Academic Senate

AGENDA

September 23, 2021
Via Zoom

3:00 – 5:00pm

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

Information items: End of Year reports from SDS, AFS

Special Reports: Update on ATI - J. Lipp, S. Ayala TC 3:20
Enrollment Strategies with E. Lopez TC 3:45

Business

1. From APARC: Priority Recommendations - First Reading - E. Acosta Lewis TC 4:20

2. From Statewide Senators: Request for feedback on AS 3501 TC 4:35

Standing Reports

1. President of the University - (J. Sakaki)
2. Provost/Vice-President, Academic Affairs - (K. Moranski) TC 3:15
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

Fall Meetings of the Senate
8/26
9/9
9/23
10/7
10/21
11/4
11/18
12/9


Proxy: Missy Garvin for Ben Smith

Absent: Cookie Garrett

Guests: Damien Hansen, Melinda Milligan, Laura Lupei, Jonathan Smith, Jerlena Griffin-Desta, Katie Musick, Jenn Lillig, Aidan Humrich, River Shoptaugh, Kari Manwiller, Kim Purdy, Stacey Bosick, Hollis Robbins, Karen Schneider, Merith Weisman, Liz Burch, Sadie Pettit, Rhianna Casesa

The Chair had technical difficulties accessing Zoom. The Vice Chair began the meeting.

Approval of Agenda – item removed: Enrollment Report. Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 8/26/2021 – Approved.

President Report – J. Sakaki

The President said good afternoon, it's great to see all of you here. She mentioned that Chancellor Castro is visiting various campuses. His goal this year is to visit all 23 of the CSUs and we are scheduled for Wednesday, September 29th. We're in the process of finalizing the schedule we received from him including who he would like to meet with and what he would like to see. We also will be hosting the new trustee Julia Lopez who has informed us that she'll be visiting the campus Friday, September 24th. She lives relatively locally in San Francisco. She's just been appointed recently and she's expressed an interest in spending the day with us and has interest in both the faculty and the student experience. This morning we had our President's Budget Advisory committee meeting and you may hear a little bit more of that meeting from either the Chair or the Provost. She appreciated the many
continuing members on PBAC and there are new members as well. L. Morimoto and B. Burton are representing the Senate on that group and it is important for planning purposes for us to understand, and for all of the Senators to understand, what's going on with our budget. We will be having budget forums about strategic budgeting and helping us look at the deficit. Laura Lupeí's report will be helpful. She appreciates the engagement and the advice and sees all of you as her eyes and ears. The intent is to be very transparent and to communicate well with everyone about what is going on and we certainly welcome advice. This coming week, Tuesday and Wednesday, is the Board of Trustees meeting. It will be virtual. There are a couple things that are happening that the Senate might be interested in.

Chancellor Castro is going to deliver his first inaugural State of the CSU address, and that will be on Tuesday at 10am. We're proud that at this meeting on Tuesday, one of our students will be recognized, Doshia Dodd, who is an Anthropology Master’s student in Cultural Resources Management. She will be acknowledged at four o'clock. She will be introduced along with other students who are receiving scholarships and then at five, there is a reception with the Trustees, Presidents and the recipients. We're very proud of her. Last Saturday, we had a Green Music Center concert with Tower of Power which is a band from her hometown in Oakland. What was interesting was we chose to invite as guests a couple of Community College Presidents and Chancellors. It was a great opportunity. Several of them said to her, “Oh, you know I hadn't really spent time on your campus.” We arranged for a tour prior to the concert, so they could actually see the campus and what she learned afterwards was that the guests loved our campus and will be referring more students. That was music to her ears. A partnership with our Community Colleges is what we want and need, so if ever anyone has a colleague, a potential donor, someone that can help bring students to us, don't hesitate to introduce them to us. She saw several faculty at the event. It was great to take a couple selfies with some freshmen that were there and had brought their parents. Next Tuesday is an important election and we happen to have our own ballot box right at the flagpole so you don't even have to go far. She walked over there at lunchtime to deposit her own ballot. It's part of the Center for Community Engagement work to have that ballot box right there at the flagpole at the entrance to our campus. There is no excuse for not getting your ballot in and we should encourage students to also walk on over there and put their ballot in the box.

A member said last year, there was a lot of concern among faculty about all the trainings we all have to take. Many of them don't apply to our jobs. He had completed all of them, and yesterday got an email that said: please note that the heat illness prevention training will expire on October 7th. He didn't want to get reminders. He understood that it would cost a lot of money to figure out which employees should do which trainings. If someone makes a mistake and someone who should have done some training didn't do it, and then something bad happened then the CSU would be liable. He thought the cheapest thing to do, and the safest thing to do, is to ask every employee to do every training, but that just puts the burden on us instead of on the CSU to figure out the appropriate people to do the appropriate training. His request is if the President could somehow relay that concern to the Chancellor, he would be grateful.
The President said that one's a tough one, and she would offer the background on that one. There was a terrible tragic accident on one of our campuses where a student died from heat exhaustion. It was the largest litigation settlement in the history of the CSU, approximately $39.5 million, and one of the conditions of that is that all of us be better trained, so that if we are around a student or an employee who happens to have a heatstroke that we could be more attentive. We are legally held to the terms of the settlement. She believed from now until forever, all CSU employees will take heat exhaustion, heat stroke prevention because of that very, very terrible situation. She heard the concern loud and clear. She completed her heat exhaustion training because we do get some warm days here. Hopefully we won't have to use any of this knowledge, but if someone around us that gets into difficulty, we are more apt to know what to do. We're a big system and some of these things occur on another campus, but because we are one university, meaning the California State University, the settlements impact all of us.

S. Nosek said there are a number of days here where heat is a factor, exactly as the President has indicated, but we now have asked HR and Risk Management on campus to go through the trainings and see if there are 1, 2, 3 or 5 that need not be across the board to everybody. We are doing that review and he thought we'll have a result within the week. Then the question will be: What type of support can we get from CO regarding that?

A question was posed in the chat: Is the requirement to do the trainings on an annual basis, upon hire or every three years? The President said the heat exhaustion training will be annual. There are some that may be every other year or every few years.

Chair Report – L. Morimoto

The Chair noted the information items. The draft scheduling guidelines for Spring 2022 went out to at least to Department Chairs and Dean’s. Those guidelines have not yet gone through meet and confer with CFA. Once that meet and confer is done, then we can implement it. But in real life, of course, we have to start planning for spring semester. Most chairs are using these guidelines to figure out how to set up their classes, to try to get a certain percentage of their classes in person versus online. The big piece of information in the guidelines is that hybrid classes are now considered online by WASC and to her that was earth shattering. She would leave it at that since the first time certain was reached.

Special Report: SSU Budget – L. Lupei

The Chair said the reason she asked L. Lupei to come to the Senate was that she thought for a lot of faculty, who have been here a while, we have a hard time believing there's a budget crisis because talk about the budget has been “the skies been falling” for many years and then we later had audits which found there was money. She thought there's some skepticism, and it might be helpful if Senators could see this report. The budget crisis is real.
L. Lupei said she would give her fall budget briefing which she does throughout the campus every semester. This helps to get the entire campus understanding what is going on with our budget and the fall budget briefing focuses mainly on the current year’s budget. The spring budget briefing focuses on the planning process for the next year, so fall tells us where we settled with this year’s budget. She said she would focus on the campus budget. We’re not going to talk about our self-support or auxiliary budgets today which includes housing, parking, the Student Health Center, CAPS, those types of things. A lot of our self-supporting auxiliaries are experiencing lower revenues as well with falling enrollment and having less students on campus but none of them are experiencing crisis. They have reserves that they’ve used or they’ve been able to reduce expenses. The loss of enrollment is impacting the campus budget more deeply, so we’re going to be spending a lot of time talking about that here and throughout the campus this year.

