

Academic Senate

April 22, 2021
Via Zoom

3:00 – 5:00pm
Free the 50's
3:50 – 4:00 break
4:50 – 5:00 break



Spring Meetings of the Senate

~~2/4~~
~~2/18~~
~~3/4~~
~~3/18~~
~~4/8~~
4/22
5/6
5/20

AGENDA

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

Consent Items:

Business

1. From EPC: Electrical and Computer Engineering MS name change – (<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:2090/form>)
First Reading – E. Asencio TC 3:20
2. From EPC: THAR Concentration in Dance Discontinuance (<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:2228/form>)
– Second Reading – E. Asencio TC 3:30
3. From EPC: BM Music Composition Concentration (<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:2145/form>)
– First Reading – E. Asencio TC 3:40
4. From APARC: Program review policy revision - 7 year program review cycle – First Reading – E. Virmani TC 4:00
5. Resolution in Support of AAPI Community and Related Curriculum – First Reading – J. Reeder TC 4:15
6. From FSAC: Revision to the RTP Policy – Second Reading – P. Lane TC 4:25
7. Request for motion to reconsider endorsement of AFS/PDS Teaching of Sensitive Materials statement – J. Reeder TC 4:40

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
April 8, 2021
3:00 – 5:00 with free the fifties
Via Zoom

Abstract

Special Student Report. Chair Report. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 3/18/2021 – Approved. Consent items: THAR Concentration in Acting Revision, THAR Concentration in Technical Theatre Revision, THAR Concentration in Theatre Studies Revision, Candidates for Graduation – Approved. Motion that the Academic Senate endorse the EPC statement on administrative encroachment into curricular matters – Endorsed. President Report. Provost Report. From FSAC: Revision to the RTP policy – First Reading completed. Posthumous Degree request for Lisa Dunwoody – Approved. FSAC Report. From EPC: Discontinuance of Dance concentration in THAR – First Reading completed. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. From EPC: Request for Waiver of A3 for Engineering program – Second Reading. Vice President for Student Affairs Report. Statewide Senator Report. Good of the Order.

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-Heckman, Rita Premo, Izabela Kanaana, Jordan Rose, Adam Zigelbaum, Kevin Fang, Rick Luttmann, Judy Sakaki, Karen Moranski, Joyce Lopes, Noelia Brambila-Perez, Chase Metoyer, Kate Sims, Elita Virmani, Emily Asencio, Paula Lane Hilary Smith

Absent: Amal Munayer, Cookie Garrett, Wm Gregory Sawyer

Guests: Katie Musick, Kari Manwiller, Matthew Callahan, Andrea Lopez, Jenn Lillig, Catherine Nelson, Napoleon Reyes, Karen Schneider, Jerlena Griffin-Desta, Damien Hansen, Merith Weisman, Scott Horstein, Richard Whitkus, Susan Pulido, Kim Purdy, Laura Alamillo, Mary Wegmann, Christine Cali, Matty Mookerjee, Janet Hess, Brent Boyer, Laura Williams, Farid Farahmand, John Lynch

Special Student Report – A. Lopez

A. Lopez said “this is my second year here. I am a criminology and criminal justice major. I plan to graduate next year. The one of the reasons I came to SSU is because of the programs that are offered to aid my college experience. I chose to come here for summer bridge which is hosted by EOP. That program helped me, not only with my transition from high school, which I was very anxious about as any senior would be, and then after I came to SSU, the program still stuck with me to make sure I was still doing good. It offered a lot more than just financial aid. It offered me support. My advisor, Amal, she's amazing. She's always checked up on me to make sure I was doing good, not only academically, but also emotionally, mentally, physically and in any way that she could. Something else that I've done here at the university is I worked with a program that helps students that are on the teaching pathway. I

worked there for about a year. I'm a local. I live literally two minutes from Sonoma State, so I was very excited to come here and stay close to my family and before coming to SSU, I went to Petaluma high school and I actually graduated from there. It's also very close and before that I lived in Cuba for nearly half of my life. I moved to the United States in 2012 when I was in fifth grade. That was a very challenging time for me, but obviously I've overcome every challenge about moving from another country. As a fifth grader and not knowing English, presented a huge challenge, but clearly I have overcome that since I'm speaking to all of you right now and am very happy to be here, very happy to graduate from Sonoma State and I'm looking forward to getting to know some of you.

The Chair said thank you very much for taking the time to come and speak to us and to share your impressions of Sonoma State and why you chose to come here and your thoughts. As always we'll use your example and your voice to help us make our decisions and deliberations today.

Chair Report – J. Reeder

J. Reeder said he wanted to talk a little bit about balance and, in particular, as an Academic Senate, we have a number of challenging things that we balance. We consider items that are brought forward as resolutions, we deliberate on the curricular future, the academic future of the institution, as well as those things which are peripheral to, but an integral part of delivering our academic mission. So often, we have to strike a balance. There's no guidebook or manual about exactly how to weigh out that balance, but often there's a balance between expedience and access and on the one hand, and then, on the other hand, deliberation and consideration. As a deliberative body, it is important to us and it behooves us to make sure that we consult with our various constituencies that we represent, as well as making sure that we take time to think of things. The other side of that is making sure that we leave this as a space that's open to full participation and whenever things come up quickly that we are able to react to them and deliberate on them quickly.

There's some discussion right now on the endorsement of a statement that we passed in a previous Senate session. There has now been an Associated Students resolution regarding that, as well as an administrative statement regarding the statement. Those two statements are coming forward for our consideration as a body and he suggested that rather than attempting to deal with or dispatch it today, that we work those two new pieces of information that we didn't previously have into our Executive Committee agenda. We can have a little bit more time to interact with this new information, as well as interact with our various constituencies. That was his impression and suggestion related to those items and also related to consultation and speed versus deliberation.

He noted he has a resolution that he has written in support of Asian American Studies courses at Sonoma State University, as well as a statement against anti-Asian American Pacific islander violence and micro aggressions including that which may occur in our own University or in our own community. The resolution will be

coming to the Executive Committee next week and, depending on what the Executive Committee does with it, it will come before the full Senate.

Approval of Agenda – Motion to add a resolution from AFS about Title IX encroachment into curricular matters. There was discussion. **Failed.** The proposer was asked to move the resolution through the normal procedures of governance – FSAC – Ex Com, then Senate. **Motion to add Associated Student Resolution and Administrative response to AFS/PDS statement on Teaching of Sensitive Materials to agenda.** The Chair asked that this be part of FSAC’s report. **Approved.**

Approval of Minutes of 3/18/2021 – Approved.

Consent items: THAR Concentration in Acting Revision, THAR Concentration in Technical Theatre Revision, THAR Concentration in Theatre Studies Revision, Candidates for Graduation – **Approved.**

Motion that the Academic Senate endorse the EPC statement on administrative encroachment into curricular matters – postponed from last meeting.

J. Reeder noted this motion was postponed to this meeting and opened the floor for discussion. M. Mookerjee said he was here representing EPC. This is a letter that came from EPC and as much as we appreciate that the Senate passed a resolution last time, it did strip away those two latter resolved clauses. He thought this letter gives the event little more context. The important thing is to say, this happened and it's not our normal way of doing things and we need to just acknowledge that this happened and it's not good, and so he hoped that the Senate will in fact endorse this letter. A member said weeks ago when there was a report of an agreement that had been reached between the affected parties, he had intended to move to withdraw this motion, but now that his understanding is that an agreement was not reached to the satisfaction of all parties, he did not intend to ask to withdraw this motion and hoped the Senate would agree to endorse this motion today. The Chair said to add one thing which is an encapsulation of some of our prior discussion, especially that which is related to the other motion, and with this statement, was that some of the facts surrounding this issue are part of protected dialogue that are unavailable to us as a body. They may be either interconnected with personnel issues or other such matters, so that he just wanted to remind the body that that was one of our concerns previously.

Vote on motion to endorse – Approved, 16 – 2.

President Report – J. Sakaki

J. Sakaki said we are in the process right now of what's called District Week or Hill Day. Ordinarily she would be, along with other CSU Presidents, in Washington DC meeting with Congressional folks on the Hill. Obviously because of the pandemic, we're doing it all virtually. A team from the campus met with Congressman Thompson. She was pleased to say that a couple of our students were able to participate as well. We shared with him that there's a recent CSU economic impact study that was done in terms of the impact of Sonoma State and our alumni on the

region and it found that we generated over \$1.7 billion in business revenue and supported over 11,000 jobs in the academic year in the Bay Area economy. That's very positive. We also talked about a couple of CSU initiatives. One is an initiative to support Dreamers and a pathway to citizenship. We had our students who are involved in our Dream Center at the meeting, so that Congressman Thompson could directly talk to them about their needs and issues. There is also a system wide effort to request that the Pell Grant be doubled. It has not increased with cost of living for years and years. She noted that the campus climate survey has opened for input and we're asking each of you, faculty, staff, and students to participate. It was launched, and it will stay open until April 25th, so please share your views. It's important to us. Saturday is Decision Day and we are hoping to get our numbers up in terms of getting students committed for both first time freshmen and transfer students. All the schools are involved and many faculty and the Deans and so we're hopeful. All efforts are being done virtually, of course, but we're doing a lot to have them get a feel for the campus and what we offer.

She was just named a WASC Commissioner. It's a two year appointment, so she will begin that her orientation over the summer and then she be serving as a WASC Commissioner, along with two other CSU Presidents that were just appointed as well. Tomorrow she has been invited to a conversation about innovation and leadership, sponsored by the American Association of Universities and Salesforce. Ten Presidents across the country have been invited to the conversation. She said she will keep the Senate informed if anything exciting comes out of that conversation. She was also named to serve on the Public Policy Institute of California which has a Higher Ed advisory committee. They do a lot of research in the state. They advise Boards of Trustees in our regions and others. If anyone has ideas or suggestions that she can take to that Higher Ed policy group she would welcome the ideas. In terms of continuity planning and how we open up, things are changing with the Governor's comments. We're in regular conversations with Chancellor Castro and we're talking about everything in terms of classrooms and social distancing to travel policies and the lifting of some of those possibly in July. Many things are changing, but what we do know is everyone getting vaccinated will be the key for us to be able to come back on campus and all feel safe and comfortable with our students our staff and our faculty. We really appreciate the number of faculty that have signed up for in-person classes. There's a desire, as we increase our budget request to the Governor, that the Governor is very interested in making sure that students have the opportunity attend classes in person. She was on a call just this week with the new Secretary of Education who spoke about the importance of in-person instruction, particularly for first generation college students. The Secretary and Chancellor Castro were sharing that they are both First Gen students and they were urging all the Presidents and the Board of Trustees members to have on-ground, in-person classes as much as we possibly can in the fall, so she appreciated all efforts to help us move in that direction.

