

## **EPC Minutes**

**November 7, 2019**

**Meeting started at 11:00am**

**A&F Conference Room A**

**Members Present:** Jenn Lillig (JL), Christina Baker-Foley(CF), Sheri Schonleber (SS), Kristen Daley (KD), Kathryn Chang (KC), Matty Mookerjee (MMo), Emily Asencio (EA), Kaitlin Springmier (KS), Melinda Milligan (MM), Edie Brown (EB), Melissa Kader (MK), Luisa Grossi (LG), Stacey Bosick (SB)

Ex officio: Karen Moranski( KM), Katie Musick (KM)

### **Approved Agenda with following changes:**

1. Remove Consent Item Anthro 596C from the agenda
2. Adjust date from 10/24 to 11/7

### **Approved Minutes with the following change**

1. Changed the word “new” to “noon” in the minutes from 10/24, will make edit to the 10/24 minutes and approved conditionally

## **Current Discussion Items**

### **1. Status Discussion**

#### **a. Process--moving forward with program changes as a result of new GE**

JL: GE Implementation meetings, next semester's schedule is up, the School of Science & Technology's programs that have changes to majors and minors will come to EPC, as well as GEP and Philosophy because they are heavily impacted. They already have assigned dates. Then in the Fall A&H will visit EPC. This roll out is in alignment with how Area GE distribution areas are rolling out. Departments can also make other changes at that time. A question that came up is what are programs going to submit? In the past programs submitted materials showing what they use to have and then how it is now. Can we simplify by saying here's your new curriculum, and then look at comparison of major course work, and not worry about all the other little changes to catalog copy? Because what is in Curriculog and how departments are thinking about it could very well be two very different things. Does that make sense? Do we as a committee want to see a side by side for catalog copy as departments move through with changes?

MM: The side by side is super helpful, not sure what we would not be seeing?

JL: Well it depends, in Chemistry we use 4 year plans, those units don't matchup with Curriculog. Some departments will pull their catalog copy from the computer, Curriculog will not match with what a department thinks it will offering. What do we want departments to bring to EPC?

MM: Imagine the sorts of issues that have come up in the past when we look at proposals, will we have access to that information?

JL: Could we just pretend that they are new, a new program? We could ignore the old units. Could we pretend that they are new and not ask for a side by side? If Chemistry does not know what to put forward, no one will. Could we just ask departments for a summary of changes, not ask for that side by side? Don't know what is best.

MM: Can there be a set of instructions that go out to help specify what is needed and then revised based on feedback?

KM: I wonder if a few of us could sit down and work it out and then come back to EPC with a set of instructions or a modest proposal?

JL: Can all EPC members go to Curriculog and look at your own department's catalog copy for your own program. Look at your department's curriculum, what would you have said your original copy would say? They are not coming until February, but they will need to go to school curriculum committees first.

KM: Right now I am hearing there is much confusion on a variety of fronts, not least of which is Curriculog and the way it looks and where people find things. We have some work to do to help people acclimate.

KMu: Advocate that we not get caught up on what the old program was, especially for 4 year plans and move forward with looking at only the new programs.

KM: Deciding what we mean by side by side comparison is the issue, deciding what we need to know from programs, can we "templatize" that side by side comparison so basically people can fill in the blanks?

## **New Business Items**

1st Reading: Business Admin BS Conc. Wine Business Strategies (TC

11:30 K. Thompson and D. Jordan)- see Curriculog

DJ: Brief introduction, the Wine Business Concentration wants to establish a production track, and the idea is to work the SRJC so students take some courses at the JC that are more production orientated, then come to SSU and finish their Wine Business Concentration, except it would be with a production track. A lot of people are very excited about this. SRJC is very excited doing this with us, and so are the Wine Concentration faculty. There seems to be very little downside from SSU's side. Really just gives options to JC students, do stuff there and then come here to SSU. Students from the JC could get a Wine Production Concentration with a production track. Call their degree from the JC the production track certificate. Doesn't really change anything that happens at SSU in terms of the Wine Business Concentration.

MM: What about our native students? Can they be current students here at SSU and then take classes at the JC and bring them back?

DJ: Yes they can.

KM: If a SSU student goes over to the JC are those 8.5 units from the JC replacing units they would do here (at SSU)?

KT: Four units in particular, students would take a bunch of courses that enable them to work in the field. As part of those experiences we say we will count that as our Internship requirement, which would count as 4 units.

DJ: So an SSU students would have to plan ahead, so they would not take over 120 units. The Internship is required, so if they do an Internship prior and then decide to do this track they would have to take an additional 3 units at the JC.

