

# **Minutes**

## **Executive committee**

### **2/1/01**

Present: P. McGough, R. Luttman, A. Merrifield, L. Brooks, S. McKillop, V. Garlin, C. Nelson, S. Moulton, J. Filp, S. Heft, R. Arminana, B. Goldstein

Absent: M. Dreisbach L. Furukawa-Schlereth

Guests: Rose Bruce, Elaine Sundberg, Katharyn Crabbe

Revision of agenda- time certain for Katharyn Crabbe moved to 4:40. McGough asked for item 1a: Move Executive Committee and Senate to Tuesday.

Agenda approved

### **REPORTS**

Provost report: Provost Goldstein presented his draft of Protocols for Proposing Improved Expanded or New Academic Activities. Please read and make suggestions. These protocols would govern the creation of centers, etc.

EPC report by J. Filp - EPC has developed protocol too. She will give a copy to Provost. Filp and Goldstein will go over it together. It was suggested that the path the protocol should take be clearly outlined.

Structures and Functions report by Rick Luttman: Election upcoming for Chair of Senate, Secretary to Senate, one Statewide Senator, one At-Large Senator and two members for University wide RTP. Susan Garfin has agreed to be on RTP committee. We also need FMI appeals committee completed. 10 nominated are needed to select 5. Art Warmouth recommended to be representative to EPC from Social Sciences. Grade appeals committee has been formed. List committee here. One grade appeal is pending. Mayor Jake McKenzie has been invited to address the Executive Committee and Senate on Feb 22. Executive Committee will meet at 2:00 in the Faculty Affairs conference room. The Mayor will address the Senate at its regular time of 3:00 in the Commons.

Chair's report by P. McGough -Student Housing committee has been set to advising Larry Schlereth (alt. Neil Markley). Rick Luttman, Melaine Dreisbach, Melinda Barnard, Chuck Rhodes and Joseph Verdermane.

### **BUSINESS**

**Campus Accountability Report:**

Rose Bruce and Elaine Sundberg presented the report that is being worked on for the Chancellor's office. This reporting grows out of Cornerstones initiative. Goals are mandated from Chancellor's office. It has a March 5 deadline. This is an important document and Dr. Bruce wants input from the Senate. Dr. Bruce went over the report in some detail and described how it is linked to interim program review process.

Elaine Sundberg - GE lab started in Fall to look at area A of GE requirements and will commence with the other areas to establish assessment goals by 2003. Submitted FIPSE grant for outcomes and assessemnt in GE. This would bring in \$350,000 over three years if funded. Title 3 Strengthening Institutions grant has also been applied for to help bring assessments through to the department level and provide feedback to departments.

McGough asked if we have done a assessment on why people leave. There was discussion of anecdotal reasons and Dr Bruce stated that statistically the basis of admission is the strongest indicator.

Discussion brought up a variety of issues regarding accuracy of anecdotal evidence, diversity issues, university goals as opposed to Chancellor office goals, how recruiting more diversity influences retention rates, how Chancellor's office will use this and SFRs in relation to retention.

**It was decided that this report will go the full Senate at its next meeting, Feb. 8th.**

McKillop noted that the Master Plan comment are also due March 5th.

Luttman asked if we could we leave goals as they are or let them go down. President Arminana stated he will not sign off on the report if goals go down or stay the same.

#### **RTP review document review panel**

**McGough proposes Bill Barnier, Tim Houston, Doug Martin, Lynn Cominsky, with Bill Poe as back up.**

*Approved.*

#### **Moving Senate and Executive committee to Tuesday**

After a short discussion Garlin proposed referring this to Structures and Functions to ascertain full implications of change. **McGough will take this issue to the committee and report back.**

#### **Two proposed policy changes for EPC**

After a brief discussion these policies were referred to EPC. **Filp will bring back a report to the Senate.**

### **Resolution for Senate from Peter Phillips**

McGough presented an alternative version of the resolution.

Brooks - **Motion to bring both resolutions to the Senate.** Victor seconded.

*Approved.*

### **Senate Agenda of February 8**

Waive second reading on budget report.

Resolutions from Phillips and McGough.

Accountability report.

Master's plan for first reading - Susan McKillop will give a few minutes introduction to the document at Senate meeting.

### **EMT Program Review**

Filp- EPC received diverse input on this issue. EPC wants a cost analysis, the results of the interim program review underway and the ability to request more information if needed. EPC wants to know what other questions the Executive Committee has regarding the EMT Program Review.

The following is an outline of the discussion.

Goldstein - Program review process for EMT is going on.

Crabbe - EMT committee is looking at different ways of structuring freshman seminar such as grouping around student interests, service learning. Also looking at less costly models.

McGough - All department must assess student learning outcomes for WASC. Real question - what was told to EPC by Executive committee about how to assess EMT.