*Presentation slides follow.*

**2021-2022 Campus Budget**
She reported on how the campus did the prior year with our roll-forward balances because these are funds that we have available to us this year. This graph shows the report of every division’s prior year budgets, how much they spent and how much they had leftover, so it’s a lot of information packed on one graph. The green line is the base budget. That’s how much each division starts within their base each year. Those are their ongoing, recurring funds. The purple line is the revised budget. That’s their base budget plus any one-time money. One-time money is their prior year roll-forward from the previous year, or any one-time money that they received from the Chancellor’s office to spend on a specific initiative. The yellow line is what they actually spent. The budget minus expenses equals how much they have left over at the end of the year. Every division stayed within their budget and had a little bit of money left over. The big ticket items to pay attention to here on this graph are in our two larger divisions which is University Wide and Academic Affairs. University Wide pays for things that affect the entire university such as benefits, utilities, insurance payments, and those types of things. It has the largest roll-forward because that’s where our university reserves are held. Also, because we pulled down some of our federal funding last year, we call that our HEERFA funds and because HEERF stands for Higher Education Emergency Relief Funds. We pulled down about $7 million of these funds last year because we’re planning on using them for the deficit this year. This will show when we go through our deficit plan towards the end of this presentation, but those funds are sitting here in this blue line as well as the rest of our university reserves. In Academic Affairs, you can see the roll forward is not super high considering the size of the division. There are some funds in there to use for the classroom refresh program, for furniture and then some funds in the Schools. Overall, we looked at division roll-forward balances as a source of funding to help with our deficit this year. These have been carefully
analyzed to look at priorities that are needed to be taken care of in the division and to help with our deficit.

Moving on to this year, first of all, on the left is the funding request that went forward from the CSU to the state. This funding request went forward from the Board of Trustees back in November 2020 which was in the middle of the pandemic, even though the pandemic keeps stretching out further and further, but it was when we were all still doing everything completely virtually. The state was not looking great for tax revenues, so requesting $556 million for the next year’s budget seemed like an aggressive request. $556 million sounds like a lot of money, but $299 million of it was to restore the reduction in the budget. In the news, it’s reported that we got an unprecedented increase in our budget in the 21-22 year, and, while that may be technically correct, it doesn’t feel correct because, while we did get most of what we asked for, we ended up getting $500 million - $300 million of that is to correct what was taken out of our budget. What we ended up getting was $150 million dollars of Graduation Initiative money which is great news, but $75 million of that is what we should have gotten in 20-21. Then, what we would have gotten in 21-22 is the second $75 million. We got $55 million to cover mandatory costs which are costs that are going up for opening new space, implementing AB 1460, covering the increases in our health care costs and then the big item is $300 million to restore what was already cut out of our budget. All these other items are pretty well earmarked. They are not going out as discretionary dollars. In a lot of years where there's extra tax revenue, people are fighting to get them into designated spots. Overall, we did get a large amount of new funds, $550 million, and they are going into the main categories on the slide.
The effect that has specifically on our campus budget is outlined above. Our prior year campus revenue budget was $130.6 million. We did get our prior year reduction restored; she could not overstate what a large deal that is. Having that $8.5 million taken out of our budget was a large amount, so getting this back this year is welcome relief. We also got new funding for new space that we’ve opened up. This is for the expanded space in Stevenson Hall, and for the CAPS modular buildings. We also got new funding for the Graduation Initiative in the area of $1.8 million and new funding for the mandatory cost of implementing the AB 1460 Ethnic Studies requirements. That totals about $11.7 million of increased funding to our budget. We do have some decreases to our budget as well. We ended up with decreases to our employee salary lines and benefits lines. This is because this year retirement costs went down, so the state reduced our benefits costs for retirement and that’s a net reduction to our benefits pool. We also have a reduction from the Chancellor’s office of funding being held back for systemwide priorities. What we had requested from the state back in November 2020 was before we had a new Chancellor and he wasn’t part of the development of that budget request. He has different priorities than what was put forward at that time, so he has asked that funding be held back to accommodate those priorities. We have had funds swept from our budget of $3.3 million.

A member asked did you say that retirements we’re down? He thought we had an incredible number of retirements. L. Lupei said the cost of retirement per person per individual or the pooled cost of retirement has decreased, so the state is paying down the CALPERs pensionable cost, and that is reducing the cost of retirement.
We also have a reduction in our CSU Financial Aid State University Grants. These are the funds that come to us from the CSU that we distribute directly to students. These are provided on a formula given to us by the CSU and they’re allocated out to campuses based on share of campus need. Every year the CSU reviews that share of need by campus and this year, our share of need related to other campuses was less, so our financial aid amount was reduced and distributed as financial aid at other campuses. She made some decreases to our revenue budget that are primarily related to the drop in headcount and loss of residential tuition fees. That was about $1.4 million of the $1.8 million reduction. We implemented a new cost allocation plan that is reducing the revenue that we’re collecting, so that is about $6 million of reduced revenue this year. That nets out to about a bit less than a $6 million net increase for our budget, bringing our revenue budget up to $136.3 million.

![2021-2022 Preliminary Budget by Division](image)

We allocated out our funds to the divisions and this is how those funds are allocated. We are going to have all of our budgets in Open Book on our budget website. ([https://budget.sonoma.edu](https://budget.sonoma.edu)) Anyone can access Open Book. This year’s budgets will be loaded next week. A campus email will go out announcing that, so Senators can take a look at what is in these divisions by line item. These are still preliminary because the new budget allocations for the new money hasn't been finalized yet. For example, the GI 2025 funds are going to be discussed at GIG next week. What is seen on this slide looks similar to last year. Not a whole lot has changed. We've had some small reorganizations that have moved funds around, but it looks pretty similar.
This is every fund that we budget in the university. We are not going to spend too much time talking about support and auxiliary partners, but she did want to show the Senators their budgets. One thing to note here is the total university budgeted resources last year, this amount was $189 million because we weren't on ground, we didn't have as many students in the dorms, we weren't having students sign up for meal plans, and we didn't have the students buying parking passes. All of those things affected our budgeted revenue. Two years ago, this budget was $250 million, so those types of things and enrollment are affecting our campus-based fee programs. We’re recovering, but we’re not in full recovery. The effects of the pandemic and enrollment are affecting not just the campus budget, but all of our budgeted funds.

She was not going spend too much time on this slide because she wanted to get on to the deficit.
She said we've already talked about how we built our campus budgeted revenue this year, so overall our revenue increased, which is great news. A year ago, she wouldn't have known what was going to happen with the revenue budget this year, if it was going to go up or down. It's been a really chaotic year. What's also true is that our expense budget has been holding steady and not decreasing, even though our revenue overall has been decreasing, so what that results in is a deficit.

### Sonoma Campus Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022 Campus Budgeted Revenue</td>
<td>$136,313,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022 Campus Budgeted Expense</td>
<td>$147,502,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2021-2022 Base Deficit</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(11,188,772)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main driver of our deficit is the loss of our enrollment over the last several years.
This graph shows that enrollment that Sonoma has had steady enrollment with moderate increases for a number of years until about the 19-20 year when we started falling. We fell about 6% in 19-20 and then fell more steeply last year and have continued to fall. This year the 6927 figure is this year's projected academic year headcount. These figures are all academic year head counts. This is a pretty dramatic looking at the graph. It really shows what has happened with our headcount the last couple of years, and illustrates why we’re having a budget issue, because there are dollars attached to these heads. In round numbers it’s approximately $5500 of tuition revenue per head. If we’re going to add one or take one away, that’s what we’re losing. If we use guesstimate numbers, that’s a good way to start. Those 2000 heads is about $11.7 million in lost revenue over this time and it’s happened very quickly. It took us a long time to get to those students.
We have had the deficit for two years. In 19-20 our revenues and our expenses were pretty much the same, which is what you want in a budget. It’s her job is to make sure that we’re spending no more than we have. We had about a $20,000 deficit in 19-20 which is close enough. Our budget was around $145 million at that time, so that was good. This really started in 20-21. This is two years total of what’s happened with our deficit and the bulk of it is enrollment related. It’s $11.7 million of the lost tuition, then we had that $3.3 million that the Chancellor’s office swept of state budget funding that they didn’t give us this year. We’ve had some other revenue reductions, mostly related to the cost recovery, cost allocation plan relaunch and the revenues that have gone down with that last year. The State gave us our reduction back, but they never funded us for our mandatory cost increases that went up last year, and they never gave us funding for our health increases, minimum wage increases or those types of things last year that we had to pay for anyway. We had several other campus underfunded costs that we had to pay for, increases in rent, in our insurance costs. Benefit retirement costs did go up last year and those also weren’t funded and then cabinet did a process this year to identify the priorities that they needed to fund, despite the deficit and those total about a million dollars. Most of them are also campus under-funded costs. There are things like commencement not being fully funded in the base. We created a budget for campus settlements, because we had just been paying for those from one time money, even though they happen every year. For those types of things when they’re reoccurring, we should have a budget for them anyway. We did take a base reduction last year, so every division, except University Wide took a 10% base reduction and generated $8.3 million of a reduction to offset these losses and that’s still $11.2 million deficit.
That’s the base deficit. Base deficits are ongoing. We also have additional one-time costs this year. The cabinet has identified one-time costs are mainly associated with the strategic enrollment priority, recruitment, scholarships, marketing initiatives and those types of things. We have to help pay down that CALPERS liability loan that the state is paying, which is producing our retirement costs, but it’s still costing us money. We have to pay for that, and that brings our current year deficit up to $12.3 million.

