AGENDA

April 8, 2021
Via Zoom

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

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

Consent Items:
- THAR Concentration in Acting Revision
  (https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:1106/form)
- THAR Concentration in Technical Theatre Revision
  (https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:1352/form)
- THAR Concentration in Theatre Studies Revision
  (https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:1267/form)

Candidates for Graduation - on team drive

Business

1. Motion that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University
endorse the EPC Statement on Administrative Encroachment
into Curricular Matters – was postponed to this meeting. TC
3:20

2. From FSAC: Revision to the RTP Policy – First Reading – P.
Lane TC 3:35

3. Posthumous degree request from GEP for Lisa Dunwoody –
K. Fang TC 4:00

4. From EPC: THAR Concentration in Dance Discontinuance
  (https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:2228/form)
  – First Reading – E. Asencio TC 4:15

5. Engineering A3 Waiver request – Second Reading – E.
Asencio TC 4:30

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
Abstract


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

Absent: Viki Montera-Heckman

Proxies: Laura Monje-Paulson for Wm Gregory Sawyer

Guests: Victor Garlin, Kari Manwiller, Jenn Lillig, Maricruz Ovideo, Napoleon Reyes, Megan McIntyre, Katie Musick, Hollis Robbins, Laura Alamillo, Jerlena Griffin-Desta, Merith Weisman, Isabelle Barkey, Ajay Gehlawat, Damien Wilson, Farid Farahmand, Jonathan Smith, Stacey Bosick, Matty Mookerjee, Karen Schneider, Meggie Williams, Natalie Hobson, Janet Hess, Liz Burch, Sandy Ayala, Suzanne O’Keeffe, Stefan Kiesbye, Theresa Nguyen

Approval of Agenda – Motion to swap item 2 and item 5. Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 3/4/2021 – Approved.

Special Student Report – Maricruz Ovideo

“Thank you for having me for the student spotlight. My name is Maricruz Ovideo. I am a fifth year here at Sonoma State and I will be graduating in a few weeks. My majors are Spanish and Human Development, double majoring. I’m a proud first generation woman of color and me being here for five years could not have been done without CASSE, especially EOP and their generosity and all of the unconditional support, personal growth and professional growth that they have
demonstrated to me and skilled me with. I come from a small agricultural town in northern California, where most of the students that graduate from there don't go to college. My mom told me as soon as you graduate high school, can you please get a grocery store job so that you can start helping me with the bills. That wasn’t an option for me, so I began working as soon as I was a sophomore in high school. I began looking for universities and just wanted to know how I could be appealing so that I could be accepted into university. I got accepted to all of these wonderful universities and the only one that stood out to me was Sonoma State because I wasn’t accepted into the EOP program and it was a little challenge. I wanted to know why I wasn’t accepted, so I made the decision to come all the way to Sonoma State and meet the Director at the time, who retired that summer, and she told me why it was that I didn’t get in and I accepted that because I agreed with what the situation was, and I want to talk about it because I felt defeated. She called me 30 minutes later and said, hey because you made it all the way over here, and you told me your story, you told me how much you love EOP and how much they have helped in the past, I’m making an executive decision to allow you to be in the program, so that truly solidified my decision to come to Sonoma State for sure. After being acquainted with the university in year two, I was a sophomore, my favorite place to hang out in was that EOP lounge. I remember meeting so many students from different majors and if I was ever stressed, I would go in there and Amal would give me some inspirational words and always gave me advice. I met Sammy there, he graduated in 2017 and he would always talk about his studying abroad experience and at the time, I only had one major. He told me about his experience, and I was amazed that Spanish had so many dialects, and the history that I hadn’t learned in public school and I wanted to learn more about my roots, so I wanted to study abroad and my mom didn’t want to let me again. I went to Amal, like any other time that I needed advice, and she told me, let's make a strategy. Every single time you take a step like applying or talking to someone about X or Y, let your mom know. That way she feels in control, she feels like she’s a part of the dream that you want to fulfill. That approach eventually got my mom on board. It really helped and I studied abroad, had a wonderful time, came back, and I wanted to continue my leadership positions with the school, so I became a residential advisor and also, I was accepted again to be a summer bridge leader for the third time. Truly there’s no place like home because you feel the unconditional love and support EOP gives you and the care that they put into their students. Everything that they do is to help us succeed, to get us to a point where we feel confident professionals. I was an EOP leader and I had my students, I was nervous. I told them, you know what, college is really hard and it asks a lot of you, and it puts you in uncomfortable positions, but truly all of the work that you put into this is to one day cross that stage and be proud of yourself, be proud of who you are and what you have accomplished. Let your parents see how proud they are of you. I’m not going to get a traditional graduation, but I am very excited to say that I’m continuing in Higher Ed for a degree in social work. I truly want to acknowledge my EOP family and CASSE as a whole and I couldn't have done it without them. I would have been lost in so many assignments, I would not have had so many wonderful experiences, taken on so many leadership positions, without their support. The Chair said thank you very much Maricruz. We appreciate so much hearing your story, and it is truly inspirational and moving and we will hear your words, will
think about your words and we'll use those as we make decisions today and, as we
guide our curriculum, as we guide our discussions.

Chair Report – J. Reeder

J. Reeder said there’s a lot going on in the world, in the campus and there’s also a lot
going on in this agenda. In terms of recruitment, the university is continuing efforts
to reach out to students. Department chairs have recently received a helpful toolkit
of information to encourage students that have been admitted to come to Sonoma
State. The university is reaching out to prospective students and admits as well.
Some of those points are the best four year graduation rate for transfers in the CSU,
support for students who want to pursue a teaching career, the fact that most of the
first year English and Math courses will be in person, the Rec Center will be open
fall 2021 and our housing, which is the number one ranked housing in the CSU, has
spaces for up to 2000 students. Special deals described on a postcard came in the
mail yesterday to one of the admitted students in his household describing those
special deals, including free drip coffee and free parking. There’s been ongoing work
with commencement including a walkthrough for timing and logistics and
messaging is going out to the graduating classes of very soon. Area F of the GE
program implementation is moving forward and recently the Chairs of the Ethnic
Studies departments, along with Academic Programs, the GE subcommittee and
EPC have coordinated and collectively agreed on assigning temporary tags to 10
courses that were previously already designated as Ethnic Studies courses and
which fully comply with EO 1100 and AB1460 on the requirements for those courses.
That will give us time as a campus and as faculty governance to develop procedures
and processes around content area criteria and, of course, proposals to fill out that
area. He talked about collegiality. Two weeks ago, he talked said that everyone at
this institution is united in our mission, but we may disagree on pro-
cedure, and
there are a number of those topics that that will come up today that might have
disagreement. He wanted to frame th
e
meeting with a short story. The very first
time he was on Academic Senate and to be quite frank, after that year on Senate, he
decided to himself, he didn't ever want do that again. It was difficult and
challenging and also, he was new to the institution and, in many cases felt it was a
rancorous time in our institution’s history. It was several years before the no
confidence vote and things were starting to ramp up in a negative way. My
observation was that in many cases, in many reactions, the Senate and the
Administration and anybody involved in these rancorous discussions were often
acting, or rather reacting, from a traumatized position, often acting or expressing or
reflecting feelings or sensations of previous traumatic experiences. This is not the
Senate that he sees today. It’s not the Senate that he has seen in the last few years. He
hoped that we will keep going that way and don’t allow our body politic to go down
that route.

At SSU, we do not currently have an Asian American Studies Program and, in light
of our current academic needs and in light of our current societal needs, and
especially in light of the anti-Asian Racism and anti-Asian violence that was
shockingly demonstrated last week and throughout the last year, this is an area of
curriculum that as a faculty we should discuss and consider as becoming a part of
our reality as we move forward.
Consent item: Revision to Spanish MA – Approved.

President Report – J. Griffin-Desta for J. Sakaki

J. Griffin-Desta thanked the Chair for his insight, particularly related to the curriculum opportunity in this current moment where we’re experiencing an increase in violence against our Asian American family. The President participated today in a discussion that was put together for Asians to come together from our campuses to just sit with each other and to be in community and to listen and hear the concerns and the fears that the community is having. It was a wonderful group and they asked her to come and help facilitate the conversation. She thought the conversation was very honest and heartfelt and they express a lot of appreciation for being able to come together and help make sense of what is happening. The President participated the entire time and they appreciated that she was in that space with them. Interim Provost Moranski will talk about repopulation plans to some degree, but it has certainly been a conversation at the highest levels within the CSU and with our new Chancellor. There’s been a lot more communication and more consistent meetings related to this work, as well as the Chancellor’s Cabinet who work with our colleagues here. They will have some updates in the near future. The President wanted to her to remind the Senate that our Campus Climate survey for faculty, staff, and students will be released on April 3rd and there’ll be a three week open period. We’re very excited about it. She especially thanked the Senate Diversity Subcommittee, who she went before to get feedback on the draft survey questions and they provided some great feedback. She thought that the process over the last three weeks engaging the campus Community around the feedback and about the questions was very robust. She thought the end product will reflect that and it will be very much localized to Sonoma State.