Luttman read his email about what he remembers Executive committee said and raised specific questions about EMT program. Following is the content of the email he read:

I want to remind you that the Executive Committee has been very clear in directing the EPC to give the Freshman Seminar program a FULL REVIEW -- not the abbreviated review proposed by Carlos Benito that has been approved for most other programs. Not only must the review be a full one, but it must honestly and adequately engage the many issues that faculty have raised about this program over the years since its never-approved-by-faculty inception. If the review submitted to the Exec Comm by the EPC does not

meet these standards it will be sent back.

I also remind you that Provost Goldstein has fully signed on to this process, and has even offered to make available to EPC whatever resources are necessary to conduct the kind of review envisioned.

I don't remember exactly when you came to Sonoma State; perhaps it was after this program was initiated. Perhaps for this reason you are unaware of some of the faculty's concerns about it. It is a program which, though having (some) academic content, carrying academic credit, involving faculty who get credits for their involvement, and being therefore unquestionably a part of our curricular offerings -- which are, by law, under the faculty's jurisdiction -- has never received the faculty's formal approval. The reasons which the Administration has given over the course of time for continuing to offer this program without it being subject to faculty review processes have varied. First, "it does not concern curriculum" -- but this is clearly false. Second, "it is an experimental program" -- but this is certainly no longer true. Third, "it is not paid for out of the academic affairs budget" -- but it appears that this will no longer be true in the near future (even if it were a compelling argument when it was true).

I want to emphasize that neither I, nor to my knowledge any other member of the Executive Committee, has pre-judged the issue of whether the Freshman Seminar is a "good thing" and whether it should be continued -- although we clearly have concerns about "process". There are, however, some legitimate questions about what form the Freshman Seminar should have in the future, given the new budget realities. We have to decide -- and are counting on a solidly argued recommendation from EPC -- whether the program is giving us sufficient "bang for the buck". Is this the most efficient use of the considerable resources that are devoted to it? Should the length of time devoted to it by the participants, the number of credit hours given for it, and the amount of faculty time consumed by it all be reduced, or are they appropriate as is?

Goldstein - Stated that he always recommended streamlined review.

**Filp - Motion: Read interim program review, with cost analysis and if more questions then require a full program review. Cost would not be a basis for any decision.**

McGough - EPC not budget committee and should eliminate that from request.

Crabbe - Remembers agreeing to interim program review.

Luttman - Is concerned that questions brought up in email be addressed. Disagrees with McGough regarding cost analysis. EPC criticized in the past for not taking budget into consideration. Cost information needed to make informed decision.

Nelson - Does the process EPC proposes address Rick's questions? What faculty committee will address the budget questions?

Filp - They could be.

Arminana - We do not do any program reviews on cost. Dangerous question. Could kill good programs.

Nelson - Unit reduction for faculty has direct impact on her work for EMT. Where can she address this issue?

Katharyn Crabbe identified as person Nelson can go to for this question

Arminana - If program is doing well he doesn't care what cost is. If question is on academic integrity, then appropriate for faculty to discuss.

Merrifield - What about proposals for graduate programs to be self-supporting -- these are budgetary considerations on curriculum. EMT created to retain freshman, did not go through regular approval process. Talking about money and curriculum goes on all the time. EMT may be an appropriate case for such an analysis. Bernie's protocol shows that budget and curriculum are linked.

Goldstein - Have asked Katharyn to look at budget issues with EMT.

McGough They could be separated in this instance.

Crabbe - Discussions about graduate programs being self supporting would take place in department and schools, not Senate. Senate reviews curriculum and policy. Freshman seminar is EMT's curriculum. EMT program created around freshman seminar. EMT not a new piece of curriculum.

Garlin - Faculty's authority in consultation in budgetary decisions happens through VPABC. EMT has absorbed a lot of energy over the years. It is special, different. What is the group that is similar to the VPABC in EMT? There seems to be resistance to a review, let this be fully stated and discuss this special relationship. Let's resolve the fact that this has created tension between administration and faculty governance.

Goldstein - Interim program review is appropriate. Asked Katharyn Crabbe to bring cost issues to VPABC.

Arminana - The main question is does EMT have academic integrity - ask budget questions after the first.

McGough - Interim policy does not look at academic integrity - only student learning outcomes.

Goldstein - Full program review process was not clear so he proposed interim program review to answer WASC and then go on to do regular program reviews.

**Merrified moved to support Filp's motion (page 5). Nelson seconded.**

McKillop - There is no outside reviewer in interim policy. This needs to be added.

McGough had to leave. Luttmen took over chairing the meeting.

Luttman - Does not think there can be a clean division between curriculum and budget.

Brooks - Agrees that budget is appropriate to consider.

Nelson - Calls the question

*Approved unanimously*

Meeting ADJORNED AT 5:45

Minutes respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom