Academic Senate

AGENDA

September 9, 2021
Via Zoom

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – L. Morimoto
Approval of Agenda
Approval of Minutes

Information items: End of Year reports from Senate, APARC, AAS, GE, PDS, FSSA, Scholarship, S&F; Draft Scheduling Guidelines for Spring 2022; Revised Academic Advising Subcommittee charge

Special Reports: University Budget with Laura Lupei TC 3:20; Enrollment Strategies with Elias Lopez TC 4:00

Business

1. Resolution Endorsing Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History- Second Reading – L. Morimoto


Standing Reports

1. President of the University - (J. Sakaki)
2. Provost/Vice-President, Academic Affairs - (K. Moranski)
3. Vice Chair of the Senate - (B. Burton)
4. Interim Vice President/Admin & Finance - (S. Nosek)
5. Vice President for Student Affairs – (W. G. Sawyer)
6. Vice-President of Associated Students – (K. Shipton/C. Gomez)
7. Statewide Senators - (W. Ostroff, R. Senghas)
8. Staff Representative – (K. Sims)
9. Chairs, Standing Committees:
   - Academic Planning, Assessment & Resources – (E. Lewis)
   - Educational Policies – (E. Asencio)
   - Faculty Standards & Affairs – (R. Whitkus)
   - Student Affairs – (K. Thompson)
10. CFA Chapter President – (E. J. Sims)

Occasional Reports

1. Senate Diversity Subcommittee – (L. Murdock-Perriera)
2. Lecturers Report – (St. John )
3. Graduation Initiative Committee (GIG)

Good of the Order


Absent: Wendy Ostroff, Izabela Kanaana, Cookie Garrett

Proxies: Jerlena Griffin-Desta for Judy Sakaki, David Crozier for Stan Nosek, Missy Garvin for Ben Smith

Guests: Carlos Torres, Jonathan Smith, Laura Krier, Melinda Milligan, Aidan Humrich, Katie Musick, Stacey Bosick, Kaitlin Springmier, Merith Weisman, Jenn Lillig, Kari Manwiller, Damien Hansen, Laura Alamillo, Kim Purdy, Arcelia Sandoval, Lynn Prime

Chair Report – L. Morimoto

L. Morimoto welcomed everyone to the first Senate meeting. She announced changes to the Senate membership this year. Brian Burton returns as Vice Chair. Emily Clark is our new Secretary. Ben Smith from Human Development joins us as the rep from Social Sciences, but he has a proxy, Missy Garvin, here today. Elita Virmani returns as representative from Education, Hilary Smith returns as a rep from the Library. Katara Shipton joins as the Associated Students representative. Emily Acosta Lewis joins us as the new APARC chair. Emily Asencio remains the Chair of EPC. Richard Whitkus joins us as a new FSAC chair. Karen Thompson is the new chair of SAC and Stan Nosek joins us as the interim VP of Administration and Finance and today he has a proxy, David Crozier. Jerlena Griffin-Desta will be proxy for President Sakaki today.
Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 5/20/2021 – Approved.

Consent item: Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – Approved.

Information Items: Proposal for Leadership Development; Resolution of No Confidence in Library Dean; Faculty Services through Academic Personnel

L. Morimoto offered the floor to the Senate Analyst to talk about the proposal for leadership development. L. Holmstrom-Keyes asked the Senators to send her any feedback they might have on the proposal.

L. Morimoto asked the visiting Library faculty if they wished to speak to the no confidence resolution. L. Krier said it's fairly self-explanatory and we have no specific request from the Senate at this time.

The ERFSA rep said on behalf of the ERFSA Board he wanted to express that they are extremely concerned that for the second time in this calendar year we have an altercation between a Dean and a faculty group. The Deans are supposed to be here to serve the faculty, to help us to do our jobs, to give us support, to do the work of budgets and hiring and so on that don't really require our help. These intrusions into faculty work, as these two Deans have done is totally unacceptable and he hoped that J. Griffin-Desta will take this message back to the President. Something's got to be done about this. These Deans report to the President and they really need to be lectured on what their role is here. We can't have this kind of thing going on. L. Krier said she wanted to note that the President and Provost have responded and there are things being done. We just wanted to send this forward as an information item to make sure that people were aware.

L. Morimoto noted that she will have the President and Provost reports first and then move to Senate business. Once the business is concluded, then she will return to reports. If anyone has a critical report to give, let her know and she will prioritize it.

President Report – J. Sakaki given by J. Griffin-Desta

J. Griffin-Desta said the President regrets not being able to attend today, but she did want to let you all know, she's received numerous calls and letters from parents and students expressing their gratitude for being here last week for opening up the campus. This is similar to a lot of the feedback she received during our car commencement, so she wanted me to pass that on and that several of those notifications specifically praise faculty for doing a wonderful job. She wanted me to make sure faculty were aware of those communications. She also commented about the successful concert last Saturday which was the Jurassic Park/Santa Rosa symphony concert. There were over 2000 attendees, so it was the largest crowd, masked and distanced, since we opened. She wanted to support the remaining Green series that we’re very proud of and has been finalized in terms of the season. She mentioned that Dr. Sylvia Alba who was the previous Provost at Cal Poly
Pomona is the newly appointed Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs in the Chancellor’s office.

Provost Report – K. Moranski

K. Moranski said welcome back and it has been a real pleasure to see faculty, to see students, to see staff, to see the campus waking up and being alive, to see students engaging and talking with one another. Welcome to all who are in person and for those of you who are not in person, thank you for the continued work that you are doing in remote fashion to ensure that our students have continuity in their educational process. We really appreciate the work that everyone is doing in every way that they are doing it. To that end, the Continuity Planning group has been reappointed for the 21-22 academic year. This is the group that has done considerable work and has been making decisions through the pandemic and they are continuing that work at the President’s behest. The group has been reconstituted. We meet tomorrow. VP Stan Nosek, herself and Jacob Yarrow from the Green Music Center are running the Continuity Planning group. One of the subjects that we will be taking up tomorrow is the percentage of in-person, hybrid and online courses and the guidelines for the spring semester. We will be working on what the spring semester should look like and what those targets might be. Our recommendation will obviously be discussed widely and we’ll get input and feedback from the Senate. It’s important that we move forward as quickly as possible because scheduling is happening for spring and she wanted to make sure that we have clear objectives in mind as we did for this fall. She thought it helped to have clear expectations, objectives and clear targets.

We are hearing that some students are a little bit confused about which mode they’re in and part of that is because we’re seeing some temporary shifts of mode of instruction related to a couple of classes in which there have been positive cases of COVID. She urged faculty to be very clear with students about what mode they’re in and help students to understand that if there has to be a sudden shift, what the timing of that is and what’s going to happen with the class while that shift is happening. We are also looking at the suggestion of some of our faculty in the School of Social Sciences at metrics for determining when the campus might have to pivot as a campus, under what circumstances, what level of infection that might have to occur for us to pivot to remote again. We certainly hope that that doesn’t happen and our COVID numbers are low. We’re in pretty good shape, as we always have been, because we’ve been conservative and she wanted to ensure that continuity as we move forward throughout this year and that we have the best and latest information about the delta variant and the issues that are related to pivoting remotely for individual classes or for the campus as a whole. She encouraged the Senators to look at the Faculty FAQs - academicaffairs.sonoma.edu/faculty-faqs-fall-2021. A lot of questions are continuing to come up and a lot of the answers, at least what we know now, are in those FAQs.

The search for the AVP of Faculty Success is continuing, and we hope to have announcements about that within the next few days. We appreciate the work of the search committee.
A member said he was hoping that we might hear a little bit more from Provost Moranski about the matter of replacing Deborah Roberts’ former position. Things were in some turmoil last time we met in May. There's been considerably more chaos this summer. The Provost said that's what she was just talking about. The member said he didn’t feel we heard sufficient detail. We need to know what the thinking is and what's the strategy on the reorganization. The Provost said the position of AVP for Faculty Success is a position that responds to the concerns that faculty raised in May at the Forum about having a position that would be supportive, that would be in the Provost’s office, that would be a highly ranked position and that would address concerns of faculty related to RTP, related to faculty hiring, and related to a number of other issues that arise for faculty. She shared the position widely, including with ourselves this summer to get feedback. That’s what’s moving forward right now through a search process. We want to get that position in place immediately, we want to have that support available immediately for faculty, so that faculty can receive the support that they need. In addition, the staff in Faculty Affairs have moved to HR and are now called Academic Personnel and are under Jeff Banks’s direction. They are still in place, they’re already supporting faculty, they’re already answering questions as they always have and as they will continue to do.

There is a document in the Senate packet with a list of the functionalities that are part of what has formally been Faculty Affairs and is now Academic Personnel. We created that list so that faculty would have access to it and would be able to find out where they need to go for support from the folks that that have always been supportive of faculty. We'll also try to put up a graphic organizer online so that is graphically represented as well. The work continues, the support continues, and we will be moving forward to do everything we can to support faculty in the many ways that they asked us for support.

The member said the timing here seems to be very awkward. We’re already in the second week of instruction. He heard that this is an internal search. Is someone going to move into this position and leave a bunch of courses without instructors. What are you thinking about that? Secondly, he want to wanted to confirm that it is still an interim position for this year. The Provost said yes, it is an interim position because we will respond to and get feedback from faculty about how this works and what we need to do. In terms of your question about classes, in the job description and the call for applications, one of the things that we indicated is that she would work with anyone who assumed that position to find equitable solutions, and it is going to depend on what the faculty member is teaching this semester, but we will certainly not leave students without faculty. We will work with folks to ensure that we have the classes covered. We may just have to work with someone to continue having a light teaching load this semester. She worked closely with Senate leadership on this issue and the timing of this issue, because all of us were worried about the timing of the issue, and we did contemplate that this would go into the first couple of weeks of the semester, and indeed it has. We’ll do the best we can and work with the process and work with people to ensure that continuity of instruction happens, but also that we have the support that we need because that has been a prime subject of consideration.
Crash Course in Robert’s Rules

A singing and dancing PowerPoint was shown providing a crash course in Robert’s Rules. Resources on the Senate website for RR:
http://senate.sonoma.edu/governance/governance-resources

Resolution Endorsing Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History - First Reading – L. Morimoto

L. Morimoto said before she presented this, she want to be clear about what she was bringing to the Senate. This resolution is asking the Senate to endorse the statement, not to become signatories, to endorse it and to ask President Sakaki to endorse it and the Chancellor of the CSU system to endorse it. This resolution is addressing the efforts in certain states to legislate the teaching of American history and in particular what topics are permitted to be taught, how certain topics are to be taught and then the exclusion of certain theoretical constructs in the discussion and teaching of American history. We were troubled by this for numerous reasons. It’s problematic in terms of the practice of history itself. It’s problematic from a pedagogical standpoint as well. This is a first reading. First reading completed.

Vice Chair Report – B. Burton

B. Burton said we have been working with ERFSA on trying to incorporate retired faculty more into the Academic Senate process. Also, we have been working with the staff council. We’re trying to make communication better between these different groups.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – S. Nosek given by D. Crozier

D. Crozier said he had a short budget update. The Cabinet is working on closing the campus operating budget deficit of approximately $11 million and the plan for that is to use one time funds of $7 million which came from the Federal stimulus dollars. Next year is going to be the more serious challenge. We’re going to have to increase revenues through enrollments and look at decreased expenditures because we’re projected to have a similar budget deficit next year and those federal dollars aren’t available next year for us.

A member asked about the issues of venues on campus for food and coffee. We only have SIP and the Kitchens right now and for a lot of us, that’s quite difficult. He has been speaking with S. Nosek and wanted to mention this explicitly to the Senate, to know that there is communication going on. He’s been getting positive feedback from a number of his colleagues about the idea that during this interim time having food trucks that are independently operated, pop ups for food and coffee in multiple places on campus would really make this place much more livable. If anybody has been having difficulty getting access to textbooks for their courses, if they’re late coming in, we’re trying to look into this at a more process structural level rather than
isolated incident kind of response. If you have any of those kinds of issues, please send him an email, richard.senghas@sonoma.edu, and so we can try and look at the Senate level, to reduce the likelihood of repeats in the future.

Vice President for Student Affairs Report – Wm. G. Sawyer

Wm. G. Sawyer said he hope that those on campus have noticed the activity on campus yesterday. We had a number of folks who assisted us with handing out hot dogs and other things to students. It was almost as though the campuses was back to normal. It was fun seeing that. A number of our athletes showed up in their gear. A number of students came to for about two hours, and it was fun watching the President sling hot dogs and a couple of our folks were out there handing out the ketchup and mustard. He provided an update on housing. With all the divisions putting in so much effort, he could report that we have 604 first year, first-time students. We have 227 transfer students that are also first time and we have 1062 returning SSU students for a final count of 1935. 1800 was our break even number. We were excited that we would be at 1935. We pushed for 2000 and at one point we were at 2000 and little bit above, but when some students found out that they may not have in-person classes, they decided to stay at home and opt for virtual. If the numbers start to change around census we will certainly bring that back to the Senate. Also, very importantly, we have about two thirds of all students that are attending the university vaccinated and over three quarters of our students that are participating in-person had been vaccinated. Also know that there are opportunities for students to have a medical exemption or a religious exemption. All that is in Point and Click, and we have all that information in our Student Health Center. We’re keeping track of all of those individual and they still must be tested weekly. The test will show on their clearance form, so if they were to come into class and they have not been tested, it will show. You’ll either see a yellow or red, but you won’t see the green clearance. Testing is happening in the Daneli Gym in the Rec Center. Numbers are going up and this is only our second week. Students know now that they can’t go into class until they have a green screen, so they must be tested, if they are not vaccinated. He has been assured that vaccinations continue to go up weekly.

The Chair said that she saw in the news that Chico State had a data breach and students who had asked for exemption, their personal information was put out in the universe. Did that cause any examination of our security or are did the VP know if we’re doing something different. Wm. G. Sawyer said we are. What happened at Chico is that they use a third party vendor. For us, we use Point and Click. Point and Click is what we’ve been using all along for our students, so it when you have your card it’s automatically uploaded into our system. We have three exemption forms: An exemption for medical, for religion, and an exemption that we just ask them to fill out even if they’re not going to be on campus, letting us know that they have not been vaccinated, they don’t plan on it, but they are not coming to campus. Those are the three forms and ours are all uploaded immediately. It’s the same process that we’ve used in the past for vaccinations. Chico did not do that. We feel very badly, because we all know these individuals, and particularly for the students whose information is now out there. That won’t happen with us. He was not saying that it couldn’t possibly happen, it can happen anywhere, but our system
is much tighter. We had to send a report to the Chancellor's Office. The Chancellor's Office checks all campuses now, after that incident at Chico. The Provost said we are getting reports from the CIO David Chang about this, and we have been reassured that the structure of our operation insulates us from some of this in ways that Chico’s operation could not.

A member asked is it possible, or are the HIPAA hurdles and other things like that preventing the faculty from being able to be sent a list on the day of their class, showing which students have green or red notifications rather than us having to have the personal confrontation which he sensed might actually be more problematic. If we got advanced warning, and then could send a message to the student that might facilitate things. He could imagine a cranky student having driven a long way and showing up on campus and then being asked to show their status. It's going to be a very different mindset then knowing ahead of time and saying please don't come in, we will work with you. Wm. G. Sawyer said that one of the things he does during check-in for housing is the physical check-in himself with some of his staff. What they did is get a QR code which automatically gets them to the page and they just simply fill out the information. They get a big green screen which simply shows us they've been vaccinated and maybe haven't had to do the testing. But he understood that the difficulty is that we can't provide information along the line of what is being asked. The other part is sometimes the students do it right outside the classroom or do it right outside the building because they forgot. Some of us have forgotten and come to campus and then remember to do it. We are trying to remind students on a regular basis - make sure you get it done beforehand, so you don't hold up the faculty. That personal message went to every student he checked in - do not leave a faculty member waiting, have it ready to go show, so they can see that big green screen because that's very helpful. He didn’t know that there's anything else that we can do because we really are prohibited by HIPAA and by FERPA to be able to provide that information ahead of time. We have to be very, very careful with that. He wished there was a better way, and maybe we can find another way to resolve this. He wanted to make sure that if we do it, it doesn’t affect our students negatively, as well as faculty in the classroom.

A member said she understood that faculty may request information from students individually. Is that correct? Wm. G. Sawyer said yes. She said she did think there was a way and she thought he was thinking this through to make sure that we are all safe. Wm. G. Sawyer said absolutely and for the students we want to make sure that we’re providing an opportunity to safeguard their personal information and who better than the Professor who can speak with them one on one rather than starting sending something globally. Students are in your class and they’re under your tutelage and your protections and so it may take a little bit longer, but that’s where we can simply say to them again, please be prepared to walk into class and show me the green screen. The Provost said students had been told to do that, to be ready. S. Bosick said she would add a little bit of nuance to the individual request. She wanted to emphasize how important it is, if you're asking one student, that we ask all of the students in the class. Most folks know that and you’re used to working in that way. Certainly, feel welcome to pass that along to some junior colleagues who may not be thinking in those terms, so students aren’t feeling like they were called out for some other reason. Wm. G. Sawyer said we also are pushing extremely
hard with students about masking and reminding them that a gaiter is not appropriate. Some people have pulled up shirts over their nose, that does not work either. We’re just trying to make sure that’s not commonly held behavior on our campus. Any time that you see those things, as you can let us know. We’re just trying to make sure that we safeguard all of our students and faculty and staff to make sure that everyone is protected.

A member said he wanted to recognize the unfortunate event that happened last month where one of our students was killed on East Cotati avenue crossing the street. There was quite a bit of transportation related chatter on the Senate-talk mailing list over the last few weeks. At the end of last year, he was appointed as the one of the reps to the new Alternative Transportation Committee. His personal background is in transportation, so he hoped that we can have some fruitful conversations related to safety issues particular for students who are walking around our campus. Wm. G. Sawyer said thank you Senator, we are in conversations with the city and the city council and having those conversations with them. We would love to make sure that we have our faculty engaged in those same conversations because that’s going to be key in terms of how the students move around the city and, particularly more locally, how can they do that safely.

The Chair noted there was a chat question about N95 masks. For those who might need to N95 for protection as opposed to the regular surgical type masks, where might those be distributed on campus for faculty staff and our students. The Provost said we have to look into this one and she would see if she could find out during the meeting.

Associated Students Report – K. Shipton

K. Shipton introduced herself. She said she is a fourth year college student and a transfer student. She will be reading the report for Executive Vice President of the Associated Students Christina Gomez. She says “Hello, I wanted to start off by letting you all know that I unfortunately have class during the Academic Senate. However, I’m very excited that Katara gets to join you. She and I will be meeting weekly to discuss the agenda, along with the position of the Associated Students on these items. The Associated Students are prioritizing the expansion of in-person classes for the next semester, and ensuring that the online classes are of the highest quality. We are also looking into issues with accessibility, when it comes to taking courses at Sonoma State. One thing we’re looking into is faculty not placing their book orders in on time, which prevents students who need their course material in an accessible format like Braille in time for due dates classes. I look forward to working with all of you to ensure that the students at Sonoma State University receive a quality education and graduate with the tools to succeed in their fields. I’m always open to meeting with faculty so they can get a better understanding of the student perspective or to discuss any issues or new ways to educate. My email address is executive@sonoma.edu.”
Statewide Senator Report – R. Senghas

R. Senghas said the Academic Senate CSU is will be having its first plenary session on the second and third. All the committees will be having their first meetings on the first next week. We haven't really gotten underway, some of our agendas are still being established. Wendy Ostroff is going to be a member of the Academic Affairs Committee for this year. And she's also serving on a few other smaller university wide committees, including the Services to Students with Disabilities Advisory Committee and the Institute for Teaching and Learning Board and the Academic Conference Implementation committee. He will be serving on the Faculty Affairs committee. We're going to be bringing forward some of the concerns that we've been hearing at various different campuses about faculty workload whether it's dealing with how we handle those students who are unable to come to class because of COVID quarantining, requests for going into “high flex” or for in-person, those kinds of issues, as well as how do we handle on a policy level faculty who are wanting to teach remotely, especially if the institution is saying that they want to have more in-person courses. When those faculty don't feel safe, where they have family members who aren't safe and, in many cases we're seeing that it doesn’t qualify under the care that the various campuses have policies for ADA. They're not needing protection themselves, and so they can't say no, “I want to go remote,” regardless of what department or University policies are. Those will be among some of the things coming up in Faculty Affairs at the statewide level. He said he was open to taking any questions or, especially, to hear if people want things brought forward to the CSU Senate, let him know, and he can redirect it to whatever committee is appropriate.

Staff Representative Report – K. Sims

No report.

APARC Report – E. Acosta Lewis

E. Acosta-Lewis said APARC is doing some soul searching and we're trying to get back in touch with the roots of why APARC was formed and move forward with that charge. We're also going to update the charge to include ATISS, which is not currently included. We will focus a little bit more on the budgets and things that are not in happy times, right now, and also look at the future of online learning on campus, trying to figure out what we want to look like as a university in terms of online learning moving forward.

The Provost posted in the chat: Missy Brunetta indicates that N95 masks may only be officially distributed to the unvaccinated. This is an OSHA regulation. A member asked what about immunocompromised faculty/staff/students? The Provost said apparently the Cal OSHA the standard is about vaccination, not about at risk status. The Cal OSHA guidelines indicates that N95 masks may only be distributed by us to the unvaccinated. People could query HR regarding any accommodations that might need to be made.
The Chair noted those of you on Senate last year know that J. Reeder had instituted free the 50s. She knew it was better to let the Senate do that again, but she finds it’s like herding cats to get people back and focused again. She figured everyone was grown up enough to stand up and jump around and put on your music and take care of yourself as you see fit. If the Senate as a body decides, they would like to free the 50s in the middle of the meeting, make a motion. She didn’t want to do the last 10 minutes because she thinks we’re often going to need that, but if we finish early, then of course we’ll call it a day. If, as a body you decide now we want that break and please bring it up on the floor and she would be happy to take a motion on it and consider it.

EPC Report – E. Asencio

E. Asencio said EPC met for the first time today. We are getting our bearings for the semester. The main order of business will be responding to Provost Moranski’s decline to accept our approved WIC criteria on May 26th. We are going to be working through that and with the WIC chair and Chair Morimoto as well. That’s going to be forthcoming.