From EPC: Engineering A3 Waiver – First Reading – E. Asencio

E. Asencio said this was presented at Ex Com last week and there’s a memo provided on in the packet today with all the information. This request is supported by both the GE subcommittee and EPC as well. It’s not a request for an area waiver, specifically, but more for a course waiver and because the engineering curriculum meets the requirements of the A3 area. The request is to waive the need for engineering students to have to take an additional course because this is a high unit major and this will allow the degree to stay within 120 units.

A member said there was a good deal of material in the packet about the history of this. Apparently some years ago, the Chancellor decided that all majors should be confined to 120 units unless there were some special reasons to make an exception. A number of campuses did request exemptions from that 120 unit CAP for their Engineering programs. All it says in the documentation was that Sonoma State did not make that request. It isn’t clear to him why we didn’t and why we couldn’t. It seems a better solution to this problem than it would be to get a waiver and then enable the program to go to 128 units. It would give them more units to accomplish their goals, instead of just for this proposal.
F. Farahmand from Engineering responded that this is a great point. The previous administration, President and Provost, were very adamantly against increasing it over 120 units. There was absolutely no support from the President and Provost, therefore, the department could not really request going over 120 units at that time. We were bonded as a campus that we must stick with 120 units. Because of that decision, the department had to cut back units of the program. Right now, there are campuses which have more than 120 units for Engineering. 120 units is definitely doable, but harder in terms of equity which could be a major issue for students being able to graduate in four years. Anything more than 120 units really puts students in jeopardy, of not being able to graduate within four year. If they fail any courses, basically, they have to stay one extra semester. That's how it's worked out currently. This is almost 15-16 units every semester.

A member said students take five years to get Engineering degrees and many CSUs did ask for a waiver to the 120 units. He was glad to hear that Engineering was not being allowed to ask for that waiver, because he was on the SST curriculum committee at the time and he encouraged them to ask for a waiver and he never understood why they did not so. He encouraged Engineering to ask for a waiver instead of what they're asking for now because SSU is the only CSU campus in the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges (COPLAC). If there is one campus where the three requirements should not be dropped, it is at Sonoma State University and, with all due respect to the Chair of Engineering, he was opposed to this proposal. He recommended that instead they asked for a waiver to the 120 units requirement.

A member echoed what the previous member said and as somebody who's taught a lot of a courses, she predominantly teaches three courses that actually do critical thinking and she teach courses that just say they do critical thinking on the books and that's not her choice. As a COPLAC institution, we are remiss to ever give away one of the most fundamental and foundational aspects of what make us a COPLAC campus which is critical thinking, and if that means an extra semester, then that's just maintaining basic COPLAC status. She was delighted to have our Engineering students at the university and did not in any way, shape or form want to take away quality due to quantity.

The Provost pointed out that there was an irony in this history, and that is the reason that all majors at the institution were at 120 units is because of our COPLAC identity. We needed to stay at 120 because that's what liberal arts and sciences institutions do. She thought this is not about our COPLAC identity, this is about what is the best way for our Engineering program to move forward. She reminded the members that we are still in the final four years of our Graduation Initiative and there is considerable pressure to ensure that students do graduate in four years, not only because of what the Chancellor's Office says we have to do, but also because it's the right thing to do for our students to make sure that they can graduate in four years. As you weigh your decision, just keep that in mind that we are being called upon to make sure that students can graduate in four years.

The student rep said she agreed with the sense that Sonoma State is a very special place, but disagreed with a student having to add an extra year or add an extra semester. She’s a student that has to add an extra year, and she’s not happy about it.
She’s not happy about it because there was a lack of resources from the University itself to let her know what kind of classes she needed to take. Speaking to the Engineering students themselves, they feel the same way. Engineering is already a very, very rigorous major to have, but know that this is something that they talk about and can get them out in four years at Sonoma State.

A guest said she wanted to call attention to another piece of the Engineering proposal, and that is that this waiver will address a current inequity in the way that we treat transfer students coming to Sonoma State. For Engineering, as it stands, transfer Students must take extra coursework that our first time, first year Engineering students do not have to take. This then puts the transfer students at a disadvantage, and it also puts our Engineering program at a disadvantage in terms of recruiting students to their degree, so this this waiver will also remedy that inequity for transfer students.

First Reading completed.

Provost Report – K. Moranski

K. Moranski said she called upon the institution to think about how we can respond to the Asian violence and other Asian violence that’s occurring in our society today. We need to address that as a campus. As others have said, we don’t have an Asian Studies program in the same way that we have the other three areas of Ethnic Studies. She encouraged the faculty to think about ways that we can add Asian focused materials to our courses and develop courses that are focused on Asian populations. We can think about how we could advance Asian studies on our campus and she was happy to have those conversations as faculty think about curriculum.

Our last WASC visit was finalized between the past Senate meeting and this one. In the report that the site team issued, we were commended for our strategic planning and strategic budgeting so kudos to all of you who have focused on, believing in, manifesting and living those core values and strategic priorities. They reframed a recommendation around program review asking us to deepen our practice and to close the feedback loop so we’ll be continuing to work on those assessment issues as we move forward.

We now are officially an HSI. What happened is that the Department of Education releases a standard for the percentage of Pell eligible students and students from underrepresented minorities and Latinx students and we had no trouble meeting the percentage of Latinx students, but we have had trouble meeting the percentage of Pell eligible students. Last week, the Department of Ed notified us that we had met that threshold, and so we are now officially an HSI campus and are eligible for Title III, Title V grants. This is a huge milestone for this campus, so kudos to everyone who has recruited and supported our Latinx students and our Pell eligible students. Now we can apply for grants to support those populations and students.
In continuity planning a lot is happening right now. We've had faculty forums, student forums and are in the process of having staff forums related to repopulation for fall. That is what we're focusing on. The situation continues to change.

**Time certain reached.**

**Resolution on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters – Second Reading – S. Brannen**

The Chair commented about this item. In many ways, one of the things he sees is this resolution determines the future of where our Academic Senate goes and what our Academic Senate does. Obviously, and without any question whatsoever, the Academic Senate is the primary body responsible for deliberating on matters of curriculum and making those determinations. He wanted to frame the discussion by looking at the resolution and seeing that the first three resolve clauses are very broad and speak to what he saw as our values. The sixth resolved clause is describing to whom those values should be reported. Clause four and five, as well as the rationale, deal with very specific incidents or instances, which although they are important matters, are beyond what the Academic Senate has purview over with respect to our curricular matters and curricular deliberations. There has been a lot of discussion. There has been a lot of energy and enthusiasm and passion around this issue on our campus and everybody's going to disagree with everybody else at some point or the other. Everybody has invested a lot of time and thought and many people have different versions of the facts or different sets of facts from different sources as well as different interpretations. He wanted to acknowledge and value the time and effort and commitment that has been put into this issue. He was proud of this high level of engagement.

S. Brannen said, two weeks ago, it was reported that an agreement had been reached between the administration and the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice Studies, so he was hoping to remove resolved clauses four and five because he agreed with the Chair. Unfortunately, he now understood that the terms that had been agreed upon did not appear in the official written agreement that was offered by the administration, most notably, that the CCJS faculty member was not reinstated as CCJS internship coordinator. This is disappointing, disheartening, and highly concerning.

A member asked who the current CCJS internship coordinator was.

The Provost said she hoped the Senate could reach a couple of points of agreement as we move forward. One of those points of agreement is that our first priority is always to ensure that students are not harmed either by preventing them from graduating or putting barriers in the way of them graduating or by putting them into situations where health and safety concerns are present. Our other priority is that we, as a campus need to work on the way we do internships and we need to find better ways to do our internships. This is a campus wide discussion. It's not one department, it's not one school, it is a campus wide discussion. She hoped that, in the spirit of shared governance, where we talk together and agree on a path forward, that we can do that with internships. The third thing about the process.
Last time we met, we had hoped that we had agreed on a way to proceed in this particular situation that did move back to the department and give that department, the capability of assigning the internship coordination to the to the person who had had it previously. It is inaccurate to say that we did not agree to return that internship coordination to the department to assign it. We went back and forth, with attempts to formalize the agreement that does not appear to have worked and the Department has notified the Dean that she must continue to teach the course and will continue to be the internship coordinator. There are due process procedures in place there that are playing themselves out. There are grievance processes in place, we need to let those play out. Those are contractually guaranteed and are important processes of shared governance, and so we do need to let those processes play out. We need to think about how we move forward as a campus, that we think about how we serve our students well and that we think about how we do a better job with internships, as we move forward.

A guest from CCJS said he wanted to address the point mentioned by Provost Moranski. The safety, health and the well-being of the students were never an issue. It’s a fact that on February 2th, we did reach an agreement with the administration. We reached six agreements and Provost Moranski agreed to settle the dispute. He also met with the Dean and we were just waiting for the formal execution of the settlement agreement. Unfortunately, when the written agreement was sent to us by the administration, four of the terms that the Provost had the agreed upon were removed, and this includes the commitment that the Professor will be allowed to resume as internship coordinator, that there will be no more encroachment into curricular matters, that the standards for evaluation of the students in the Dean’s class right now will be made consistent with the curriculum of the CCJS Program. We’re in the middle of the semester and the students in the section being handled by the Dean don’t know what’s going on. They don’t have a course syllabus. They continually reach out to us for guidance, but we can’t because officially the Professor is not the internship coordinator. The Dean has appointed herself as internship coordinator, so we cannot officially help the students. We were ready to move forward with the settlement. We have the record of the six commitments made to us on February 24th and the Provost could verify that she did commit to all of this, but in March, they reneged on four of those six commitments. That’s why we needed to come back to the Academic Senate to raise this issue because this is not the first time this has happened. In fact, there’s a Senate resolution that was passed in 2012 dealing with a similar issue, so this is not first time that the Senate would make its sentiment known about academic encroachment into curricular matters. We have records of everything that went on during the settlement discussion.

A member asked for clarification on something that the Provost said. Why were the students not returned back to faculty in the CCJS department? Why are they still being coordinated by a Dean, and not a faculty member? They were offered to be returned to the faculty to supervise and yet they’re not being supervised by faculty.

The Provost said the course was offered to the department to run. There was an email agreement that, in fact, that would occur. There was a meeting between the department Chair and the faculty member and the Dean, to make that transition. The department turn down the written agreement there and then did not take the
course back. That leaves the students in limbo, so the Dean is now seeing those students through the rest of the Semester to ensure that there’s no further disruption to those student’s path to graduation and to completion of their requirements. We agreed to follow through on all the concerns that the department raised. We felt we had done that and had returned the four units to the department and the department didn't like the wording of the settlement agreement. This gets into to grievance issues at this point.

The student rep said the CCJS guest is saying that no students were in the middle of this and that's a complete lie. Students came to the Associated Students asking us about this, and why the internship program was cut. They were not given any reason, leaving only 12 students to be part of that group and leaving 28 students with the missed opportunity of having a class to meet the internship requirement. These students were left two weeks in limbo. Nothing was said to them, which is very disappointing. Please do not add students in. That is inappropriate. Our students should not be in the middle of the situation and saying that you can't help the students because they’re assigned to the Dean is also unacceptable knowing that students need help. Why are you all saying that you here for the students when you’re actually clearly showing something else, so please do not put us in the middle of this. Take us out of it and handle your own issues without putting us in the middle, but also making sure that you can hear our perspective and do not modify our wording.


The Chair pointed out that the agenda is packed. There are several constraints around the timing of items in the agenda. First, is that first readings are accorded 15 minutes, so that's why we have already a block of that. The time among all the other agenda items was equally distributed and that’s why they’re only 10 minutes per item. Every item is important so every item has an equal time on the agenda. Since this issue that we’re discussing in the previous business item is part of an ongoing grievance, then there are certain facts that are part of the grievance procedure and process that can't be made public. As a Senate, we can't have access to all of the facts and all of the statements. Finally, Senators have received from AFS that the Academic Freedom subcommittee determined on their own volition, that this was an encroachment into academic freedom, but he pointed out that this was not done under instruction of FSAC, which is the standing committee over the Academic Freedom Subcommittee, nor was it done under the request of the Senate itself but, nevertheless, that document is there for everyone to read and consider. (note: AFS does adjudicate academic freedom complaints. – LHK)

**By-Law Change for URTP membership – Second Reading – L. Krier**

L. Krier said after our discussion in the last two meetings of the Senate, she went back to URTP and FSAC and Structure and Functions to clarify the intentions that they had for their proposed changes and to edit the proposal to make their intentions a little more transparent and to take into consideration the concerns raised in our last meeting. In the packet on page 31, the changes are in red and there’s another strike through that’s bolder, so you can see them more clearly. What
we changed was that each member from the school is elected from the school and that the at-large member is elected by plurality of the vote. It should probably say elected *by and from* the school.

**Motion to amend:** from: one of each member will be elected from the school of arts and humanities, etc. and the remaining at-large member elected by plurality vote of the faculty to one of each member will be elected *by and from* the school of arts and humanities, etc. and the remaining at-large member elected by plurality vote of the faculty. Second.

(voting started and then, incorrectly, was interrupted with a question. This was out of order, but not stated at the meeting. The question concerned whether plurality was in the by-law change and it was determined that it had been changed from “majority” for the second reading. It was noted that faculty governance does not tell the Schools how to run their elections and that the motion being voted on did not include what the interrupting member was discussing. There was a re-vote.)

**Vote on amendment – Approved.**

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

**Return to discussion of resolution:**

A guest from CCJS wanted to address the issue that was raised earlier. By the way, what he had meant by the health and safety of the students was that, even when CCJS was running the internship, they were never at risk. The reason why we’re not able to advise the students for the internship is because our internship coordinator was removed by the Dean. If we act on it, that would be violating an order that was given to us by the Dean’s office. That was why we were preparing for the transition. We met on March 5th because the Provost and the Department had an agreement with six commitments. We met with our Dean and Professor Asencio was in that meeting. We already discussed what we were supposed to do with the class and bringing them up to the standards required by the curriculum. But, unfortunately, in March the terms that were agreed upon where changed. Four of the six items were removed by the University in the written version of the settlement agreement. That’s why it did not receive approval by the Department. We never changed anything. The University changed what was agreed upon. We were ready to move forward.
But what we were presented with was substantively different from what Provost agreed to with us on February 24th.

Time Certain reached.

AFS/PDS Joint Statement on Teaching Sensitive Materials – Second Reading – P. Lane

P. Lane said folks may recall from our last meeting that this is something that’s been going on for quite a long time. It is in response to something that students first wrote and asked for of the Senate, but that’s not necessarily where the committees have taken it. It is about making a statement that will be posted on the Senate web page the same way that committees are sometimes posting documents that help people understand what the work they do or what kinds of issues they address.

A guest said she is a Professor with PTSD. She came to support the students. There are studies on both sides, but usually those who oppose trigger warnings don’t have PTSD. There’s a reason why the 2021 standard for Native American Studies material is always couched in terms of content learning because PTSD is an absolutely devastating condition and it’s difficult when so many of our students show up with tears, checking out, with anxiety, dropping out, anger, depression, substance abuse and self-harm before they even get a diagnosis. Even when diagnosed people like her still sometimes get triggered if we’re not warned ahead of time about a film. What happens is the traumatic incident is repeated dozens and dozens of times for several days. It can be debilitating. We might even lose someone. She’s never had the intellectual content of her material in her courses suffer. It creates a safe environment to simply say, “hey the following material has violent imagery.” Please don’t prevent the compassionate exercise of authority as instructors.

A. Gehlawat said our joint statement from PDS and AFS is not trying to deprive anyone of any resources. To the contrary, what we are trying to do is provide useful resources to faculty so that they, in turn, can provide those useful resources to students. If you look at that statement, it provides avenues that faculty can pursue and can point their students towards, resources such as CAPS and DSS. We should trust the people that we have entrusted with exactly those kind of very difficult issues such as PTSD. Very strikingly, CAPS and DSS both had a chance to review this document and provide their input which was very useful. We were able to incorporate that into the document you see before you. Approving this document is not disallowing anyone from doing anything, it would be, in fact, allowing people to provide useful resources in the classroom.

A member said looking through the statement and having thought about it and hearing from our guest, the concern is that faculty are not trained appropriately and could provoke an improper response. That was the AAUP assessment when we went through trigger warnings before. It’s not that one opposes them, it’s that it is not appropriate for faculty to deal with those situations and that we defer to the experts. She felt strongly and passionately that that we defer to the experts. She’s had students who have had so many different psychological conditions, and she would not want to make them worse in some way, by doing the wrong thing, so this
The document provides us a pathway to do the right thing. It’s been vetted by DSS and by CAPS and she supported what CAPS and DSS tell her. We need to put ourselves aside and go with what the experts tell us which is that we can worsen some of these conditions if we’re not careful.

A member said we have an alarmingly low number of CAPS professionals on our campus for the number of students that we have. That’s a huge problem across the CSU. It’s an issue at the Statewide Senate, plenary after plenary, that the numbers we have for the number of students we have, students have to get an appointment. She has students that have not been able to get an appointment the entire semester. She didn’t think we can leave it up to the professionals, if the professionals are not available for our students.