### 21-22 Deficit Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction Planning Strategies</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>One-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Campus Reserves</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funding-HEERF/HEERF-MSI (Estimate)</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Slowdown Net Savings Estimate</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Enrollment Funding from AA</td>
<td>$1,127,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Roll Forward</td>
<td>$872,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Roll Forward</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Funding Held Centrally Until Needed</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Roll Rollforwards*</td>
<td>$173,772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reduction Planning Strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,313,772</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Deficit after UW Strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on share of PY Balance
We do have a plan to pay for this year’s deficit, but we’re using all one-time money this year, which means that $11.2 million deficit continues to next year. We do have it solved for this year and this is our deficit plan for 21-22. We’re going to utilize our campus reserves. Last year we used it for the deficit as well. We had about $2 million in it last year, so we used half of it for last year and this year we had $1.2 million left, so we’re using half of it again this year. It’s really getting low, but if we don’t use our reserves when we are in a deficit, when we would use them? We pulled down some of our federal HEERFA grant money that we’re going to utilize towards the reserve. This year, we’re going to use about 7.5 million there. We are in a hiring slow down, and, as we don’t hire positions right away, can we generate salary savings? We’re sweeping that salary savings to the center and applying it directly to the deficit. We came in a little bit under where we had projected to be with headcount this year, so we are pulling the difference between where we had originally budgeted our headcount and where we ended up budgeting our headcount. We’re pulling that under enrollment revenue funding from Academic Affairs to make up the difference and then both Academic Affairs and Student affairs are providing portions of their prior year roll forward towards the deficit. We are holding any new funding we’ve received - that’s the AB 1460 funding and the GI 2025 funding and the new space funding - we’re holding it centrally until it’s actually needed, so a lot of those are positions or the new space funding for example. A lot of what’s being used for that new space funding is hiring additional custodial and maintenance support. It still takes time to hire those positions so we are not providing that funding to facilities until they hire the positions. This accrues the salary savings centrally and allows us to apply it to the deficit. We had a little bit left over in the deficit, so we took that amount and allocated it to all of the rest of the divisions, so that every division contributed to the deficit this year, based on their share of their prior year balance, and that’s how we closed the deficit for this year.

Major Takeaways

- The campus did receive some new funds from the state this year, but those funds are primarily designated for specific priorities and are not enough to offset the losses we are still incurring due to lost headcount.
- We will need to plan to address the base budget deficit in 2022-2023.

The major takeaways are that we did receive funding from the state this year. A lot of those funds are designated. We’re spending GI 2025 money on GI 2025 things. It’s very specific and it’s not enough to offset the losses we’re still experiencing because
we're in an enrollment decline. There are other campuses in enrollment decline, we're in that steep stage, right now, which makes us in a unique situation in the CSU. We've solved it on a one-time basis, but we're going to need to plan to reduce our expenses and we're planning to increase our revenues, as we go into the 22-23 year.

All our budgets are going to get posted in Open Book. We're going to immediately start planning for 22-23. This is a large deficit, and we need to have campus conversations about what we're going to do about it. She met with cabinet about it today, and we don't usually start meeting about it until December.

A member said this is her third time hearing this report and every time she picks up on different parts of it. We talked in APARC about how there weren't any kind of major cuts happening until next year. Is there a reason that that's not happening this year, to be a little bit more proactive, so that next year it's not terrible and bad? Can we can do it incrementally and then see how enrollment looks?

L. Lupei said yes, that's a great question. There are a couple reasons for that. The first is that we thought it was going to be a lower deficit this year. Going into the year we knew we had the HEERFA funds. We thought headcount was going to be a little higher and we didn't realize we were going to get this $3.3 million reduction from the Chancellor's office, so we thought that we had enough HEERFA funds to get us through the year. That was one reason we didn't plan on any base reductions for this year and thought the deficit would be smaller. The second reason is that the longer we have to plan for base cuts, the more strategic we can be about the base cuts, the more we can utilize strategies like hiring slow down and reallocating positions that are left via attrition, those types of things, rather than doing more disruptive approaches. Her anticipation was that we would still do a multi-year approach to the budget deficit.

S. Nosek noted one point he wanted to reinforce. Each time we can talk about the budget we have to remind ourselves that the CO office is currently funding us at our targeted enrollment amount which is 8500 plus students. That's currently what their funding is set for, but we're only bringing in maybe 7000 students. Many campuses in the CSU who are over-enrolled are only getting funded at their targeted amount, so those campuses are saying “what's going on, give us more, we have more students that we're getting budgeted for.” And we're saying “gee, don't take any of that money from us, even though we're not reaching our target. We're trying to get there.” So that's a year-by-year concern of ours, that we would be funded at a lower amount than the targeted figure. He just wanted to make sure we all understand that and keep that in mind as we go forward.

A Statewide Senator said he was at the CSU plenary last week and Chancellor Castro came through and gave another budgeting report. This is all resonating. It's sounding like what he has been hearing from the different angles. One thing he recalled was the response to COVID and some of the impact, especially in the southern campuses. He didn't know if anything along those lines of recruiting in the southern part of the state was being revisited. It might make next spring not quite so catastrophic for us.
The Provost said we have been doing things with an impact over the last three years. Two years ago, we unimpacted at the transfer level. Last year we unimpacted at the first-year level. Those two actions allow us to extend our application periods for longer than the standard month or so that we get normally in the CSU. This past spring, we unimpacted four majors. We can make a dent in the trouble as it takes a year to un-impact, so it would not be available to us until fall of ‘23, but we are going to see the increases from un-impacting Business and Coms and Biology. We will have an opportunity to bring increased numbers into those majors and we will go down to the CSU minimums for enrollment for those and so that does help with building enrollment.

The member said just to follow up, he had been hearing that some other campuses had opened up more down south and so students were staying down there. It wasn’t even what we do within our own majors here. He was wondering if we were hearing about them, maybe reinstating and some of those campuses that are now over enrolled and therefore getting more resources sent to them try and move them. Are we seeing anything at the Chancellor's level to do enrollment management across the campuses?

The Provost said she was not hearing yet about re-impacting. Some of those campuses are building in barriers to enrollment, but one of the things that we are doing this year during our recruitment season is going back down to southern California to recruit again. Because, even two years ago, 60% of our first-year class came from southern California or from outside of 200 miles of our campus, and so we need to go back out to the Central Valley, back to southern California to recruit first-time, first-year students. We have been purchasing names of students in other parts of California and out of state as well to try to increase the inquiries and therefore increase the applications from other parts of the state and out of region.

A member said he had been hearing concerns over the past few weeks that with some of the budget shortfall, there were concerns about lecturer budgets for schools on campus. He was wondering if it was possible to give us an update on where things stood there for the spring.

