able to discuss it.

The Board’s concerns were and are around the integration of the two pedagogical strands - the engineering content and the S and V learning outcomes. Dr Baker made a strong case for the benefits of this integration, and spoke to the need for better coordination between the faculty teaching ENGR 195 A/B and those teaching the Engineering capstone classes in which the integration implementation takes place. The Board continues to have some reservations about the institutionalization of practices designed to ensure that the GE content is appropriately integrated and assessed in the capstone experience.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:05
Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Chris Tseng (EXO), Simon Rodan (COB), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Wendy Ng (EXO)

Apologies for Absence: None

1. Approval of minutes: from August 25, 2016
   **Action - Approved (5,0,0)**

2. Matters Arising

   The Board discussed whether all sections of a particular course needed to carry out GE assessment. BOGS requires all sections of a course to be assessed. When a course has multiple sections, a robust sampling from within each section is acceptable. The particular methodology should be developed in consultation with the Director of Assessment.

   **The Board voted to grant ENGR 195 A/B a one year extension (7,0,0).**

3. Self Study Required Data Elements

   Scott Heil, Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics, presented some ideas for data elements to be included in the self study. The Board appreciated Scott’s suggestions and will work on adding to the list before the next meeting.

4. Potential external program reviewers
Thalia Anagnos had proposed two potential external reviewers for the GE program. The Board will seek clarification as to whether the program would be reviewed by one or two external reviewers.

5. **PHYS 023**
Alejandro Garcia presented some background to PHY 023 proposed as an Area B1 course. The Board asked that a revised syllabus be submitted with additional information: items on “4. Instruction”, in “Procedure for Submitting Courses for New Certification in General Education”; assignments in the class schedule and the GELO they will be used to assess; an assessment schedule that covers all year up to the end of the next program planning cycle, (which may require that some GELOS are assessed more than once).

6. **Continuing Certification**
Three courses were discussed:
- **MUSC 120**: The Board had serious concerns with the assessment of the course; only one assignment is used to assess all four Area S learning outcomes; not all GELOs were assessed; and the assessment reports showed no change from one year to the next.
- **DANC 010**:
- **DANC 109**:

Meeting was adjourned at 4:08pm
Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Wendy Ng (EXO)

Apologies for Absence: Chris Tseng (EXO)

1. Approval of minutes: from September 22, 2016

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

2. Matters Arising

The Board discussed GE assessment. There was a consensus that multi-section courses must carry out assessment on all sections; this may be carried out through random sampling of students, but all sections must be sampled. This should be added to the GE Guidelines.

The Guidelines should also require that programs include with their Appendix E program planning submission: the action items from the last continuing certification review; what has been done with respect to each; the results or outcomes of the actions taken.

Some courses have both minor changes that require only additional information be provided to the BOGS and major issues that need referral to program planning for the development of an action plan. To this end, the continuing certification reviewing categories should allow for both to be requested concurrently.

3. New GE course proposals

COMM 41: The Board liked the proposal and approved (7,0,0) the course with one suggestion, that the assignments and process for practice and feedback on writing be detailed in the syllabus.
PHY 23: The board was hoping that information from the handout circulated at the last meeting with additional information on assignments be incorporated in the syllabus. The course proposer will be contacted for this modification before the course is reconsidered.

4. **GE Pathways**

Robin Love the GE Pathways liaison reported back on progress on this project. The original task force has been wound up and a new steering committee comprising three ADs has been formed to take up the Pathways project. The task force originally selected three themes: Sustainability, Creativity and Global Issues. Courses from the GE catalog were suggested for inclusion into each. To succeed a pathway must have sufficient courses to overcome the tendency to prioritize availability and scheduling issues over content. A new pathway has been proposed, “Social Justice”. No resources have as yet been committed to the project.

5. **Self Study**

The Board suggested Kate McCarthy from Chico State and Bruno Gibreti from Cal Poly be invited as external reviewers.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:05pm
Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Wendy Ng (Assoc Dean, Undergrad Studies, Ex Off), Chris Tseng (Director of Assessment, Ex Off)

Apologies: Dave Parent (COE)

1. Approval of minutes: from October 6, 2016
   
   Approval was tabled to the next meeting.

2. Matters Arising

   None

3. New GE course proposals

   MICR 166

   is part of a two course sequence with MICR 127 that meets Area R. It is a Category 1 programmatic exception to CSU EO 1065; the course sequence is part of the major degree but the courses go through the normal GE certification, assessment and continuing certification review processes.