KMu: Nothing would keep an SSU student from graduating with over 120 units, they could complete their degree here at SSU and then complete the certificate after they graduate, 3-4 unit internship at SSU with a 2 unit course at JC plus 1 unit for being in the field.

JL: Wait, now I am confused about the certificate component?

KT: They get the certificate at the JC.

EB: And that's along with their associate degree, the certificate?

KT: Yes

MM: Now I'm confused about graduation? 4 units in the track, 8.5 at the JC, are those additional units? Doing the track does not have any additional units? Can you explain the track, does it have any additional units? 8.5 units at JC, but only getting credit for 4 units at SSU? Is that a hidden unit requirement?

KMu: Still 120 units.

KT: Students can use their free electives.

MM: What about the 70 units they can transfer, does that prevent them from taking more units?

KMu: They can continue to take classes and bring the content over to SSU. Special track within the concentration, not a transcribed requirement. They would get a certificate from SRJC. 70 units is a separate calculation count, they can continue to take JC units and bring the content over.

KMu: This is more of an advising thing, if it isn't declared. Talking about, instead of taking these 4 units the department will take this courses.

MM: So if it isn't transcribed, what do they get? How do they demonstrate the work?

KT & KM: They get a certificate from the JC.

SB: This is largely a symbolic relationship/formalizing a partnership with the JC.

DJ: This is something they can put on their resume, but not audited here at SSU, the certificate can go on their resume.

KM: One of the things that occurs to me as I'm listening is how much of this is an advising issue, sounds like we should have advice for both transfer students that are bringing it in and want to claim the production track as well as students that started here, and take 8.5 units at JC, then bring them through to claim the production track. An advising guide or page thing, that says if you are going to do a production track here is what you do, how you do it, here is what you would say on your resume, a cheat sheet for students about what this is and how it would work.

EB: This would be a choice on the students part, not a have to. This is a whole new component of advising and will trickle down to all types of advising on campus, particularly the Advising and Transfer Center.

JL: It might be useful on the side by side to note where these 8.5 units are going, shown under the general electives, under the GE Chem class with lab. Helpful to know where these units are coming from. 8.5 units go under general electives?

EB: Wouldn't it be 4 general electives and 4 for Internship?

KMu: Basically it is these lower division units, accepted, in lieu of a single course in the program other units are general electives and the GE course.

JL: You could add 105, 115, most likely will take 102. Chem 102, 105, 115, equivalents at the JC.

JL: Do they need a lab?

KT: Yes, the expectation would be that they would have a lab.

JL: I can check the Chem classes for you regarding articulation.

SS: Quick thing, on their degree it won't list the track, sometimes students think the track will show up on their degree. Make sure students are aware of that when advising.

LG: How is this available to students coming from another community college?

KT: Currently just an agreement with the SRJC at the moment. However, in the future we would love to expand it out to Napa and outside community colleges. Once we figure it out then we can work on expanding it. Otherwise, I would say transfer students would be like our native students and would take those specific courses.

LG: Not seeing how putting all of this in the catalog is helpful. I think it will just be confusing, not sure an advising track needs to be in the catalog.

KMu: I understand that it won't be listed in the catalog, the only thing that would be noted are what courses would be accepted in lieu of 499. The whole thing will not be in the catalog, all the rest is just advising.

DJ: That is not my understanding. Thought we would put all of this in there, additions of new track would go here as follows and all of our wording that follows would go in the catalog, more of a PR thing with the JC, allows us to establish a formal relationship with the JC that they want to claim.

KMu: Hesitant to list everything, want to give the JC flexibility, every academic year you would have to reach out to JC to do that, would advise that we link to the program at the JC, I would advocate linking it to the JC catalog with the electronic catalog, too much matching. Best to list it once. Not trying to match JC with SSU.

JL: What does EPC want to see for the catalog text?

KT: The trick is that the required courses are from a different couple certificates at the JC. I think we need to link to one thing that says what it is.

KMu: As long as it isn't listed at both SSU and JC, so we don't have to match our website to their website.

SS: Maybe it is just a simple phone call, person in charge can call every semester to

confirm with the JC?

SB: Certainly hear your concern Katie, about the redundancy but I do believe in this case that they need to list it separately because they are cherry picking across courses, can't easily link or reference certification program. To me it makes sense to have it in the catalog as largely the point is to create this relationship, important to create that relationship with the JC.

CBF: Is this information in the catalog at the JC or will it be?

