AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – J. Reeder
Special Student report
Approval of Agenda
Approval of Minutes

Consent Items: Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status

Business

1. From FSAC: RTP policy revision discussion for feedback – P. Lane TC 3:30
2. From S&F: By-Law Change – membership of URTP subcommittee – First Reading – L. Krier TC 4:00
4. Posthumous Degree Request for Alondra Bandt – E. Clark TC 4:20

Standing Reports

1. President of the University - (J. Sakaki)
2. Provost/Vice-President, Academic Affairs - (K. Moranski)
3. Vice Chair of the Senate - (L. Krier)
4. Vice President/Admin & Finance - (J. Lopes)
5. Vice President for Student Affairs – (W. G. Sawyer)
6. Vice-President of Associated Students – (N. Brambila-Perez)
7. Statewide Senators - (W. Ostroff, R. Senghas)
8. Staff Representative – (K. Sims)
9. Chairs, Standing Committees:
   Academic Planning, Assessment & Resources – (E. Virmani)
   Educational Policies – (E. Asencio)
   Faculty Standards & Affairs – (P. Lane)
   Student Affairs – (H. Smith)
10. CFA Chapter President – (E. J. Sims)

Occasional Reports

1. Senate Diversity Subcommittee – (K. Altaker)
2. Lecturers Report – (Bryant/St. John)
3. Graduation Initiative Committee (GIG)

Good of the Order
Academic Senate Minutes
February 4, 2021
3:00 – 4:50, using free the fifties
Via Zoom

Abstract


Present: Jeffrey Reeder, Laura Krier, Carmen Works, Bryan Burton, Wendy Ostroff, Richard Senghas, Sam Brannen, Michaela Grobbel, Sakina Bryant, Wendy St. John, Doug Leibinger, Ed Beebout, Angelo Camillo, Florence Bouvet, Rajeev Virmani, Viki Montera, Rita Premo, Izabela Kanaana, Jordan Rose, Adam Zagelbaum, Kevin Fang, Rick Luttmann, Amal Munayer, Cookie Garrett, Judy Sakaki, Karen Moranski, Joyce Lopes, Wm Gregory Sawyer, Erma Jean Sims, Noelia Brambila-Perez, Chase Metoyer, Kate Sims, Elita Virmani, Emily Asencio, Paula Lane, Hilary Smith

Guests: Jerlena Griffin-Desta, Hollis Robbins, Merith Weismann, Katie Musick, Jonathan Smith, Karen Schneider, Damen Hansen, Stacey Bosick, Catherine Nelson, Jenn Lillig, Aaron Burton, Laura Alamillo, Melinda Milligan, Kari Manwiller, Lynn Prime, Natalie Hobson

Special Student Report – A. Burton

The Chair asked B. Burton to introduce the student speaker. B. Burton introduced his twin brother who started in the MPA program this fall semester.

A. Burton said I am a fourth semester part time, even though it feels like a full time, student in the MPA Program. In my day job I’m a Union rep with SEIU local 1021, so I actually represent the classified staff at the junior college. I really do enjoy Sonoma State. I recently came to Sonoma State partly because I’m a product of the CSU system. I went to Cal Poly Pomona for my undergrad in political science and I wanted to get my MPA. It took a long time for me to eventually get to that point. Initially I was looking at Southern Utah because my twin used to teach there and they have a really good MPA program, but when he started working at Sonoma and that I began looking at Sonoma State, because it does have a good reputation for the MPA program. I am a part time student and one thing that I would suggest is that we can look at part time scholarships. Even though I take six units every semester,
and I know a lot of my classmates do the same, because, unfortunately, school is so expensive, and also because of the cost of living, it’s really difficult to go full time when you’re trying to also support yourself. so that will be something that people could look at, and then the last thing as well is this is the first time I’ve had a full time faculty teaching a class. I love my adjunct professionals who’ve done a phenomenal job, but there is definitely a difference between a professor who has a full-time job and will come in to teach versus a professor who is teaching full time. You can certainly see the difference between the ability for you to get the attention you need. I do appreciate the smaller class sizes. It’s really important to have that attention and to be able to get the help when you need it.

J. Reeder thanked Aaron for coming by and sharing his experiences and sharing his thoughts with us about why you came to Sonoma State and what you’re getting from it. We appreciate hearing from graduate students as well because graduate studies are an extremely important part of our university and our identity.

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 12/10/2020 – Approved.

Chair Report – J. Reeder

J. Reeder reported that one thing that he wished we didn't have to do, but something important and the right thing to do, is that we will be receiving requests for a posthumous certificate and posthumous degree. We lost two of our SSU students over the break. The requests for a posthumous certificate and posthumous degree will come to the Executive Committee and then to the Senate. He noted the email that went out to everybody about vaccine updates. He asked the members to look for that. There's an SSU specific email about vaccine updates and that explains the current rollout and also our partnership working with the Sonoma County Office of Education. In order to get the vaccines rolled out there are different policies, different protocols, that apply to people in specific circumstances such as students or faculty or staff who are on campus and within a certain age range category. That’s explained pretty well in the in the email, so do please look for that. He noted we’ve had to postpone until a future date the emeritus dinner which is part of our annual tradition to honor our emeritus faculty for their lasting and important contributions to the university and as a way of remaining engaged with our colleagues who are now in a different role. We made the difficult decision at Executive Committee last week to postpone this year’s emeritus recognition dinner until such time as we’re able to do that safely. He thought it might be next year, but it’s hard to tell these days. He called attention to discussions about AB1460 and how that will impact our curriculum. Specifically, at this stage the Chancellor's Office has created a process and a new GE category, area F, and they have rolled that out at Sonoma State. We continue to discuss and examine how that is going to impact us on our campus. He noted a specific webpage the University has ge.sonoma.edu, which has all things related to general education, including AB1460. We’re going to make sure that we keep it as a priority and if anything changes or, as we have new developments, to update you all. The discussions, right now, are to some extent at a bit of an impasse, given that CFA and the Statewide Academic Senate and several local campus
Senate’s have expressed disagreement with, and in some cases and an intention not to follow the Chancellor’s Office guidelines and directives which are now codified in the Educational Code and Title V. In addition, AB1460, Ethnic Studies, has been a discipline in the California State University for 50 years beginning at San Francisco State University. We have seen and there’s abundant research that already exists that suggests that disadvantaged minority students and disadvantaged students in general are being impacted to a greater extent and at a greater level because of the pandemic and the shutdown including all the issues of 2020 and now early 2021 that are going on. How we at Sonoma State University and, also, we collectively in higher education, how we handle this and how we respond to this will have an extremely significant impact. We’ve seen, for example, that the number of students from marginalized backgrounds nationwide, have dropped out of the higher education pipeline at a much higher rate than non-underrepresented minority students and that’s a troubling concern. He looked at Lobo Connect and checked on the data and it seems like we do a good job taking care of them. He looked for GPA drops between the last three semesters among overall student body and underrepresented minority students and it seems to be flat. He looked at the percentage of underrepresented minority students at Sonoma State as a comparison with the overall student body over the last few semesters and that also seems to be flat. What we’re doing here is working well, but what he wanted to do is give voice to those students who are not here, because they are among the students who chose to either defer or not go to college. As we decide what our fall semester looks like, as we decide what our classes look like, as we decide how to reach out to and engage and attract students, he hoped that we don’t just keep in mind our current students and our current colleagues, but that we give voice to those students who would otherwise not come and who last year didn’t come, because those are the truly vulnerable students.

President Report – J. Sakaki

J. Sakaki reported that this week has been California State University advocacy week and normally, it would be a week there where several of us from the campus would be up in Sacramento walking the halls and seeing different legislators and talking to them about to them about California State University budgetary needs as well as about Sonoma State. However, these meetings this week and next week are all happening virtually because of the environment we’re in. She had some great conversations with Assembly Member Jim Wood, Cecilia Aguilar-Curry and Mike McGuire is coming up as well as the Legislative Women’s Caucus which has been very interesting, since over 50% of the Presidents in the CSU are women. They were interested in meeting with representatives of the CSU. Our team has been myself, Jerlena Griffin-Desta, Chief of Staff, and Rob Eyler in his role as Government, Community relations and Regional Relations. We’ve also had a student or two join us. She said that the Legislators are always really interested in hearing the student voice. What we’ve been talking about has been the graduation initiatives, support for the Governor’s budget and appreciation for what we’ve been given so far, but hopes that we can increase that by not only restoring our full funding of the CSU, but also one-time additional needs, including deferred maintenance, as well as scholarship money for our DACA students who cannot take advantage of any federal stimulus money grants. We’d like to see some additional money from the
state for those students. It’s been very encouraging and there’s a lot of support for what we do. Some of our local legislators are alumni as well or CSU alum, so they get what we’re doing and know that we’re a value and want to be of help. In addition, last week was the Board of Trustees meeting and she presented an item which was on an update on our capital master plan. This has to do with our housing, particularly our Zinfandel villages which is our oldest village. At some point, it needs to be updated. Given the COVID environment and the economic downturn, we do not have immediate plans to build additional student housing, but we need to think into the future, and we need to be on the books, so that when we are ready, we can. The hope is that someday 50% of our students will be housed on campus and we would like to have more of a freshman village. There would be more traditional housing so they could really bond to each other and we can do some programming with them. The full board voted in support of our master plan. She thanked Joyce Lopes and her team who did the heavy lifting to get us there. Other things that are happening at the Chancellor’s Office was the first Board meeting with our new Chancellor. He announced an appointed six-month interim Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student affairs. His name is Fred Wood and he is well aware of the needs in California and he’ll be working with us for six months while they will be searching for the permanent replacement for Dr. Loren Blanchard who is going off to become the President at the University of Houston downtown campus. We kicked off a very successful Black History month celebration. She thanked all the students, staff and faculty who participated in and made that event worthwhile. She thanked everyone serving on the Senate because their voices on this body matter and she appreciated all of the input and time to help us be better as a Senate and as a university. We will be beginning some searches on our campus. Provost Moranski was appointed on an interim basis for a year, and so we will need to begin the search for a permanent Provost and she asked Jerlena Griffin-Desta to serve as the Chair of that search. We also will be starting a search for our Athletic Director as well. She asked Vice President Mario Perez to chair that search. We also have an opening for a Faculty Athletics Representative and she hoped that some of the Senators would consider applying for that position. The position does report to her. It is an important bridge between the faculty and the student athletes and the Athletic department, so that position is coming available for next fall. She spoke about Dr. Jerlena Griffin-Desta who serves as her Chief of Staff, and also as Associate Vice President for Diversity and Strategic Initiatives, noting we were one of the last campuses in the CSU to have a diversity officer and in addition, we’re probably one of the only ones that has that as a part time position. She so appreciated everything that Jerlena is doing and she is doing both of these jobs in an exemplary way. After a thorough review of structure and positions in the CSU, both on the Chief of Staff side and on the diversity inclusion side, we will be changing her working title to be a Chief of Staff and Vice President for Diversity and Strategic Initiatives. Given the budgetary situation, there’s no compensation change at all, she will continue to serve, as other Chiefs of Staff and Diversity Officers do across the system, on the cabinet.
Provost Report – K. Moranski