The Provost said one of the things that we’re doing is trying to be better at projecting enrollments for every semester, and S. Bostic and her shop have been not only starting to work with Dean’s on GE enrollments, but also on major enrollments, so we can be more targeted. One of the things that happened this fall, that we don’t want to happen in spring or next fall, is that we didn’t have enough seats in some areas to enroll our transfers and an unexpectedly large group of transfer students. For spring, one of our goals is to work together to ensure that we have enough seats for the new transfer populations that are going to enroll for spring. We don’t want them getting here and not being able to register for classes. We have also moved up transfer enrollment and new transfer enrollment into November, so actually our new students get to enroll one day ahead of our continuing students to ensure that there are seats. The other thing that we are doing is working with departments to pre-enroll students in a course in the major so that those students feel like they’re getting they’re being put into a class that is meeting their graduation needs and that
the department identifies as being crucial to completion of the degree. All of those tactics will help us to avoid problems and will therefore determine what our lecturer budget looks like for spring. We’ll hire to the need and in the spring semester for fall we’re going to have to do much more long-range projections. The trick is going to be if we have large numbers of deposits, which would be a great problem to have, we need to be prepared to supply the seats in those courses. We’re going to have to do things like shadow sections, enough built-in sections that we can staff quickly, in order to ensure that students are served. It’s going to be real tricky next fall because we’re not going to know exactly what our deposits are going to look like until May and then we’re not going to know exactly what the melt is going to be because of all the new tactics that we’re employing in order to reduce melt and increase deposits. We’re hoping to have some data available on a regular basis through the spring and summer to enable departments to make better decisions about hiring. M. Ogg is working very closely with Dean’s offices to make sure that we don’t have a gap in funding to make sure that we can do whatever we need to do in order to supply the seats. That doesn’t mean we can run a lot of low-enrolled courses; it means that we smartly budget. It does mean that our commitment is to make sure that those new students find the seats they need, so we can get them enrolled because their enrollment dollars are going to be what helps us out of this budget crisis.

The Chair said it sounds like we’re using one-time money to handle the deficit right now, and not really looking at making cuts, but it sounds like next year, we’re going to have to look at some pretty serious cuts to our budget to be able to deal with the deficit, is that correct? L. Lupei said yes, and there have not been any preliminary discussions on where those cuts might be targeted. She did meet with cabinet this morning, and they’re talking preliminarily about strategy at this point. She said that with the annual budget cycle, we don’t usually start talking about how we’re going to allocate new money or make cuts until January, but we have information early this year about what we need to do, so we’re having those meetings early. It is also extremely early. Census isn’t even until next week. We don’t even really know what our headcount is yet this year. Projecting next year’s headcount and knowing what the state’s funding plan is tricky. Everything is moving in pieces, but what we do know is that we already have an $11.2 million base deficit this year that we’re rolling to next year right so it’s basically plus or minus that. That’s already a big hole. That’s what we met about this morning and then we’re going to be moving forward on strategy. What we do know is that we have less students than we had three years ago. How do we accommodate the shrinking of our institution and also how do we focus on growing our revenue in ways to offset that? It’s both strategies, and that’s about where we are right now.

The President said although we had been able to come up with one-time funds to cover this year, it doesn't mean we're saying “oh life is wonderful, we'll just keep every single position that becomes vacant.” We are asking the tough questions. We have to think about not doing business as usual. We have to think about whether there are things or work that we could do together in a more efficient, effective way that maybe will save us in the long term. She has asked every cabinet member to begin now to think about: Are there things that we could do differently? She would ask the Senators to help us think through some of those things, and the strategic planning refresh is going to help us look at priorities and how our spending should
be so. It is an ongoing issue. We want to maintain the excellence that we have, we want to maintain our service to students, we want to maintain and support the excellent faculty and staff that we have. But with the declining enrollment, we can't just do things as they are it will get better, we have to take some proactive steps.

S. Nosek said we are working right now on the plan for next year, meaning that any position that's open we're going to keep it open for a while to save one-time money and maybe not fill that position, so that we have base funding money. When next year comes, we have to be working as of today to deal with the large deficit. We have a bunch of challenges for next year. At the same time, we are working on the revenue side too and the enrollment plan that the Provost is working on that E. Lopez will be sharing with us. This is also a major effort. We need to raise revenue and decrease expenses, and so we are working on all that. We don't have a specific plan to put out and share with you today, but, as the President mentioned all ideas are welcome.

The Vice Chair said a long time ago, in a galaxy far away, he used to make phone calls when he was an undergrad trying to get money. One of the biggest repeat donors were school teachers and police officers. They do the most giving and used to be able to put a license detail on the donor's license plate. He was wondering, in terms of Advancement, could we try to make inroads in those areas. He wanted to give money for example, to CCJS. He was not a wealthy man, he could give to his program, but he couldn’t figure out how to do that right now, and it's not on the website. The Provost said she does that, and we do need to increase annual giving and faculty, staff giving, and alumni giving. All of those areas are opportunities for us to increase and diversify our revenue streams. We have two grants in preparation for Title III and Title V as an HSI. They're in preparation right now as backups to diversify revenue streams, but in terms of advancement, yes, if anyone wants to give to a particular department or to give to graduate studies, to give to basic needs, you can do that, right now. On the advancement website, there is a pathway to set up a payroll deduction. (For payroll deduction: http://advancement.sonoma.edu/giving-opportunities/ways-give) or to give as one-time funds through a credit card or whatever. We can ask advancement to send that out, so that people would know what the processes are. That's something that anybody can do so we'll get that information out to people, so that everyone will know how to do that. That would be wonderful.

S. Nosek said the Vice Chair touched upon a couple of examples of opportunities out there to raise funds for programs and the campus. There are many, many more, and we need to invest more in our advancement operation in order to tap those opportunities. We do not have a planned giving officer, and we do not have someone who's working with corporations. There are plenty of opportunities out there for us and that's an area, like enrollment, we need to invest in to begin to build up a great opportunities to advance some programs through fundraising.

The Chair said thank you once again. She know this is the 40,000,000th time you've given this talk today, so thank you for being here and taking our questions. It's really helpful to give us that picture. L. Lupei said absolutely, thank you for having me, and thank you so much for this excellent conversation.
Return to Chair’s Report

L. Morimoto said she left off with the scheduling guidelines for Spring 22 and didn’t think there was anything too surprising. We’re trying to get more of our courses in person to meet the requirements but also the needs of our students. The other information item is the Academic Advising subcommittee charge. The Chair of the Student Affairs Committee had asked her to point out that the Academic Advising subcommittee had revised their charge, and they did a great job weaving the DEI initiatives, which are priorities for our campus, into their charge. Perhaps when some other committees are revisiting their charges or they can take a look. That’s one way to refresh it and make it relevant to the larger efforts that are being made on campus. If you take a look at that, it’s a great example of that. She met with the Accessible Technology Initiative group committee this morning and they would like the Senate to be more involved in the Accessible Technology Initiatives, because frankly the Chancellor’s office has a big long list of things that we’re going to be measured on at our campus, besides the fact that we should just want to be accessible. It’s good practice. It’s also something that we’re going to be evaluated on. They would love for faculty to be more involved, because as of right now there is not as much faculty involvement, and possibly because faculty haven’t been invited, so consider this the first invitation, if you would be interested in working with accessible technology. They are hoping to approach the Deans and ask the Deans to help them find a faculty member from each school to be a representative to that committee because they truly want that community. There’s a subcommittee on Instructional Technology and they really want our feedback, so keep your eyes open for that.

She noted that she had some questions about IRA (Instructionally Related Activities) funding. In particular, are we really using an equity lens when it’s being distributed? Who’s making the decisions about how it’s being spent? Is there accountability in the budgeting afterwards? She started poking around a little bit to try to find out and was surprised at the lack of data available to find out how different grantees are using the IRA funds. This is student money so there should be some accountability and making sure that it’s our students who benefit. She had a brief email exchange with Hollis Robbins who has expressed some of the same concerns about the funding. L. Morimoto was shocked to find out, for instance, the above line programs use the same Google form she uses to report her $12,000 lecture series, and she thought that’s amazing. She sits on the Student Fee Advisory committee and is trying to find more. If anybody knows anything or wants to help her find out she would be interested in knowing what you know. The AVP of Faculty Success search is still ongoing. It’s been a long and protracted event, but she wanted the Senators to know there has been consultation with herself, Vice Chair Burton and with Secretary Clark. She was not saying we’ve prevailed, by any means or that everything is 100%. She was not 100% sure of everything that’s going on, frankly, but know that it’s been a process to try to get this happening. She knew what an important position it is. She knows RTP files for the second years are due on the 21st of September and there’s nobody in that position.
There was a question in the chat: would it be disruptive to have somebody give up their classes? L. Morimoto said she would imagine it would be. Part of the challenge will be the Provost Office has said they would be supportive of a department to try to find a way to cover those classes, because this role is so important. She was going to assume that that means doing whatever it takes to try to bring somebody appropriate in, maybe a lecturer who’s covered it before, something along those lines.

Provost Report – K. Moranski

K. Moranski said she was not going to spend too much time on PBAC because of the budget presentation. PBAC had an opportunity to talk about that and will be working during the academic year to help advise and determine strategies, tactics and other ways of assisting with the budget deficit and responding to it in a strategic way.

One of the things that we are beginning to have conversations about is the strategic plan refresh which we’re hoping to roll out later this month. We want to make sure that we’re getting appropriate consultation on what that looks like. We have been getting some feedback and incorporating those changes. Then we’ll see if we can get that started. Another piece of that process is the Academic Master Plan. One of the things that we will do as part of our strategic plan refresh is to think about our vision for academics. One of the things that has been missing in some ways from the history of planning is - what we want academics to look like? What kinds of support do we need to provide to both students and faculty and to the staff who work in those areas that impact our academics, including areas from across the Divisions, such as Advising and Student Affairs. We need that Academic Master Plan. It gives us a real opportunity to think about how to do that effectively and how to put our priorities on the table. We want to think about where we need to change, where we need to grow and also where do we need figure out ways to rethink what we’re doing in more strategic ways. We will have a lot on the table this year, but the strategic plan refresh and the Academic Master Plan give us an opportunity to think strategically about how do we do that work rather than making draconian cuts and all of a sudden we are doing things that didn’t seem to have the appropriate consultation or the time to consider what would be most effective for the institution. L. Lupei was right in helping us to understand that it’s important to start now rather than waiting for the sky to fall for in the spring, when we just don’t have the energy and the time to really do that strategic thinking. So, that’s in the plan.

She provided context for the scheduling guidelines for Spring. One of the things that she asked Missy Brunetta to give her yesterday was the number of COVID cases that can be tied to campus and that have happened among faculty and staff, particularly. She said we know there’s some COVID cases on campus, but a relatively small number. But are there faculty and staff that are getting COVID from being on campus and her response was that there are no faculty on campus who are reporting COVID. There was one staff person and, in that case, compliance was not being met, so that is really good news for what we’re doing on campus in terms of masking, in terms of the rules that we’ve employed for this semester. It seems to be working, so far, into the fourth week of the semester. We want to keep that up. Please wear your
masks when you’re out and about on campus. Having people on campus is not a condition of causing an increase in COVID infections, as long as we’re doing the things that we need to do.

Another quick announcement. We did release six faculty hires. They are across all of the five schools. We have made sure that we spread those out as far as possible. Those are largely funded with AB 1460 money, which is what the AB 1460 money is required to be spent on - in ethnic studies and in graduation initiatives. We’ve got this big budget deficit and we’re intending to grow enrollment as quickly as we can. If we have additional enrollment and we don’t have the faculty to serve those constituencies, then we have a problem. We have had some retirements and some departures of faculty. We’re balancing all this. We’re not hiring in the same way that we used to hire. We don’t have 18 or 20 or 24 hires, but we do have enough that it helps us keep at a reasonable tenure density and allows us to do what we need to do to account for increased enrollment. We thought that we needed to put some hires into places and in some cases, and particularly with Nursing, we did not have a choice due to accreditation.

She provided an update about the AVP of Faculty Success. The search committee has asked us to open the search again for additional applications, and so we will be sending the position out very first thing in the morning and opening that up again. We had extensive conversations around this because we know how important it is to get this position in place. In the meantime, if there are questions or support needs, CTET and Matthew Paolucci-Callahan have offered to assist. Jeff Banks and herself will be assisting with the new faculty hires. Both of us are taking on that role and helping with that piece of that position as we roll out these six hires. If there are issues that arise where faculty need help or where faculty need counsel, faculty can take those to Jeff Banks or to herself until we’re able to get this position in place. Please utilize us needed and we will continue to prioritize getting this done as quickly as we can. It is one of her highest priorities along with enrollment and the budget.

The Chair of FSAC said FSAC is asking if, with the spring scheduling guidelines, hybrid is now equal to online. Could there be any sort of guidance in terms of how to determine whether particular types of hybrid courses, which may be very flexible or innovative, if they could still be considered not online and be in the face to face category. Are there any guidelines that would show where a course may actually fall out of the online category, but still be considered hybrid.

The Provost said that’s an interesting question and she was not sure that she had a very good answer. Our guidance so far, from the Federal Government, which has changed its definitions and from WASC are both pretty absolute around hybrid courses, however if we’re talking about one week or if we’re talking about a week at in the middle, or a week at the end, in other words there may be a little bit of room to maneuver if there are specific examples of innovations. She asked the FSAC Chair to let her know because it would help to have some examples of what faculty might be wanting to do. Then S. Bosick and herself can pursue those questions and just make sure that we’re not out of compliance with WASC. WASC is, so far, not providing a lot of detailed guidance, but they have been very clear about their intent.
to end the online waiver at the end of December. It puts us in a position of some
difficulty and if some programs are considering seeking online authorization, please
contact S. Bosick right away so that you could begin discussions about the time that
that would take and what the processes are. We are anticipating that WASC will be,
to some degree, inundated with requests to expand online authorization and we
have no idea how long it will take. Right now, it's a 12 to 18 month process. It is an
interesting situation.

Time certain reached

From EPC: Education Bilingual Authorization (Spanish) – First Reading – E. Asencio

E. Asencio introduced the agenda item for the bilingual authorization. She said two
weeks ago EPC didn't have any concerns at all. They unanimously approved this
after waiving a first reading. She noted that Rhianna Casesa is here from Education
and she can say a little bit more about what this program is all about, and she's got a
lot of good things to say.

R. Casesa said she was bringing forth the proposal for our added bilingual
authorizations to institutionalize this. This has been a program that has already been
approved by CTC and our most recent accreditation cycle which concluded in
January.

A little bit of background about the added bilingual authorization: The purpose is to
authorize any teachers - K - 12 public school teachers - to teach in biliteracy and
bilingual contexts. It can be added on to any existing teaching credential. It can be
added concurrently or after an existing credential, so what that means is that
students can take these courses at the same time that they are pursuing a teaching
credential. They could start the courses before they start their teaching credential
and finish them at the same time. Or they can get a teaching credential and come
back to Sonoma State and get the added authorization. The courses are based off of
bilingual authorization standards provided to us through CTC and it requires
coursework and assessment in language - Spanish bilingual methods and pedagogy
as well as culture. She collaborated with specific departments to conduct a curricular
analysis of existing syllabi and courses that already met the bilingual authorization
standards because we didn't want to write a bunch of new courses if we already had
courses that met that need already. We did identify some significant gaps and from
those gaps, we then developed a new course - an introduction to dual language
education, and policies and methods of inquiry for teachers and that was approved
as a singular course by EPC in 2018. We initially started with basically an
undergraduate pathway, with the intention that our students would start as
undergraduates taking these courses that align with much of their coursework either
CALS or Spanish majors or minors and then they would complete the EDMS 465
course while they are in the Student Teaching Credential Program. We ended up
getting feedback from the California Teaching Commission and the California
Association for Bilingual Teacher Education as well as local stakeholders, which
includes principles department chairs, middle and high schools as well as parents
that there was a need for an accelerated Program.
For candidates who are not Spanish or CALS majors or who didn't get their bachelor's degrees from Sonoma State, in the original pathway, there were seven courses that were required for the Bilingual Authorization and that was prohibitively challenging for people who were coming in and either wanted to get their credentials and bilingual authorization, at the same time. That can’t be done within a year or if they were coming in and trying to do it post a post-bac from another institution. We revisited the syllabus. CALS, Spanish and herself identified some 400 level courses that also met those standards, so we developed an additional pathway that met the same standards, but now there are three courses. The ability to offer this to people who are getting a Master’s degrees in Education in the CT and L pathway, these can be considered electives for Masters degrees. Both of these pathways were approved at our most recent CTC site visit, so we wanted to be as flexible as possible to meet the needs of undergraduates who maybe knew that they wanted to be CALS and Spanish majors and want to teach kids. People who are returning and maybe were not CALS and Spanish majors and then decided that they wanted to add the bilingual authorization are also served. We got a lot of positive feedback about our accelerated pathway from local stakeholders, such as principals who are now actively seeking content area experts with added bilingual authorization. What that means is as Sonoma county kids are moving through dual immersion programs and moving into middle and high schools, there is a need for, say, biology teachers who can teach biology in Spanish.

This accelerated pathway allows majors at Sonoma State who were not CALS or Spanish majors, but instead content area majors can then add the bilingual authorization to meet additional needs of our community.

Motion to waive the first reading. Second. There was discussion. Waiving first reading Yes - 16, No 6 – Approved.

A member said he saw that there were instructional learning outcomes and there were student learning outcomes, but there weren't program learning outcomes. He wasn’t sure why that was not done in proposal, and didn't know if it wasn't applicable and why that would be the case.

R. Casesa said if it's an added authorization put in the multiple subject credential, then the learning outcomes would be within the multiple subject.

Motion to approve the bilingual authorization (Spanish). Second. Yes – 20. No – 0. Approved.

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

L. Morimoto said this is the second reading of the Resolution Endorsing the Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism in American. This is a resolution about a statement that’s been signed by multiple organizations. This resolution is asking President Sakaki and the Chancellor to endorse the statement. We are calling out the problems with the legislative efforts to restrict the teaching of American history to a not very full version of American history.
Vote on Resolution – Yes – 19, No – 1. Approved.

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.

Approved by the Senate 9/9/2021

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
Rhetoric Society of America
Associated Students Report – K. Shipton, C. Gomez via video

K. Shipton showed a video from C. Gomez. (This transcript is verbatim)

“Hello everyone, my name is Christina Gomez and I’m the Executive Vice President of Associated Students. Today for my report, I will be reading a letter that was written by President Noelia Brambila-Perez and myself.

Dear administration and faculty, the past year and a half, has been difficult for everyone. It has impacted students on campus and in community in unimaginable ways. And during the 2020 academic year, Sonoma State was a lively university that offered wonderful opportunities in the classroom for students. This included hands on labs, fruitful class discussions and ample opportunities for collaboration. Then, in March, the campus became vacant, soon to go from live classes in person to black tiles on the Zoom screen. Students who were in labs are now using online simulators. Sonoma State lost many students and they face more mental health crises than ever before. With the announcement of the COVID 19 vaccines students began to feel hopeful and excited. New and returning students were thrilled that classes would be held in person. Then, for many, there were not able to have a single class in person. In addition, for our students entering their second year, and they still didn’t have the opportunity to step foot in the classroom. The release of the schedule last year caused students and prospective students to enroll in community college, instead of Sonoma State. Students thought to themselves - why pay thousands of dollars to sit in my room? Why enroll in a discussion based course that doesn’t let me discuss my ideas with my peers, but instead just posted on the discussion board? Why be assigned a group project done entirely over Google docs? These are questions that students had to ask themselves before enrolling in these
courses. These are all real life examples of what our Seawolves had to go through. Some decided to persevere and enroll in these online courses; many of them are disappointed, to say the least. When the semester started, students logged into classes that were supposed to be synchronous and were that informed by their instructor that it would be asynchronous. These students paid to have a top expert in their field. They paid to learn from someone who has a Ph.D. or Master’s degree and specializes in the course material that they’re teaching. Students said they are given a booklet and told to write on a discussion board on Canvas, this is not what soon signed up for when they decided that they wanted to pursue higher education. The situation that the students are in is not equitable. Students across the country and in our sister schools are being offered a range of courses and walk into the classroom every day. They are gaining experience that they need to be successful in the real world. Students who are able to walk into the classroom are able to build better connections with their professors, their classmates, and with themselves and figuring out who they are as a scholar. The opportunity to gain the skills that come with having an in person class has not been available to all of our students. Our transfer students may never step foot on the Sonoma State campus, if they’re not able to enroll for in person classes. This is not the college experience to our students deserve. As all of you think about the spring semester, I want you to think about our students. Would you pay $3,993 next semester for classes that we’re going to be held online? Take a moment and reflect back to when you’re in school. Where did you learn the most? We bet for most to you, it was in the classroom. When students are deciding to enroll in online courses money is not the only determinant. For students across the country online learning resulted in an uptick in mental health crises.

Sonoma State students are going to be in the CAPS department in record high numbers. Many students report that online classes are isolating and lack emotional intelligence. When students do not have the opportunity to attend to class in person that can push them to make the choice to no longer attend Sonoma State, to prioritizing their mental health and for some of them, that means finding another institution that can provide them with a better environment. With all that being said, this is the demand. Our students are asking for more in person classes, we cannot force our students to learn online. Students who enrolled at Sonoma State did so with the understanding that we’re an in person institution. We have a beautiful campus and great classrooms with spaces for students to learn, therefore, each class that is taught needs to have an in person option before it can be considered for online. Our students are the reason we all are here. We need to listen and take their feedback seriously. This would only help Sonoma State grow as an institution. If you read the mission statement of Sonoma State, one of its main focuses is on the geographic location. The internet says, as a member of the 23 campuses of the California State University system, Sonoma State is a proud to serve a diverse student population on our beautiful campus, at our environmental preserves and at satellite centers throughout the region located in north of San Francisco in California wine country. Sonoma State drives the economic, cultural and educational engines of the north bay. Sonoma State University prepares students for meaningful citizenship in a complex world. Our mission focuses not only on the importance of the campus, but of the students. Sonoma State exists to serve students. We urge the administration and faculty to remember this mission and commit to serving our students by providing a safe space for in person instruction.
This is our letter and I hope that you all take it seriously and when you’re deciding what classes need to be in person, I hope, you’re taking in the student's feedback, because what was written in this letter is a reflection of the students at Sonoma State University. Thank you.”

Motion to extend meeting by 5 minutes. Second. Approved.

A member said she just did an informal poll in her classes to ask what type of modality the students would like, and she was just wondering whether the there was an actual survey done from the student point of view. There’s a clear percentage of students who would like to be back full time because in her introductory class, which is mostly tailored for freshmen, she found a third of the students who still would like to stay online and, a third wanted to be in person and a third wanted hybrid. Was the statement that was read based on a student survey or just anecdotal evidence that was collected. She wants to serve her students, so she wants to make sure that the modality of teaching that we provide is what the students really need. She would feel better about the statement to know how many students support that. There’s still a proportion of students who doesn’t feel safe coming back. She wanted to know if there was data to back up the statement. K. Shipton said she asked the member to use C. Gomez’s email and ask her directly. (executiv@sonoma.edu)

The Provost said she don’t believe there has been a survey about spring yet, and thanked the Senator for the good suggestion. She thought we should survey our students. She did think that there will be some interest in continuing online courses and that’s where the strategic decision making comes in. She was happy to work with on a survey.

The Chair noted that in the chat a Senator suggested in a university wide survey students should also be asked whether they are working or not.

5 minute extension reached.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes with help from Zoom transcript
Academic Freedom Subcommittee (AFS) End of Year Report for AY 2020-2021

The AFS for the 2020-21 academic year consisted of Ajay Gehlawat (Hutchins, Chair), Zachary Wong (Business), Fawn Canady (Education), Mark Gondree (Computer Science), Cynthia Boaz (Political Science), Rhianna Casesa (Education/At-Large), Emily Ray (Political Science/At-Large), and Tonatiu Anceno (Fall ’20)/Chase Metoyer (Spring ’21) (Associated Students). Our FSAC Liaisons were Paula Lane (Fall ’20) and Stefan Kiesbye (Spring ’21). Additionally, the vacant Library position was again converted to a one-year At-Large position, filled by Bogdan Negru (Chemistry).

AFS began Fall ’20 by reviewing the Spring ’20 CR/NC policy discussion and AFS’s related statement. Following this discussion, a revised statement/letter expressing AFS’s concerns regarding the Spring 2020 CR/NC policy was unanimously approved and sent to Interim Provost Moranski, University Standards Subcommittee Chair Jolly and Faculty Chair Reeder. AFS received generally positive responses, with IP Moranski noting that there were no plans to reimplement this policy in Fall ’20.

AFS also began the fall by discussing the increasingly prevalent issue of online targeting of faculty, e.g., for their perceived political views and/or course content. AFS subsequently drafted and approved a statement regarding such targeting and sent it to FSAC. A Senate Resolution based upon this statement was subsequently introduced at the Senate in late October and approved by a 17-1 vote. The resolution, “Harassment of Faculty by Online Groups,” was subsequently posted on the Senate webpage (https://senate.sonoma.edu/resolutions/harassment-faculty-online-groups). Though this resolution calls for the administration to develop a standing plan to respond to targeted harassment of faculty online by Spring 2021, we received no response from the administration regarding such a plan by the end of the spring semester.

In tandem with its discussion of the online targeting of faculty, AFS began the fall discussing the issue of unauthorized recording in Zoom classrooms, with regard to potentially adverse effects on faculty’s intellectual property and/or academic freedom more broadly. AFS invited the input of multiple relevant parties on campus, including PDS, CTET and Interim AVP of Academic Programs Bosick, all of whom agreed that this was an important issue affecting faculty. The AFS Chair subsequently took part in a Zoom meeting with relevant members of administration and academic governance in late November, including AVP Roberts, IP Moranski, Interim AVP Bosick, and Chair Reeder, regarding online issues more broadly, where he urged that AFS be involved in discussions of these issues moving forward. Relatedly, AFS agreed to attend the AAUP webinar on “Remote Teaching, Recording of Classes and Intellectual Property,” during its final meeting of the fall.

AFS also continued to seek approval of the joint AFS-PDS statement on teaching sensitive material during the fall. At our final fall meeting (Nov. 18), the FSAC Liaison/Chair shared some of FSAC’s concerns with the statement. The AFS Chair noted that the Chair of the Faculty found the statement to be straightforward and suggested it could be used as a “Best Practices” guide. The FSAC Liaison/Chair suggested the statement include a preamble stating that it was a “best practices” guide before making it available online. AFS thanked the FSAC Chair for her input and formed a working group to draft such a preamble in the spring.

AFS began the spring semester by discussing the December AAUP webinar and subsequent steps to take with regard to safeguarding faculty and faculty IP in Zoom classrooms. AFS also reviewed and unanimously approved sending the updated joint statement on teaching sensitive material, with its newly added preamble, to FSAC. Following FSAC’s meeting/discussion, the new FSAC Liaison stated that FSAC was “polishing” the wording of the statement due to concerns raised by some members of ExCom.
AFS also received a number of AF complaints in the spring. In the first of these, brought by a member of the Hutchins School, the AFS Chair recused himself, with Boaz agreeing to serve as proxy Chair in adjudicating the matter. After subsequently and unanimously agreeing that the complaint had merit, AFS scheduled separate meetings with both complainant and respondent (without the inclusion of the recused AFS Chair). AFS subsequently held a brief discussion (again, without the recused AFS Chair) and unanimously moved to draft a letter and send it to both parties, informing them of AFS’s findings and serving as an informal resolution to the matter (“AFS Informal Resolution Letter updated,” March 15, 2021).

AFS received a second AF complaint, from members of the CCJS department. AFS found that the complaint had merit and proceeded to schedule meetings with both complainants and respondent. AFS met with the complainants in early March. Despite numerous requests, however, the respondent refused to meet with AFS to address the matter. AFS subsequently agreed to draft a statement regarding this matter and to share it with the Senate (“AFS statement regarding CCJS complaint March 2021”).

AFS received a third AF complaint, from a member of the School of Science and Technology. AFS scheduled separate meetings with both the complainant and respondent in mid-April. AFS subsequently and unanimously found that, while the issue raised in the complaint did not at this time constitute an infringement of AF, it could potentially become an infringement in the future. AFS drafted a letter to the complainant, noting our findings in the case, thanking them for bringing the issue to our attention and ensuring them that the issue would remain on AFS’s agenda.

AFS received a fourth AF complaint, from a member of the Hutchins School. Again, the AFS Chair recused himself and Boaz agreed to serve as proxy Chair in adjudicating this matter. AFS scheduled separate meetings with both complainant and respondent (without the inclusion of the recused AFS Chair) in late April. AFS subsequently and unanimously determined that the case did not have merit on the grounds of AF and the proxy Chair notified both complainant and respondent of its findings.

AFS also discussed the responses of the administration and AS to the joint statement on teaching sensitive material as well as strategies for moving forward on this issue in a collaborative manner. AFS agreed to invite Dr. Paolucci-Callahan back to speak with AFS regarding this issue in the fall.

Finally, at our last spring meeting (May 12), AFS unanimously elected Cynthia Boaz to serve as Chair for the following year (2021-22).

Respectfully submitted,

Ajay Gehlawat, Chair

Academic Freedom Subcommittee, 2020-2021
The Academic Senate Diversity Subcommittee has had a very active and productive year. A great deal of time and attention has been contributed by members to identify and address issues of equity and inequity, and offer pathways toward active improvement for many of these. Members have risen to the challenge of addressing racism, systemic oppression, and all forms of bias and inequity on our campus, supporting communities of color and other marginalized groups, related to our charge:

The Senate Diversity Subcommittee serves to review diversity issues and make recommendations to the Academic Senate to foster inclusiveness and equity. This committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the Academic Senate and 1) recommend policies or programs that will enrich diversity awareness within the campus community; 2) in collaboration with other University diversity efforts, promote increased diversity of student, staff and faculty on our campus; and, 3) in collaboration with the Educational Policies Committee, perform periodic review of diversity in the curriculum and make recommendations and accomplishments.

Beginning with the momentum from AY 2019-2020, the Course Cost Materials Report, endorsed by the Senate in early Fall of 2020, provided an overview of previous cost-related issues facing students, and highlighted several ways that faculty can participate in actively reducing costs and contribute to a more successful student experience. Included in the recommendations is the annual gathering of data regarding costs of textbooks and other materials, which Senate has asked SDS to follow up on. Further work on this topic led to discussions across campus about textbook adoption processes, and how to make low-cost or no-cost materials available to students. Numerous options have been suggested through the Library and the Center for Teaching and Educational Technology. We have worked closely with University Bookstore and tracked updated processes for faculty to communicate about course materials. Further, we engaged in information gathering around the option to create a zero-cost GE pathway in collaboration with CTET. Language was developed around this goal for the GE website and offered to EPC and GE Subcommittees.

In response to a previous letter (AY 2019-2020) on Equity-minded approach to Scholarship processes, we met with the University Scholarship Committee Chair and supported revision of the application and review processes to diminish bias and inequities.

Members reviewed student survey data in response to an awareness of many students facing significant challenges this year between pandemic, fires, and pivot to remote instruction. To further support faculty in their support of students, SDS sent out recommendations to faculty with tips and resources for anti-racism and social justice teaching/curriculum, and about options for low/no-cost materials considerations for spring semester.
SDS promoted and supported many on-campus (remotely offered) workshops, trainings, and conversations among faculty related to anti-racism, bias, equity and inclusion, and social justice. In response to a noted desire for a specific resource, SDS Members created a task force for researching and developing a Syllabus Tool to support faculty in their endeavors to integrate justice and equity-mindedness into their courses and classrooms. This was presented to Senate and endorsed in Spring 2021, with active utilization and workshops following immediately. Plans for further disbursement and mentoring with this will be ongoing.

SDS continues to partner with the President’s Advisory Council for Diversity, Equity, Campus Climate and Inclusion. Members had the opportunity to review the Campus Climate Survey and offer feedback prior to distribution in the spring.

SDS members participated in discussions and offered feedback on the AB1460 resolution related to Ethnic Studies and Critical Race Studies requirement for GE.

As part of the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion’s new website, SDS created a page to reflect this committee goals and accomplishments, highlighting specific contributions made by this team.