KT: My understanding is that this pathway has already been approved at the JC, but it won't be listed until we finish our process and it is approved.

CBF: If they have it in their catalog we should as well.

JL: So this is a first reading, the only thing I have is that we need to check on the Chemistry courses. I am not hearing anything else they need to bring back.

KT: Reorder side by side?

JL: I get it now, just add Chemistry course to side by side.

CBF: Question about the details of the Chemistry course, do they need to list the specific courses? Does it have to be defined, can it just be "lower division, GE Area B1 with a lab."

JL: Any GE Chem course with lab can work.

LG: Question in my mind, I know that the JC are lower division courses, will that be an issue with meeting the Internship requirement?

KMu: Idea was that they have to meet the requirements of the Internship course, which were in addition to taking the courses.

KT: I believe what they are doing in those courses they typically do in a 499 Internship. The only difference is that the JC students don't get paid, but there is great similarity even if it is a lower division course, so that is the justification to set up that articulation.

EB: How do we articulate that?

JL: We do that, for Organic Chemistry. It just articulates.

LG: But the students don't get upper division credit.

JL: You'll be 3 units shy for upper division in the program.

KMu: That is not an issue because Business is so far beyond its unit requirement.

JL: Okay so now, just put any GE Chem Course, underneath the lower division part, in the catalog copy, "GE Chem class with lab", instead of listing courses. That is all I am hearing. Is there other stuff?

MM: What is actually going to appear in the catalog? Sounds like more research needs to be done on their end.

DJ: What is on the proposal will appear in our catalog as the relationship with the JC is important. That is how we are demonstrating this partnership with the JC.

JL: Make those simple changes, should just say "GE Chemistry course with lab." Add that as well in the original side by side, under the 39 units, specify "GE Chemistry course with lab." That's not very much to bring back.

KD: Made a motion to waive the first reading.

MMo: Seconded

Discussion on the motion

CBF: Question about the info in the catalog. Will the info that the Wine Business has proposed be in the catalog?

DJ: Yes

CBF: Who is the intended audience for this program?

DJ: This is really for students at the JC, production expertise and then those students can come to SSU to get a 4 year degree. Really mostly for JC students.

CBF: Seems what matters most is what is in the catalog at the JC.

JL: Any other discussion on waiving the first reading? Hearing no discussion all those in favor of waiving the first reading say I.

EPC Committee: I (unanimously approved)

JL: All those opposed, say Nay, (no oppositions). Second reading, any further discussion on the proposal itself? Hearing no further discussion, I think we can go ahead and vote on the proposal, with the condition that we add or replace anywhere it says the specific Chem classes with the following “GE Chemistry course with lab.”

That will be added to page 3, original side by side as well. All those in favor of approving the proposal with those changes say I.

EPC Committee: I,

JL: All those opposed say Nay, (no oppositions), unanimously approved.

KM: Congratulations!

## Reports

JL: Back to reports. Assessment structure for the GE process, so Melinda can you discuss.

MM: The person that wanted to speak to this in particular was Christina so maybe we hold off on that until she returns.

JL: Okay, yes. I didn't have anything other than that, except for GI 2025.

KM: What do we want to say about GI 2025?

JL: That we went...

KM: Yes, so there was a group from SSU, VP's were required to be there, as was the President. Jen went in Laura Watt's place. Probably the most useful symposium we have been to so far. Brought people in from “outside,” from elsewhere in the US to do presentations on “best practices”. It wasn't CSU people delivering “best practices” to CSU people, lots of new ideas on ways to implement and use “best practices.” Allowed us to get some new ideas on ways of doing things. One of the sessions I went to was about “process mapping procedure for change.” This presentation dealt with policy and procedure issues, how we have that conversation regarding barriers to graduation, this I