   The Board would like to see a clarification of the word count for MICR 127 to be sure that together the two courses meet the Area R required 3,000 words. A table at the bottom of page 4 was unclear and may account for the missing word count. Although MICR 127 was not the course being certified, it does form part of the sequence for which approval is being sought; to that end, the Board would like some clarification as to how GELO 2 (distinguishing science from pseudo-science) was being assessed. There are some typos in the MICR 127 syllabus which still refers to BIOL 115 as the companion prerequisite course in some places. The wording that Area R courses must be taken from outside the major department needs to be updated to reflect the changes to GE policy in the 2014 guidelines. Finally, the Board was also concerned that there was no assessment data for MICR 127 and asked that these be provided if available. Otherwise the Board was happy that the course met the requirements of Area R.
The Board had some concerns with the syllabus as submitted. First the linkage between the GE learning outcomes and the assignments in which they are to be assessed is overly broad. Not every assignment, even if it is one in which a particular learning outcome is demonstrated, has to be used for assessment. Second, the Board did not see any oral communications assignments, a requirement of A3 courses. Third, the 15 page writing requirement, which is open to some “interpretation”, should be replaced by a word count (6,000, 4,000 in final form). The board would like to see more information on how the assignments are assessed. Finally information on instructor qualification should be provided.

4. Self Study

The progress of the self-study was discussed; some of the writing tasks were taken on by members of the committee.

It was suggested that Amy Strage might be able to help with coordination of the GE Area Learning Communities.

Updating of the Guidelines and the assessment report form was discussed, including criteria from the WASC assessment of assessment, and eliciting separately if faculty met to discuss the assessment results as well as if changes were made.

Advisors need training in GE to improve both the perception of GE’s value add and to help students make coherent choices in their GE courses.

It was suggested that another obstacle to GE ‘endorsement’ was that much GE teaching was left to adjunct faculty brought in at the last moment which didn’t help the perception of GE in students’ eyes, and made consistency of quality difficult to maintain.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:05pm
Board of General Studies

November 3, 2016, 1pm-3pm

Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Dave Parent (COE), Wendy Ng (Assoc Dean, Undergrad Studies, Ex Off), Chris Tseng (Director of Assessment, Ex Off)

Apologies: Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS)

1. Approval of minutes:
   October 6, 2016: Approved (5,0,0)
   October 20, 2016: Approved (5,0,0)

2. Matters Arising

   None

3. New GE course proposals

   PHY 023 was approved as a GE area B (5,0,0)
   GLST 167 was approved as an Area R course (5,0,0)

   HSPM 111

   There were a number of questions regarding this course. The Board was unclear exactly how the assignments would address each of the GE learning outcomes. For example the historical context in which customs and etiquettes developed, the way they have influenced those of the US and the ways they have themselves been changed as a results of external influences. The Board would also like to see a more selective targeting of assignments towards specific GELOs. The Board will invite the course proposer to a future meeting this semester (Nov 19th or Dec 1st).

4. Self Study
The RDE’s are to be generated by the chair in consultation with Office of Institutional Analytics and Effectiveness.

The Board discussed the WASC rubric for assessing GE assessment processes. The fourth and fifth criteria were evaluated by pairs of Board Members applying the rubric to the courses the board had already reviewed in 2014/14 and 2015/16. These results will be included in the self study. The Board also discussed the program’s assessment processes (criteria 1-3). It felt that GE outcomes were developed, curricular alignment was emerging and the assessment processes were developed. The sequencing of introduction, reinforcement and demonstration was challenging given 1) the high proportion of transfer students over whose lower division education had little to no control, and 2) the “smorgasbord” nature of GE courses on the campus. There was some sequencing in that upper division courses required the completion of lower division GE and were intended to build on the knowledge and skills learned in lower division GE courses.

AOB

The GE New Course Certification Request should be updated to add the three points relating to instruction (page 8 of the 2014 GE Guidelines): methods of instructions, instructor qualification, and how the course content will be coordinated (if a multi section course).

Action: Wendy Ng will address this.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:05pm
Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Dave Parent (COE), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Wendy Ng (Assoc Dean, Undergrad Studies, Ex Off), Chris Tseng (Director of Assessment, Ex Off)

1. Approval of minutes:

   November 3, 2016 : Approved (6,0,1)

2. Matters Arising from the previous meeting’s minutes

   Wendy Ng had received a complaint from faculty members involved in developing EADS 160 that the feedback they had received on the Board’s decision not to approve the course was evidence of the Board’s “arbitrary decision-making”. The Board noted that courses are very seldom voted down, but careful feedback is provided in the expectation proposers who are unsuccessful at the first attempt will revise and resubmit their proposals. The Board resolved to make this aspect of the process clearer when communicating back to course proposers on the Board deliberations.

   The current CE course proposal form does not have a section for proposers to provide information required in the GE Guidelines on Instruction (see page 8) including: a) methods of instruction, b) instructor qualification and c) means by which multiple sections will be coordinated for assessment purposes, if applicable.

   Action: Wendy Ng undertook to update the current form.

3. New GE course proposals

   HIST 50

   Glen Gendzel, Chair, Department of History and Eric Narveson, who teaches the course, responded to questions from the Board. The Board reiterated the comments from its October 20th meeting that the assignments in the syllabus be more narrowly targeted at individual GELOs, that the syllabus indicate the assignments that will meet the word count for the 2014 Guidelines Area A3 courses, and that oral communication be explicitly identified as a component of the course.
It was agreed that once modifications to the syllabus had been made the course would be taken up again by the Board, early in the Spring semester.

**BIOL 118**

This was the first discussion of the proposed course. The course will meet Area R requirements together with BIOL 160. It appears as though GELO #2 is not addressed or assessed in either of the two courses (GELO #1 is addressed in BIOL 115 and GELO #3 in BIOL 160). It wasn’t clear that the writing requirements for Area R courses were met. The Board would like to see word counts for the assignments.

The syllabus for Biol 160 does not list Biol 118 as a prerequisite or a corequisite. It lists Biol 115 (rather than Biol 118) as the course which together with Biol 160 will satisfy area R. The proposers will be invited to present at a BOGS meeting in the spring.

**GEOL 124**

This was the first discussion of the proposed course. The Board felt the course was close to meeting the requirements of a GE course. However there were some minor issues that the Board wanted to see addressed before approving the course. First, the Board would like to see the GE learning outcome separated from the course learning outcomes (currently they are all in a single alphabetized list) and identified as GE learning outcomes. Second, the assessment schedule only covers the next 3 years while the program planning cycle ends in AY 22/23; assessment must be done every year even when that means circling back to learning outcomes already assessed in the cycle. The Board would like to see an updated assessment schedule that sets out assessment activities for AY 20/21 and AY 21/22. Third, the syllabus needs clarification as to where the practice and feedback will take place; the main writing assignment, which only counts for a small portion of the grade, is the only assignment explicitly requiring writing and this needs some clarification. The proposers will be invited to present at a BOGS meeting in the spring.

**JPN 102**

This was the first discussion of the proposed course. First, Area V courses should engage with cultures, i.e. at least two, outside of the US. Are there ‘sub-cultures within Japan that might be used to make the comparison richer? Adding an explanation of how students will meet GELO 3 would helpful. Also all assignments are linked as assessment to all three GELOs. While many assignments may address more than one GELO -- it would be useful to specify exactly which assignment is used to assess whether students have attained each General Education Learning Outcome in the course. Since writing in all SJSU Studies courses must be evaluated on grammar, clarity, conciseness, and coherence, this need to be incorporated into the assessment for writing, and the instructor (not peers) must provide substantive feedback.
Some minor points

The Assessment Schedule indicates that the next program planning cycle ends in 2010. Should this be 2020? The description for GELO 3 appeared to be an explanation of the Area V writing requirement. On page 3 "Statistic data" should be "Statistical data". Under group presentations, indicates 3% x 2 and 15% x 1. This totals 21%, not 26%. The proposers will be invited to present at a BOGS meeting in the spring.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:05pm
Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Dave Parent (COE), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Wendy Ng (Assoc Dean, Undergrad Studies, Ex Off)

Apologies:

1. Approval of minutes:

   November 3, 2016 : Approved (6,0,1)

1. Self Study

   The self study was discussed.
Present: Martina Bremer (COS), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Dave Parent (COE), Noelle Brada-Williams (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Apologies: Robin Love (CoEd), Wendy Ng (EXO)

1. New Courses Proposals:

   BIOL 127. Partial fulfillment of Area R under GE Guidelines Modifications Category 1 Approved (6-0-0)

   MICR 166. Partial fulfillment of Area R under GE Guidelines Modifications Category 1 Approved (6-0-0)