A member asked if there is no expectation about requiring students to be vaccinated before the coming to campus. She thought some of the UCs were making that requirement. J. Sakaki said yes, we are in conversation about that with legal counsel and as the vaccine is changing from the emergency use authorization, it does allow campuses to be able to require it as we move forward. We are planning to require it

for students who are going to be living in the residence halls, and we're looking at broadening that as well.

Provost Report – K. Moranski

K. Moranski said she had several pieces of good news that happened in the last week. Sonoma State was selected to participate in the 2021 virtual Institute on Truth, Racial Healing and Transformation that's being held this summer. Our thanks go to Jerlena Griffin-Desta who organized this effort and to Senator Carmen Works, who wrote the proposal, as well as to others who participated, Merith Wiseman, Maureen Buckley and Tramaine Austin-Dillon. This is an important recognition of our work around diversity, equity, inclusion in social justice and allows us to work with experts in this arena to help develop and sharpen our work on racial healing and racial justice. That group will be going to the Institute this summer and will come back with a plan of action around a campus center. This is an exciting pathway to action on diversity, equity, inclusion and social justice. We are moving forward with Social Justice week. There have been some terrific presentations and there are two more tonight and she encouraged everyone to continue participating in Social Justice week and thinking and talking about how we can create action around social justice.

From FSAC: Revision to the RTP policy – First Reading – P. Lane

P. Lane said we're at the end of two years of work and we are excited about what we've done. We have reorganized and we have word smithed, but we haven't changed that much in the actual policy. We do believe that a helpful accompanying document might be something useful, and there is talk in our committee that next year the committee would create a handbook for the RTP process. We can't do anything that doesn't match the CBA. In the documents that were created there are questions in bubbles that FSAC has chosen not to officially make a decision on, but want ask this body what their opinion is to help us come to some decision. As a first reading, we're happy to hear what people have to say and we're taking notes. If everyone has had a chance to read the documents, you will see one that shows the reorganization. The other is showing what some of the changes are and the side by side helps show where we moved different things. There was no way to do a line out on one and show the other. We start with the actual changes and where we've listed questions.

A member had a question about II A. 3. It was not clear to her whether it's the faculty member alone that's going to decide which set of criteria will be used, because at the end it says "in collaboration with the department." How could we make sure that the Department Chair is not going to be able to put pressure on the faculty and say, well we're going to apply the new criteria as opposed to the one that you were hired under. Maybe it just needs clarification of the language to make sure it's clear who is really making the decision about which set of criteria will be used. P. Lane said FSAC felt that this is a very important issue. We would like to think about this as a decision we could make together. We're not worried about the logistics of it at this time. We've talked about it with Deborah Roberts and we think there's a way to do it with On Base. Of course, there's always pressure from Chairs. If people think

that wording should be removed “in collaboration with the Chair,” we were thinking it was a helpful thing if you're a new faculty member and a year or two later, the RTP criteria changes in your department, that your department would help you. She didn't think of non-supportive departments, but if that's what the reality is, we would love to hear from people if we should take out that, “in collaboration with the Department Chair” and let the individual faculty member decide on their own.

A member said he agreed that the faculty members should ultimately have the choice, but they may want to consult with their chair. On that same issue the policy says that faculty have the option to choose the criteria that was an effect during their first appointment or during the year that they are reviewed for tenure or first promotion, but he thought it should be when they were hired because it takes six years to get promotion. In the very last year a department could change their criteria if they wanted to get rid of someone in such a way that it would be impossible for that person to meet those criteria. He thought it should be in effect when they were hired.

A member noted that the language in section III B. 3 about committee membership, eligibility on the University RTP subcommittee should reflect the changes that were recently made to that subcommittee, so it should not say elected at-large.

A member said she had three comments or questions. One, the office of Reporting and Analytics is now called the office in Institutional Effectiveness. Two, where you talk about the SETEs, the policy says two SETEs are required from two classes and then it talks about summary copies that are supplied by the office and it's not clear whether they are supplied and also required. Three, a more substantial question regards publications. Peer reviewed publications are accepted and non-peer reviewed publications are acceptable. She was wondering if that kind of language encourages non-peer reviewed publications over peer-reviewed publications. Most major publications or major academic journals and book publishers are peer reviewed, but we also want to encourage participation in the non-peer reviewed area. It's not always possible to place manuscripts in peer reviewed publications. It might help if we replace the word “may be acceptable” in those non peer reviewed publications, instead of it is acceptable. We could add language such as if evidence and evaluation of manuscripts submitted to peer review journals accompanied these non-peer reviewed publications. The language looks like non peer reviewed publications may be favored and people may not have to strive for peer reviewed publications. But each situation is different, each candidate is different, each field is different, so she thought more specific language might be used.

A Statewide Senator said he would be participating in the statewide Faculty Affairs committee and at that meeting there would be good people to connect with around this. He was going to try and see if he get a chance to get input from folks from other campuses dealing with some of these issues, what they found helpful and who within the CFA might be helpful contacts. We can make sure that the CFA and our faculty governance don't end up stepping on each other's toes, especially during the year of bargaining.

P. Lane said suggestions are also welcome in email, to her, though they might not be happening here today. From word smithing and linguistics to actual bigger ideas that we can discuss next week, send them along.

3:50 reached.

J. Reeder said when he ran for Senate Chair, he didn't know we were going to be in a pandemic and he had some ideas of things that he wanted to do. That's all changed, and one of the things that he decided that's important is making sure that we have space for reflective and meaningful self-care. Now we're kind of mid semester, late mid semester, he wanted to go through short steps of self-care. It's important to acknowledge your need for self-care and to be supportive of that need for others, to give yourself the space for it and permission. He thought avoiding, for example, framing it as "I want to *indulge* in a little self-care," it's not really an indulgence. It's like any other physical or emotional need. Identify what works for you, and then the next step is we can continue our campus culture of self-care and self-awareness and sharing this out is part of our duties as Senate representatives. He offered some music as self-care: <https://youtu.be/-t06Bg7BweU> - El Pescador de Barú (1982), by Hernan Rojas y los Warahuaco.

Posthumous Degree request for Lisa Dunwoody – K. Fang

K. Fang said he was speaking on behalf of the Department of Geography, Environment and Planning with a request for a posthumous degree for Lisa Dunwoody. Lisa Dunwoody was a student in the old department of Environmental Studies and Planning back from 2002-2003. She completed almost her entire curriculum, save for one incomplete for internship units back in the fall of 2003 and did not come back to complete it at a later date. She passed away in 2019 and a few months ago, we received a request from her husband inquiring if there was some way that she could receive her degree, posthumously. This was initiated with a request from her husband trying to get her across the finish line. When she was a student, she was a very strong student. She finished with a 3.5 GPA and was on the Dean's list several times. He couldn't share anything else about Lisa Dunwoody because we have no one left on our faculty who was in the department in that timeframe. One thing that will be the extra wrinkle here in this particular case, requires us to waive one aspect of our policy which currently reads that it applies to matriculated students. Lisa Dunwoody, being last enrolled in 2003, is not a matriculated student.

Motion to waive the policy rule, for this instance, that students must be matriculated students. Second. Approved.

Vote on request for Posthumous Degree for Lisa Dunwoody – Approved.

Time certain reached.

FSAC Report – P. Lane

P. Lane said the reason she was interested in bringing these documents (AS resolution and Administration response) forward is to help with the discussion about them. The document from the administration is addressed to her as FSAC Chair because the resolution is one that she brought forward as the FSAC chair. It seems that we need to revisit a combination of things that the statement has addressed. It addresses student reaction, it addresses things like trigger warnings, it is addressing post-traumatic stress, it's addressing Disability Services, it's mixing up a whole lot of things. The Associated Students resolution asks for something to be put in syllabi among other things. She thought it would be good to have a discussion amongst ourselves about how we would like to deal with this. It doesn't have anything to do with curriculum. It doesn't have anything to do with telling you what to teach. It doesn't have anything to do with what might happen to you, if something happened to you or a student had a problem with you. It's just about a statement that would help us deal with something that students find objectionable based on their own personal experience or thoughts, not necessarily anything that would be a disability. The conflation of that was always problematic at Ex Com and all the way through this process, but we all listened to the committee felt that the AFS always stressed that DSS had been consulted and it's a bit disturbing that it appears they never saw the final documents. As Chair of a standing committee, she decided that if a document comes to any of us and it mentions a different entity, we should make sure that that entity has a letter of support. We do that in lots of other venues or other ways, so that was sort of a misstep and she took responsibility for that. She said she should have insisted upon or asked for that and perhaps she should have helped direct the subcommittee. She did respect the the committee members on both PDS and AFS who worked hard to try to bring something forward and try and help with the issues. She wanted to bring forward these two documents forward for us to deal with later and that's why they exist. The Chair said he accepted and acknowledged some responsibility, for the same reason, by not following up to fact check.

Return to Provost report

K. Moranski said we were talking about repopulation plans. What's important for Senators to know as we move into continued discussions about repopulation is that on Tuesday Governor Gavin Newsom indicated in a statement that he was going to be ending some of the complicated metrics, county by county rules, and color coded tier system that has governed our work and the way we've done business over the last year with regard COVID. He stated that on June 15th, almost all of the restrictions will be lifted, and we will be moving back into a more normal state, and the question is about how we're going to change our own practices as we move into repopulation. She provided some idea of where we're headed on the academic side. We have moved towards that that range of 45% to 55% of our courses being in-person and we're not quite there yet. We are still working to get to 50% of our courses being in person. We have done a deep dive into the schedule and it's a complicated schedule. There are some questions, there are some errors, there are some ways in which we could maximize in-person instruction in the schedule that exists, hopefully before students begin to register on Monday. But students do begin

to register on Monday, and one of the things that we have committed to is not making huge changes in the plan for fall, and simply try to continue to maximize our capacity for in-person instruction. We have our rules and regulations and our social distancing. Following the new guidelines, we are able to perhaps fit more people into spaces than we thought we could, and we are working to do that as well.