K. Moranski reported on spring enrollment. We have a new student cohort of 407 students and since we predicted a spring class of 379, we are ahead a little bit on our actual numbers for new students for spring. This gives us an annualized head count of 7515. That is ahead of budget predictions for this year, so that’s good news for the budget deficit. Obviously, for fall 2021, the trick is going to be conversion and making sure that we convert our applications to deposited students into enrolled students in sufficient numbers to continue to help with the budget and continue to make progress on boosting our enrollment. It’s going to be an immense effort. We have already been working with the schools and with units across campus and with our Student Affairs partners to boost our conversion rate. Another note related to enrollment is that we have submitted an impact report that impacts several programs on our campus. The faculty in those programs in Communications, in Pre-Business, Business, Liberal Studies/Hutchins and Biology have made the decision to release impaction for the 2022 class. We will be working on moving forward with the public process that happens when we change compaction criteria. In addition, we have some programs changing their impaction criteria to allow for more flexibility in lower enrollment situations. All of that is good news and she offered deep appreciation to the faculty who have thought long and hard about this in order to be able to do it and to Stacey Bosick in Academic Programs and Elias Lopez in Strategic Enrollment who have supported the discussions around this issue. We are also deploying next week, a set of scholarships for new students as part of our efforts to bring that conversion rate up, and we will be doing three levels of scholarships. The President has a set of 10 scholarships, each Dean has a set of 10 scholarships and then there is a pro bono set of scholarships that covers the additional monetary amount that we have to give out in scholarships. This set of scholarships is primarily for first time, first year students, but we will be working on a program for transfer students. We released yesterday core scheduling guidelines for fall of 2021 to department chairs and dean’s offices. This is rocket science in some ways, so contrary to the to the expression, it’s very difficult and very complicated and to speak to Chair Reeder’s point about making sure that we’re speaking to the students, we really need to make sure that our course scheduling guidelines are equitable and fair, and that they allow as many students as possible to participate and complete their education in a timely fashion. We will be partially on ground, in person and partially online and we’re going to have a mix of modes and methods, so we are trying to do our best to work within a very constrained budget situation to be able to manage our schedules most effectively. Faculty will be in discussions about those as we plan for the fall schedule. She thanked the faculty for their creativity and flexibility and their willingness to explore multiple modes of teaching and learning as we move forward. We are also moving forward this spring with a forum where we’re going to be talking about institutional identity and this is one of the issues that has been brewing for the last several years. We’re going to have that discussion forum probably in March. We’ll send out a “save the date” and we’ll be inviting all members of the Sonoma State community to participate in a discussion about our liberal arts and sciences identity and how that relates to professional programs, how that relates to workforce demand. She thought that is an important conversation for us to engage in as we move forward as an institution. As we work on budget reduction and budget deficits, it’s important that we know
who we are so that we budget according to who we are and also so that we can move forward as an institution and capitalize on a firm commitment to identity.

A member said she was contacted by some faculty members who are frustrated by the assigned SSU trainings. How were they assigned? Why are there so many? For instance, there are probably some people on campus for whom the storm water and pollution prevention means something, but as a math faculty working from home, not so much. It seems that other CSUs don’t do it this way. She wondered, are there going to be training like this from now on? She thought the frustration is we are spending so much time on computers right now and then spending additional hours on some of those trainings while not understanding the value of them was the cause.

J. Lopes said we actually had recently been audited, both by the State of California and by the system office and we found that trainings that are mandated had not been assigned across the campus. It is unfortunate, now, that we have all of these trainings, so we need to get caught up on. We did ask for an extension on the timeline. Specific to the stormwater training, why that is important on our campus is because our campus does get all of our water through a well system, which is very unusual. She didn’t know if there are any other campus in the CSU that had that. There are certain trainings that are unique to the situations that we have on our campus and every employee then has to participate in that training. Once we all get this done and we’re caught up, then the trainings will be more on a routine basis. Some of them need to be redone every year, but others are every two to three years or every five years.

The President noted that she has participated and done all of her trainings as well, and she asked for faculty indulgence to go through them. Some of the information is useful just for us in our personal lives, sometimes it is tedious. She said she is evaluated based on the percentage of our staff and faculty that participate. When she goes in for her summer evaluation with the Chancellor, the first thing she has been handed in the past was - what percentage of staff and faculty had completed their training and part of her evaluation is whether or not we have compliance, because increasingly there are some concerns that end up in litigation and we are asked to please encourage folks to participate.

A member posted to the chat: “The trainings are not timed, so I found that just by skipping straight to the test I could pass without reading or watching anything (most of the questions are common sense or common knowledge), so each training took me less than 5 minutes. I passed them all!”

J. Lopes said that’s absolutely right, the trainings are not timed. If you go to settings and if you’re able to listen at faster than a 1.0 ratio, you can speed that the training up and take it at one and a half times. There are some tricks to get through it a little bit more quickly, but it is mandated and we have got to get the campus caught up.

One of the Statewide Senators noted, he will be bringing this very issue to the Statewide Faculty Affairs Committee to ask them about - to what extent are any of these able to be managed or could faculty be given a choice. He understood the stormwater one is different by campus, but we’re also wondering if we see different
ones on different campuses and to what extent does the Chancellor's Office have the ability to set policy. We'll bring it up at that level since we've also heard it constantly said it's coming down from above.

A member asked the Provost, at the Ex Com meeting you said 13 sabbaticals were awarded for next year, and some faculty are wondering how many applications, there were in total. The Provost responded, there were 25.

**Vice Chair Report – L. Krier**

L. Krier reported that Structure and Functions voted to amend the bylaws to increase the membership on the university RTP subcommittee from five to seven members. We started discussing guidelines for committees to conduct business by email and we'll be working on something that we can share soon. We voted two additional faculty to governance positions.

**Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – J. Lopes**

J. Lopes reported that the President's Budget Advisory Committee met this morning, and we had a good discussion around working collectively on our budget. While we are still facing a deficit, the one-time stimulus funding will help and we talked a lot about how it is important it is to ensure we are keeping strategic budgeting at the forefront as we think through this process. We're not focused on having a deficit. We think about how do we resolve that, but we keep in mind our values and our strategic priorities and look at where we need to invest to ensure that we're moving those priorities forward. It was a great discussion. We're going to have more conversation, looking at the various priorities, identifying which ones need to be addressed first, putting dollars to that and figuring out how that all fits into our full budget picture. We'll be putting a budget forum together for the spring semester. We're going to spend some time figuring out how we visually depict how our values are embedded into our budget for the forum. She thanked everyone on the Budget Committee and for the very helpful comments and suggestions that everyone brought to the table. Regarding vaccines, Missy Brunetta, is working with the Sonoma County Office of Ed who is now in charge of making sure that the educators in the county are vaccinated. The county public health has told the Sonoma County office that they will start releasing vaccines to them again, hopefully, in a week or so. They were supposed to get vaccines this week, but then they read about the prioritized groups, so we have given the Sonoma County office all of the information about our employees and faculty and staff, including ages. We've got the plus 75, plus 70s, plus 65 age cut offs Those are all being considered. They know who’s working on ground, who’s working directly with students and so vaccines will be prioritized based on the age groups, and then who's on ground working directly with students. As folks reach a tier where you’re eligible to be vaccinated, you'll get a message directly from the campus. If it's necessary for you to take a letter, then the letter would be attached to the communication and you could print that out and take it with you or show it to them on your phone screen. It's continuing to move forward and they're very hopeful than the next month or so we'll start making good progress on getting our education tier vaccinated.
A member asked in regards to the vaccine, the next month or so, for those who are 75, 70, 65 - do you have any sense at all, about people who are in my category (mid 40s), not working currently with students and what that might look like. Are we still thinking about eight months or have they given us any update or do they plan to ever?

J. Lopes said Missy does attend at least weekly update meetings with the county. They were predicting that for those of us who are not on ground, it will probably be this summer before we get our vaccines. It’s so hard to know. If another vaccine is approved, if there’s more vaccines in the pipeline, if the State lets organizations like Kaiser or Sutter or Catholic health get more involved, it could really change the whole logistical process. Her crystal ball was broken.