A task force was created to review RTP processes on campus, at all levels of review. This is ongoing work – many departments are in process of, or have recently revised criteria. Concerns were raised that many faculty of color have a disproportionate advising and mentoring role, and there is little or no credit given for this work outside of teaching/scholarship or formal service roles. Further investigations will follow with the goal to explore how to support faculty in getting recognized for their work in DEI areas. Collaboration with Voices to Action group led by Sharon Fuller and Matthew Paolucci Callahan.

Provided feedback to EPC in discussions on Writing Intensive Course (WIC) criteria, supporting the 25 student cap on these courses.

Guests: Megan D’Errico presented on Project Adapting Higher Education to Meet BIPOC Needs in the New Virtual Environment – housed in School of Science and Technology, working with MESA as part of TEAGLE grant. Reed Mathieson presented the CARES program. Justin Lipp visited with information on GE Pathway options and discussions. Ex-officio members active and contributing members as representatives of their specialties.

Lisel Murdock-Perriera was elected Chair for AY 2021-2022.
SDS Membership AY 2020-2021

Krista Altaker, Chair
Megan McIntyre
Aidong Hu
Lisel Murdock-Perreira
Willie Gin
Monica Lares
Silvio Machado
Derek Bradley
Nataly Hernandez
Teresa Nguyen

Ex-officio Members:
Merith Weisman, CCE
Aja LaDuke, Education (CFA)
Kristen Daley (EPC Liaison)
Mark Fabionar, The Hub
APARC PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS 2021-2022

Recommendation 1: Determine how online learning fits into the identity at SSU
As a COPLAC institution and one that has almost exclusively taught face-to-face pre-pandemic, we need to examine how online learning fits into the broader goals of the university. We encourage the university to continue to support funding and staffing for IT and CTET to support online and inclusive learning initiatives; to support the library in providing electronic resources that are accessible remotely; and to support equitable student access to reliable technology.

A. Provide support for students who might be struggling to adapt to change or to learn in challenging environments and transitioning to online learning.
   a. Identify students who are having technology issues or are without a reliable device to engage in online learning (e.g. no laptop, connectivity issues, unreliable internet connection) and provide resources (e.g. long-term laptop loans, noise-canceling headphones, hot spots) to students to support their engagement and success in online learning
   b. Establish mechanisms to teach students about ways to be successful in an online learning environment both in terms of Canvas and in terms of learning successfully in an online course

B. Offer more courses as part of CSU fully online which will allow students at other CSUs to take courses at SSU.

Recommendation 2: Implement Multi-Year Scheduling
There are inequities built into the system of higher education and SSU, particularly glaring are the differences between tenure-track faculty and temporary faculty in terms of planning for courses and expected workload.

A. Establish multi-year scheduling of classes aligned with SSU’s strategic priorities and core values.
   a. Multi-year scheduling will provide greater predictability for temporary faculty and tenure-track faculty
   b. Multi-year scheduling will allow students to plan their schedules further in advance to allow them more flexibility in studying abroad, taking classes in the modality of their choice, etc.

Recommendation 3: Build Assessment Capacity
In order to build long-term assessment capacity, we recommend that APARC collaborate with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Assessment to support assessment at the university level. Some critical steps for expanding assessment efforts at SSU include providing funding for assessment coordination across the campus and within academic programs. There should be more resources assigned to assessment professional development opportunities.
A. Collaborate with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Assessment to:
   a. define the relationship between assessment, program review and strategic planning
   b. identify the ways in which program learning outcomes come together to inform a set of institutional learning outcomes
   c. 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 (in collaboration with UPRS)
   d. examine how assessment could be used to help determine academic priorities (e.g. programs need more funds to be able to grow and attract new students, programs that could be reimagined based on student need or aligned PLOs)

B. Allocate resources to support a culture of ongoing assessment at SSU:
   a. 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
   b. commit resources for faculty professional development and implementation of effective assessment practices

Recommendation 4: Continuing Transparency in Budget Process
We recognize there have been significant advances with respect to the transparency of the budget with the development of online dashboard budget tools, which have revealed differences in budget allocations and instructional metrics between schools. There has been positive movement in the communication of how budget decisions are reached, but faculty feel there is still room for improvement.

A. Involve faculty in budget decision making process rather than after such decisions have been made
B. Increase transparency in how resources are distributed between schools, including funding for a tenure track faculty, release time, promotion raises, faculty salary, and lecturer budgets
RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the Chancellor urge campus presidents, in the context of the continuing pandemic, to be flexible, compassionate, and accommodating in responding to evolving conditions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that all campuses permit individual instructors working with their department chairs to modify curriculum and pedagogy (including modality of instruction) as needed to meet their particular emergent circumstances and constraints and to best deliver instruction to their students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That ASCSU urge all campuses to honor as much as possible, flexibility in established programs, practices, and policies regarding online instruction; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge that the Chancellor's Office request extension of the WASC Senior College & University Commission (WSCUC) authorization of virtual learning through Spring, 2022; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge all campuses to honor the safety article in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA - Article 37) and remain compliant with the Health Insurance Portability & Accountability Act (HIPAA) and the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) requirements, particularly by protecting the privacy of medical information when seeking vaccination exemptions and/or access to alternative modalities of instruction; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the Chancellor direct all campus presidents, or their designated agents, to frequently report timely campus COVID diagnosis counts and vaccination counts, broken out by faculty, staff, and students in a single, easily accessible location such as a web-based dashboard or table; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Office of the Chancellor, CSU Presidents, California Faculty Association (CFA), California State University Employees Union (CSUEU), California State Student Association (CSSA), CSU campus
Provosts, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, and the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU ERFSA).

**RATIONALE**: We are still in the midst of an ongoing COVID-19 global pandemic. A state of emergency was declared in California by Governor Gavin Newsom March 4, 2020, and remains in effect to this day. With the explosion of the delta variant of SARS-CoV-2, which is highly transmissible with a viral load roughly 300-1,000 times the viral load of the original SARS-CoV-2 virus, and which is transmissible by vaccinated individuals, our campuses are still experiencing an ongoing public health crisis. We are also very likely to be facing future variants with characteristics different from previous ones, and quite possibly in ways that cannot yet be anticipated.

This historic pandemic has had inequitable impacts on different groups across different socio-spatial geographies, including racial, gender, age, employment disparities; disparities in access to healthcare and in vaccination rates; as well as disparities in exposure, comorbidities, and long-term health impacts. These disparities are also present across county and local scales, leading to different campuses experiencing different phases of the pandemic (entering a wave, cresting, etc.) at different times. This requires local and individual autonomy in decisions that weigh both curricular and pedagogical issues with individual health and welfare concerns. This includes the autonomy to return to virtual instruction or another instructional modality when local circumstances warrant.

---

1 Our thanks to Aracely Alvarez, Christopher Espino, Rebecca Galvan, and Fabian Montoya, M.A. Geography students at Cal State LA, for their invaluable research assistance.


In addition to these disparities, many of our students, staff, and faculty in the CSU are immunocompromised, have household members that are immunocompromised, or have comorbidities that make them more susceptible to COVID-19, requiring vaccination exemptions and/or access to alternative modalities of instruction. We remind CSU and campus administrations that, in providing these necessary accommodations, they are governed by applicable CSU policies regarding confidentiality, privacy, and security of health records, as well as state and federal law, and that information shall be used only for the specific purpose intended and only accessible to CSU personnel who have a business need-to-know.

Finally, to make informed and timely decisions, it is important to have public access to relevant data about COVID-19 outbreaks and vaccination rates on campus. This information can be provided in a full-service dashboard\textsuperscript{15}, a webpage\textsuperscript{16}, or a table appended to an existing and easy-to-find webpage\textsuperscript{17}. Some examples of timely and useful reporting include the CSU Fullerton Campus Case Count, CSUN’s Reported COVID-19 Cases on their Health and Safety page, and San Jose State University’s COVID-19 dashboard.

Approved – September 2-3, 2021

\textsuperscript{15} Example from CSU Fullerton: \url{http://coronavirus.fullerton.edu/on-campus-case-count/}
\textsuperscript{16} Example from San Jose State University: \url{https://www.sjsu.edu/healthadvisories/covid19-dashboard/index.php}
\textsuperscript{17} Example from CSUN: \url{https://www.csun.edu/csunasone/health-and-safety}