The student rep said she was hoping to clarify what exactly DSS and CAPS are saying, because after speaking with Title IX, they’re actually hoping that faculty use trigger warnings because they have seen that a lot of students, more recently, leaving their classes, because faculty haven’t been understanding about their situations. She was hoping to get clarification on what exactly they said, and who, because it seems like there’s miscommunication going on from these departments.

A. Gehlawat responded that DSS and CAPS looked at our statement and they approved it precisely because CAPS and DSS find that they are the ones who can make the best assessments of students who may be experiencing trauma, to the point that it requires some kind of accommodation, and that’s the point we have to think about. If we don’t provide this kind of a resource to faculty, not only are we in a sense de facto dictating to faculty what they have to do, which puts them in a vulnerable position, but as CAPS and DSS noted faculty are happy to directing students to those resources. It’s unfortunate those resources are currently underfunded by the University, but that shouldn’t become a reason for making faculty the de facto providers for those resources.

Motion to Call the Question. Second. Approved.

Vote on Statement Regarding Teaching of Sensitive Materials – Approved.

Time certain reached.

Motion that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University endorse the EPC Statement on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters – postponed to this meeting.

Motion: that the time allotted for this item be given to the continued discussion of the previous item, the Senate Resolution on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters and postpone this specific business item - endorsing the EPC statement to the next meeting. Second. Approved.

Return to discussion of Resolution
The CFA rep said on behalf of CFA, we are deeply disheartened and deeply concerned that the commitments that were made with the Chair of our CCJS department and others involved in those negotiations have not been honored. The commitments made during those discussions was an agreement to negotiate in good faith and she was hearing that that did not happen. She thought we could be setting a very dangerous precedent where there continues to be administrative encroachment on curricular matters. She’s sincerely hoping this is not a pattern as we have other negotiations coming up, certainly the one on repopulating the campus for fall 2021. She wanted want to be on the record saying it is disheartening and it is deeply concerning that the agreements that were achieved in the negotiations upon were not honored in full as they should have been.

A member said she didn’t know what it's like to be a Dean. She knew that if faculty have trouble with a Dean and if you want to work with a Dean, they have to want to work with the faculty. She didn’t think the Senate could fully understand the details because this is both a legal matter and grievance. What we can know is that having a new Dean in tough times could see decisions that have resulted in a painful mess and probably wrong set of decisions. But Deans get paid a lot of money and they're in charge of things and we work for them, and if they just tell us what to do without consultation, without working with us, without setting up committees to try and figure out what to do with the money, without calling together all the chairs to perhaps figure out how they could lead the new program and how to deal with internships, that’s a problem. She fully support the resolution because this cannot be how we deal with whatever the problem actually is, whether it's about money or load or who was promised what. It cannot be that someone who is in charge of a school can do this. They cannot just take the course and or fix the problem, even if that seemed like the most expedient way.

Time certain reached.


K. Altaker said thank you to the Senators for taking the time to review our proposal from the last meeting. Theresa Nguyen and Megan McIntyre from our SDS Task Force who created this document, worked on some revisions, based on the feedback we received since the last time.

T. Nguyen said she wanted to bring to the Senator’s attention the top of the document. Specifically, we outline methods for asynchronous use for this document, as well as synchronous workshop use. We provided the contact information of the task force members who can coordinate guidance on how to use this document effectively and how we can be involved in co-facilitating a synchronous workshop. We solicited feedback from the Library and the Faculty Fellow for anti-racist curricular design Sharon Fuller and their contributions informed our revisions of the technology module and the assignments and grading module, so we also wanted to bring your attention to those sections. We also note that the version presented at the first reading was also reflective of feedback from student reps to SDS, the Advising
Center and the Hub as well as others in campus leadership. We’re currently in communication with Academic Programs.

M. McIntyre said thank you to those of you who reached out to us and offered feedback. She wanted to say a special thank you to Dr Fuller who spent time with us and gave us immensely helpful feedback. We believe the document is better than it was.

The Chair said thank you on behalf of the entire Senate, and the entire faculty for all of your work on this. His graduate education prepared him to be a Spanish Professor and did not teach him anything about how to make a good inclusive syllabus or how to convey that information, and this is hugely beneficial, useful and necessary.

Vote on Endorsing the Syllabus Checklist for Diversity/Inclusivity – Approved.