Vice President for Student Affairs Report – Wm. Gregory Sawyer

Wm. Gregory Sawyer reported that, right now, we have 85 hotspots which we have already distributed this semester, and we do have a waiting list for those hotspots. On a positive note, we are actually caught up with our Chromebooks and the library still has additional inventory if we need it. We still are looking to acquire more hotspots. We’ve had 500 students move into housing and that is an increase of around 50 students from last semester. This morning he receive a text message that said that our area coordinators in housing will be able to be vaccinated for their first shot next week. That’s because they’ll be working directly with those students. As of today, we have four people in housing that are in quarantine or isolation, three that are positive, one that is in quarantine and not in isolation. In terms of Care numbers, so far, so last year ‘19- ‘20 throughout the year, we had 505 students needing care. So far this year, up to February 3rd, there have been 466 student needing care. That shows you the number of mental health and COVID cases that we are working with in care. He thanked the faculty that are working with us and partnering with our student success model. What we’re trying to do with our early warning system is working with about five classes and faculty are letting us know whether or not students have checked in online. About 23% reported that that students have not have not checked in with their online programs. Just as an FYI, as you’re talking to other faculty those final reports will be due on February 8th. What we’re trying to do with an early warning system is find out what students have not checked into their classes. Other things that are of importance, going back to immunization as well as vaccination, one of the ideas that we’re looking at is making sure that all students check in to my health portal. As soon as they check in, there will be an individual confidential statement, and we will be able to let the students know as that information comes up, they will be notified by Student Health. Then we can start vaccinating students on a regular basis as we get the vaccines. We have a new wellness program on campus. We talked about it a little bit last semester is called
You@Sonoma. There are about 15 universities now in the CSU that are using it. It allows students to check in to find out how are they doing on campus, be it for academics, or their own physical or mental health. It helps them to adjust so they can go through at their own pace and they can see how they are doing on a college campus. We’re excited about the program and the students will be able to log in the portals which is being set up. Laura Williams from CAPS wanted him to talk about SeaWolf safe. The first training will be in February 16th, 9:30 – 11:00 and we will be sending that information out. It’s our Suicide Prevention program.

**Free the Fifites (3:50) reached** and Natalie Hobson provide desktop yoga.

**Consent items:** From EPC: Proposal for the Environmental Science, Geography and Management BS, as well as the Geography and Planning BA programs (and all associated course proposals and discontinuances) and From EPC: Proposal for elevation to full degree of the MA in Educational Leadership and associated discontinuance of the MA in Education with Concentration in Educational Leadership – **Approved.**

**Questions for VP Sawyer**

A member asked if the early warning system is accessible for faculty members and, if so, how. We need that. Wm. Gregory Sawyer said yes, faculty can do that. He listed the courses that are part of the early warning system - English 101, Math 165, History 252 and GEP 305 can all run progress reports. But that can certainly be extended to other faculty, but those are the classes right now that are in the program with us. The member said she teaches Eng 101 and frequently teaches English 100 AB and she sees a lot more problems in those courses. She strongly recommended that those courses also be added to the early warning system. Wm. Gregory Sawyer said absolutely and asked to talk to the member offline. We have found out over the last couple of semesters, some students are just not even signing into classes. We're having our peer success coaches following up with them, we have our professional advisors, but anything faculty can do to help us would be wonderful.

**Upcoming WASC visit – K. Moranski and M. Milligan**
K. Moranski said the Western Senior College and University Commission is coming for a visit on March 4th and 5th. We want to talk a little bit about the timeline, what’s been happening, what we’ve done and what we may need from the campus community as we prepare for this special visit. In February 2017, we submitted an institutional report to WASC, which we do every 7 to 10 years based on the timeline they give us. When the WASC team came to visit, it was a week after we had returned from the fires. The team was very complimentary of our efforts to be resilient and to continue with the site team visit and they focused on five lines of inquiry. At the end of that visit they gave us a report. They made seven recommendation to us and did affirm our accreditation for an eight-year period. The year 2025 is our next full institutional report. WASC asked us to take those seven recommendations and address them as part of a special visit set for March 2021.

SSU’S RECENT ACCREDITATION HISTORY

February 2017
- Institutional Report submitted to WSCUC
- Based on work of Accreditation Steering Committee

October 2017
- WSCUC Team visit to SSU campus
- Focus on specific Lines of Inquiry

February 2018
- WSCUC reaffirmed SSU’s accreditation for a period of eight years

March 2018
- WSCUC action letter provided seven recommendations to SSU
- Special Visit set for March 2021

M. Milligan said she would talk about what was done in anticipation of that special visit which was to gather a WASC special visit working group. This group was charged with gathering evidence to respond to the seven recommendations.
This slide shows the membership of the Special Visit Working Group. It is comprised of representatives from across campus. The focus of this team was to drill down into the seven recommendations and to find out what the campus could do and where the best support was for explaining what we were doing and plan to do in between the initial review and the follow up special visit. The committee divided itself into working groups, each of which focused on a particular recommendation, gathering information, consulting with appropriate groups on campus, to create the background. The Chair of the committee, Karen Thompson, worked with that information to draft the special report that was then submitted to WASC on December 22nd of this year in advance of the visit.

K. Moranski said it's important to realize that we had been working on the seven recommendations. Our strategic planning process, our diversity plan and diversity framework, the changes to our program review policy were all happening over the last...
three and a half years or so. These seven recommendations and the full report are in the Senate packet. The slide above is a summary of the progress on the seven recommendations and they largely concern assessment and program review. They concern strategic planning and strategic budgeting. They concern our use of data tools, our strategic plan and our diversity framework and the identity question - What it means to be an SSU undergraduate or graduate student.

M. Milligan said the special visit is scheduled for March 4th and 5th, which of course will be a remote special visit. The visiting team is listed here and there are four members of the team. These four members were on the team that did the full review in 2017. It’s fantastic that we can have them back to our campus to do the special visit because they know so much about Sonoma State, and they will be able to see in detail, the progress that we’ve made. We can show them everything we’ve been doing, and she thought they will have a special understanding of where we were in 2017 and the circumstances that surrounded that visit. That will create a good context for them being able to see everything that the campus has done, as illustrated in the reports. In terms of the schedule, it is still a bit up in the air, because the team will be meeting next week to finalize for themselves what they specifically would like to know when they visit us on March 4th and 5th. After they determine where they want to drill down, they will send a draft schedule to our campus. We will flesh it out and send it back, and then we will arrive at the final schedule. Because this visit is a special visit, it’s going to be different in focus than the previous visit which had much more engagement with the campus as a whole. This visit, we anticipate, is going to be focused on meeting with key leaders, such as President Sakaki, the Executive Cabinet, and Interim Provost Moranski. Beyond that we anticipate that the WASC team will want to focus on questions or additional information they need around the seven recommendations, and so the planning that we’ve been thinking through is who best would represent the campus to speak to both the content of the report and the current state of campus affairs around the issues in those seven recommendations. We anticipate a series of sessions focused on the recommendations with key campus representatives that can speak to each of the
recommendations. There are sub groups that have special expertise in each of the seven recommendations, and we will also be pulling in individuals from across campus that can add to the information that WASC will be searching for. From a faculty governance perspective, recommendations one and two, the program learning outcomes and assessments and the second recommendation that focuses more on program review will have engagement with faculty governance. She has contacted APARC and UPRS to give them a heads up that we will likely ask their leaders and membership to be in these visits. The packet today has not only the full special visit report, it also has a helpful one sheet summary that details the recommendations and also details the campuses response to those recommendations so that’s the first place to start and then you can drill down into the report, in the areas that are of special interest to you.

**WSCUC SPECIAL VISIT**  
**MARCH 4-5, 2021**  

**Anticipated Meetings (schedule in development)**
- President Salaki
- Executive Cabinet
- Interim Provost/ALO Moranski
- WSCUC Special Visit Working Group
- Sessions focused on seven recommendations (with key campus representatives for each)

**RESOURCE LINKS**

- [SSU Institutional Accreditation Website](#)
- [Special Visit Report (December 2020)](#)
- [Institutional Report (February 2017)](#)
Associated Student Report – N. Brambila-Perez

N. Brambila-Perez reported that elections are up and running. If faculty know of any students who might be interested in leadership positions, and please tell them to apply through February 16th. We have virtual info sessions available for them for the next few weeks. One of our programs, JUMP, is getting ready to send out a student email on virtual volunteering options. One of the cool things that they came up with this semester is a crisis text line. Students can go ahead and volunteer in these lines and help others who are in need. ASP is also having events every week such as campus drive-in movies, as well as a drive-in concert. The Children’s School is up and running, just like it was last semester and we have great protocols. Young children are still getting the best of the best, so we’re really happy over that. She provided an update on the Basic Needs Initiative. We gave on campus and off campus bag distributions this January, and we were open during the break as well. We do have six students in case management for grants or other resources. Calfresh outreach days come in the last week of February, please spread the word to students. She thanked all the faculty who have been very understanding of students and giving them the option of having their cameras on and off. We are in this very weird time right now, so making sure that the students are comfortable and having that open communication with faculty is great. If anyone needs any student representation on committees, she is the one to contact.

The Chair noted that in terms of reaching out to students interested in leadership, he suggested rather than attempting to determine which students are already interested in leadership, think about which students have the potential for being interested in leadership and encourage them to get in touch with the current student leaders and to consider that as an option. A substantial number of our local elected officials, including our state Senator Mike McGuire, a number of city council members, and vice mayors, in our region are SSU alumni.

Statewide Senators Report – W. Ostroff, R. Senghas

W. Ostroff reported on what happened at the most recent Statewide Senate plenary on January 21st and 22nd. We heard from the CSU ERFSA. They have a charitable foundation which gives grants and those grants are open to both current and retired faculty. The grants are about 1200 dollars each and faculty are encouraged to apply for CSU ERFSA grants. We heard from our new CSU Chancellor Joseph Castro. An important item he mentioned is that he’s sponsoring legislation to reallocate prop 63 funds for student mental health services in our CSU system and is hoping to improve the counseling ratios which are very crucial to us right now in this in this challenging time for our students. We also approved three interesting resolutions. One was protecting fair workload for faculty in the CSU, one was on disparate impact of technology on underserved students and one was on the ongoing collaboration of ethnic studies and the implementation of ethnic studies. Notable upcoming issues that are being worked on in the Statewide Senate are the faculty emeritus status revocation and appeal process. Committees are working on a resolution about how emeritus status is awarded and also whether it can be removed under certain circumstances. A committee is working on general education area B4, which is the mathematics and quantitative reasoning course guidelines and
principles in the Math Council of the CSU document and hoping it will be included in the guiding notes for general education course review.

R. Senghas noted that he will be bringing to the Faculty Affairs Committee the question about what would be appropriate levels of training, for which people and do faculty need to be doing all the trainings.

A member asked what ERFSA stood for. It stands for the Emeritus and Retired Faculty and Staff Association.