   JAPN 1A, 1B 25A, 25B: Approved (6-0-0)

   CHIN 25A, 25B: Approved (6-0-0)

   FREN 1A, 1B 25A, 25B: Approved (6-0-0)

   SPAN 25A, 25B: Approved (6-0-0)

   PORT1A, 1B: These are new GE course proposals. There are four things the Board would like to see modified in the greensheet before approving the courses. First, a more targeted approach to assessment, ideally having only one GELO assessed in any one assessment activity. At the moment several activities are being used to assess all the GELOS, which isn’t necessary. Second, it wasn’t clear how GELO #1 was to be assessed. While GELO #1 was addressed in the discussion, the means by which student understanding was to be assessed appeared to be missing, and GELO #1 wasn’t mentioned in the list of graded assignment. Third, there was some concern about the amount of student writing and whether it met the required 1,500 words for an Area C2 course. Finally there did not appear to be an assessment schedule included in the package.
1. Minutes

The minutes for February 2nd and December 8th meetings were approved (4-0-0).

2. New Courses Proposals:

HUM 177A/B was approved for Areas R, S and V (5-0-0).

HSPM 111 is a required course for Hospitality Management majors. Jooyeon Ha and Tsu-Hong Yen presented the updated syllabus. The Board, while appreciating their response to its prior comments mostly regarding assessment activities, still had some misgivings as to the suitability of the course content to Area V. While the course asked students to compare different approaches to service in different cultures, it did not seem to require students to engage with the question of their historical origins. The textbook was more of a “how-to” guide and lacked the academic perspective required of Liberal Arts Area V courses and liberal arts education more generally. Its emphasis needs to move from the primarily practical to a more academic orientation. The Board would like to see the specific instructions for each of the GE related assignment to better understand how they are framed, what students are expected to do, and the academic (e.g., sociological, anthropological) sources they are expected to consult.

2. Self Study

The Board discussed the self study and in particular the action plan section. It was agreed that the material from this section would be moved to a new section called “recommendations and background”.

The external reviewers are to be invited to campus for the week of April 10th and will meet with the Board 2-4pm on April 13th.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05pm.
Board of General Studies
March 2, 2017, 2pm-4pm

Minutes

Present: Martina Bremer (COS), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Noelle Brada-Williams (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS)

Apologies: Wendy Ng (EXO), Chris Tseng (Director of Assessment)

1. Minutes

The minutes for February 16th meeting were approved (5-0-1)

2. New Courses Proposals:

JPN 102: Yasue Yanai presented the changes to the initial version of the course. The Board noted that the revision does not yet reflect multiple non-US cultures. Several suggestion were made, including urban vs rural culture, the cultures of different islands in Japan, or Japanese communities in Latin America. The Board needs to be provided with examples of assignments for each GELO that will be used for assessment to see how the GELO will be assessed; this need not include all assignments. The term paper assignment 3 pages, 1.5 line spacing looks like fewer than the required 1500 words; the Board suggest stating the minimum word count explicitly. Finally the syllabus should be clear to the students as to where each GE learning outcome is to be assessed. If this requires a major course revision it will need to be reapproved by the department, college, C&R and GUP.

GEOL 124: was approved for Area R (6-0-0)

2. Self Study

Some minor edits to the self study were suggested but with those, the Board was happy with the current version of the document.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30pm
Present: Martina Bremer (COS), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Noelle Brada-Williams (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Wendy Ng (EXO)

1. Minutes

The minutes for March 2nd meeting were approved (6-0-0)

2. EO 1110

The Chancellor’s Office is soliciting campus feedback on EO 1110. This folder contains the memo, executive order, and the feedback form.

The committee decided that the invitation to comment on the policy was best handled by the committee itself and will be providing feedback on the policy against the three criteria: (1) clarity; (2) equitable treatment of students, including transfer students and first-time freshmen; and (3) streamlining graduation requirements. The committee discussed a range of issues relating to the delivery of GE on the campus. Of note were the anecdotal student perceptions that “faculty don’t care about GE because GE isn’t part of the major”, and the feeling among faculty that lower division GE was particularly labor intensive.

There was also discussion around the issue of transfer students having not fulfilled area E and whether a combined upper division course might be created. The committee felt that this might compromise Area E. Another possibility was the creation of upper division Area E courses.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40pm
Present: Martina Bremer (COS), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Noelle Brada-Williams (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Wendy Ng (EXO)

Guests: Eileen Collins, (Associate Dean, COS), Steve Branz (Chemistry)

1. Minutes

There were no minutes from the previous meeting which was devoted to a discussion with the self study external reviewers.