found very valuable. Bigger takeaways: we heard from Gavin Newsom who indicated his support for GI 2025. But also indicated that there would not be, for the CSU in general, a lot of big money coming our way for future years, we got our big stake this year. And, so I don't know what that means for future funding, will we get 75 million or smaller increments of funding, which would be nice? Not clear we can count on that in the future, might be what we received is what we have, clear message from governor that a big slate of money is not coming to the CSU. The other thing that came out as we were at the conference were the new GI 2025 metrics for the past year, and what was astounding was that the four year graduation rate went up 6 percent in one year to 40 percent, remember in 2016 it was 28 percent. Most of that change came in the last year, a testament to the funding we have gotten and the way we have deployed that, finally having impact, finally seeing the payoff of that. Other really good news for us was that our gap for Pell eligible students went down by 4 percent, went basically from 9.5 percent to 5.5 percent, went down 4 percent which is excellent. Indicating again that some of our programs for low income, under-represented, first generation students are starting to pay off. Those are the good pieces of news. The 6 year rate remains really flat, speculation that we see change there soon, not quite there yet, but will see the 6 year rate go up as well. The transfer rate was kind of flat this year but had been going up, so we really need to think about our transfer work. Jen, other takeaways for you. JL: I think yes from the faculty perspective, there was a lot of talk, particularly from the student panels regarding what helps them stay in college and graduate. This is when faculty and student affairs work together, such as the CARE team, EOP programs, the fact that the faculty member knows about these programs and can communicate that to students, that interface was a big deal. A little bit going on about the quantitative reasoning requirement, that's controversial.

KM: Two big legislature issues, the quantitative reasoning requirement and the ethnic studies requirement.

MM: Because Jen mentions that, I'll mention that the feedback I have gotten on the Senate Ethics Memo, thus far is not relevant, it is just rehashing old conversations from last year. How do we move forward? People want to keep having those conversations.

JL: Maybe this is an item for Senate to consider; how we move forward after these decisions?

SB: Yes, an outlet for those conversations to occur.

MM: Content Criteria meeting for C, same idea, rehashing ideas, needs to be a way to get past that now, and work with what was passed.

JL: Anything else we need to talk about.

KM: AIS (Association for Interdisciplinary Studies) Conference, held in Amsterdam this year. The Hutchins School at SSU hosted the first conference in 1989. This organization was founded in the late 1970s by people from Hutchins along with others from across the United States. SSU was a founding member of AIS and Hutchins played a huge role

and hosted the conference in 1989, so there is history with this organization from Sonoma State. In the 90s and early 2000's SSU didn't continue its association with AIS. But I came to SSU having been a president of AIS and have been trying to bring it back into the radar screen. So we decided to host the conference, next October. Faculty members, Jeff Baldwin and Kim Hester Williams (and others) have been involved thinking through our conference proposal. We finally settled on the topic of "Wicked Problems." Conference proposals in 2020 will be centered around "Wicked Problems" some of it regarding sustainability, but also how do we sustain institutions, our academic mission, etc. I think there are a lot of questions that fall under "Wicked Problems." We are really excited about the topic as was the group in Amsterdam, there were 29 countries--6 continents represented in Amsterdam, so the conference was extremely international in focus. We will try to get 20 countries. Jen went and Merith Weismann went and presented with Damian Wilson, we had good representation there and a number of good conversations. We will be putting out a call for proposals soon for SSU to participate, hope that faculty can consider what they can bring to that conference. Spoke with Jacob from GMC about bringing Liz Lerman back for the conference. We are still looking for speakers.

JL: I would like to put it on our horizon for us to talk about, talking about Sea Lanes, start helping folks think about Sea Lanes and how to connect it to the conference.

KM: One more thing, at the Provost's Leadership Council the Deans were expressing concern about how to use Curriculog, so there is a lot of confusion, we seem to be in a little cycle here where people are really struggling with it. If you have thoughts about that, we need to get on top of that and help people in as many ways as possible. Please send any feedback you have to Stacy, and she can work with Kari to manage this and work through the issues.

SB: What are some of the things that came up?

KM: Part of it is the real confusion about the catalog approval process through Curriculog...the Deans didn't know Hello Sign would go away once we started Curriculog. They are saying "it isn't user friendly, don't know what I am looking at, where do we find that, what's the best way to look at it." Further instructions on how to work with it in a better way. Mentioning it to this group because you are our group for curricular change so if you are struggling with it or have suggestions to lessen the struggle let us know.

JL: We will want to think from an EPC perspective what do we want to look at? Do we want them to upload the old forms?

KM: No, Absolutely not perpetuate the old forms, we should not have a new system and then have old forms.

JL: Maybe talking to Science and Tech, they are working on new proposals with Curriculog at this time.

MM: One thing that might help us now is to have Kari come back around and do more

hands on tutorials. Really need a low level workshop. I Heard the workshop at the Social Science Chair's meeting was very confusing for them.

MMo: I would say a similar thing for when Kari came to the Science & Technology Chair's meeting, it was very confusing.

SS: Maybe a small training here at EPC with Kari to make it relevant to our needs?

JL: We need a "button, next to Canvas."

KM: A tile, we will follow up on that.

SB: So in my mind it would be useful if I had help when I am actually working on a proposal, that one on one training is helpful, rather than looking at a pdf.