**Staff Representative Report – K. Sims**

K. Sims reported that that one of our latest endeavors is that the Staff Council has been inviting new officers on the campus to our meetings. So far, we have enjoyed meeting and hearing from the CARES Caps team on campus, the new Chief of Police, Nadar Oweis, the Dean of Education Laura Alamillo and the Dean of Social Sciences Troi Carlton. If any Senators know of any new people on campus that would like to meet with the Staff Council, just let her or Katie Musick know.

**APARC Report – E. Virmani**

E. Virmani provided few updates on APARC business. One item is that we had an engaging APARC meeting about assessment Melinda Milligan and Jenn Lillig, thinking about the role APARC can play more explicitly in assessment at the university and guiding assessment processes. It's still very much in the beginning stages of conversation, but it's exciting to think through how APARC might work, in terms of guiding and / or oversight of some of the processes that need to happen on a meta level with program learning outcomes. There's a lot to think about. She invited all the Senators to think about ways to engage and invite faculty to play a role in assessment at the university level. The other thing that we've completed is that last semester we worked with UPRS to integrate language into the self-study guide to more explicitly state ways in which their goals and mission engage with core values and the strategic plan of the university.

**EPC Report – E. Asencio**

E. Asencio reported that EPC had their first meeting this morning, and we had lots and lots to talk about. First of all, we are going to be extending the temporary tags for online courses through summer due to the uncertainty of many different things for fall and for scheduling purposes for spring. We're sending a memo out shortly, just so that you are aware that that's happening and it won't be necessary to apply for a course mode delivery change. We're going to extend that permission to teach online without having to do that through summer 2022. It's currently through summer 2021, so that's one of the major developments. EPC is currently doing a first reading of the WIC overlay criteria and EPC today decided, we're going to be bringing that out to the schools, so just keep an eye out for that and as an opportunity to provide feedback for that criteria. We're working things out during the first reading, so you should be expecting to hear from your EPC representatives about that and we would appreciate your feedback. Academic Programs has
brought to EPCs attention an update, or potential update, to the academic calendar for fall that would allow for a week of flexibility, and that would accommodate fire type of emergencies. She will bring be bringing the changes through the Ex Com.

FSAC Report – P. Lane

P. Lane reported that FSAC had just enjoyed their first meeting, and they are practicing our own version of the free five-minute break in the middle of our meeting, and she thanked Chair Reeder, for leading us in that endeavor. FSAC is taking on a procedure to look to look at faculty retreat rights. It’s come to our attention that the current procedure is a little bit loose and unclear, and we would like to help direct that in the hiring of new MPPs on the campus, Deans, etc. in order to have the process a more organized, a possibly more consistent process for how an applicant learns of and how departments help decide about retreat rights. AFS has provided us with their document again of the statement for teaching of sensitive materials. This is a statement that’s been going back and forth for over four years. We hope to help edit it one more time. As you may know, it was brought to the Ex Com and was sent back to AFS for more edits. We’ve received it again and we are still working with it and hope very shortly to bring that forward. PDS is looking to change their name to the Teaching and Learning subcommittee. They are looking at changing their charge as well. They would work more on teaching and learning awards and perhaps be the group that would help us all think about teaching and learning awards and presentations, etc. April 1 is our deadline to receive revised RTP department criteria. We expect quite a few of these this semester. Please, if you know your department is working on or is thinking of working on their RTP criteria, get that revised document to FSAC by April 1, so that we have time to look at it and review it. FSAC will be bringing documents regarding the RTP policy revisions to the Senate next time for feedback.

Student Affairs Report – H. Smith

H. Smith reported that Student Affairs met this week for the first time this semester. SAC is moving forward with a review of the plagiarism and cheating policy, looking more closely at the different pieces at the university that intersect with that policy. We will be having Ben Ellis, the Student Conduct Officer, join us at our next meeting, so we can talk about how that process works from the administrative side. We’re also going to shortly put out a call for applications for priority registration. Applications are due by March 5th.

CFA Report – E. J. Sims

E. J. Sims reported that the California Faculty Association is very pleased and proud to bring to the Sonoma campus, the statewide Interrupting Racism workshop. The email about the workshop went out yesterday morning to our Board of Directors and to all of our CFA members. We’re asking members to commit five hours to improving racial justice and the campus climate for all faculty, staff and students. The workshop is in two parts. Part one is February 12th from 10:00 to 12:30 and there is some pre homework that folks can view in preparation - articles and a video. Part two is going to be on Friday February 19th from 10:00 to 12:30. For those who
register for part two, you’ll be receiving the pre-assignment articles, videos etc. at that time. In the email it’s just a matter of clicking on the part one to register for that and clicking on part two to register for that part of the workshop. This is certainly a timely topic in light of what’s been going on with the racial injustice and unrest in this country and we’re very pleased to be one of the campuses to have this workshop. The other thing we’re excited about is that this semester we have a student intern. Her name is Sally Gonzales. She’s a senior, majoring in psychology. She has been involved in a number of organizations at Sonoma State. She’s also one of the Faces of Sonoma State. She has tremendous energy and she will be working with the Students for Quality Education, which is our interns group statewide. She received her first training with them as well. We are working in collaboration with Deborah Roberts from Faculty Affairs to put on a workshop for department chairs about article 12 - entitlement and we appreciate having another collaboration with the Faculty Affairs.

A member asked whether the workshops will be recorded for those who are unable to participate. E. J. Sims said right now, there are no plans to record them because they’re very interactive and some folks may feel uncomfortable being recorded, but it is possible to offer it again later in the semester, if there’s sufficient interest around doing that. It was clarified that the workshops were only for faculty at this time.

Adjourned.
DATE: February 3, 2021

TO: Academic Senate

FROM: Sally Russo, Director of Faculty Personnel
Faculty Affairs

RE: Emeritus Eligible List Spring 2021

The following member of the faculty have either retired or completed the Faculty Early Retirement Program and have served the university for ten or more years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Roberts</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list is presented for the Senate’s recommendation as to their emeritus status.
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy
Proposed Outline for Revision
Draft 2020-21

The arrangement of materials in the current RTP policy is arguably dense and confusing to many candidates. Although the overall arrangement of information appears to fit into two broad categories (‘Procedures’ and ‘Criteria’), the inclusion of ancillary information (such as how SETEs and peer observations of teaching are conducted, or, recommendations to candidates and committees) detracts from a clear policy (a set of principles of action to guide and determine decisions). No doubt, the additional information is helpful for candidates and committees, but it is not clear that this information belongs in a policy document. Evaluation of the material in the current document suggests that a cleaner policy with less ancillary information, could provide an attractive alternative. The ancillary information would be provided as associated referenced material, maintained on the Faculty Affairs webpage. Having this information separate from policy would make it easier to update or correct ancillary information while retaining a written policy, rather than needing to revise the policy when information and/or procedures inevitably change.

Below is the suggested reorganizing of material in the RTP policy (in side-by-side with current policy). The basis for this arrangement is to inform and to guide the efforts of all participants in the RTP process.

1. Following the standard ‘Preamble’ and ‘Definitions’ for a policy, the first main section is the listing of ‘Criteria’ for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This is the information all candidates should have at any stage of the process, so it is brought to the front. Next, the steps in the process of ‘Evaluation’ are provided, followed by the process of ‘Recommendation’ at each level of review. These represent the three main sections of the policy. Additional sections cover ‘Grievances’ and the ‘Dates/Timelines’.

2. Along with the policy reorganization is the suggestion to produce separate documents of the recommendations that are currently distributed throughout the policy. These maybe folded into #3.

3. The final suggestion is to address a number of issues that currently reside in the current policy, but would better serve as separate documents. A number of these may need to become policy, updated policy (SETE), or at least approved procedure/recommendation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Outline</th>
<th>Suggested Outline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preamble</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preamble</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definitions</strong></td>
<td><strong>I. Definitions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Procedures</strong></td>
<td><strong>II. Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Dissemination of Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>A. General:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. RTP Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)</td>
<td>B. Teaching Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. RTP Evaluation Document</td>
<td>C. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>D. Service to the University and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Evaluation Procedures: Reappointment</td>
<td>E. Department Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Evaluation Procedures: Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>F. Eligibility for Tenure &amp; Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Levels and Sequence of RTP Review</td>
<td><strong>III. Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Communication of Action Taken</td>
<td>A. Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Candidate’s Right to Respond and Opportunity to Confer</td>
<td>B. WPAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Reports and Recommendations</td>
<td>C. Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Appeals and Grievances</td>
<td>D. Levels of Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured and Probationary Faculty</strong></td>
<td><strong>IV. Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Department Criteria</td>
<td>A. Candidate’s Right to Respond and Opportunity to Confer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Criteria and Methods for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness</td>
<td>B. Reports and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship, Research, and Creative Achievement</td>
<td>C. President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Criteria for Evaluating Service to Both the University and Community</td>
<td>D. The President’s Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calendar</strong></td>
<td><strong>V. Grievances</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly as in current policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Timeline Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly as in current policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associated documents – not part of policy, but would help to have as reference within. Currently, most or some of this text is folded into the current policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CV template (not accepted by Senate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SETE policy (update) Include something about SETE table?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Peer observation document (see CTET information) (new)
- Colleague letters (as per CBA15.12.d)
- Chair report outline (guidelines on what should be included)
- University RTP schedule (Faculty Affairs)
- Periodic Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty Form (new)
FSAC has undertaken a review of the URTP Policy and incorporated input from the URTP subcommittee and a survey of faculty conducted in February of 2020. The rough draft of a revised policy is provided for comment and feedback. This document includes explanation of the main changes that have been incorporated.

1. FSAC endorsed a major rewrite of the current URTP policy (see RTP Outline Suggestions). Given the extensive nature of the proposed reorganization of materials, an attempt at a side-by-side comparison of the proposed changes produces an unreadable draft. Therefore, the proposed draft is viewed as a rewrite of the current policy, not a “revision”. FSAC will make the effort to detail where any substantive changes have been introduced. But wording of the original policy, although reorganized and edited (rewrites, additions, deletions), is retained in many instances.

2. On Feb. 27, 2020, FSAC reviewed the results of a faculty survey on the URPT policy and makes the following recommendations:

   ● On issue of FERP serving on RTP committees:
     o FSAC recommends FERP serve as long as they are available entire year (FERP fall and spring semesters).