Time certain reached.

From EPC: Discontinuance of Dance concentration in THAR – First Reading – E. Asencio

The Chair noted that the reason that this is a business item is not because it was controversial at any level beneath us, it has been unanimously approved at all levels. It's an item that needs to go to the Chancellor's office and because it is a discontinuance, it needs Senate approval as a business item.

E. Asencio said the discontinuance was needed, as they had revised their program. She noted that the member of Dance and Theater Arts were present to answer any questions.

C. Cali said historically, the Dance program has been a one of the concentrations in Theater Arts and we just elevated the program to become a BA in Dance in its own right, which we're super excited about. It also supports NAST accreditation that we're working towards in the school, so we're pretty amped about it and we've also mapped requirements for our current students that fall under the old requirements and how we will map them to ease full pathways to graduation with the new program. The new BA has already been approved at the Chancellor level. The requirements for the curriculum have already shifted for our students, so it's basically saying the concentration doesn't exist anymore, because the BA is now coming into fruition. **First reading completed.**

Continue questions for the Provost

A member said she appreciated what was said about repopulation and she was one of those faculty would very much like to teach face to face as much as possible in-person with students. Just this week she received her offers and they were not in-person, in fact, they were bi-synchronous. These are small first year courses. Given the time sensitiveness, please communicate with all Chairs that things are changing. She attempted to communicate what happen because of what she learned from the news and it didn't seem like the word had quite gotten out that we might have different spatial situations. There are people like herself who just can't wait to get back in the classroom with her 25 students who are first years. She wants to keep those students in the university and see them all the way through and know that that will make a huge difference to do that versus doing it in a bi-synchronous course. Thank you for being timely and communicating with the Chairs about that or the Deans or whoever needs to know. The Provost said she appreciated that. She thought space has been one of the constraints on faculty teaching in person and we are trying the best we can, as fast as we can, to eliminate those barriers to in-person courses. We're working on the space issue.

A member said he saw some students who really love online teaching and some students who hate online teaching. One of the things he was concerned about is that some students can't handle online teaching anymore. The way he had always taught his classes, even before a pandemic, was to video record his lectures, basically, and provide them online for everyone, regardless. How can we try to address that difference in students the best we can. The Provost said she actually gets questions every day from students who are asking about wanting to complete their degree online or needing to take online courses because of where they are, or because of their situation and, and so we are still trying to balance all of that and to make sure that we're offering sections that are going to allow students to graduate whether they need online or whether they need in person. I think that's particularly true for the fall semester. In the spring semester we will be more normal in terms of in-person coursework, but she still thought we're going to need a substantial number of online courses in order to allow students to complete their degree. It raises the question of what the role of online learning is at Sonoma State moving forward.

A member said she appreciated the challenges of changing a schedule at the very last minute, and she appreciated the people are probably working a lot of overtime to figure this out right now. She was wondering about how making changes to our plans that go beyond courses. We have talked a lot about scheduling, but there's so many other things that we do at the university and she was curious to know how the continuity planning groups are going to be moving forward with adapting our plans for those things that are outside of the realm of course scheduling. J. Lopes responded that it is an ever evolving situation and between now and June 15th, our plan is to continue to move forward with our repopulation plan and start bringing employees back, who will be working on ground between May and August, in a phased way to start planning for having a more populated campus in that timeframe. We are trying to work with the state, seeing if we can be able to provide vaccinations, if people haven't gotten them elsewhere. We could provide them on campus or through a mobile site, tracking what we need to do from a CDC standpoint. In terms of sanitation, of course, we will continue to have various sanitation protocols in place like providing hand sanitizer, providing wipes, making sure if you don't bring them, you can get them somewhere on campus. We are probably continuing to disable the hand dryers in the bathrooms and use cloth for the time being. We've also gone through and modified all of our HVAC and made sure that those are all upgraded to energy 14 standard which is one step higher than what the CDC is recommending. We put out communication about when people are back on campus, please don't use fans, please don't leave your windows open. We're prepared for moving ahead. It's still going to be a phased process. It's not like flipping a switch. It's going to take time and we're planning to be ready to re-engage beginning of August to welcome people back and to do that safely and within the guidelines that will be in place at that time, which we're just monitoring daily and continuing to try to keep abreast of.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – J. Lopes

J. Lopes said she was happy to answer any questions. She knows there are lots of questions and concerns and we're all in this place of trying to figure it out. She did

want to thank our continuity teams. We have multiple people across the campus meeting weekly and sometimes multiple times a week to try to sort through the ever evolving news, and she wanted to thank the Provost for her leadership in that space and for all the work that the academic instructional continuity team is doing and the logistics continuity team is doing under Jacob Yarrow's leadership. It takes a team, and we are fortunate to have so many talented people across campus who are willing to give their time and energy to help thinking this through. A member asked about other non-curricular things happening on campus. How is event planning for fall and the spring semester proceeding at the moment, such as the Green Music Center. Will events be held there, including the Santa Rosa Symphony. How is that being incorporated into repopulation efforts. J. Lopes said it is a phased approach to work more like pre-COVID levels. She imagined over the summer, we may have an event or to a small concert. Then as we get back into the fall will see more events on campus. In terms of travel, it looks like the CDC is lifting some guidelines as well as the Chancellor's Office, so we'll be looking at what could be our travel policy for field trips or athletics. We're still awaiting news from the NCAA and from the CDC about how that impacts our athletic program. There's still a lot to come, but our repopulation plan is to be ready to phase back into more of a pre-COVID environment and to continue to try to do that safely.

From EPC: Request for Waiver of A3 for Engineering program – Second Reading – E. Asencio

E. Asencio said this is the second reading for the Engineering A3 waiver. She noted Farid Farahmand was available for any questions. A member asked how many transfer students would be affected by this waiver. F. Farahmand said the maximum would be 20 students.

It was noted that Zoom times out yes/no reactions which makes accurately counting the Senate votes difficult. A poll was given for the vote on the Engineering waiver and a discussion was held about voting in this manner. Some thought that seeing how others voted was important and polling was likened to a secret ballot. The Senate decided that polling could be used to get an accurate count of the vote and members will also indicate their vote by using yes/no on the Zoom reactions.

Vote on A3 waiver for Engineering – Approved, 18-1.

Vice President for Student Affairs Report – given by K. Moranski

What VP Sawyer would like to report is that the first fall applications for housing are going well. We are currently at 1084 as of today. At some point, once students know more about in-person class offerings, and there are communications going out to students about the in-person course offerings, this number is sure to increase. The target for in-person for housing for this fall is 1950 students. The REC Center opened this past Monday April 5th and that speaks to the changes in the tiers. The advising team has been providing 10 hours per week for drop-in to support students during peak advising season.

Associated Students Report

The Chair asked for this report, but no one was available. He said when Associated Students met last semester their regular meeting time was 4pm on Mondays and they've changed it this semester to 5pm on Monday, so he felt a little bit out of touch with their goings on because he was able to attend the 4pm, but had a conflict with the 5pm. He has been very impressed with their meetings and how they run and their level of dedication.

Statewide Senator Report – W. Ostroff, R. Senghas

W. Ostroff said the Academic Senators from all of the campuses are going to be participating in Moving Beyond Bias training this May. The California State Legislature has allocated over \$2 million for the development of this program which is evidence based in-person, anti-bias training for the UC and CSU. We haven't been able to do the in-person, because of COVID, but it looks like we are going to be able to complete that training before the funding is done. We also had a message from the Office of the Chancellor inviting campuses to administer the beginning college survey of student engagement, the BCNSSE, to the entering 2021 fall cohort for all the CSU. Just we got word that our colleagues at San Francisco State recently passed a resolution to prioritize the recruitment, hiring, retention and promotion of black, indigenous, and people of color staff, faculty, and administrators, so that's a pretty interesting resolution. We may want to look at that for our own Senate. We also received the recent national report of Stop Asian American Pacific Islander Hate and that report was very striking and jarring about the types of hate that have been happening here in the US. These are incidents only between March 19, 2020 and February 28, 2021. There were close to 4000 incidences of hate toward Asian American and Pacific islanders, mostly verbal harassment, lots of shunning, physical assaults and civil rights violations. Women were reporting these hate incidents 2.3 times more than men. Something else that also really struck her about this horrific report is that 44% of all of the incidences have occurred in California, so a huge percentage occurred here. It's something to open our eyes to what's happening in our state when it comes to hate towards our colleagues and our family and our friends.

R. Senghas said he will be bringing what he mentioned earlier to the Faculty Affairs committee when they meet and also one other question that surfaced is that we want to be asking the Chancellor's office - will faculty be able to travel to do research in the summer based on what Governor Newsom said. This could really affect our summer projects. Can we be approved for using research money from grants and other things to travel, where we haven't been able to before.

The Chair said if there are any reports that should come to the attention of the Senate from any representatives who were not able to give their report today, please submit those in writing, and they will become part of the part of the record.

Good of the Order

A member noted that it is Holocaust Remembrance Day.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes with help from Zoom transcript

DRAFT - Proposed Policy Updates Regarding Frequency of Program Review

Summary of changes

UPRS proposes an extension of the program review cycle from five to seven years. In recommending policy changes associated with this extension, UPRS acknowledges the serious investments in time and effort involved in program review and stands committed to ensuring effective assessment and sustaining program quality at Sonoma State University.

The key changes in the updated program review policy are as follows:

- 1) The program review process at Sonoma State University will typically run on a seven year cycle
- 2) For programs that undergo external accreditation, care will continue to be taken to coordinate program review with accreditation cycles for the discipline—as outlined in the current version of the policy
- 3) In the case of new programs, including those that undergo external accreditation, a developmental period of no more than five years will be allowed before the first program review. After which, programs will then revert to a typical 7-year timeline.¹

Rationale

Extending the frequency of program review to once every seven years will allow programs time for substantive improvements. Identifying, applying, testing, and reassessing changes made in curriculum, teaching and assessment require sufficient time to implement if they are to have a measurable effect on students. With an additional two years, programs can more effectively engage in the vigorous analysis and intentional activity, with a focus on program improvement, that characterizes the program review process.

Additionally, a number of programs have been delayed in the program review process as a result of the emergency pivot to remote instruction necessitated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Since these displaced programs will still require review by UPRS in addition to the programs already slated for review in upcoming semesters, an extension to a seven-year cycle would serve to alleviate the considerable backlog of reviews facing UPRS within the coming years. Hence, the shift to a seven-year cycle also carries the short-term benefit of relieving this significant UPRS backlog.