KM: Interesting that you ask that. Deans want a pdf with instructions such as: "Step 1 screenshot, Step 2 screenshot, a step by step..."

SB: So maybe both?

MM: Combination of both ideas, with separate "how to guides" that are role specific.

JL: Will invite Kari back to EPC's final meeting of the semester for a training. Please think about what types of things you want her to go over.

## **Old Business Items 21:12**

2nd Reading- Discontinuance Reading and Literacy Leadership

Specialist Credential (TC R. H. Casa, 12:30)- in Google Drive Folder

Rhianna Henry Casesa

RHC: I have twelve copies and the documents are also in the Google drive. The first reading was about a month ago. We are proposing to discontinue the Reading & Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential (housed within the School of Ed and the Dept of Literacy Studies), the main reason is that there is no longer community demand for this Tier 2 specialist credential. I have compiled the documents that you have requested, updated the initial rationale, anything bolded is what you requested, indicated we no longer have students in the program, added letters from local administrators, slides from our most recent Reading Advisory Meeting informing the community about this discontinuance. This is something we have been talking about since at least 2015. You will also find in your packet a statement I wrote as Reading Advisory Committee Chair giving you some background information and all the MCCCFS for all of the courses we are proposing to discontinue. Do you have any questions or do you want more detail?

JL: We have to figure out how to get this into Curriculog.

RHC: So that's the problem, right, because we started this back in the Spring, and now it has gone to Grad Studies, but seems there is no evidence of it ever being there.

JL: It has gone there because you have been agendidized, but got lost in the black whole of documentation. If Karin Grady will sign the forms in Curriculog and then add the minutes from GSS that would be helpful. We will need to get all materials on Curriulog. I will speak with Kari about having her upload those materials.

KM: Laura Watt will need to sign for Graduate Studies

JL: Other questions? Hearing no further discussion...all those in favor of approving the discontinuance say I.

EPC Committee: I

JL: All those opposed, say Nay. (no oppositions)

Unanimously approved

### **Discussion on GE Assessment 12:50**

MM: First to bring you up to date, S&F was charged with collecting input on how to manage GE Assessment and the GE overlays--how is that going to fit in governance? For the overlays part, S&F came up with proposing an ad hoc subcommittee of EPC modeled off of GE in terms of membership and that there would be specific language we recommend for the task of this committee. Finalizing that at our next meeting, bringing forward to ExCom, what is working well. The big question is the GE Assessment question, how should it be changed/where should it be housed? Academic Programs clearly interfaces with governance, but where does that intersection happen? Is it APARC or EPC? Does everything come back to EPC or to APARC? Where in governance and administration is it housed?

KM: We decided that GE Subcommittee doesn't want to hear any of that information?

KS: GE Subcommittee wanted to have representation if there was an assessment group and wanted to hear about it, but didn't want to do all of the leg work.

JL: What do you mean by leg work?

KS: Assessment of signature assignments.

MM: They are doing that on the administration side but who is doing it on the governance side? Take us through what is happening on the administration side.

KM: Take a step back, envision this happening, taking each area and sub-area, each course Learning Outcome, rolling sets of faculty (staff) on those teams organized and paid for by Academic Programs, I am having that conversation with the Provost about needing money for the next three years to run the assessment program. It will work like the WASC process, prior to our report, assess learning outcomes and courses and put a call out to faculty, they would meet as a small group 4-5 faculty during the summer for one learning outcome. They would pull in the student work that's been done that meets that learning outcome, strip them of all identifying information, student/faculty name goes away and then assess. Seems it would go back to GE Subcommittee, maybe as a complete package back to APARC. It would go to GE Subcommittee, they would be the decision makers.

KS: GE Subcommittee doesn't have that power.

JL: Who has the power to change the GE programs?

KM: EPC. Has to go potentially to two places depending on what we hear, either EPC or APARC.

JL: Who starts it? We should talk about that.

KM: I think it has to start at GE Subcommittee and then if they want to make recommendations for curricular reform it would go to EPC, if it is for planning or resources and they have recommendations for that then they would go to APARC.

MM: We should think about GE Subcommittee's Charge so that they feel empowered.

JL: Should we add a little more time for this discussion at our next meeting Melinda?

MM: Yes, it would be helpful to think about what the questions are and how to make sure everyone understands what is happening with assessment and who is charged with doing what and how it will be sent to governance.

JL: Please go through the Internship Policy and add your comments.

Meeting adjourns 12:50pm

Minutes submitted by Kristen Daley