   ● On issue of number of full (performance) reviews during TT cycle:
     o FSAC expressed concerns about faculty coming in with 2 years of service credit and beginning first year at SSU with a performance review. For faculty starting with no service credit, they must wait until 3rd year at SSU to get a full review. Thus, an issue of aligning a 3/6 split with years at SSU and adequate feedback to tenure-track candidates.
     o If the impetus for 3/6 split of performance reviews is workload driven, then can an alternative be found for reducing workload but maintain adequate feedback to candidates?
     o FSAC recommends keeping current 2/4/6 cycle for performance review, but reduce workload for periodic reviews. To this end a periodic review template, similar to that used for periodic review of temporary faculty, has been drafted (attached).

Review of the current distribution of academic and probationary years, with levels of review in current policy (Section I.E.2)

KEY: B = periodic review; F = performance review; Ser = granted service year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad. Yr</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Prob. Yr, no service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Prob. Yr, 1 yr. service</td>
<td>Ser</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Prob. Yr, 2 yr. service</td>
<td>Ser</td>
<td>Ser</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vs. a 3/6 split for Performance review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad. Yr</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Prob. Yr, no service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Prob. Yr, 1 yr. service</td>
<td>Ser</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Prob. Yr, 2 yr. service</td>
<td>Ser</td>
<td>Ser</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- On issue of SETEs:
  - FSAC recommends keeping the number of SETEs to all (not just 2) per review to provide full picture of candidate’s class performance. FSAC will also look into how other CSU’s use SETE data. FSAC will query Reporting & Analytics regarding that office supplying summary data table.

- On issue of peer evaluation template:
  - FSAC recommends providing links to Faculty Center’s resource page on evaluation of teaching and the templates provided therein for suggestions on best practices. Will not add a template for RTP.

- On issue of teaching effectiveness and inclusiveness in teaching:
  - FSAC discussing how to best incorporate inclusiveness into RTP document. Clearly self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness should be discussed by candidates, but how will this be assessed? Need more thought on issue.

3. New text/sections on current draft:

- Definitions: updated to clearly define and align “years at SSU” “probationary year” and “review cycle”
- Criteria II.2: suggested ‘legacy’ clause inserted. Faculty Affairs and FSAC in agreement that tracking of individual candidates will not be an issue. Will a legacy clause be acceptable?
○ Note that a contrast exists between URTP policy as university-wide in application vs. departments RTP criteria. University policies relate to scheduling and nature of the process, whereas departmental documents only address criteria. Will need assurance that this change would be universally applied and implemented.

- Department RTP Committees: FSAC considers if an upper limit should be set? There could be problems in large departments with too many committee members, where dissenting opinions might be forthcoming. Thus leaving the committee size as a minimum, but giving departments an option to decide if more is needed. Limits committees to odd number for deciding votes.

- WPAF: FSAC addressed the issue of electronic storage of indexed materials. Candidates maintain an electronic index (Google drive) and provide all committees access to the drive for review.

Other issues that remain open to input:

- Evaluation III.C.4 – Should a candidate be given more direction on requesting delay in promotion?
- Evaluation III.D.2 – School RTP Committee: Should this level of review be reconsidered?
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy
Proposal for Revision
DRAFT 2020

Preamble
This policy is intended to protect both the right of the University to exercise judgment in the granting of reappointment, tenure, and promotion and the rights of the faculty to a complete and impartial evaluation, to confer at any level of review, and to have access to the criteria and information used as a basis for the decisions made by the University for regular tenure track faculty. Furthermore, this policy is intended to support candidates in their careers at Sonoma State University.

Authority for the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Procedures and Criteria: These procedures and criteria are based on and derived from several documents. Procedures are set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, hereafter known as the CBA, and Title 5, California Code of Regulations. Criteria are set forth in Title 5 and policy statements of the Board of Trustees. Although these procedures and criteria are intended to stand alone, candidates and RTP Committees may wish to consult all of these documents, which are available in the Office of Faculty Affairs, for a full understanding of the procedures and criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Departmental criteria (see below II.E) provide guidance but do not supersede this policy.

I. Definitions
Definitions are based on the Collective Bargaining Agreement and SSU policy.

- **Candidate** – Faculty member applying for reappointment or promotion.
- **CBA** – Collective Bargaining Agreement, Unit 3, between the Trustees of the California State University and the California Faculty Association
- **Day** – A calendar day. The time in which an act provided in this policy is to be done is computed by excluding the first day and including the last day, unless the last day is a holiday or other day on which the campus in not regularly open for business, and then it is also excluded. (cf. CBA 2.11)
- **First Probationary Year at SSU** – The first academic year a probationary faculty is appointed at SSU in a tenure track position, regardless of service credit.
- **Grievance** – **DEFINE?**
- **Minority Report** – **DEFINE?**
Periodic Evaluation – This brief evaluation (cf. CBA 15.20) occurs in the 1st, 3rd, and 5th probationary years, and in the 2nd PY 1st year at SSU.

Performance Review – This full review, longer and more comprehensive (cf. 15.31), occurs in the 2nd, 4th, 6th probationary years, and for tenure and promotion.

Personnel Action File (PAF) – The one official personnel file maintained by Faculty Affairs containing employment documents and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty employee. (see Working Personnel Action File) (cf. CBA 2.17)

Probationary Faculty – A full-time faculty unit employee appointed with probationary (i.e., not tenured) status and serving a period of probation. (cf. CBA 2.13c)

Probationary Year (PY) – A year of service for a full-time tenure track faculty unit employee is two (2) consecutive semesters within an academic year. For the purpose of calculating the probationary period, a year of service commences with the first fall term of appointment. (cf. CBA 13.6)

Review cycle – Is the time period of evaluation of the WPAF

Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) – The file specifically generated for use in a given review cycle. The contents are 1) all required forms and documents used for evaluation in the given review cycle, 2) all faculty and administrative level evaluation recommendations from the current cycle, and, 3) all rebuttal statements and responses submitted. At the end of each review cycle, the WPAF is incorporated into the candidate’s PAF (cf. CBA 15.8-15.9)

II. Criteria

A. General:
1. It is the obligation of the Chair of the Department to provide the faculty member, upon appointment, with copies of the Departmental criteria, procedures, and standards at all levels of review.

2. Policy-making bodies shall provide all faculty with revisions of the policy or criteria as they occur, but no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Once the annual RTP process has begun, there shall be no changes in the criteria and/or procedures used to evaluate a faculty member.

Probationary faculty have the option to apply the RTP version that was in effect during their first appointment for all subsequent reappointments and consideration for tenure/first promotion, or, in effect during the year they are reviewed for tenure/first promotion. Tenured faculty have the option to apply the
3. A faculty member being considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion shall be evaluated according to criteria in each of the following categories (cf. CBA 20.1) with primary emphasis placed on teaching effectiveness (or equivalent for Librarians, Counselors and SSP-ARs):
   - Teaching effectiveness (or equivalent).
   - Research, scholarship, or creative achievement
   - Service to the University, the profession, and the community.

4. This policy is enacted at the beginning of the academic year following its adoption and applies to all reappointment, tenure and promotion candidates, except as specified elsewhere in the document.

B. Teaching Effectiveness (or Equivalent for Librarians, Counselors and SSP-ARs)

The Department RTP Committee shall assess the candidate’s teaching effectiveness in terms of these criteria:

1. Displays enthusiasm for teaching his/her subject
2. Presents material with clarity. Uses teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content.
3. Clearly specifies course goals, and employs course materials to achieve course goals.
4. Enables students to participate actively in their own education.
5. Fosters appreciation for different points of view.
6. Demonstrates competence and currency in course material.
7. Consults and advises effectively outside of class.
8. Engages in professional development to enhance his/her teaching effectiveness.

C. Research, Scholarship, and Creative achievements

The candidate has the primary responsibility for providing appropriate evidence of a record of significant growth and contribution in the area of research, scholarship, research or creative achievement. The candidate should explicitly state whether their scholarship is in progress, under review, accepted for publication (or equivalent), or published.
D. Service to the University and Community

The candidate has the primary responsibility for providing all appropriate evidence of both University and community service. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for substantiating and evaluating service to the University and Community.

E. Departmental Criteria

1. Each department shall develop criteria that will describe what is expected of candidates in all evaluation areas.

2. Departments are responsible for developing and explaining to candidates, departmental criteria that delineate standards and expectations in their discipline. It is to be expected that the balance among scholarship, research or creative achievement, and professional development will vary among the disciplines.

3. Publication of scholarly books and/or publications in a professional journal in an appropriate field, especially if refereed, are traditionally considered appropriate accomplishments, but other publications, which are generally considered credible within the intellectual community, are acceptable.

4. Scholarship that does not result in publication must be in a form that can be shared with peers (beyond what is shared in the classroom) and must be capable of being evaluated and peer reviewed. As with all scholarship, it should demonstrate excellence, originality and impact. Candidates must show that they have made a substantive contribution to their discipline(s).

5. The departmental criteria will be reviewed by FSAC to ensure that they are consistent with this policy, the CBA, and the University mission. If they are found to be inconsistent, FSAC will consult with the department to resolve the issue. Departments should regularly review their criteria to ensure their currency; changes cannot take place until they are approved by FSAC in time for the next review cycle.

F. Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion:

1. Probation shall be a total of six years of full-time probationary service, including credited service. In the case of an outstanding candidate, a deviation from the six-year probationary period shall be the decision of the President following his or her consideration of Performance Review recommendations.

2. A probationary faculty member normally shall be considered for promotion at the same time he or she is considered for tenure; however, a faculty member
with an exceptional record, with a positive recommendation from the department RTP committee, may be considered for promotion earlier than normal. Non-tenured faculty unit employees shall not be promoted to the rank of Professor (or equivalent) without tenure (cf. CBA 14.2).

3. Promotion of a tenured faculty member normally shall be considered after he or she has been five years in his or her current rank or has reached the maximum salary for the rank, unless the faculty member requests in writing that he or she not be considered.