Including Sonoma State University, a total of ten CSU campuses currently follow a five-year cycle for standard program review. At three CSU campuses, programs typically undergo a comprehensive review once every six years. The model for program review frequency at the remaining ten CSU campuses follows a seven year cycle. As such, there is considerable precedent within the California State system for extending the frequency of program review beyond five years. It is our recommendation that Sonoma State adhere to the seven-year model adopted by ten other CSU campuses.

¹This change is made in accordance with the Chancellor's Office expectation that new degree programs will be reviewed within five years of implementation, as outlined in the [Elevating Options or Concentrations to a Full Degree Program Template](#).

Updates to the Program Review Policy approved May 18, 2017

(Changes to the previously approved policy have been indicated in yellow)

I. Introduction and Purpose

- A. Program Review at Sonoma State University provides Departments and programs the opportunity to evaluate their curricula and their success at helping students achieve stated learning objectives. Regular reflection and assessment are necessary for effective long-term planning, resource allocation, and for continuing to build a viable University. The program review process brings together self-reflection and relevant evidence to explore the current state of academic programs and to set directions for the future.
- B. The program review process is faculty-driven and is intended to be open and participatory. It relies on the engagement of the faculty, staff, administration, and students. Assessment approaches should reflect the uniqueness of each discipline and Department culture and should enable Departments and programs to make evidence-based decisions about curricula, Department structure, and resource needs.

II. The Process of Program Review

- A. Each academic unit engages in the program review process once every **seven** years. Programs which are externally accredited may conduct their program review on a cycle that is consistent with their external accreditation cycle, **in consultation with Academic Affairs. In the case of new programs, including those that undergo external accreditation, a developmental period of no more than five years will be allowed before the first program review. Upon undergoing their first program review, programs will then revert to a seven-year review cycle or to an appropriate review cycle aligned to their external accreditation cycle.** Approval to delay completion of program review must be requested from the AVP of Academic Programs and will not change the **seven-year** review cycle. Programs that are late in completing the program review and have not received this permission will not be allowed to make substantive program revisions until their program review is completed.
- B. Periodic review enables programs to reflect on the decisions that were made and whether the goals established have been achieved. It provides continuity in long-term planning. However, program assessment is not something that occurs once every **seven** years; it is continuous. Program review should allow faculty to reflect on data gathered over the previous **seven**-year period through a number of assessment methods.
- C. The process of continuous assessment is defined at the academic Department level, but all assessment plans include methods for evaluating student learning outcomes, and whether the current curriculum is effectively graduating students who meet the Department's educational goals and objectives.
- D. Academic Affairs will maintain the required schedule of **seven**-year reviews for each academic unit, developed in consultation with the School Deans, and will

inform the Department chair, program chair, or coordinator when the time for program review is approaching.

- E. The academic program review process consists of:
 - 1. The preparation of a self-study document, incorporating all of the components defined in the self-study template approved by the Academic Planning, Assessment, and Resources Committee (APARC). This document is created after a period of participatory engagement in discussion and reflection among all faculty, staff, and students, a review of assessment data, and collaborative conversations about the direction and resource needs of the program.
 - 2. Site visits and reports from external reviewers.
 - 3. Review of the self-study document and external reviews by the School Dean and School Curriculum Committee, including a written summary and response.
 - 4. A review by the University Program Review Subcommittee, including a written summary of responses/recommendations.
 - 5. Submission of the final report to the Provost for review and action, and to the university community as a public record.

III. Program Review Self Study

- A. The purpose of the self-study is to provide the faculty an opportunity for reflection and inquiry. The self-study document is the outcome of a process in which all members of the faculty reflect on the goals that were set in prior program reviews, gather evidence relevant to those goals, and collectively analyze that evidence to determine the Department's effectiveness in meeting the goals. Regular reflection and open inquiry into the effectiveness of the Department are necessary for the continued growth and health of the academic program.
- B. The self-study document should describe the program's assessment plan as well as present evidence of the program's strengths and weaknesses. It should propose an action plan for changes that will improve the program in light of evidence presented.
- C. A template for the self-study will be made available by the Academic Senate and the Academic Planning, Assessment, and Resources Committee to guide programs in writing the self-study document. The self-study process itself is led by the faculty and is most effective when it engages all members of the faculty, as well as staff, administrators, and students.

IV. Resources for Program Review

The university will provide the necessary resources for each academic unit to complete a meaningful and comprehensive review, and to engage in effective assessment. The resources required by the academic unit should be discussed and agreed upon between the Dean and the Department Chair.

V. External Reviews

- A. The purpose of external review is to provide an independent and broad perspective on the program. The process requires at least one external consultant, to be nominated by the academic unit. Consultants should either hold

- faculty rank (or the equivalent) in the same or similar programs, be individuals of significant professional reputation in the field, or (in the case of an existing external accreditation board) be an official representative of the accrediting body.
- B. The program faculty submits a list of potential consultants to the School Dean for approval. Selection of the external reviewer is made by the School Dean in consultation with the program faculty. The program faculty provides the consultant with a copy of the self-study document and other relevant materials for their visit. The program is also responsible for setting the itinerary and agenda for the visit.
 - C. The consultant is expected to submit to the Department a written report of his/her findings and recommendations within four weeks of the visit. Copies of these reports, and the program's response, will be included in the final program review document.

VI. Finalizing Program Review

- A. The completed program review provides the basis for institutional action in oversight and support of its academic programs, as well as evidence in support of the institution's commitment to educational effectiveness, and the quality of its academic programs. To complete the process, the appropriate faculty committees and administrators review the self-study, supporting documents, and external review report(s), and work with the Department faculty and Dean to agree on outcomes and actions to be taken.

Step 1a: School-level Review

The self-study, supporting documents, external review report(s), and program response are sent to the School Dean and School Curriculum Committee (including SEIE Curriculum Committee when relevant) for review. The School Curriculum Committee will provide a written response and report explaining how the Department and its curriculum fit into the overall School's curriculum. The Dean will provide a written response and report explaining how the Dean has worked with the Department over the previous **seven** years to help them achieve goals and priorities.

Step 1b: Graduate Studies Subcommittee (graduate programs only)

Program reviews involving a graduate program send the self-study, supporting documents, external review report(s), School Curriculum Committees' responses, School Dean's review, and program's response to the Graduate Studies Subcommittee (GSS) for review. GSS is to provide a brief written report that will be forwarded to the University Program Review Subcommittee (UPRS).

Step 2: University Program Review Subcommittee

The self-study, supporting documents, external review report(s), School Curriculum Committees' responses, School Dean's review, the program's response, and the report from GSS (when appropriate) are sent to the University

Program Review Subcommittee. UPRS reviews the materials and, based on the evidence reviewed, writes a report detailing the major findings and recommendations resulting from the evaluation. The Findings and Recommendations report (FAR) represents a cohesive plan of action for program improvement based on the program review documents. The draft FAR is forwarded to the program by UPRS. The program reviews the findings and recommendations and prepares a response either outlining plans for implementing the recommendations or detailing reasons for not doing so. The program's response to the draft FAR is submitted to UPRS for consideration in drawing up a final FAR. This is distributed to the program and appropriate administrators for action.

Step 3: Review by Provost and Agreement on Actions

Following completion of each program review and FAR, the Provost, Dean, and Department Chair meet to discuss the outcomes and the steps to be taken as a result of the review. From the discussion, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is prepared by the Department Chair, Dean, and Provost to establish common expectations for all parties in order to support the program's continued progress over the subsequent program review cycle. The MOU may also contain commitments for resource allocation.

Step 4: Archiving of Program Review Documents

Results of program review are shared with the campus and community by maintaining copies of all documents (self-study, external review report(s), Dean's report, final FAR, program response, and MOU) in a public location. Academic Affairs serves as the primary repository for all program review documents and makes these available on the appropriate website. Programs are strongly encouraged to maintain all documents in their Departments for reference.

VII. Program Review Outcomes

- A. Although program review is conducted on individual programs, the Findings and Recommendations represent a source of information for institutions to link evidence of academic quality and student learning with planning and budgeting. Collating the information provided by program reviews provides an effective mechanism to guide institution planning and budgeting.
- B. At the end of each cycle (academic year) of program review, UPRS submits a summary report to the Academic Planning, Assessment, and Resource Committee (APARC) on observed patterns and trends across programs, with special emphasis on common findings and recommendations.
- C. Each year, APARC will report to the Academic Senate on the quality of academic programs and provide input on where additional focus may be required at the institutional level. This report will provide guidance for decisions such as re-sequencing of courses, refinements in the criteria for student evaluations, re-

organization of instructional efforts, additional workshops for assessment or teaching, or hiring staff and faculty to fill current or upcoming needs.

- D. The Educational Policies Committee (EPC) will refer to program review documents when considering proposals for course revisions, experimental courses, and other changes to a Department's curriculum. Program review documents provide evidence for the need for curricular changes; Departments that have not completed a program review in over **seven** years may not be able to present adequate rationale or evidence for revisions to existing programs.

VIII. Combined Program Reviews

- A. Each program required to undertake program review must be evaluated separately by the University Program Review Subcommittee. If a Department has more than one program (i.e., undergraduate and graduate, degree-granting and certificate, or others), the programs may be reviewed concurrently or separately. If reviewed concurrently, the Department shall prepare its report so that the components can be separated for individual assessment.
- B. Any academic unit which is separately accredited by an external agency or accrediting body may request, with the approval of the School dean and consent from Academic Programs, to substitute an accreditation report as the basis for a program review. If such a report is accepted in lieu of a program review, certain questions or sections unique to the Sonoma State review process may be required in addition to the report. These requirements will be determined by UPRS in consultation with the AVP for Academic Programs. The program may coordinate the time frame it uses for its separate accreditation process with its SSU review.

Resolution in Support of AAPI Community and Related Curriculum

RESOLVED: That the Sonoma State University Academic Senate stand with members of the Asian, Asian-American, and Pacific Islander communities and unequivocally condemn all forms of anti-Asian and anti-Pacific Islander rhetoric, harassment, violence, and microaggressions. Be it further

RESOLVED: That Individually and collectively as a university community we direct our energies to stopping AAPI hate, rhetoric, harassment, violence, and microaggressions through our teaching and curriculum, and furthermore pledge to use our voices and positions to increase understanding and reduce xenophobia on our campus and in the community. Be it further

RESOLVED: That in response to the aforementioned increase in reported incidents of anti-Asian and anti-Pacific Islander rhetoric, harassment, violence, and microaggressions, and in response to the intent of legislation and CSU policy stemming from AB 1460, that Sonoma State University direct resources and support toward the development and delivery of academic coursework in Asian American Studies.