A member asked what aspects of the proposal were rejected. E. Asencio said the reason for the decline was the specification of a CS code in the criteria. The member asked which code number and what was the maximum size or the enrollment limit for that number that EPC proposed. E. Asencio said it’s for CS 25 for maximum enrollment of 25 students, which corresponds to the pedagogical structure of the WIC courses that have come out of all the research that was done on how to best to serve our students to the best of our ability in this kind of a course. The member said what number did the Provos’s office want it to be. The Provost said CS codes are guidelines, they are not regulations and so they should not be in a policy and because we may need to do other CS codes and faculty may request other CS codes. She did work with the Chancellor’s office extensively and with other Provosts from other campuses on that issue. A member said are you are you thinking of a particular number of students that should be in those with courses. The Provost said
there has been a traditional acceptance of 25 student size for those courses, but some faculty have requested or taken additional students in those. She thought it's about not setting maximums, so that we're locked in. It's not that she thought that that WIC courses should have large section sizes or be lectures. That's not the intent. The intent is to keep guidelines as guidelines and keep policy as policy.

A member asked do faculty need the assurance that they can stick to the 25 maximum student number and will they have that in the future, or is there a way to make sure that that will be guaranteed? The Provost said she thought that discussion of how to manage that is exactly what needs to happen in EPC. She was happy to help with that as needed.

The Chair chimed in on this, since she was at EPC today and noted that the student representative brought up a great point. The student felt that the class size was appropriate for the pedagogy and she got a lot out of the writing class. L. Morimoto said she would question how many of the course objectives are being met by a faculty member who says they want to take 35 students. Maybe they're just super teachers, but she thought it'd be very hard to do the things the WIC course is supposed to do. In terms of the student experience, the student said she got immediate feedback and she got feedback often. If we can, of course, have that opportunity for faculty, if faculty want to take more students, but she thought there was concern. We really want to look at what are we trying to do with those courses and keep the students in the forefront. Being able to give that kind of detailed feedback, she couldn’t imagine trying to do it with more than 25 students in a class. S. Bosick said she thought most folks recognize the benefit of having small courses and we're so fortunate to be where we have quite a few small courses. There is no interest in undermining that and in terms of the data, she wanted to reassure faculty that overwhelmingly the courses are taught at 25. There are just a couple of exceptions. That's their choice, not any administrative pressure. Overwhelmingly it is 25, because she thought everyone agrees that's a good recommendation.

**FSAC Report – R. Whitkus**

R. Whitkus said FSAC met for the first time today. One order of business that we conducted was to approve revised department RTP criteria so that they could get posted in time for this review cycle and those departments were Early Childhood Studies, English and Biology.

**SAC Report – K. Thompson**

No report.

**CFA Report – E. J. Sims**

E. J. Sims welcomed everyone back to campus and the fall semester, on behalf of herself and the CFA Executive Board, we're wishing you a great and productive and safe fall semester. Our first CFA meeting will be on September the 1st at 12 noon. It's a virtual meeting. It's for our Executive Board and it's a general meeting for all of our members. She hoped faculty can join us for that very first meeting. We will have
a presentation during that meeting on bargaining 101 to help you understand the bargaining process and also information about our contract action teams which we will be forming this fall semester. CFA is actively involved in getting out the vote against the recall of Governor Gavin Newsom. Governor Newsome has been a great friend of education K through PhD and with CFA’s advocacy we were able to convince him and the State legislators to add an additional $299 million to the budget. There’s money available for our fair contract and we’re committed to fighting for it. CFA has been made aware of the issues and concerns by our Librarians and we are monitoring that situation very carefully and we will be protecting the rights of our Librarians that are included in the contract and supporting them in their library work and work flexibility. The CFA fall kickoff was this past weekend and it was a great opportunity to bring our CFA activists together from all 23 campuses to set our agenda for the fall semester. We are going to be focusing on a fair contract, one that protects our rights, honors our dignity and also respects our work. We will be forming some contract action teams on this campus to assist our CFA bargaining team to achieve our perspective proposals at that bargaining table. The Chancellor’s Office and his representatives always play hardball, so we're gearing up for protecting the rights of our unit three members, which include tenured faculty, tenure track faculty, lecturer faculty, coaches, counselors, and our Librarians. We did beta test a new CFA Statewide workshop entitled Understanding Privilege. It was well received at the fall kickoff and we are interested in bringing that Understanding Privilege workshop to Sonoma State late in the fall or certainly by early spring. She wished everyone a wonderful fall Semester and said the union is here for you. Let us know about your issues and concerns and join us on the contract action teams in order to fight for a fair and just contract.

Occasional report: Graduation Initiative Group Report (GIG) – S. Bosick

S. Bosick provided a quick update. This year Darrel Jones and herself will be co-chairing GIG. GIG is tasked with keeping us on track with our Graduation 2025 goals. We have not yet met, but we are currently working on the roster for that committee, which includes staff, faculty, and administrators across the university, including the registrar and all sorts of folks. The last couple of years have been aimed that tackling barriers and, frankly, tearing up you what we've come to see as useless paperwork and bureaucratic systems that have run their course. We will be defining the goals of the committee at our first meeting and she would be happy to report back on those goals to the Senate at a later meeting.

Good of the Order

The Staff Council will be meeting on Tuesday August 3rd at one o'clock and we're looking forward to collaborating with the Academic Senate this semester.

The Chair said thank you all so much. She knew that this can seem like thankless work, and she did hope that this body, this year becomes more a part of the consultation, not just hearing things after the fact. She encouraged all of you who report to bring those things to us before it reaches its conclusion, so that we can either assist or get in the way.
Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes with help from Zoom transcript
### Curricular items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New BA in Physical Science - Approved</td>
<td>9/24/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New MA in Early Childhood Education - Approved</td>
<td>10/8/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for the Environmental Science, Geography and Management BS, as well as the Geography and Planning BA programs (and all associated course proposals and discontinuances) – Approved</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation to full degree of the MA in Educational Leadership and associated discontinuance of the MA in Education with Concentration in Educational Leadership – Approved</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision to the BA in Philosophy – Approved</td>
<td>3/4/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAR Concentration in Dance Discontinuance - Approved</td>
<td>4/22/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM Music Composition Concentration – Approved</td>
<td>4/22/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name change for Electrical and Computer Engineering - Approved</td>
<td>5/6/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special/Annual Reports & Guests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report/Request</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Report: Graduate Initiative Group</td>
<td>5/20/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Student Reports (all year)</td>
<td>AY 20-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Campus Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From SDS: Course Materials Cost Report with recommendations - endorsed</td>
<td>9/10/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution on Faculty Workload - Approved</td>
<td>9/10/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – Approved</td>
<td>9/10/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution regarding evaluation of teaching performance and RTP review during the COVID-19 emergency academic year 2020-2021-Approved</td>
<td>10/8/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma State University Ethnic Studies Resolution In Opposition to the Chancellor’s Office (CO) Proposed Implementation of AB 1460 – Approved</td>
<td>10/22/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution in Response to Targeted Harassment of Faculty by Online Groups – Approved</td>
<td>10/22/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trip Policy – Approved</td>
<td>11/19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – Approved</td>
<td>2/18/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posthumous Certificate for Luis Cid – Approved</td>
<td>2/18/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posthumous Degree Approved for Alondra Bandt – Approved</td>
<td>4/22/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision to the RTP Policy – Approved</td>
<td>4/22/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for motion to reconsider endorsement of AFS/PDS Teaching of Sensitive Materials statement – motion made and approved</td>
<td>4/22/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion to refer AFS/PDS Teaching of Sensitive Materials statement to FSAC approved</td>
<td>5/6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information item: Credit Hour Policy</td>
<td>5/6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsideration of AFS/PDS Statement on the Teaching of Sensitive Materials – endorsement not approved</td>
<td>5/6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review Policy revision – Approved</td>
<td>5/6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution in Support of AAPI Community and Related Curriculum – Approved</td>
<td>5/6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution on the Matter of Jeffrey Reeder – approved by acclaim</td>
<td>5/20/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Off Campus or Statewide Items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma State University Ethnic Studies Resolution In Opposition to the Chancellor’s Office (CO) Proposed Implementation of AB 1460 – Approved</td>
<td>10/22/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Governance Items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revision to Standing Rules: Faculty Governance Distance Meetings - Approved</td>
<td>10/8/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Events:**

- Faculty Retreat in virtual mode
- Spring Election
- The Senate Twitter account now has 228 followers - @SSUFacSenate
- Chats with Chair of the Faculty weekly
Over the course of the past year APARC met 16 times. We convened through Zoom for 8 meetings in Fall 2020 and 8 meetings in Spring 2021.