III. Evaluation

A. Committees

There are three levels of faculty review: the Department, School, and University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committees. Review by the Dean constitutes a fourth, administrative, level of review. Department Chairs may make separate recommendations. If the department chair makes a separate recommendation, they shall not also serve on the other RTP committees for that candidate.

Performance Reviews are evaluated by all levels. Periodic Evaluations (except for first year at SSU) are reviewed by the Department and School RTP Committees and the Deans. Candidates may request a review by URTP in cases of contrary recommendations.

1. Committee Membership and Eligibility

A faculty member shall not serve on more than one level of review in the same annual review cycle. Only Professors may serve on committees for candidates for promotion to Professor.

a. Department RTP Committee:

   The Department RTP Committee is composed of a minimum of three eligible faculty members elected by the Department. If more than three members are elected, the committee must consist of an odd number of members. To be eligible, a faculty member must be tenured, and must hold a rank equal to or above the rank to which advancement of the candidate is being considered. If a Department has fewer than three eligible faculty members, the Committee shall be composed of eligible faculty members within the Department, augmented by faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (with approval by the President; CBA 15.2) and
tenured faculty members of appropriate rank from related disciplines. The Department Chair, if tenured, may, at the discretion of the Department, be a member of the Department RTP Committee. Committee membership shall be for at least one year, contingent on an eligible faculty’s availability for the entire year.

b. School RTP Committee:
Members of the School RTP Committee shall be tenured, and shall hold a rank equal to or above the rank to which advancement of the candidate is being considered. Members of the School Committee shall be elected by tenured and probationary faculty from their School according to each School’s election procedures, with a minimum of three members serving staggered two-year terms.

c. University RTP Subcommittee:
The University RTP Subcommittee shall be elected at large from among the eligible tenured professors or equivalent of the instructional faculty and librarians. Committee members will serve in staggered three-year terms.

B. Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)
The evaluation is based solely on the contents of the Working Personnel Action File. Materials for inclusion to this file originate with, in order:

- The candidate,
- the Department RTP Committee,
- the Department Chair (optional report).

Evidence from unidentified sources shall be excluded from the WPAF except that the University’s SETE shall be anonymous.

The Candidate shall provide up-to-date documentation for the WPAF showing evidence of their achievements and professional development. Candidates may place additional materials in their digital file and reference them by index.

a. For a Periodic Evaluation (brief) the candidate will include:

- Current curriculum vitae.
- Self-assessment discussing strengths and areas for growth in teaching and professional activity (typically no more than two pages).
- One peer observation from the current review cycle.
● Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETEs) are required for two classes. Summary copies of SETEs for all classes are supplied by the Office of Reporting & Analytics.

● Index of appropriate evidence to support a record of growth and contribution in the area of scholarship, professional development and service. Materials in index will be maintained by the candidate in a digital file. Access to the file must be provided to all levels of review.

b. For a Performance Review (full) the candidate will include:

● Current curriculum vitae.
● Self-assessment of teaching and professional activity (typically no more than seven pages), and shall include:
  o an outline or description of courses taught by the candidate summarizing course materials, goals, and methods.
  o a statement of the candidate’s goals for teaching
  o a discussion of new course development
  o an explanation of how the candidate’s scholarly activities contribute to the classroom experience.
  o an indication of methods by which the diverse learning styles of students are addressed.
  o a discussion of the candidate’s teaching strengths and weaknesses and the ways in which he or she is attempting to improve their teaching.
  o an assessment of the candidate’s scholarship, service and professional activities.

The candidate has the primary responsibility for providing appropriate evidence of a record of significant growth and contribution in the area of scholarship, research or creative achievement.

The candidate should explicitly state whether their scholarship is in progress, under review, accepted for publication (or equivalent), or published.

● Two peer observations of teaching since the last Performance Review.
● Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETEs) are required for two classes. Summary copies of SETE’s for all classes are supplied by the Office of Reporting & Analytics.
● Index of appropriate evidence to support a record of growth and contribution in the area of scholarship, and quality of service to the University, to the profession, and to the community. Materials in index will be maintained by the candidate in a digital file. Access to the file must be provided to all levels of review.
be maintained by the candidate in a digital file. Access to the file must be provided to all levels of review.

2. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for the completeness of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), which consists of:
   - Department RTP recommendation included on University Record of Action Taken form.
   - Candidate’s materials (see above)
   - Evaluation document prepared by the Department RTP committee (see III.C). The Department evaluation document shall not exceed two pages for Periodic Evaluations (brief) and ten pages for Performance Reviews (full).

3. The WPAF shall be declared complete with respect to documentation of performance for the purpose of evaluation five working days prior to the date the Department RTP Committee provides the Committee’s recommendation to the candidate. After this date, inclusion of any material that became available after the WPAF is declared complete and deemed necessary for evaluation of performance must have the approval of the University RTP Subcommittee. Material inserted in this fashion shall be returned to the Department RTP Committee, with a copy to the candidate, for review, evaluation, and comment before consideration at subsequent levels of review.

   A candidate shall have access to their WPAF at any time, but may not remove material therefrom.

C. Evaluation

All evaluations will follow the annual Sonoma State University RTP schedule as established by Faculty Affairs.

1. A Periodic Evaluation (cf. CBA 15.20) is used for candidates in their 1st year at SSU regardless of service credit, 3rd and 5th years. This “brief” evaluation shall typically be 2 pages in length, and answer the following questions:
   - What are the candidate’s strengths? Explain.
   - Does the RTP committee have any concerns or see any areas for growth in the candidate’s performance? Explain, especially as related to the department criteria.
2. A Performance Review (cf. CBA 15.31) is used for candidates in their 2nd, 4th, 6th probationary years and for tenure and promotion. This full evaluation document shall not exceed 10 pages and will include:
   - An overview or introduction.
   - An evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (or equivalent for librarians, counselors and SSP-ARs).
   - An evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, research and creative achievements.
   - An evaluation of the candidate's service to the University and community.

3. Evaluation for Reappointment
   Evaluation for reappointment must be undertaken annually for each probationary faculty member. Subsequent evaluation shall reflect teaching performance and professional growth and development since the most recent evaluation. Copies of the previous department recommendations shall be transmitted along with the current evaluation so that a coherent professional history and measure of growth can be ascertained. Each evaluation document shall explicitly identify areas that need improvement (if any), or any other specific conditions or factors, which may affect future consideration for reappointment, tenure and promotion.

4. Evaluation for Tenure & Promotion
   Faculty who apply for tenure & promotion to Associate in the same annual cycle will prepare only one document under the timeline for tenure. Candidates applying for early promotion (prior to tenure) will prepare a WPAF in the annual cycle they wish to be evaluated for promotion. A separate WPAF will be required in the year the candidate is considered for tenure. Any applicant for early tenure or promotion must request a Performance Review and notify Faculty Affairs prior to the deadline for the WPAF. Copies of evaluations from previous promotion recommendations shall be transmitted along with the current evaluation, but reviewers shall not be bound by previous recommendations. Each evaluation document shall explicitly identify areas that need improvement, or any other specific conditions or factors that may affect future consideration for promotions.

Tenured faculty may request in writing that they not be considered for promotion.

D. Levels of Review

1. Department RTP Committee

Commented [19]: Does this need additional clarification?
The Department RTP Committee shall review and evaluate the materials submitted by the candidate, write an evaluation document, and make a formal recommendation. The Committee is responsible for the completeness of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). The completed WPAF, including any minority reports, and any separate report from a Department Chair, shall be forwarded to the School RTP Committee according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs. Late documents shall be forwarded to the next level of review without recommendation. Under extraordinary circumstances, the University RTP Subcommittee and Faculty Affairs, at their discretion, can allow for adjusted timelines without affecting candidates 10-day review.

a. Teaching Effectiveness
   The Department shall assess the candidate's teaching effectiveness in terms of the criteria listed in II.B.1 above. The three required methods are Peer Observations of Teaching, Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness and Self-Assessment of Teaching and Professional Activity. In evaluating the evidence gathered by these different methods, the evidence is to be considered as a whole in addressing teaching effectiveness. If a Department deems it necessary to use additional methods of measurement, it shall specify the method in writing in the department criteria. The candidate has the right to add comments to any document or data submitted into the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) as a measure of teaching effectiveness.

i. Peer Observation of Teaching
   Each Department is required to conduct peer observations of the teaching activity of each candidate and shall develop written procedures for such observations. Departments should follow the guidelines approved by FSAC. The observer shall be mutually acceptable to the Department RTP Committee and the candidate. If mutual agreement cannot be reached on an observer from within the Department, then a mutually acceptable observer from outside the Department may be used.

   One peer observation is required per Periodic Evaluation; two are required for Performance Reviews.

ii. Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness
   The Department RTP committee’s evaluation of the Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness includes an analysis and interpretation of the data that explain the data within the context of the teaching experience of the Department. For tenure documents, a summary table and analysis of data over the entire probationary period should be included; for promotion, the summary table and
analysis should include data since the candidate’s initial date of employment at SSU or the candidate’s last promotion, not just the previous year. A discussion of this data analysis includes implications of the data for the instructor, the student, and the Department curriculum. Candidates and committees are encouraged to discuss themes and strengths or areas of growth across their classes rather than focus on SETEs for specific courses.

iii. Self-Assessment of Teaching (or Equivalent) and Professional Activities

b. Scholarship, Research, and Creative Achievements
   The Department RTP Committee is responsible for substantiating and validating authenticity of appropriate evidence, and that the candidate demonstrates scholarship, research or creative achievements, and professional development, as delineated in the department’s criteria.

c. University and Community Service
   The Department RTP Committee shall evaluate the candidate’s contributions to both University and community service, including: (1) evaluate the quality and length of service, and (2) specify whether the candidate is supported by released time for any given assignment or 3) if the candidate was financially rewarded for any particular activity.

2. School RTP Committee
   The School RTP Committee shall review and evaluate the materials submitted by the Department RTP Committee, write an evaluation document, and make a formal recommendation. These documents shall be incorporated into the WPAF. The School RTP Committee shall forward to the School Dean the WPAF and its evaluation and recommendation according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs. Late documents shall be forwarded to the next level of review without recommendation.