Rationale: The Sonoma State University Senate, according to its own constitution, serves as the primary consultative body in the University in formulating, evaluating and recommending to the president policies concerning curriculum and instruction, and additionally serves as the primary body through which members of the faculty may express opinions on matters affecting the welfare of the University. Harassment and violence against Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) persons, families and communities have increased since the start of the COVID- 19 pandemic and this nation's history of white supremacy, misogyny, systemic racism and colonialism undergird the environment of hate, intolerance, and violence against Asian Americans. The increase in hate crimes against Asians is a direct result of white supremacist, anti-Asian xenophobia that has persisted in North America for centuries to keep Asian Americans as "perpetual foreigners."

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy Outline of Revision and Equivalency of Sections March 2021

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. This draft is provided for consideration by the Academic Senate. Several questions are indicated in the margins for Senate response (keep, modify, remove). Text in red is new relative to the current policy.

Provided below is the reorganized material in the proposed RTP policy provided in various forms: 1) a side-by-side of the main headings of the current policy with the proposed draft; 2) an equivalency of the sections of the proposed draft with the relevant sections of the current policy; and separately attached, 3) the current policy with highlighted sections that have been retained in the draft and noting the respective sections in which the text occurs, either verbatim or edited. It is hoped these various documents will be useful in lieu of a typical side-by-side comparison of the proposed policy with the current policy, given the extensive reorganization that is proposed.

Along with the policy reorganization, sections of the current policy are dropped as they represent guidance and suggestions that although useful, are not germane to policy. This ancillary information should be provided as associated reference material, maintained on the Faculty Affairs webpage, with approval from FSAC. Having this information separate from policy makes it easier to update or correct the information while retaining a written policy, rather than needing to revise the policy when information and/or procedures inevitably change. One example of the type of additional documents is the proposed Periodic Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty. This form is based on the current form used for evaluation of Temporary Faculty, and would be a useful workload reduction approach to evaluating probationary faculty in their 1st, 3rd, and 5th evaluation years.

Side-by-Side Comparison of Current and Draft URTP Policy Major Sections

Current Outline	Suggested Outline
<p>Preamble</p> <p>Definitions</p> <p>I. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Dissemination of Evaluation Criteria B. RTP Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) C. RTP Evaluation Document D. Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion E. Evaluation Procedures: Reappointment F. Evaluation Procedures: Tenure and Promotion G. Levels and Sequence of RTP Review H. Communication of Action Taken I. Candidate’s Right to Respond and Opportunity to Confer J. Reports and Recommendations K. Appeals and Grievances <p>II. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured and Probationary Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Department Criteria B. Criteria and Methods for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness C. Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship, Research, and Creative Achievement D. Criteria for Evaluating Service to Both the University and Community <p>Calendar</p>	<p>Preamble</p> <p>I. Definitions</p> <p>II. Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. General: B. Teaching Effectiveness C. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity D. Service to the University and Community E. Department Criteria F. Eligibility for Tenure & Promotion <p>III. Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Committees B. Committee Membership and Eligibility C. WPAF D. Evaluation E. Levels of Review <p>IV. Recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Personnel recommendation B. Record of Action Form C. Candidate’s Right to Respond and Opportunity to Confer D. Reports and Recommendations E. President F. The President’s Letter <p>V. Grievances</p> <p>Timeline Summary</p>

Equivalency of Sections between the Draft Policy and Current Policy

Current Section	Draft Section
Preamble	Preamble
Definitions	I. Definitions
II.	II. Criteria
---	A. General
I.A.1, 3	1.
---	2.
I.A.1	3.
I.A.2	4.
II.	5.
II.B	B. Teaching Effectiveness
II.B.1	1.
II.C	C. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity
II.C.1, 2, 3	1.
II.D	D. Service to the University and Community
II.D.1	1.
II.A	E. Department Criteria
II.A.1	1.
II.C.4	a.
II.C.5	b.
II.C.6	c.
II.A.2	2.
I.D	F. Eligibility for Tenure & Promotion
I.D.1	1.
I.D.2	2.
I.D.3	3.
---	III. Evaluation
I.G.1.a	A. Committees
I.G.1.c	1.
I.G.1.b	2.
I.G.2.a, b	B. Committee Membership and Eligibility
I.G.3.a	1.
I.G.5.a	2.
I.B	3.
I.B.1	C. Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)
I.B.4	1.
I.B.3.a	2.
I.B.3.b	a.
I.B.3.c, II.B.2.b.i,	b.
II.B.2.c	c.

I.B.6	3.
I.B.3.d	4.
I.B.5	5.
I.E	D. Evaluation
I.E.2.d	1.
I.C.4	2.
I.C.3	3.
I.E.1	4.
I.F.1, 3	5.
I.F.6	6.
I.G	E. Levels of Review
I.G.2.c	1.
II.B.2	a.
II.B.2.a.i, ii	i.
II.B.2.b.i	ii.
---	iii.
II.C.3	b.
II.D.2	c.
I.G.3	2.
I.G.4	3.
I.G.5	4.
---	IV. Recommendation
I.B.1, I.H.1, 2	A. Personnel recommendation
I.H.3	B. Record of Action Form
I.I	C. Candidate's Right to Respond and Opportunity to Confer
I.J.1, 2, 3, 4	D. Reports and Recommendations
---	E. President
I.J.6	1.
I.F.4	2.
I.J.5	3.
I.F.5	4.
I.J.7	F. The President's Letter
I.K	V. Grievances
---	Timeline Summary

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy Proposal for Revision DRAFT 2021

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. Departments provide discipline specific criteria (see below II.E) that supplement the requirements outlined in this policy, but do not override them.

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 is 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.
- **Periodic Evaluation** – This **brief** evaluation (cf. CBA 15.20) occurs in the 1st, 3rd, and 5th probationary years, and in the 2nd PY 1st appointment year at SSU.

- **Performance Review** – This **full** review, longer and more comprehensive (cf. 15.38), 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).

Deleted:

Deleted:

II. Criteria

A. General:

1. 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. 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.
2. 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.
3. *Probationary faculty have the option to apply the RTP version that was in effect during their first appointment for all subsequent reappointments and*

Commented [rw1]: FSAC feels the continuity clause may be a good addition to the URPT policy, but notes there may be several complications with its application.

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 RTP version that was in effect upon their first promotion, or, in effect during the year they are reviewed for subsequent promotion. In all cases, the candidate will apply the chosen criteria in collaboration with the Department Chair at the beginning of the review cycle.⁴

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):

- a. Teaching effectiveness (or equivalent).
- b. Research, scholarship, or creative achievement
- c. Service to the University, the profession, and the community.

5. Professional development may be included in any of the above categories, as appropriate for the department.

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

1. The candidate has the primary responsibility for providing appropriate evidence of a record of significant growth and contribution in the area of teaching effectiveness. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for substantiating and evaluating the candidate's teaching effectiveness in terms of these minimum criteria:

- a. Displays enthusiasm for teaching their subject
- b. Presents material with clarity. Uses teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content.
- c. Clearly specifies course goals, and employs course materials to achieve course goals.
- d. Enables students to participate actively in their own education.
- e. Fosters appreciation for different points of view.
- f. Demonstrates competence and currency in course material.
- g. Consults and advises effectively outside of class.
- h. Engages in professional development to enhance their teaching effectiveness.

C. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Achievements

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

Deleted: ¶
Deleted:
Deleted:

Deleted:

is responsible for substantiating and evaluating the candidate's research, scholarship, or creative achievements in terms of the approved Department's RTP criteria.

D. Service to the University and Community

1. 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 in terms of the approved Department's RTP criteria.

Commented [w2]: As above, not criteria, but reporting

E. Departmental Criteria

1. Each department shall develop criteria that will describe what is expected of candidates in all evaluation areas.
 - a. 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.
 - b. 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.
 - c. 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).
2. 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.

Commented [w3]: Is this listing criteria? Input requested.

Commented [w4]: Same as above. Criteria? Input requested.

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 their consideration of Performance Review recommendations.

2. A probationary faculty member normally shall be considered for promotion at the same time they are 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 they have been five years in their current rank or has reached the maximum salary for the rank, unless the faculty member requests in writing that they not be considered (cf. CBA 14.3).

III. Evaluation

A. Committees

1. 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 choose to provide separate recommendations, but must do so for all candidates in a review cycle. If the Department Chair makes a separate recommendation, they shall not also serve on any other level of review for RTP for those candidates.
2. 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.

Deleted: .

Commented [rw5]: This allows a Department Chair to provide the chair letters in their department, but also serve in another department's RPT committee. (CFA 15.40.b and 15.42)

B. 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.

1. 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

Commented [w6]: Provides departments flexibility in size of committee, but maintains odd number for deciding votes.

Commented [w7]: Resolves issue on inclusion of FERP faculty in 2019/02 RTP cycle.

(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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

C. Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

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

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

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

a. Contents of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF):

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.

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

- i. Current curriculum vitae.
- ii. Self-assessment discussing strengths and areas for growth in teaching and professional activity (no more than two pages).
- iii. One peer observation from the current review cycle.

Deleted:

Deleted:

- iv. 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.
- v. 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.
- c. For a Performance Review (full) the candidate will include:

Commented [8]: Back to 2 SETEs as in previous RTP policy

- i. Current curriculum vitae.
- ii. Self-assessment of teaching and professional activity (no more than seven pages), and shall include:
- an outline or description of courses taught by the candidate summarizing course materials, goals, and methods.
 - a statement of the candidate's goals for teaching
 - a discussion of new course development
 - an explanation of how the candidate's scholarly activities contribute to the classroom experience.
 - an indication of methods by which the diverse learning styles of students are addressed.
 - a discussion of the candidate's teaching strengths and weaknesses and the ways in which they are attempting to improve their teaching.
 - an assessment of the candidate's scholarship, service and professional activities. **Note: The candidate should explicitly state whether their scholarship is in progress, under review, accepted for publication (or equivalent), or published.**

- iii. Two peer observations of teaching since the last Performance Review.
- iv. 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.
- For tenure a summary table and analysis of SETE data over the entire probationary period shall be included. For promotion, the summary table and analysis shall include data since the candidate's initial date of employment at SSU or the candidate's last promotion, not just the previous year.