### 2020-2021 Meeting Dates

- **Fall 2020 Meeting Dates:** 8/25, 9/8, 9/22, 10/6, 10/20, 11/3, 11/17, 12/1
- **Spring 2021 Meeting Dates:** 2/2, 2/16, 3/2, 3/16, 3/30, 4/13, 4/27, 5/11

### APARC members during the 2020-21 academic year

- Elita Amini Virmani, Education, Chair
- Megan Burke, A&H rep
- Puspa Amri, Econ
- Catherine Fonseca, Lib
- Rheynia Laney, GEP
- Kathleen Rockett, Nurs
- Emily Acosta Lewis, At-Large
- SSP: No Rep
- Trevor Paige, AS rep; Mid-Year transitioned to Victor Madrid, AS rep
- Ex-Officio: Academic Affairs representative: Stacey Bosick
- Mike Ogg, AVP Academic Resources
- A&F designee: Laura Lupei
- EPC Liaison: No Rep
- Occasionally present: M. Weisman, CCE; J. Lopes, A&F, E. Asencio, EPC chair

### Overview

We began the year reviewing the APARC charge, reviewing meeting structures and processes and reviewing APARCs priority recommendations from the previous year. We also discussed the lenses, such as a focus on racial and social justice that we hoped to bring into the work of the committee.

The primary items addressed throughout the year included, but were not limited to the following:

1. **Integrated Core Values & Strategic Priorities into Program Review Self-Study Guide.** Syncing program review process with strategic planning: APARC worked with UPRRS to integrate new language into the program review process

   We engaged in this process by reviewing APARCs role in the program review process, learning about the Academic Dashboard and discussing ways to align the program
review process with the University’s Core Values and Strategic Plan. This process included meetings with Heather Brown, Associate Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness; Laura Krier, Vice Chair of the Faculty; Provost Moranski. Provost Moranski articulated that we had not yet adequately addressed a Racial Justice lens as it mapped onto the strategic priorities and program review process.

Heather Brown introduced APARC faculty to “Dashboards to Support Academic Planning” and highlighted dashboards abilities to address:

- Department measures (metrics: size, ratios, trends)
- Student achievement (retention, graduation)
- SSU-Tableau (applications to enrollment—by region, high school, and where admitted students went instead of SSU)
- Additional resource of the CSU Dashboard and new dashboard on the horizon that will capture daily FTES, retention with equity lens, GI 2025 school and w/ equity lens, alumni tracking (degree achievement, salary tracking)
- To get access to Tableau, departments need to request access (if program review coordinators are not chairs).

Considerations/Questions that emerged and will require continued follow-up:

- Explore the stipends that are provided to external reviewers
- Consider the data that is best utilized to represent the work of the Library
- How do we consider a Racial Justice lens in program review?
  - Self-study guide
  - Courses offered with faculty reporting on what they teach in courses
  - Commit to better understanding student experience about belonging, felt sense of community in the classroom and on campus
  - Need to look at ways other campuses are integrating an equity lens into the program review process.

ACTION TAKEN: APARC worked with UPRS to modify language of the Program Review Self-Study Guide to more explicitly align to the program review guidelines to incorporate core values and strategic priorities more explicitly into the program review self-study guide.

2. Revised the Syllabus Policy. APARC worked with ATI to propose new language for the syllabus policy to ensure that the syllabus policy was in line with the CSU Policy requiring SSU to use the LMS to disseminate course information to all students and ensure that faculty provide syllabi to all students with the content built into the learning management system. The ATI committee had been working for two years to try to bring the campus into compliance with the **CSU policy** that is based upon ADA section 508. APARC brought the syllabus policy forward to Ex-Com, back to APARC and then to Ex-Com and Senate for approval.
ACTION TAKEN: Senate approved the language of the syllabus policy and it is now as follows: Syllabi shall be provided in a format that is accessible to all students with the content built into the university learning management system.

The previous syllabus policy stated: Syllabi shall be provided in a format that is accessible to all students. It is recommended that faculty use the Accessible Syllabus Template. If the accessible syllabus template is not used, faculty members should consult with the Disability Services for Student office to ensure their syllabus is accessible.

3. Reviewed APARC’s Role in Assessment at SSU and Considered Ways to Shift the Culture of Assessment at SSU. We met with Stacey Bosik, Interim Associate Vice President of Academic Programs & Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies; Melinda Milligan, Professor, Department of Sociology & Director, Assessment and Accreditation; Jenn Lillig, Interim Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Academic Programs to discuss APARCs role in the assessment process.

ACTION TAKEN: APARC engaged in discussions about APARCs role in the assessment process. Over the course of the year APARC discussed the potential for APARC’s role in assessment. As a committee APARC discussed the following as next steps:

APARC to collaborate with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to:

a. define the relationship between assessment, program review and strategic planning and collaborate with
b. identify the ways in which program learning outcomes come together to inform a set of institutional learning outcomes
c. in collaboration with UPRS provide guidance for development of a academic dashboard that is aligned with SSUs strategic priorities and core values in a way that encourages ease of data gathering for program review process

Discuss with the administration the possibility of allocating resources to support a culture of ongoing assessment at SSU

a. Build in course release time and/or assessment coordinators in each department
b. Provide training on academic dashboards and ways for departments to gather program level data in ways that are aligned with SSUs strategic plan and core values
c. Commit resources for faculty professional development and implementation of effective assessment practices.
4. **Revised UPRS Cycle from 5 to 7 Years:** Catherine Fonesca presented a proposal to APARC that was developed by UPRS to extend the UPRS review cycle to a seven year cycle which would allow UPRS to catch-up on some of the backlog due to COVID and also allow more time to see improvement and change that can be challenging to see in a 5 year cycle. APARC engaged in discussion with UPRS about the changes and were unanimously supportive of moving the proposal forward to the Senate.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Senate approved moving the UPRS review cycle from 5 to 7 years.  
Vote on Program Review policy revision – Yes = 20, No – 0. Approved.

5. **Developed APARC Priority Recommendations for 2021-2022 Academic Year:**  
APARC Chair Virmani presented a draft of APARC’s priority recommendations that had been informed by several discussions among committee members to Ex-Com in May 2021. APARC received feedback and suggestions for adjustments. As new chair, Emily Acosta Lewis will integrate the feedback into the priority recommendations to present to the Senate in Fall 2021.
2020-21 End-of-Year Report, GE Subcommittee

Over the course of the 2020-21 Academic Year, the General Education Subcommittee

- Approved 79 courses, primarily in Areas A, B, and E
- Continued implementing the 2019 GE Revisions (approved by the Academic Senate in May 2019)
- Began the process of implementing additional GE changes related to AB 1460 and the newly created Area F
- Requested (and received support from EPC for) a revision to course proposal routing so that School Curriculum Committees’ feedback comes earlier in the GE course approval process
- Offered feedback on Study Abroad procedures, as requested by Academic Programs
- Consulted on GE Assessment processes
- Updated the GE website to clarify information and to reflect changes to GE requirements for 2021 FTFY
- Implemented new committee processes to standardize and clarify requests/feedback for proposers

In 2020-21, the GE Subcommittee consisted of the following members:

- Megan McIntyre, English, Chair
- Merlin Hanauer, Economics
- Chiara Bacigalupa, Early Childhood Studies
- Stephanie Dyer, Hutchins
- Andy Martinez, Psychology (part of fall 2020)
- David McCuan, Political Science (part of fall 2020; all of spring 2021)
- Kim Hester-Williams, At-Large for Library
- Tom Targett, Physics & Astronomy
- Luis Vega, Student Services Professionals Representative
- Leticia Medina Esparza, Associated Students Representative
May 24, 2021

MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Senate, Jeffrey Reeder, Chair
TO: Interim Provost, Karen Moranski
TO: AVP Academic Programs, Stacey Bosick
TO: Senate Diversity Subcommittee, Krista Altaker, Chair
TO: Faculty Subcommittee on Scholarly Activities, Carmen Works, Chair
TO: Student Affairs Committee, Hilary Smith, Chair
CC: Senate Analysis, Laurel Holmstrom-Keyes

FROM: University Scholarship Committee, Mackenzie Zippay, Chair
University Scholarship Coordinator, Sara Golightly

Pursuant to the charge of the University Scholarship Committee, the following report is made of activities during the 2020-2021 academic year and for the 2021-2022 award cycle. During that time, the Committee membership consisted of the following:

Committee Members:
- **Arts & Humanities:** Letha Ch'ien, Ed Beebout, Megan Burke, Kim Mieder
- **Business & Economics:** Jane Sutanonpaiboon, Aidong Hu, Nadiya Parekh
- **Education:** Rhianna Casesa, Yajuan (Vivien) Xiang, Aja LaDuke
- **Science and Technology:** Mackenzie Zippay (Chair), Jerry Morris, Shubbhi Taneja
- **Social Sciences:** Silvio Machado, Bryan Burton
- **President’s Appointees:** Patrick Johnson, Sudhir Shrestha, Natalie Hobson
- **Ex-Officio:** Laurie Ogg, David Crozier (temp for FAO Director)
- **Library:** Catherine Fonseca
- **Student Affairs Liaison:** Tony Bish
- **Emeritus Readers:** Susan Garfin
- **Scholarship Coordinator:** Sara Golightly

At the end of Spring 2020 (April) Dr. Jerlena Griffin-Desta, Chief Diversity Officer, provided a full review of the scholarship program called *Equity-Mindedness and Sonoma State University’s Academic Merit Scholarships*. Sara and I, met with Krista Altaker (Senate Diversity Subcommittee Chair) and Charles Elster in May 2020 to discuss the document, and encouraged us to move away from the ‘traditionally’ merit-based scholarship process and more toward equity-mindedness to better serve our university students as a whole, including historically underserved students.

NEW CHANGES for the SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

1) At beginning of the Fall 2020 (August), the (above) document was presented to the scholarship committee, and quickly formed an Equity Subcommittee (Chair-Megan Burke, Patrick Johnson, Byran Burton, Nadiya Parekh, Sudhir Shrestha, Rhianna Casesa and Sara Golightly). This subcommittee met three times, in early Fall, to discuss the philosophical and moral commitments underlying and motivating SSU’s scholarship program by stressing the importance of developing new criteria for eligibility. Their recommendations to the whole committee were centered around two areas:
   A. Shift the scholarship program so that the mission, values and commitments of SSU underlie and structure the entire scholarship program.
a. Redefine the meaning of merit so that it speaks to and honors the values of SSU (e.g. social justice, compassion, community involvement, etc.). There should be alignment with what SSU says it is and with the scholarships we give out.
b. Award intellectual endeavors, curiosity, and life experiences not mere academic achievement; SSU’s merit scholarship program has the opportunity to put SSU’s values and mission into practice, and we believe doing so is a significant part of creating an equity-minded scholarship program.

B. Move away from the essay. We believe that providing students with focused questions that solicit short answers (with word counts) will address issues of equity and routine content problems with the essay more generally. Reasons for this change in form includes:
   a. essay writing does not necessarily capture merit, but can instead benefit those who are good at writing essays
   b. essay writing is known to reproduce inequity (e.g. affluent students are more likely to receive help, paid or otherwise, in the writing of these essays, students with learning differences can be differentially impacted by the form)
   c. while eliminating reader bias is good practice, it does not resolve the aforementioned problems and is not a panacea to inequity
   d. readers have mentioned problems with the essays in the past, including going over or not meeting the page requirement, the inclusion of irrelevant information, the absence of information needed to assess merit, and other content problems generated as a result of the essay style itself
   e. short answers will help us solicit more focused, targeted content from students and will benefit a wider range of students who are not necessarily good writing in itself

C. Change how criteria (e.g. GPA) is measured/weighted. Although the previous rubric provides some good checkpoints, the weight given to categories of academic achievements is heavy and needed addressing. We needed to create new scoring categories that allow us to measure beyond academic achievements (e.g. intellectual growth, extracurricular involvement).

2) After the suggestion brought forward by the equity subcommittee, we voted unanimously to eliminate the traditional essay style and move to three specific questions with each having a 200 word limit:
   • Short Essay Topic #1: Think about one experience or encounter with an intellectual influence (for example, literature, theory, art, social movement, an individual, research endeavors, etc.) during the past two years that has contributed to your growth and thoroughly explain the impact.
   • Short Essay Topic #2: Think about one example of service beyond the classroom (for instance, have you taken on significant familial obligations, helped others in a specific way, been involved in political action, worked/volunteered/interned at a particular organization, etc.) and thoroughly explain the significance of that service to you and your community.
   • Short Essay Topic #3: Where do you see yourself after graduation from SSU and how does that vision contribute to the overall good of society?

3) We also created a new evaluation rubric and changed the weight given to the GPA from 50% to 10% to achieve an equity-minded scholarship program.
   • Rubric Evaluation:
     o Evidence (3 points): Specific qualities to look for: Is the prompt clearly addressed? Is the evidence specific, lucid, and convincing? Is the significance of the evidence explained in relation to the prompt? Does the statement of evidence of extracurricular and community activities, innovative contributions to the workplace, or relevant life experiences, etc., indicate analytical or creative accomplishment?
Intellectual promise and/or creativity (3 points): Specific qualities to look for: Which of the following does the response demonstrate: depth in thinking, promise for intellectual growth, integration of scholarly ideas or influences, creativity in pursuits and response? Is there something novel or unique about the applicant’s service, contributions, or future goals? Does the response give evidence that the applicant has or will likely contribute to the overall good of society and/or demonstrates promise in a given field or creative pursuit?

- GPA: 1-2 points (scaled point distribution: 1 point 3.0-3.4 and 2 points 3.5 and up).
  - Question #1: 1-6 points
  - Question #2: 1-6 points
  - Question #3: 1-6 points
  - Total: 20 points

4) A short guideline to advice in completing the new application format was also provided to the applicants on the scholarship website - the “Do’s and Don’t”:

- **Do…** Be specific. Include exact names, activities, and descriptions that will help the scholarship committee understand what these are and their significance to you. **Go for depth.** Focus your response to each question so that it offers a comprehensive account of your experience. Help the scholarship committee to understand why an experience is meaningful to you. **Focus on what makes you unique.** The scholarship committee wants to hear your voice and know who you are. **Revise and edit your writing.** Take the time to brainstorm, draft, and proofread your responses in a separate document. Seek outside writing support. Pay attention to word count.

- **Don’t…** Don’t be too general or abstract. Vague references and descriptions won’t highlight your strengths or uniqueness. Avoid clichés and sentences that could have been written by anyone. **Don’t list awards and accomplishments.** The scholarship committee is looking for the person behind the credentials. Avoid laundry lists of activities, etc., and focus on the select few experiences that have meant the most to you. **Don’t share your GPA.** The scholarship committee already has this information and it does not help us understand who you are as an individual. **Don’t write your whole life story.** Instead, focus your response on the question asked.

5) The applicants name was also removed from the reviewing processes to minimize bias in reading the scholarship applications.