3. School Dean
   The School Dean shall review and evaluate the materials submitted by the School RTP Committee, write an evaluation document, and make a formal recommendation. These documents shall be incorporated into the WPAF. The School Dean shall forward the evaluation and formal recommendation for candidates in their 2nd PY/2nd, 4th, and 6th years, tenure and promotion to the University RTP Subcommittee, according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs. Deans, as President Designee, will notify candidates in the 1st, 3rd, and 5th years of the decision to reappoint.
4. University RTP Subcommittee
The University RTP Subcommittee shall make formal recommendations to
the President concerning reappointment in the 2nd PY/2nd at SSU, 4th, and
6th years, tenure, and promotion. The University RTP Subcommittee may
forward a separate ranked list of candidates recommended for promotion to
the President.

IV. Recommendation
The formal recommendations at each level of review are included in the WPAF.
Recommendations at each level of review shall be acknowledged by the candidate and,
at the Committee levels, by all members of the Committee. The candidate’s
acknowledgement that they have received the recommendation does not mean they
necessarily agree with the content of the recommendation.

A Record of Action Taken form is prepared by Faculty Affairs. At the end of each review
cycle the candidate, the Department, School, URTP chairs and Dean are required to
sign the Record of Action Taken as an acknowledgement that they have seen the
recommendations at all levels. The signature does not necessarily indicate agreement
with the content of the recommendations.

A. Candidate’s Right to Respond and Opportunity to Confer
1. At any level of review, within ten days of receipt of the recommendation
and reappointment expectations, a candidate may submit a response in
writing and/or request that a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation
and the reappointment expectations.
2. Upon such request, the candidate shall be provided an opportunity to
confer with the Committee at each level of review and the School Dean. This
 provision shall not change the evaluation timelines.
3. The Committee or School Dean shall notify Faculty Affairs of any request
by a candidate for rebuttal or meetings.
4. The Committee or School Dean shall summarize the conference in writing,
and include in its recommendation matters discussed at the conference that
affect the recommendation.

B. Reports and Recommendations
1. Positive Recommendation. At each level of review a report shall be written
in sufficient detail to impart a reasonable understanding of the grounds for the
positive recommendation to members of the academic community.
2. Negative Recommendation
a. If, at any level of review, the candidate receives a negative recommendation, this recommendation shall be detailed in writing to a degree sufficient to communicate a reasonable understanding of the grounds for the negative recommendation to members of the academic community.

b. If, at any level of review beyond the Department level, the candidate receives a negative recommendation, the written notification to the candidate shall specify any grounds upon which the negative recommendation is based that differ from those used by the prior Committee.

3. No Recommendation. Documents that cannot be completed in a timely manner will be forwarded to the next level of review without recommendation.

4. Minority Reports. A Committee member at any level of review may submit a recommendation that differs from that of the majority. This document shall be forwarded along with all other documents to subsequent levels of review.

C. President

The President, in consultation with the URTP Subcommittee, may grant a conditional one-year reappointment to a candidate who displays remediable deficiencies in the areas of scholarship or service. Explicit expectations for such remediation will be outlined in the reappointment letter. Conditional one-year reappointment is not available to candidates applying for tenure.

The President, after reviewing and considering the evaluations and recommendations, shall make a final decision on tenure and promotion and shall notify the faculty member in writing of the final decision as per section I.I.7.

Only the President can grant additional time to the tenure clock, and only under circumstances explicitly stated in the CBA (13.8).

The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in an administrative position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and positive recommendation by the appropriate Department and the University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Subcommittee or its designee. Individuals appointed with tenure must have previously earned tenure by serving a probationary period at a post-secondary educational institution.
D. The President's Letter
   1. It is the responsibility of the President or designee to provide written notification to each individual who is granted reappointment, tenure, or promotion.
   2. If an individual is not granted reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the President's letter to the individual shall state the reasons for that action.
   3. If recommendations forwarded to the President note any areas for improvement, or any other conditions or factors, which may affect future consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the President's letter of formal notification shall bring these to the attention of the faculty member.
   4. The President should make every effort to concur with faculty recommendations about reappointment, tenure and promotion, except for compelling reasons, which should be stated in detail.

V. Grievances

The candidate whose reappointment, tenure, or promotion has been denied shall have the right to appeal to the President for a reconsideration of the decision. The request for a reconsideration shall be in writing, shall specify grounds for the reconsideration and be received within ten days of the date of notification. If the appeal is denied, the candidate may seek remedy as provided for by the CBA.

VI. Timeline Summary

The Office of Faculty Affairs will publish timelines for each academic year by WHEN? The following table summarizes when and at what level evaluations are due.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probationary Year</th>
<th>Evaluation Level</th>
<th>Levels of Review</th>
<th>Date of Presidential Notification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year at SSU</td>
<td>Periodic</td>
<td>Department &amp; Dean</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd PY/2nd @ SSU</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd, 5th</td>
<td>Periodic</td>
<td>Department, School and Dean</td>
<td>No later than June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th, 6th, tenure &amp; promotion</td>
<td>Performance Review</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>No later than June 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Associated documents

- CV template
- SETE policy

The SETE is a standardized university-wide form administered at the end of each term. Each Department may add quantitative and qualitative questions to be used department-wide.

Student evaluations are required for all faculty who teach. Summaries for all classes are included in the WPAF.

Each Department shall provide for full student participation in the evaluation process and preserve the anonymity of student participants. Administration of student evaluations of instruction shall take place for all faculty within the last three weeks of the semester. The instructor shall not have access to or any knowledge of the contents of these evaluations until grades have been submitted to the Admissions and Records Office.

- Peer observation policy (new)

Peer Observations of Teaching

Each Department is required to conduct peer observations of the teaching activity of each candidate and shall develop written procedures for such observations. Departments should follow the guidelines approved by FSAC.

The observer shall be mutually acceptable to the Department RTP Committee and the candidate. If mutual agreement cannot be reached on an observer from within the Department, then a mutually acceptable observer from outside the Department may be used.

One peer observation is required per Periodic Evaluation; two are required for Performance Reviews. At least one observer shall be tenured. The faculty member being observed should be notified 5 days prior. Each observation shall be carried out at a time that is mutually agreeable to the candidate and the observer. For candidates for promotion, the observation shall occur during the fall semester in which the promotion review commences, or during the prior academic year. The evaluation shall address the criteria in II.A.1. and II.B.1 above, and include recommendations as appropriate. The candidate may discuss the evaluation with the observer and may submit a written response to the evaluation. The candidate may also request subsequent observations by the same or another observer during any given semester. Within ten days of the observation the evaluation shall be signed by the observer and delivered to the candidate. The candidate then has 10 days to sign the document, acknowledging receipt, but not necessarily agreement with the content of the document. These peer observations are to be included in the candidate’s WPAF before the established deadline. At the end of the review cycle these documents become part of the PAF.

- Colleague letters
- Chair report outline (guidelines on what should be included)
- University RTP schedule (Faculty Affairs)
- Periodic Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty Form
The University RTP Subcommittee shall provide to candidates, departments and schools a format to be used for submission of recommendations and supporting materials.

Candidates in their first year of a tenure track appointment are advised to consult with their departments in order to receive feedback, guidance, and assurance on the path to tenure and promotion. All such candidates will meet with their respective Department RTP committees, or their representatives, in the Spring semester no later than May 1st to discuss the candidate’s progress. In this meeting, candidates and representatives will discuss the Department’s criteria, SETEs and peer observations (or equivalent for librarians, counselors and SSP-ARs), scholarship, research and creative assignments, and service. A one-page summary of this meeting, prepared collaboratively by the candidate and department representatives, shall be included in the candidate’s subsequent WPAF.

It is the Department RTP Committee’s responsibility to write the document, supported by factual statements (documented or referenced as appropriate), which evaluates the candidate’s performance under each of the criteria as described in Section II.

Advancement in rank shall be based upon documentation of professional achievement and growth measured in accordance with criteria and standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion documents as outlined in Part II of this policy and departmental criteria.

The evaluation for the first promotion to Associate or Professor (or equivalent) shall provide a thorough assessment of the candidate's performance from the time of his or her initial appointment in their current rank. Evaluations for subsequent recommendations for promotion shall reflect professional growth and development since the most recent promotion or application for promotion.
It is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee, not the candidate, to use available qualitative and quantitative components as evidence in their evaluation document.

For tenure documents a summary table and analysis of data over the whole probationary period should be included; for promotion, the summary table and analysis should include data since the candidate’s initial date of employment at SSU or the candidate’s last promotion, not just the previous year. A discussion of this data analysis includes implications of the data for the instructor, the student, and the Department curriculum. Candidates and committees are encouraged to discuss themes and strengths or areas of growth across their classes rather than focus on SETEs for specific courses.

Examples of scholarship, research or creative achievement, and professional development (complete citations are required) include but are not limited to:

1. published professional or scholarly books and articles
2. published textbooks and other instructional materials
3. reports or other products that result from consultancies, software development and electronic media products, designs, or inventions.
4. digital scholarship
5. creative activities in the arts.
6. funded grants.
7. submitted proposals.
8. research reports or scholarly papers presented at conferences, colloquia, and other appropriate gatherings.
9. participation in professional meetings as discussant, committee member, or organizer of colloquia/seminars.
10. awards, honors, exhibitions, shows, performances, or speaking engagements.
11. contributions to discipline outside his/her primary area of specialization.
12. post-doctoral studies or continuing education.

Examples of service to the University include but are not limited to:

1. Contributions to the organizational, academic, intellectual, and social life of the University, including participation on committees and with student organizations.
2. Activities that enhance the University’s ability to serve the needs of a diverse student body, non-traditional, and prospective students.
3. Activities that enhance the University’s ability to retain and graduate students, including mentorship and advising.
4. Representation of the University in an official capacity to the CSU and other institutions.
Examples of public service and service to the community include, but are not limited to, membership or participation on:

1. Local, State, and Federal boards, commissions, and committees.
2. Civic organizations.
3. Community service organizations.
4. Schools.
5. Charitable organizations.
7. Political groups/organizations.
8. Recreational agencies and groups.
9. Cultural organizations.
10. Leadership in professional organizations at local, state, and national levels.
11. Service as critic, reviewer, editor, or consultant
Suggestions for Associated documents with extracted text from the current URTP policy.