Commented [9]: Back to 2 SETEs as in previous RTP policy

v. 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.

3. The WPAF shall be declared complete by the candidate 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.
4. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for the completeness of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), which consists of:
- a. Department RTP recommendation included on University Record of Action Taken form.
 - b. Candidate's materials (see above)
 - c. Approved Department RTP Criteria
 - d. Evaluation document prepared by the Department RTP committee (see III.E.1). The Department evaluation document shall not exceed two pages for Periodic Evaluations (brief) and ten pages for Performance Reviews (full).
 - e. Department Chair's recommendation, if any.
 - f. all previous reappointment letters from the President
 - g. all reappointment, tenure and promotion recommendations added at any level of review, including candidate responses.
5. A candidate shall have access to their WPAF at any time, but may not remove material therefrom.

D. Evaluation

1. All evaluations will commence on the appropriate days following the annual Sonoma State University RTP schedule as established by Faculty Affairs.

Commented [rw10]: What happens if a candidate is very late or does not submit materials?

2. 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:

- a. What are the candidate's strengths? Explain.
- b. 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.

3. A Performance Review (cf. CBA 15.38) 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:

- a. An overview or introduction.
- b. An evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (or equivalent for librarians, counselors and SSP-ARs).
- c. An evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, research and creative achievements.
- d. An evaluation of the candidate's service to the University and community.

4. 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.

5. Evaluation for Tenure & Promotion

Faculty who apply for tenure & promotion to the Associate level 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

Commented [w11]: FSAC recommends keeping current 2/4/6 cycle for performance review, but reduce workload for periodic reviews. Review draft template similar to that used for periodic review of temporary faculty as possible mechanism to reduce workload to committees and candidates (2/27/2020)

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.

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

E. Levels of Review

1. Department RTP Committee

The Department RTP Committee shall review and evaluate the materials submitted by the candidate, write an evaluation document, and make a formal recommendation. 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. 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 may choose to follow the Center for Teaching & Educational Technology guidelines or include their own procedures in their department criteria. 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.

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

The Department RTP committee's evaluation will reflect on the candidates Self-Assessment of Teaching and Professional Activities as outlined above in sections III.C.2.b.ii and III.C.2.c.ii.

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, as required by the type of review (periodic or performance), 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 year of appointment, 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 review and evaluate the materials submitted by prior levels of review, write an evaluation document, and make formal recommendations to the President concerning reappointment in the 2nd PY/2nd year of appointment at SSU, 4th, and 6th years, tenure, and promotion. These documents shall be incorporated into the WPAF. The University RTP Subcommittee may forward a separate ranked list of candidates recommended for promotion to the President.

Commented [rw12]: Making language align with parts 1-3 above.

IV. Recommendation

- A. Personnel recommendations or decisions relating to reappointment, tenure, promotion, non-reappointment, or any other personnel action shall be based solely on material contained in the Personnel Action File (PAF), which incorporates the WPAF by reference. (cf. CBA 15.9). 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.
- B. 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 depending on the appropriate type of review 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.
- C. 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.

D. 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.

E. President

1. 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.
2. 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.F below.

3. Only the President can grant additional time to the tenure clock, and only under circumstances explicitly stated in the CBA (13.8).
4. 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 (c.f. CBA 13.17) 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.

Commented [rw13]: This is out of agreement with Representation on Administrative Appointment Committees Policy and the CBA. Only Department is required for making the decision. Should be removed? Faculty Affairs informs FSAC this has never been applied at SSU.

F. 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 in rare instances and for compelling reasons, which should be stated in detail.

Commented [w14]: Following input from EFRSA

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. The following table summarizes when and at what level evaluations are due.

Probationary Year	Evaluation Level	Levels of Review	Date of Presidential Notification
1st year at SSU	Periodic Evaluation	Department & Dean	Feb 15
2nd PY/2nd @ SSU	Performance Evaluation	All	Feb 15
3rd, 5th	Periodic Evaluation	Department, School and Dean	No later than June 1
4th, 6th, tenure & promotion	Performance Review	All	No later than June 1



Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Procedures, Criteria, and Standards for Tenured and Probationary Faculty

Recommended By: Academic Senate

Approved: Ruben Armiñana, President

Issue Date: Wednesday, September 1, 1971

Current Issue Date: Wednesday, March 9, 2016

Effective Date: Wednesday, March 9, 2016

Contact Office: Academic Affairs

Policy number: 2009-3

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.A) provide guidance but do not supersede this policy.

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 is not regularly open for business, and then it is also excluded. (cf. CBA 2.11)
- **First Probationary Year at SSU** – The first or second academic year a probationary faculty is employed at SSU in a tenure track position, regardless of service credit.
- **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.
- **Personal Action File (PAF)** – The one official personnel file (housed in Faculty Affairs) containing employment documents and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty employee. (see WPAF) (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 faculty unit employee in an academic year position 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** – The time frame of Periodic Evaluation or Performance Review of a faculty employee. For probationary faculty, this is annual, starting at the beginning of the academic year. For probationary faculty under consideration for promotion, this review cycle is since they were hired. For tenured faculty under consideration for promotion, the review cycle is at least 5 consecutive years since last promotion. (cf. CBA 14.3)
- **Working Personal Action File (WPAF)** – The file specifically generated for use in a given review cycle, which includes all required forms and documents. It shall also include all faculty and administrative level evaluation recommendations from the current cycle, and all rebuttal statements and responses submitted. At the end of each review cycle, it is incorporated into the candidate's PAF (cf. CBA 15.8-15.9).

I. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Procedures

A. Dissemination of the Evaluation Criteria

Note: Professional development may be included in any of these categories, as appropriate for the department.

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 (see Part II of this policy). Policy-making bodies shall provide all faculty with revisions of the policy or criteria as they occur. Once the annual RTP process has begun, there shall be no changes in the criteria and/or procedures used to evaluate a faculty member.
2. At each level of review, 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) in priority order, with primary emphasis placed on teaching effectiveness (or equivalent for Librarians, Counselors and SSP-ARs):
 - a. Teaching effectiveness (or equivalent).
 - b. Scholarship, research, or creative achievement
 - c. Service to the University, the profession, and the community.
3. This policy goes into effect 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. RTP Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

1. Personnel recommendations or decisions relating to reappointment, tenure, promotion, non-reappointment, or any other personnel action shall be based solely on material contained in the Personnel Action File (PAF), which incorporates the WPAF by reference. (cf. CBA 15.9)
2. The University RTP Subcommittee shall provide to candidates, departments and schools a format to be used for submission of recommendations and supporting materials.
3. Contents of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)
 - a. The **Candidate** shall provide up-to-date documentation for the WPAF showing evidence of his or her achievements and professional development. Candidates may place additional materials in their department office and reference them by index.
 - b. For a Periodic Evaluation (brief) the candidate will include:
 - i. current curriculum vitae

- ii. self-assessment discussing strengths and areas for growth in teaching and professional activity (typically no more than two pages)
 - iii. One peer observation from the current review cycle.
 - iv. Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETEs) are required for all classes (cf. CBA 15.15) Institutional Research provides faculty with summary copies of SETEs for all classes. These should be included.
 - v. 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 on file in the department office.
- c. For a Performance Review (full) the candidate will include:
- i. current curriculum vitae
 - ii. self-assessment of teaching and professional activity (typically no more than seven pages)
 - iii. Two peer observations of teaching since the last Performance Review.
 - iv. Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETEs) are required for all classes (cf. CBA 15.15) Institutional Research provides faculty with summary copies of SETE's for all classes. These should be included.
 - v. 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 on file in the department office
- d. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for the completeness of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), which consists of:
This forms the working document that is forwarded to subsequent levels of review.
- i. department RTP recommendation
 - ii. curriculum vitae
 - iii. evaluation document prepared by the Department RTP committee (see I.C)
 - iv. department criteria
 - v. department chair report, if any
 - vi. candidate's self-assessment

- vii. peer observation(s) of teaching
 - viii. student evaluations of teaching effectiveness
 - ix. index of materials available
 - x. all previous reappointment letters from the President
 - xi. all reappointment, tenure and promotion recommendations added at any level of review, including candidate responses
4. Evidence from unidentified sources shall be excluded from the WPAF except that the University's SETE shall be anonymous.
5. A candidate shall have access to his or her WPAF at any time, but may not remove material therefrom.
6. The WPAF shall be declared complete with respect to documentation of performance for the purpose of evaluation five working days before the date by which the Department RTP Committee must notify the candidate of the Committee recommendation. Insertion of material after this date must have the approval of the University RTP Subcommittee, and shall be limited to items that become accessible after the WPAF is declared complete. 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.

C. RTP Evaluation Document

1. The Department evaluation document, not including attachments, shall not exceed two pages for Periodic Evaluations (brief) and ten pages for Performance Reviews (full). The department RTP committee shall not attach any additional materials, other than those specified in I.B.3
2. 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.
3. The 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:
 - a. an overview or introduction.
 - b. an evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (or equivalent for librarians, counselors and SSP-ARs).
 - c. an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, research and creative achievements.

d. an evaluation of the candidate's service to the University and community

4. 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:

a. What are the candidate's strengths? Explain.

b. 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.

D. Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion

1. The normal period of 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 normal 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.

E. Evaluation Procedures: Reappointment

1. Evaluation for reappointment

a. 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.

2. Document Submission Timelines

- a. Candidates in their 1st year in a tenure track appointment at Sonoma State with any years of service awarded at hire, will receive a brief evaluation as specified in section I.C.4. These candidates shall receive a letter of reappointment or non-reappointment from the President or designee by the following February 15.
 - b. Candidates in their 2nd probationary year, and two years of service at SSU or in their 4th and 6th probationary years will receive full evaluations as per section I.C.3; 2nd year candidates shall receive a letter of reappointment or non-reappointment from the President or designee by the following February 15; 4th and 6th year candidates will be notified no later than June 1.
 - c. Candidates in their 3rd and 5th probationary years will receive brief evaluations, and they shall receive a letter of reappointment or non-reappointment from the President or designee no later than the following June 1.
 - d. All evaluations will follow the annual Sonoma State University RTP schedule as established by Faculty Affairs.
3. 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.

