

## EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 1ST 2009

### ROLE CALL:

Works-HERE  
Stearns-HERE  
Milligan--HERE  
Cabaniss-  
Grady-HERE  
Morrow  
Armand  
Cunnigham  
Clark  
Lee  
Colemen- HERE  
Barnard-HERE  
Tice- HERE

Meeting has began at 11:04

Approval of the Agenda: agenda approved

Approval of the minutes; minutes are approved

### REPORTS

CW report: GE committee passed to eliminate the nine unit upper-division GE in residence at the CSU other than SSU to comply with an executive order from the Chancellor. WASC next week on Thursday in Library third floor.

MB report; Dean/ departments are asked to create a five year plan in order to close the loop on program review to create and MOU. Catalog is going to be online. Deadlines are going to November 6th for catalog changes or changes to majors and minors. This is going to be an every year catalog, this should be a fluid cycle change. The new catalog is out May 28th of every year. Retention task force is issuing a report; "consider having student declaring their major earlier?", does this correlate with retention... Dean Rahimi and Rose Bruce collected data.

CW; there is a lot of confusion on what this five year plan MOU is going to accomplish; relay message to provost.

TS report: he did not attend the committee

CW Report GE subcommittee: Nov 6th presentation on 4 unit GE pattern.

TS Senate budget committee: there is a resolution that is being formulated out of the senate budget committee to change the percentage of the allotment that comes from the state from its current levels to Academic Affairs up to 50% (with benefits), it is currently at 31% without benefits, 43% with one. More details yet to come.

Nobody on University Standards committee so no report.

## Business Items

TC: 11:20-11:40 Sandra did not show up at the right time as noted on the agenda.

CW speaks on double major and minor conversation. Do we want to make a policy that works for both sides of the issue?

MB other campuses are looking at this same issues. 852 students with more than just 230 have two majors, 577 major and a minor, 26 two majors and one minor, 5 students with three majors, 2 people with one major and three minors.

TS: university standards maybe?

MB: the provost asked this committee for a response

CW: we will bring this issue to the next EPC meeting.

TC began at 11:46 changes to the Liberal Studies Program Ukiah:

Sandra: Solano asked to replicate Ukiah program for Solano Community college. The shift came in policies to ask bachelors program regarding preschool and kindergarten, this is on hold till 2012 to teach early childhood education. This is why we were asked. Obama passed January new GI bills, and of the states basis in military areas (Vallejo and Fairfield Area). This has been looked at for a year. Napa has 60 participants in the program, demand is increasing at a fast rate. This is a substantive change because of the increase in distance.

SF: very diverse population at the Napa and Solano campus

SF: 275 a unit is the cost, an increase Extended Ed. May increase the cost to 295 a unit. Money is not coming back the department yet. OSHER is doing a great job getting monies for students for scholarships.

TS: does not think he is ready to support this without the document without resource allocation; this needs to have a clear statement on how resources are going to come back to the university. This is a very important part. Note: section 4 in regards to faculty in "how is this going to be staffed."

BC: there needs to be a comparison of money going in and out of this program, how does other extended education return monies to schools, we need that quantitative analysis

TS: we need it to come back for a first reading.

TS: I am moving that a completed document be brought back for a first reading in two weeks.

SF: the approval by this body for the Napa program used the same document.

CONTACT: [sandra.feldman@sonoma.edu](mailto:sandra.feldman@sonoma.edu) for more correspondence.

TC 12:06 PM Rheyana Laney GE SUBCOMMITTEE-

CW: first reading of the whole GE program review.

SC: advising subcommittee should be a participants in the conversation of advising in GE. What does "centralize" mean in item ten.

RL: is there scheduling conflicts in GE subcommittee? That is how I read item number 10.

BC: does this infringe on departments right to schedule. This could be prescriptive

JT: I think that item 8-9 should be high priorities not 2-3 years ones

RL- I do not think that we can put all priorities as high for the next years.

CW- we are approving the document of the whole (GE program review).

TS- why are we commenting on the action items? What are we talking about how to proceed.

CW- this is the time to say the RL to look at comments and questions; do we want any changes, this is program review of general education.

RL- a lot of pressure from executive order and WASC, this is why we set up priorities about how we need to spend our time. We don't to over step our bounds as a subcommittee of EPC.

BC- GE subcommittee is a senate committee, not a department, What is going to be future of program review. What does this mean to department.

CW- please look at the Assessment plan because WASC is looking at it, lets have RL come back for a second reading.

ASSEMENT PLAN- TC 12:25

RL: we had a retreat in August, WASC WANTS TO SEE AN ASSEMENT PLAN- so they made one. There is a lot of stuff that we want to assess, they did not have enough time to put together a full plan, so this is what that they rolled out to please WASC. They were told that "you need to start with sub area learning out comes- the assessment plan." ASSEMENT INSTUMENT AND PROCESS- the idea here is that everyone who is teaching in D1 will be operating off of a common rubric to asses the common objectives that they want to do. Every faculty will come up with their own assessment of instrument that can fall into broader rubric that can identify " apples and apple" so there is continuity to program review and assessment. THIS IS A LOT OF LABOR, we cannot do it as a subcommittee and they NEED RESOURCES to do this, faculty member and student assistant???? and the time line in SPRING 2010.

CW- should we endorse this to be looked at by WASC?

MB- this is not a cement detail to WASC, this just shows what GE subcommittee is doing as a next step. This would be a good vehicle for WASC to relay communication to the provost that MORE RESOURCES ARE NEEDED.

Karen moves to give to GE assessment to look at WASC to look at document-

CW- eventually we can approve the assessment plan as a plan later in committee work in future agendas. Reyna will be back.

TS- he likes the document, although complex, and this is unexplained territory. Move to move time certain by 5 minutes- moved by TS second by Lynn.

TC 12:36- discontinuance policy

CW document is unclear about discontinuance policy for concentrations. Any additions corrections and additions. There are bargaining units implications. So are there suggestions for changes?

MB: I think that we need to really absorb this. The most concerning, is budget and layoffs, this changes the nature for discontinuance. The speed at which this happens may change in tough budget times. This committee needs to talk about layoff discontinuance policy. It is done department by department

Lynn- suspension of program? Why do we use this as a mechanism is that is to happen?

CW- we need a suspension piece.

TS- our policy needs to be precise and clear about the process by which that happens especially if the provost prioritizes departments. Who can INITIATE DISCONTINUANCE, THIS IS IMPORTANT!!!! Especially GIVEN BUDGETARY IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEXT YEAR. BLUE PAPER POLICY. THIS NEEDS TO BE EXPLICIT.

BC- this conversation did come up during psychology concentration.

MC- echoes TS concerns.

CW what is EP&R 79-10 and EP&R 80-45

BC- this is a question for both EPC AND APC.

SC- this needs to happen before students are stopped being accepted.

MB- we never officially went into lay off on this campus.

CW- I WILL SEND THIS OUT AS A WORD DOCUMENT AND WE CAN ALL WORK ON IT AND BRING IT BACK.