- CV template. This suggestion did not receive positive feedback from the Academic Senate.
- SETE policy. The University SETE policy should be reviewed and updated if necessary

  The SETE is a standardized university-wide form administered at the end of each term. Each Department may add quantitative and qualitative questions to be used department-wide.

  Student evaluations are required for all faculty who teach. Summaries for all classes are included in the WPAF.

  Each Department shall provide for full student participation in the evaluation process and preserve the anonymity of student participants. Administration of student evaluations of instruction shall take place for all faculty within the last three weeks of the semester. The instructor shall not have access to or any knowledge of the contents of these evaluations until grades have been submitted to the Admissions and Records Office.

- Peer observation policy. This could be a new policy (or FSAC document), or simply use the current Peer Observations of Teaching on the CTET webpage: https://ctet.sonoma.edu/peer-observations-teaching

Peer Observations of Teaching

  Each Department is required to conduct peer observations of the teaching activity of each candidate and shall develop written procedures for such observations. Departments should follow the guidelines approved by FSAC. The observer shall be mutually acceptable to the Department RTP Committee and the candidate. If mutual agreement cannot be reached on an observer from within the Department, then a mutually acceptable observer from outside the Department may be used.

  One peer observation is required per Periodic Evaluation; two are required for Performance Reviews. At least one observer shall be tenured. The faculty member being observed should be notified 5 days prior. Each observation shall be carried out at a time that is mutually agreeable to the candidate and the observer. For candidates for promotion, the observation shall occur during the fall semester in which the promotion review commences, or during the prior academic year. The evaluation shall address the criteria in II.A.1. and II.B.1 above, and include recommendations as appropriate. The candidate may discuss the evaluation with the observer and may submit a written response to the evaluation. The candidate may also request subsequent observations by the same or another observer during any given semester. Within ten days of the observation the evaluation shall be signed by the observer and delivered to the candidate. The candidate then has 10 days to sign the document,
acknowledging receipt, but not necessarily agreement with the content of the document. These peer observations are to be included in the candidate’s WPAF before the established deadline. At the end of the review cycle these documents become part of the PAF.

- Colleague letters. CBA 15.12.d allows for external review of materials. FSAC should provide guidance for departments that wish to include such letters.
- Chair report outline; FSAC could provide guidelines on what are good practices in chair reports.
- University RTP schedule (Faculty Affairs)
- Periodic Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty Form (draft attached). This is seen as a mechanism to reduce workload on committees, and follows the current form that is applied to temporary faculty.
TO BE COMPLETED BY DEPARTMENT

Candidate Name: ________________________________
Department Name: ________________________________
School: ________________________________
Date: ________________________________

Evaluation is for (choose one)
☐ 1st year at SSU (evaluation by Department and Dean)
☐ 3rd year at SSU (evaluation by Department, School, and Dean)
☐ 5th year at SSU (evaluation by Department, School, and Dean)

Department Evaluation

Maximum of 2 pages. Must address the questions:
1. What are the candidate’s strengths? Explain?
2. Does the RTP Committee have any concerns or see any area for growth in the candidate’s performance? Explain, especially as related to the Department’s RTP criteria.

Attach evaluation to this form.

________________________________________
Department RTP Committee Chair Signature

______________________________
Print Name

TO BE COMPLETED BY CANDIDATE

My signature acknowledges receipt of this evaluation and does not necessarily indicate agreement with the evaluation. I realize that I have 10 days, if I wish, to respond in writing: this response will become part of this evaluation package.

________________________________________
Candidate Signature

______________________________
Print Name

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE SCHOOL RTP COMMITTEE

Based on our review of the candidate’s WPAF and Department RTP Committee Evaluation (choose one)
☐ The School RTP Committee agrees with the Department RTP Committee evaluation.
☐ The School RTP Committee provides additional input to the candidate’s evaluation (max. of 1 page, attached).

________________________________________
School RTP Committee Chair Signature

______________________________
Print Name
TO BE COMPLETED BY CANDIDATE
My signature acknowledges receipt of this evaluation and does not necessarily indicate agreement with the evaluation. I realize that I have 10 days, if I wish, to respond in writing: this response will become part of this evaluation package.

_________________________________  __________________________
                   Candidate Signature                   Print Name

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE SCHOOL DEAN
Based on review of the candidate’s WPAF and Department and School RTP Committee Evaluations
(choose one)

☐ I agree with the Department and School RTP Committees’ evaluations.
☐ I provide additional input to the candidate’s evaluation (max. of 1 page, attached).

_________________________________  __________________________
                   Dean Signature                   Print Name

TO BE COMPLETED BY CANDIDATE
My signature acknowledges receipt of this evaluation and does not necessarily indicate agreement with the evaluation. I realize that I have 10 days, if I wish, to respond in writing: this response will become part of this evaluation package.

_________________________________  __________________________
                   Candidate Signature                   Print Name
Preamble

URTPS requests an amendment to the Senate By-Laws increasing the number of URTPS members from five to seven.

Current Language

The Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Subcommittee shall be composed of five members elected At-Large from among the tenured instructional members of the faculty who hold the rank of Professor or the equivalent Librarian. Members may not hold an administrative appointment. The Structure and Functions Subcommittee shall conduct elections for the Subcommittee. Election shall be by majority vote. The terms of office will be three years and the terms will be staggered.

Proposed Language changes – deleted, added

The Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Subcommittee shall be composed of seven members, with one member each from the School of Arts and Humanities, the School of Business and Economics, the School of Education, the School of Science and Technology, the School of Social Sciences, and the University Library. The remaining member shall be elected At-Large. Any seat unable to be filled by a member from a school would be elected At-Large. All members shall be elected from among the tenured instructional members of the faculty who hold the rank of Professor or the equivalent Librarian. Members may not hold an administrative appointment. The Structure and Functions Subcommittee shall conduct elections for the Subcommittee. Election shall be by majority vote. The terms of office will be three years and the terms will be staggered.

Clean Version

The Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Subcommittee shall be composed of seven members, with one member each from the School of Arts and Humanities, the School of Business and Economics, the School of Education, the School of Science and Technology, the School of Social Sciences, and the University Library. The remaining member shall be elected At-Large. Any seat unable to be filled by a member from a school would be elected At-Large. All members shall be elected from among the tenured instructional members of the faculty who hold the rank of Professor or the equivalent Librarian. Members may not hold an administrative appointment. The Structure and Functions Subcommittee shall conduct elections for the Subcommittee. Election shall be by majority vote. The terms of office will be three years and the terms will be staggered.

Justification

This increase serves two purposes: workload and representation.

1) Workload.
Over the last five years there has been a wide fluctuation in the workload of the committee, with some years (notably the 2018-2019 cycle) exceeding the capacity of a five-person committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of RTP Files Reviewed by URTP</th>
<th># of Sabbatical Files Reviewed by URTP</th>
<th># of Tenure-Track Hires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>50?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Representation.

Each School has distinct approaches to scholarship and teaching (and service?). While we ask all candidates to present their materials in a way that communicate clearly to colleagues from a different discipline, it is very useful to have someone on URTPS who understands the methods, culture, and standards of the candidate’s discipline. At the current time, we have one member from the School of Arts and Humanities, one from the School of Social Sciences, and three from the School of Science and Technology, with no representation from the School of Business and Economics, the School of Education, or the Library.

approved by Structure & Functions February 2, 2021
Thursday, February 2, 2021

Sonoma State University Academic Senate
1801 East Cotati Avenue
Stevenson Hall 1027
Rohnert Park, CA 94928-3609

To the Esteemed Members of the Sonoma State University Academic Senate:

It is with deep sadness that the Department of Nursing would like to nominate Mr. Luis Cid for a posthumous Certificate of Recognition in the field of Nursing.

Mr. Cid passed away suddenly on January 21, 2021 because of injuries sustained from a fall from a cliff on his 28th birthday. At the time of his death, Mr. Cid was an exceptional junior in the Prelicensure Nursing program. While we would like him to receive a posthumous Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree he was not close enough to graduation having only completed his first semester of the Prelicensure Nursing program. Mr. Cid had another 45 units to go before graduation.

Mr. Cid joined the Prelicensure Nursing as a junior in August 2020. During his short time with the Department of Nursing he impressed the students, faculty and staff who worked with him. Mr. Cid was an Emergency Technician at Healdsburg District Hospital in the Emergency Department. He worked during the pandemic as an essential worker placing himself at risk to meet the health care needs in our community while attending school. Mr. Cid was a dedicated health care professional who brought significant knowledge, skills, and experience to the classroom. He often mentored and supported his peers as they developed nursing competencies.

In closing, The Department of Nursing respectfully requests that the Sonoma State University Academic Senate confer a posthumous Certificate of Recognition to Mr. Luis Cid’s family to acknowledge the substantial impact he made within the nursing program and the community. His presence will be missed in our classrooms, and the community at large.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Anna Maria Valdez
Professor and Chair
Department of Nursing
To the Sonoma State University Academic Senate:

The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, with great sadness, wishes to nominate Ms. Alondra Bandt (Seawolf ID# 007088543) for the posthumous degree of Bachelor of Arts in Spanish.

Alondra Bandt was in her final semester of coursework toward earning her Bachelor’s degree in Spanish. On Monday, January 4, 2021, Alondra and her mother were involved in a tragic car crash on Highway 12 in Santa Rosa, a collision in which both Alondra and her mother lost their lives.

Those of us who knew Alondra remember her genuine smile and how her positive outlook brightened up a room - even over Zoom. She was a ray of light brightening all of our lives, she was always wonderful and kind, and her presence lifted the spirits of those around her. Alondra had great hopes, dreams, and plans for the future – she was planning on continuing her education in graduate school as well as fulfilling her dreams of traveling and living abroad in Spain. She will be deeply and truly missed.

The faculty of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures respectfully request that the Sonoma State University Academic Senate confer upon Alondra Bandt a posthumous Bachelor of Arts in Spanish in acknowledgment and recognition of her achievements.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey T. Reeder
Professor of Spanish and Chair, Modern Languages & Literatures