F. Evaluation Procedures: Tenure & Promotion

1. Faculty who apply for tenure & promotion to Associate will prepare only one document under the timeline for tenure. Should a candidate decide to apply for early promotion only, they will need to prepare two separate WPAFs. Any applicant for early tenure or promotion must request a Performance Review and notify Faculty Affairs prior to the deadline for the WPAF.
2. 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.
3. 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. 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.

4. The President, after reviewing and considering the evaluations and recommendations, shall make a final decision on promotion and shall notify the faculty member in writing of the final decision as per section I.I.7.
5. 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.
6. Tenured faculty may request in writing that he or she not be considered for promotion.

G. Levels and Sequence of RTP Review

1. Levels and Membership

- a. There are three levels of peer review: the Department, School, and University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committees. Review by the Dean constitutes a fourth level of review. Department Chairs may make separate recommendations, which are forwarded on to subsequent levels of review. If the department chair makes a separate recommendation, s/he shall not also serve on the other RTP committees for that candidate.
- b. A faculty member shall not serve on more than one level of review in the same review cycle. Only Professors may serve on committees for candidates for promotion to Professor.
- c. 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.

2. Department RTP Committee

- a. The formal recommendation, along with the evaluation document, for reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall originate in the Department. The Department RTP Committee is composed of three or more eligible faculty members elected by the Department. Any information or recommendation from a Department Chair regarding a candidate shall be directed to the Department RTP Committee before the WPAF is closed to further documentation (see I.B.6.above) The formal recommendation shall be added to the WPAF. The Committee shall complete its work (as described in I.G.2.c. below) and forward the WPAF to the School RTP Committee according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs.
- b. Committee Membership and Eligibility. To be eligible, a faculty member must be full-time and 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 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.
- c. Committee Responsibilities. 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). Reappointment expectations shall be explicit and clear. The completed WPAF, including any minority reports, and any separate report from a Department Chair, shall be forwarded to the School RTP Committee in a timely manner according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs. Late documents shall be forwarded to the next level of review without recommendation. Under extraordinary circumstances, URTP and FA, at their discretion, can allow for adjusted timelines without affecting candidates 10-day review
- d. The candidate shall have access to the WPAF according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs.

3. School RTP Committee

- a. Committee Membership and Eligibility. Members of the School RTP Committee shall be full-time and 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.

- b. **Committee Responsibilities.** The School RTP Committee shall review the WPAF and prepare a formal recommendation, which shall be incorporated into the WPAF. Reappointment expectations shall be explicit and clear. The School RTP Committee shall forward to the School Dean the WPAF and its recommendation. Late documents shall be forwarded to the next level of review without recommendation. The candidate shall have access to the School recommendation according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs.

4. School Dean

- a. Following receipt of the WPAF the School Dean will review all materials and then write a separate, independent evaluation of each candidate based on the URTP policy and departmental criteria.
- b. The School Dean shall forward the evaluation and formal recommendation for candidates in their 2nd/2nd, 4th, and 6th years, tenure and promotion to the University RTP Subcommittee. Deans, as President designee, will notify candidates in the 1st, 3rd, and 5th years of the decision to reappoint. Reappointment expectations shall be explicit and clear. The candidate shall have access to the Dean's recommendation according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs.

5. University RTP Subcommittee

- a. **Committee Membership and Eligibility.** The University RTP Subcommittee shall be elected at large from among the eligible tenured professors or equivalent of the instructional faculty and librarians. Members may not hold an administrative appointment except as Department Chair. Committee members will serve in staggered three-year terms.
- b. **Committee Responsibilities.** The University RTP Subcommittee, in addition to its other responsibilities, shall make formal recommendations to the President concerning reappointment in the 2nd PY/2nd at SSU, 4th, and 6th years, tenure, and promotion. The candidate shall have access to the URTP recommendation according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs. Reappointment expectations shall be explicit and clear. The University RTP Subcommittee may forward a separate ranked list of candidates recommended for promotion to the President.

H. Communication of Action Taken

1. The formal recommendations at each level of review are included in the WPAF.

2. 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.
3. 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.

I. 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.
3. This provision shall not change the evaluation timelines.
4. The Committee or School Dean shall notify Faculty Affairs of any request by a candidate for rebuttal or meetings.
5. 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.

J. 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.
 5. Only the President can grant additional time to the tenure clock, and only under circumstances explicitly stated in the CBA (13.8).
 6. 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.
 7. The President's Letter
 - a. It is the responsibility of the President to provide written notification to each individual who is granted reappointment, tenure, or promotion.
 - b. If an individual is not granted reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the President's letter to the individual shall state the reasons for that action.
 - c. 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.
 - d. 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.

K. Appeals and Grievances

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. If the appeal is denied, the candidate may seek remedy as provided for by the CBA.

II. **Evaluation Criteria for Tenured and Probationary Faculty** Candidates shall possess the appropriate terminal degree as noted in their appointment letter to be eligible for tenure and promotion. As indicated in Part I.F. above, advancement shall be based upon documentation of professional achievement and growth since appointment or the most recent evaluation, in accordance with the appropriate departmental criteria and standards. (Note: professional development may be included in teaching effectiveness, scholarship, or service, as appropriate to the activity and department.)

A. Departmental Criteria

1. Each department shall develop criteria that will describe what is expected of candidates in all evaluation areas.
2. The departmental criteria will be reviewed by FSAC to ensure that they are consistent with this policy, the CBA, and the University mission. Department criteria will be accepted unless they are found to be inconsistent with this policy, the CBA, and/or 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.

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

1. Criteria. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for reviewing and evaluating all pertinent evidence to show that the candidate:
 - a. Displays enthusiasm for teaching his/her subject
 - b. Presents material with clarity. Uses teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content.
 - c. Clearly specifies course goals, and employs course materials to achieve course goals.
 - d. Enables students to participate actively in their own education.
 - e. Fosters appreciation for different points of view.
 - f. Demonstrates competence and currency in course material.
 - g. Consults and advises effectively outside of class.
 - h. Engages in professional development to enhance his/her teaching effectiveness.
2. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness (or equivalent for Librarians, Counselors and SSP-ARs).

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence or methods of collecting information. The Department shall assess the candidate's teaching effectiveness in terms of the criteria listed in II.A.1. and II.B.1 above. The three required methods are Peer Observations of Teaching (section 2a. below), Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (section 2b. below) and Self-Assessment of Teaching and Professional Activity (section 2c. below). 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, give a copy to each member of the Department in advance of a review cycle, and include the statement in the Personnel Action File (PAF) of all candidates. 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.

For a brief Periodic Evaluation, the candidate's self-assessment should discuss continuing strengths and areas for growth in teaching and professional activity (typically no more than two pages)

a. Peer Observations of Teaching

- i. 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.
- ii. 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.

b. Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE).

- i. 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. 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. The Department RTP committee's evaluation 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 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.
- ii. Student evaluations are required for all faculty who teach. Summaries for all classes are included in the WPAF.
- iii. 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.

c. Self-Assessment of Teaching (or Equivalent) and Professional Activities: A self-assessment is a reflective statement written entirely by the candidate and unmodified by the Departmental RTP Committee. The Self-Assessment for a full Performance Review (typically no more than seven pages) shall include:

- i. an outline or description of courses taught by the candidate summarizing course materials, goals, and methods.
- ii. a statement of the candidate's goals for teaching

- iii. a discussion of new course development
- iv. an explanation of how the candidate's scholarly activities contribute to the classroom experience.
- v. an indication of methods by which the diverse learning styles of students are addressed.
- vi. a discussion of the candidate's teaching strengths and weaknesses and the ways in which he or she is attempting to improve their teaching.
- vii. an assessment of the candidate's scholarship, service and professional activities.

C. Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship, Research, and Creative Achievements

1. 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.
2. The candidate should explicitly state whether their scholarship is in progress, under review, accepted for publication (or equivalent), or published.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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).
7. Examples of scholarship, research or creative achievement, and professional development (complete citations are required) include but are not limited to:

- a. published professional or scholarly books and articles
- b. published textbooks and other instructional materials
- c. reports or other products that result from consultancies, software development and electronic media products, designs, or inventions.
- d. digital scholarship
- e. creative activities in the arts.
- f. funded grants.
- g. submitted proposals.
- h. research reports or scholarly papers presented at conferences, colloquia, and other appropriate gatherings.
- i. participation in professional meetings as discussant, committee member, or organizer of colloquia/seminars.
- j. awards, honors, exhibitions, shows, performances, or speaking engagements.
- k. contributions to discipline outside his/her primary area of specialization.
- l. post-doctoral studies or continuing education.

D. Criteria for Evaluating Service to both the University and Community. Service to the profession is included as community service.

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. Examples of service to the University include but are not limited to:
 - a. Contributions to the organizational, academic, intellectual, and social life of the University, including participation on committees and with student organizations.
 - b. Activities that enhance the University's ability to serve the needs of a diverse student body, non-traditional, and prospective students.