2. Intensive Science Transfers

The issue broke down into two parts: A) the general case of a student moving out of a major in which the intensive science Category 2 modification allows them to get both B1 and B2 credit if passed with a C or better, and B) the subset where, due to a glitch in the degree audit (now fixed), students were unaware of the C or better requirement.

A) For students who have taken some of the intensive science courses but did not get a C or better in one or more (and who would therefore not get GE credit); if they have successfully completed one GE course in Area B2, Area B1 would be deemed satisfied by the intensive science course(s) completed with any grade other than F. This will be minuted as "Martina's Rule" since she suggested this solution.

B) The Board agreed that while Martina’s Rule rule be applied in future cases, a slightly less stringent approach be applied to students expecting to graduate this semester, and for whom Martina's Rule would require that they take a B2 course. Because of a coding error in the degree audit system, students were unaware of the C or better requirement when they moved out of the intensive science major; the Board characterized this as a "lapse in advising" and suggested the following: For students graduating this semester, who have not taken a B2 course, and who did not complete all the intensive science courses with a C or better, the Board was willing to waive the B2 requirement, just as would have been the case had they completed all the intensive science courses with a C or better. This should avoid their having to delay their graduation to meet the B2 requirement in "Martina's Rule".
The issue of transfer students who complete the equivalent articulated intensive science courses at community college, where they earn GE credit without the C or better requirement, was discussed but consensus was not reached as to a specific recommendation.

2. Quantitative Reasoning Assessment

Steve Branz presented his recommendations for changes to the GE Guidelines so that quantitative reasoning might be included in the learning outcomes for GE Areas R and S. There was some concern that while certain Area S courses would have little difficulty in including material and assessment activities that demonstrated quantitative reasoning, others might find this difficult. The issue will be discussed further.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15pm
Present: Martina Bremer (COS), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Noelle Brada-Williams (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Wendy Ng (EXO)

1. Minutes

Minutes from two prior meetings, the March 16th meeting and the April 27th meeting were both approved (6-0-0)

2. Matters arising from the minutes

The external reviewers report will not be available by the May 15th deadline. No ETA is currently available.

3. Continuing Certification

The Board reviewed seven MAS GE courses MAS 010A/B, MAS 025, MAS 030, MAS 074, MAS 130, MAS 160. MAS 1A/B MAS 130 MAS 160 were recommended for continuing certification. MAS 74 was postponed pending consideration of the assessment reports. No material were received for MAS 025. The department will be contacted to ascertain whether the course is still being taught; if so the Board would like to receive the end of cycle materials for the course.

4. Reactivation of dormant GE courses

Courses that are being reactivated from a dormant state need only be re-reviewed by The Board of General Studies if the course has not been recommended for continuing certification within the last 5 years.

5. EO 1110 Feedback

The Board will provide feedback on the CSU GE Guidelines in a shared Google doc.

6. Any other business

The Board discussed the question as to whether, in approving new GE courses, it should
consider whether an existing course with largely the same content was already being taught. It concluded that to do so would require greater subject matter knowledge that the board might have available in its members, and that such content control was out of the scope of the Board’s remit.

The inclusion of short-form syllabi, presumably prepared specifically for the GE continuing certification submission was discussed. This presented two problems and an opportunity. First it seemed as though the syllabi were not the same as the course syllabi available to students. Second the Board struggled with how the review was to be conducted. It could not do a review for each version of the syllabus, yet there was marked variation between them. The opportunity presented is to encourage faculty to create syllabi that have a greater degree of commonality across sections of the same course, at least with respect to those assignments in which GE learning outcomes are to be assessed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4pm
Present: Martina Bremer (COS), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Simon Rodan (COB), Noelle Brada-Williams (HA), Matthew Spangler (COSS), Wendy Ng (EXO)

1. Minutes
Minutes from May 11th meeting were approved approved (6-o-o)

2. Matters arising from the minutes
None

3. Continuing Certification
The four outstanding continuing certification were discussed

MAS 010A, MAS 130 and MAS 160 were approved for continuing certification. Review of MAS 030 was felt to have had a variety of issues and will be referred back to program planning.

4) Dates were tentatively agreed for the 17/18 academic year.

5) Simon Rodan was re-elected as committee chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 4pm.