6) All the above new changes were implemented during the November 2020-February 2021 application process. On average each committee member had 100-105 applications to read and assess.

7) Had a record number of applicants this funding cycle with 1050 completed applications received (compared to the 783-last year). Total award amount = $457,800 compared to last year’s $435,765 with the average award $1795 (compared to $1662 from last year).

8) The scholarship committee had further discussion about some of the redundancy in the applicants answers and lack of depth in their answers. Thus, we will discuss the possibility of putting together a workshop next academic year to help the applicants understand what we are asking for and wanting to see with their answers. It was also suggested to have a “bias” workshop in place to help when assessing students.

A list of the rewards and receipts is available upon request.
Over the 2020-21 AY, the Academic Advising Subcommittee worked on the following:

- Revised the Subcommittee charges to have it address the University’s mission on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion more explicitly; The revision will be presented to and reviewed at the Structure & Functions, then the Executive Committee on the beginning of the ’21 Fall semester.

- Continued our concerned effort to address administrative barriers to academic advising by means of a shared Google doc discussed serially in our meetings; items were tagged by priority as well as with parties responsible for their resolution; the committee met with some of these identified parties to offer recommendations for improvement;

- Continued discussion of criteria for entrance to impacted majors for current SSU students through consultation with Stacey Bosick, including the best means for disseminating this information to students and attention to Chancellor’s memos on the topic;

- Consultation with Sean Johnson regarding newly implemented online graduation application process; including recommendations for improvement;

- Continued discussion and dissemination of the uses of Lobo Connect, including identifying at-risk students by means of faculty progress reports and recommendations for improvement (altered deadlines for add/drop, etc.);

- Consultation with Shanon Little regarding financial aid deadlines and new Satisfactory Academic Policy (SAP) and appeal form, including recommendations;

- Consultation with Hope Ortiz regarding advising students who study abroad, including recommendations;

- Consultation with Jamie Zamjahn and Michael Balasek regarding transfer orientation and first-year student orientation, including recommendations;

- Continued concerted effort to address issues related advising during the COVID pandemic onward, including temporary changes in policy; study abroad; impact on admissions; “what ifs” if we continue to be online in the fall;

- Consultation with Jamie Zamjahn and Michael Balasek regarding advising during summer orientations, with recommendations for improvement.

Respectfully submitted by Ayumi Nagase, Chair, Academic Advising Subcommittee
Professional Development Subcommittee
End of Year Report

Members:
Suzanne O’Keeffe, Education; Chair
Monica Lares, Chemistry
Talena Sanders, Arts & Humanities
Kathryn Chang, Business & Economics
Rita Premo, Library
John Lynch, CTET
Merith Weisman, CCE
Deborah A. Roberts, Fac Affairs
FSAC Liaison: Thomas Whitley, Anthro

PROPOSED CHANGES TO PDS (TLS)
The professional Development Subcommittee is proposing that we change our name to the Teaching and Learning Subcommittee (TLS) with a new charge. The PDS committee has sent the new charge to FSAC and URTP and is currently in the process of receiving feedback. PDS will work on getting Senate approval on Fall 2021. The new charge describes PDS (TLS) duties as:

- Promote a campus environment supportive of professional development in regards to Teaching and Learning pedagogical support.

- Provide feedback to agencies of the university on the development of programs in support of faculty needs pertaining to teaching and learning in higher education.

- Creating and supporting opportunities for recognition of teaching and service excellence.

- Review applications and give recommendations to the appropriate administrators for faculty submitting proposals for awards such as: (a) Educational Experience Enhancement award and (b) Excellence in Teaching award.

- Organize and promote an annual Teaching Symposium or other events to support excellent teaching and enhance faculty understanding of pedagogy and andragogy.

- Co-sponsor workshops with Center for Teaching and Educational Technology and the Center for Community Engagement through collecting exit survey data, targeting recruitment at the school and department level, and providing data from faculty surveys.
OVERSEEING THE EEE and EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AWARDS
The professional development committee is currently working with FSAC to manage and oversee the Educational Experience Enhancement and Excellence in Teaching awards. PDS will be looking at changing the nomination and application criteria for the Excellence in Teaching Award in Fall 2021.

FACULTY NEEDS SURVEY
A faculty needs survey was administered in April and yielded 112 responses from participants. Data was analyzed and given to CTET and CCE to use for future faculty professional development workshop planning in the 2021/22 academic year.

TEACHING SENSITIVE MATERIALS
PDS attended Senate meetings in solidarity with FSAC and AFS to advocate for passing the Teaching Sensitive materials initiative. The initiative was originally passed, then reconsidered. PDS will most likely continue to be a part of this conversation in Fall 2021.
Structure & Functions End of the Year Report
2020 - 2021
Prepared by Letha Ch’ien

Over the 2020 - 2021 academic year, Structure and Functions

• clarified procedure for subcommittee charge changes
• reviewed, clarified, and passed new URTP structure allowing for additional members to aid with workload
• reviewed and renewed Faculty Governance Distance Standing Rules
• wrote guidelines for conducting committee business between meetings
• continued work on reviewing By-Laws
• strategized and improved outreach for encouraging participation in Faculty Governance
• filled positions on IRA, GE, S&F, Overlay, Campus Planning, Care team, Information Security Steering, FSSA, Alternative Transportation Committee, ACIP

Future Business should focus on cleaning up typos and inconsistencies in By-Laws and reviewing faculty governance structure.
The Academic Advising Subcommittee (AAS), of the Student Affairs Committee (SAC), collaborates with students, faculty, staff, administration, and other relevant university constituents to:

1. Regularly review the policies, systems, and delivery of academic advising by faculty and professional advisors, highlighting strengths, identifying opportunities, and making recommendations to improve the overall effectiveness of faculty advising at SSU.

2. Advocate for effective academic advising to support student learning, development, and success, including advising that is inclusive, respectful, current, accurate, private, safe, convenient, and accessible.

3. Advocate for university-wide efforts to understand and address barriers to student success, retention, persistence, and on-time graduation; especially advising-related barriers that impact educational equity and that disproportionately affect low- to middle-income students from historically underserved and under-resourced communities, students of color, and first-generation college students.

4. Provide a forum for consultation and feedback on academic advising-related issues and initiatives among faculty and professional advisors, the various advising constituencies, and stakeholders.

Previous AAS Charge
The Academic Advising Subcommittee of the Student Affairs Committee works with administration, students, and other relevant university constituents on issues related to advising. AAS recommends policy related to advising to SAC and serves as the contact point for advising related issues on campus. They identify potential advising strengths and challenges and work towards improving performance. AAS facilitates publicity for November and April advising months. Also, AAS represents Schools in the creation, governance, and participation in any campus advising center.
DRAFT Spring 2022 Course Scheduling Guidelines

General Guidelines

● Health guidelines indicate that most courses can be fully in-person for spring 2022 and that the campus will be fully reopened. The expectation is that faculty will be back on campus to serve students in person.

● At this point, state, county, and CSU officials mandate mask wearing. The CSU has indicated that irrespective of FDA approval, we will require that all faculty, staff, or students be vaccinated by September 30. Medical and religious exceptions to the vaccination requirement are allowed with testing at least once per week, per the Sonoma County health order.

● WSCUC (WASC Senior College and University Commission) temporary authorizations for distance learning expire in December 2021. Beginning in spring 2022, programs offering more than 50% of coursework online must apply for and be granted distance learning status, which requires both substantive change approval from WSCUC and Chancellor's Office approval. Substantive change and Chancellor's office approval take 12-18 months so programs will not be able to receive approval for distance learning status by spring 2022.