- c. Activities that enhance the University's ability to retain and graduate students, including mentorship and advising.
 - d. Representation of the University in an official capacity to the CSU and other institutions.
4. Examples of public service and service to the community include, but are not limited to, membership or participation on:
- a. Local, State, and Federal boards, commissions, and committees.
 - b. Civic organizations.
 - c. Community service organizations.
 - d. Schools.
 - e. Charitable organizations.
 - f. Social agencies.
 - g. Political groups/organizations.
 - h. Recreational agencies and groups.
 - i. Cultural organizations.
 - j. Leadership in professional organizations at local, state, and national levels.
 - k. Service as critic, reviewer, editor, or consultant

Probationary Year	Evaluation Level	Levels of Review	Date of Presidential Notification
1st year at SSU	Periodic Evaluation	Department & Dean	Feb 15
2nd PY/2nd @ SSU	Performance Evaluation	All	Feb 15
3rd, 5th	Periodic Evaluation	Department, School and Dean	No later than June 1
4th, 6th, tenure & promotion	Performance Review	All	No later than June 1

Periodic Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty Form

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



Associated Students of Sonoma State University
GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION
Reexamination of Teaching Sensitive Material

- Whereas** The mission of the Associated Students of Sonoma State University (AS), a student run, student led auxiliary corporation, is to enrich the lives of students and build a sense of community; and
- Whereas** the Associated Students of Sonoma State University is the official voice of over 7,000 students that attend the institution; and
- Whereas** the Associated Students of Sonoma State serve Sonoma State’s students through awareness, advocacy, and representation; and
- Whereas** the Professional Development Subcommittee (PDS) created a joint statement with Academic Freedom Subcommittee (AFS) which impacts the lives of students; and
- Whereas** the Professional Development Subcommittee created a statement which impacts students with no student input or representation; and
- Whereas** both committees previously responded to a resolution from the Associated Students published in 2017 regarding trigger warnings; and
- Whereas** in this statement the committees’ said they had input and approval from both Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) and Disability Services for Students (DSS) at Sonoma State University, a claim that was false, and confirmed as false by both programs; and
- Whereas** the committees failed to address the Associated Students’ primary request to provide students with a warning before showing graphic material in the classroom; and
- Whereas** warnings allow students to make informed decisions with regard to managing their own trauma reactions; and



Whereas the Associated Students are asking faculty to be responsible with their academic freedom and be transparent with students on the course material; and

Whereas the Associated Students' resolution of 2017 was not asking faculty to treat students trauma reaction or remove curricula or content; the statement of resolution was simply to provide a warning before sensitive material was presented; and

Whereas the Joint Statement by AFS and PDS is designated as a “Best Practice” statement though it fails to address research from a variety of academic fields that indicate the value of warnings for trauma-informed teaching; and

Whereas the committees' statement indicates “Some discomfort is inevitable in classrooms when the goal is to expose students to new ideas; to have them question beliefs they have taken for granted; to grapple with ethical problems they have never considered; and, more generally, to expand their horizons contributing to an informed and democratic society.”; and

Whereas academic discomfort is very different from a trauma reaction; and

Whereas due to the lack of this warning resource, the dilemma students may encounter would be too late to make informed decisions having to drop a class after the add/drop period; and

Whereas these kind of actions undermine students’ ability to achieve their academic goals; and

Whereas some faculty members have failed to understand the difference between “discomfort” and trauma reaction and require students to disclose a diagnosis of PTSD or report that they have experienced trauma and leave students with no other option but to be referred to DSS or CAPS for class accomodations; and

Whereas requiring students to disclose trauma demonstrates a continued stigma with



mental health issues; Executive Orders 1095 and 1097 indicate that a Confidential Advocate and/or Title IX are able to request supportive and/or interim measures without students disclosing a diagnosis; and

Whereas only three Faculty in Senate voted against this joint statement; and

Whereas the University has created numerous ways to hold students accountable but fails to hold faculty accountable; and

Whereas CSUs like Cal State Long Beach, Cal Poly Pomona, and others have initiated similar programs that support the use of trauma-informed instruction and language in syllabi;

Therefore let it hereby be resolved that the students of Sonoma State University demand the following actions by the University and the Academic Senate:

- **make it mandatory for faculty to have trauma informed instruction,**
- **publish the Confidential Advocates, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), and Office for the Prevention of Harassment & Discrimination (OPHD) contact information on all syllabi,**
- **and reexamine the Teaching Sensitive Material joint statement.**

Action Plan

- 1. Associated Students will distribute this resolution to the Sonoma State University Academic Senate.**
- 2. Associated Students will distribute this resolution to the Sonoma State University President.**
- 3. Associated Students will distribute this resolution to the Sonoma State University President's cabinet.**
- 4. Associated Students will distribute this resolution to the Sonoma State University Academic Deans and the Dean of Students.**

April 5, 2021

To: Paula Lane
Chair, Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee

Jeffrey Reeder
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Karen Moranski *Karen R. Moranski*
Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Wm. Gregory Sawyer
Vice President for Student Affairs

Joyce Lopes
Vice President for Administration and Finance

Brent Boyer
Director, Disability Services for Students and Testing Services

Laura Williams
Director, Counseling and Psychological Services

Susan Pulido
Confidential Sexual Assault Advocate

RE: Administrative Response to Joint AFS/PDS Statement Concerning Teaching Sensitive Materials

On March 18, 2021, the Academic Senate voted to endorse a Joint AFS/PDS Statement on the Teaching of Sensitive Materials. Since that time, the Associated Students (AS) has prepared a resolution asking the Senate to reconsider the Joint Statement, based on misrepresentations and misunderstandings inherent in the statement and the Senate debate. Upon review of the Statement and in response to the Associate Students' resolution, a group of administrators, including the Vice Presidents from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Administration and Finance, along with the Directors of DSS and CAPS and the Confidential Sexual Assault Advocate, offer the following letter in support of the AS resolution. We ask that the Senate reconsider the Statement.

Our first concern deals with the role DSS and CAPS played in the development of the statement. DSS and CAPS were contacted by email on May 22, 2019 to provide information on the services they offer for students who have experienced trauma. They were provided with an earlier version of what is now paragraph 5 of the statement, not the full AFS/PDS Statement.

Both unit administrators reviewed that paragraph and suggested changes to it. The Joint Statement indicates that the statement was developed by AFS and PDS "with input from CAPS and DSS." It needs to be noted, however, that prior to the Senate's endorsement of the Joint Statement on March 18, neither unit administrator was asked to review or comment on the wording of the whole statement, and they were not asked for nor did they provide their endorsement of the Statement, despite claims in the Senate meeting that "CAPS and DSS both had a chance to review this document and provide their input" (Senate transcript). Any consultation was only on trauma services and not on the central question about trigger warnings. The implication that these two unit heads were in favor of the statement is misplaced, since they never saw it.

Moreover, we have reservations about some of the wording of the statement. In particular, we note the conflation of two issues--the treatment of trauma and the use of trigger warnings in course syllabi. The concerning sentence is "Exposure to certain graphic images/discussions can elicit reactions associated with trauma; however, the classroom is not the appropriate venue to treat PTSD or trauma, both of which may require professional treatment." All of us agree that most classes are not the appropriate place to treat trauma or mental illness (with the exception of clinical courses in which students are learning those skills).

The problem is that the statement assumes that trigger warnings are *the equivalent* of treating mental illness in the classroom. That is not the case. Trigger warnings are not treatment. They acknowledge the possibility students may be adversely impacted by some material, allowing students to make informed decisions about whether a course is a good match for their learning needs and about whether they should seek appropriate accommodations. The conflation of trigger warnings with treatment creates unnecessary concern about whether faculty should be involved in treatment. They should not be involved. Trigger warnings, as the AFS/PDS statement rightly suggests, are merely "part of an effective teaching pedagogy."

Research indicates that students can experience trauma in the classroom, sometimes as a result of course materials. Students have a right to a safe learning environment, and referrals to student support services are a valuable tool in the faculty member's toolkit. CAPS, DSS, the Office of Confidential Advocacy, and the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination are all offices at Sonoma State that provide supportive measures to which students could be referred. Supportive measures do not require a diagnosis of PTSD and need not interfere with course content. All of the offices mentioned above can work with faculty to craft supportive measures that do not interfere with course content.

A second concern is related to the claim that faculty are being asked to remove course content. Again, we endorse the premise that some discomfort, grappling with ethical problems, and expanding of horizons, are all laudable benefits of a college education, as suggested in the AAUP report and the AFS/PDS Statement. And we also endorse academic freedom and the instructor's right to determine content and pedagogical approach. Trigger warnings are not the same as asking a faculty member to remove course content--they are not a constraint on a faculty member's choices. At their simplest, trigger warnings simply indicate that sensitive

material is included in the course content, again allowing students to ask questions and make decisions.

We want to make it clear that the discussion in the SSU Academic Senate on March 18, 2021 misrepresented the views of DSS and CAPS, claiming they supported the statement when they did not. Furthermore, we argue that the AFS/PDS Statement Concerning Teaching Sensitive Material fails to address the central concern posed by Associated Students, that trigger warnings about the use of sensitive materials in a course would help students to make informed choices. Trigger warnings are not treatment of trauma, nor are they a request to remove sensitive materials, and they should be debated in a forum that is not confused by those claims. We encourage the Senate to have an appropriately informed debate about the value of trigger warnings in syllabi, leaving aside treatment issues and removal of materials from courses.

Joint Statement by the Academic Freedom Subcommittee (AFS) and Professional Development Subcommittee (PDS) Concerning Teaching Sensitive Material

The following is a Best Practices statement regarding teaching sensitive material developed by AFS and PDS, with input from CAPS and DSS, and intended for our fellow faculty. This statement is based on related studies conducted by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), regarding trigger warnings. The full text of the AAUP report is available here: <https://www.aaup.org/report/trigger-warnings>

Associated Students expressed concern over graphic or sensitive course content that has the potential to elicit overwhelming feelings of anxiety, stress, trauma, and/or grief.

Neither the Professional Development Subcommittee (PDS) nor the Academic Freedom Subcommittee (AFS) advocates for the removal of sensitive content. We do believe providing context with any assignment can be part of an effective teaching pedagogy, however it is entirely up to the instructor to determine the most effective pedagogical approach, as well as whether, how and when to provide such context.

Some discomfort is inevitable in classrooms when the goal is to expose students to new ideas; to have them question beliefs they have taken for granted; to grapple with ethical problems they have never considered; and, more generally, to expand their horizons contributing to an informed and democratic society. In addition, as professors, we have the academic freedom to include whatever course content we deem necessary to address our course standards.

As two University Faculty Committees, we listened to the students who are advocating for their needs and attempted to find an equitable solution for both students and faculty. We also fully considered the importance of upholding our individual and collective academic freedom as faculty. Exposure to certain graphic images/discussions can elicit reactions associated with trauma; however, the classroom is not the appropriate venue to treat PTSD or trauma, both of which may require professional treatment.

A student who is reporting a diagnosis of PTSD or reporting that they have experienced trauma should be referred to Disability Services for Students (DSS) if they would like class accommodations, and/or to Counseling & Psychological Services (CAPS) if a psychological treatment consultation is desired. Professors are encouraged to help guide students to these available resources. Under the Americans with Disabilities Act, the DSS office works with students and faculty members to provide accommodations to ensure equal access, while maintaining the academic integrity of the course. Referrals should be made and accommodations addressed without affecting other students' exposure to material that has educational value.

Faculty who are interested in learning practices that support the teaching of sensitive material may wish to contact the Center for Teaching & Educational Technology (CTET)

which offers customized workshops for departments and schools, in addition to free, confidential, non-evaluative consultations for individual faculty. It is important to note, however, that such workshops and consultations are not mandatory and it is the individual faculty member's decision to participate in such workshops.