Program and Course Guidelines

● Instruction for every academic program will conform to the following delivery mode targets:
  ○ In-person delivery: At least 70% of coursework in every program must be delivered in-person.
  ○ Hybrid and online delivery: Hybrid delivery is now considered online delivery by WSCUC. Departments may offer no more than 30% of their courses in hybrid or online modes (synchronous or asynchronous), unless the program is an approved online program.
  ○ Deans may submit exceptions on behalf of programs. Exceptions must be reviewed by the Continuity Planning Group and approved by the Provost. Department schedules will not be entered into the official spring 2022 course schedule without these approvals.

● EPC has approved temporary online modality tags for Spring 2022 and Summer 2022, which means faculty do not have to ask for approval to teach courses in online modes.

● Currently, there are no physical distancing requirements in classrooms, therefore room capacity is established according to pre-COVID, Fire Marshall standards. Outdoor classroom spaces may continue to be approved on a case-by-case basis.

● The following types of courses and student populations should be prioritized for in-person instruction:

Commented [1]: What happens to unvax’d students on Oct 1? A sentence here explaining might convince staff and faculty that there is a plan and action will be taken.

Commented [2]: This decision is still under discussion.

Commented [3]: This section is important because it should convey that this is not just a campus level decision, but rather one by our accrediting agency. I assume that failure to comply would risk our standing. This should help faculty understand that programs may not simply shift their courses online without going through these approval processes. I wonder if a sentence could be added to make this point, but I leave it to your judgment Karen.
- 100-level courses or courses for first-year students, especially in math, English, and first-year learning communities
- Introductory courses in the major (these may be 100-, 200-, or 300-level courses)
- Courses required to be in-person for licensure or accreditation
- Courses requiring specialized equipment
- Courses requiring in-person pedagogies (these may, for example, include experiential learning courses, laboratory courses, discussion-based courses, and project-based learning)
- Courses that must be in-person to promote on-time graduation or completion of graduation requirements or required learning experiences (e.g., capstones, some senior-level Geology courses)

- Programs are encouraged to leave room in departmental FTES for upper division courses that may need to be offered in both in-person and online/hybrid modes.
- All in-person and hybrid courses must have a plan to pivot to remote instruction in the case of pandemic surges or other emergencies requiring campus closure. We continue to encourage faculty to include contingency plans in their syllabi to account for loss of remote access due to wildfires, planned public safety power shutoffs, or other emergencies (even in spring semester).

**Faculty Guidelines**

- Decisions about course modality should be driven by equitable student access, alignment between pedagogy and content, the curricular needs of the program, and timely graduation of students.
- Faculty with approved medical accommodations may be scheduled to teach online. Such accommodations must be formally documented through University Personnel by December 1, 2021 - or whatever a reasonable date would be.
- Hyflex mode (courses in which some students attend in-person and some attend virtually) may be offered by faculty who have received CTET training, depending on the availability of classrooms set up to support that mode. Note that hyflex courses are considered online, per WSCUC guidelines. Please discuss your interest with your department chair, dean, and CTET.
Resolution Endorsing Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History

Resolved: the Sonoma State University (SSU) Academic Senate endorse the Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History from the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Resolved: the SSU Academic Senate calls on the SSU President to endorse this statement as well as CSU Chancellor Castro.

Resolved: that this resolution be distributed to the faculty of SSU, the ASCSU Chair, the CSU Board of Trustees, President Judy Sakaki and Chancellor Joseph Castro.

Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History

We, the undersigned associations and organizations, state our firm opposition to a spate of legislative proposals being introduced across the country that target academic lessons, presentations, and discussions of racism and related issues in American history in schools, colleges and universities. These efforts have taken varied shape in at least 20 states, but often the legislation aims to prohibit or impede the teaching and education of students concerning what are termed “divisive concepts.” These divisive concepts as defined in numerous bills are a litany of vague and indefinite buzzwords and phrases including, for example, “that any individual should feel or be made to feel discomfort, guilt, anguish, or any other form of psychological or emotional distress on account of that individual’s race or sex.” These legislative efforts are deeply troubling for numerous reasons.

First, these bills risk infringing on the right of faculty to teach and of students to learn. The clear goal of these efforts is to suppress teaching and learning about the role of racism in the history of the United States. Purportedly, any examination of racism in this country’s classrooms might cause some students “discomfort” because it is an uncomfortable and complicated subject. But the ideal of informed citizenship necessitates an educated public. Educators must provide an accurate view of the past in order to better prepare students for community participation and robust civic engagement. Suppressing or watering down discussion of “divisive concepts” in educational institutions deprives students of opportunities to discuss and foster solutions to social division and injustice. Legislation cannot erase “concepts” or history; it can, however, diminish educators’ ability to help students address facts in an honest and open environment capable of nourishing
intellectual exploration. Educators owe students a clear-eyed, nuanced, and frank delivery of history so that they can learn, grow, and confront the issues of the day, not hew to some state-ordered ideology.

Second, these legislative efforts seek to substitute political mandates for the considered judgment of professional educators, hindering students’ ability to learn and engage in critical thinking across differences and disagreements. These regulations constitute an inappropriate attempt to transfer responsibility for the evaluation of a curriculum and subject matter from educators to elected officials. The purpose of education is to serve the common good by promoting open inquiry and advancing human knowledge. Politicians in a democratic society should not manipulate public school curricula to advance partisan or ideological aims. In higher education, under principles of academic freedom that have been widely endorsed, professors are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject. Educators, not politicians, should make decisions about teaching and learning.

Knowledge of the past exists to serve the needs of the living. In the current context, this includes an honest reckoning with all aspects of that past. Americans of all ages deserve nothing less than a free and open exchange about history and the forces that shape our world today, an exchange that should take place inside the classroom as well as in the public realm generally. To ban the tools that enable those discussions is to deprive us all of the tools necessary for citizenship in the 21st century. A white-washed view of history cannot change what happened in the past. A free and open society depends on the unrestricted pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

Rationale:

The following have also signed this statement:
PEN America
American Historical Association
American Association of University Professors
Association of American Colleges & Universities
ACPA-College Student Educators International
Agricultural History Society
Alcohol and Drugs History Society
American Anthropological Association
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Council of Learned Societies
American Educational Research Association
American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO
American Folklore Society
American Library Association
American Philosophical Association
American Political Science Association
American Society for Environmental History
American Society for Theatre Research
American Sociological Association
American Studies Association
Anti-Defamation League
Association for Ancient Historians
Association for Asian American Studies
Association for Documentary Editing
Association for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies
Association for the Study of Higher Education
Association for Theatre in Higher Education
Association of College and Research Libraries
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
Association of Research Libraries
Association of University Presses
Association of Writers & Writing Programs
Business History Conference
Center for Research Libraries
Central European History Society
Chinese Historians in the United States
Coalition of Urban & Metropolitan Universities (CUMU)
College Art Association
Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, & Transgender History
Comparative & International Education Society
Conference on Asian History
Conference on Faith and History
Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes
Czechoslovak Studies Association
Forum on Early-Modern Empires and Global Interactions
French Colonial Historical Society
German Studies Association
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities
Historical Society of Twentieth Century China
Immigration Ethnic History Society
John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education
Labor and Working-Class History Association
Middle East Studies Association
Modern Language Association
NAFSA: Association of International Educators
National Association for College Admission Counseling
National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education
National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education
National Women’s Studies Association
National Coalition for History
National Council for the Social Studies
National Council of Teachers of English
National Council on Public History
Organization of American Historians
Phi Beta Kappa Society
Radical History Review
Rhetoric Society of America
Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media
Shakespeare Association of America
Society for Austrian and Habsburg History
Society for Classical Studies
Society for Historians of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era
Society for the Study of Early Modern Women and Gender
Society of Architectural Historians
Society of Civil War Historians
Southern Historical Association
The Freedom to Read Foundation
Urban History Association
Western History Association
World History Association