Return to discussion about resolution:

A member said he fully support the assertion of faculty rights, as expressed in resolve clauses 1, 2 and 3. However, he had a lot of problem with clauses four or five the way it's worded, particularly with language like “retaliatory” and “condemning.” The problem is he couldn’t independently verify any of that information and he’s hearing some nuance disagreement about what’s been going on in the grievance process. It would be irresponsible on his part, and also go against his sense of fair play to include those two resolve clauses.

Motion to remove resolved clauses four and five. Second. Approved.

A member said he wanted to point out that now that CFA is involved in this, and rightly so, and there’s an ongoing grievance, he didn’t don’t see that that prevents the Senate from expressing its policy positions on this issue. He strongly supported voting on the resolution.

Time Certain reached.

From APARC: Letter regarding Syllabus Policy and Syllabus Policy revision –E. Virmani - Second Reading

E. Virmani said today we’re wanting to ask for your support for the proposal that the language of the syllabus policy be revised so that it requires all faculty to provide syllabi in a format that’s accessible to all students with the content built into the learning management system, so the ask is a revision of the syllabus policy so that we can also be in alignment with what has been requested at the CSU level in terms of ensuring accessibility for students.

The Chair said there has been some discussion around this item in the past about issues relating to cases where faculty members might not either want to or be able to upload the content into the LMS on their own. He called the Senators attention to the policy revision language. The way that it's worded requires that the syllabus is
to be uploaded to the LMS, but it does not explicitly state that that a faculty member shall do so. Any faculty member that wishes to request or coerce or trade donuts for somebody else uploading it to the LMS, would be okay, according to the proposed policy.

**Vote on syllabus policy revision – Current Policy:** C. Syllabi shall be provided in a format that is accessible to all students. It is recommended that faculty use the Accessible Syllabus Template. If the accessible syllabus template is not used, faculty members should consult with the Disability Services for Student office to ensure their syllabus is accessible. **Change to Policy:** C. Syllabi shall be provided in a format that is accessible to all students with the content built into the university learning management system. **Approved.**

**Return to resolution discussion.**

A. Gehlawat said on behalf of AFS, he endorsed that the Senate can act on its own even as the administration is dealing with this issue regarding CCJS and the complaint. Specifically, if the administration is not proceeding in good faith and this also leads him to CFA President Sims’ wise words of caution, which he thought bear careful attention from all Senators. We don't want to see a precedent set here where faculty rights are disregarded, and this is precisely why AFS has been asked by CCJS to get involved here, and if you take a look at our statement addressing precisely this case and some of you may have even been involved with that in 2012. ([http://senate.sonoma.edu/resolutions/call-respect-faculty-authority-over-curricular-matters](http://senate.sonoma.edu/resolutions/call-respect-faculty-authority-over-curricular-matters)) If we don't address these problems, they come up again and no one should be surprised if and when they do. It’s appalling that this was already addressed by the Senate in the 2012 resolution, that the administration should not be encroaching on faculty rights and yet here we are again in 2021 addressing the same issue. This needs to be addressed decisively.

A member said she wanted to circle back to our VP of Associated Students and agreed with her call that we are here to assist our students and we shouldn't put them in the middle of this contentious situation and until it is solved she hoped a positive solution will be found to assist these students and help them towards graduation. We've already heard the technical reasons why CCJS is not able to do that, so her question now to Provost Moranski is what can be done? She could not imagine that there’s no way to solve it, with at least as a temporary solution until we do have a permanent solution.

The Provost responded the temporary solution is to continue with Dean Carlton supervising the students through to the end of the semester. That prevents the students from being yanked back and forth between instructors. We want to make sure that the students have a consistent path to completing their requirement and to finishing their degree in a timely fashion, so those 28 students will be seen through to completion and will be completing that course.

The Vice Chair pointed out that we have passed a resolution on something very similar to this in the past and that makes it clear that passing a resolution does not
resolve or address these kinds of issues. Things can't really be resolved by the Senate passing a resolution, they have to be resolved through people figuring out how to work effectively together. Whether or not we pass this resolution today, that doesn't actually have very much of an impact at all on how people work together. (The Senate Analyst posted to the chat, that passing resolutions creates a pattern that can be used as evidence for further action in the future.)

**Motion to extend the meeting to 5:00. Second. Approved.**

The guest from CCJS said we did not come to the Senate hoping that the problem will be resolved. What we want is an affirmation of the values that we have as an institution. We don't expect that the problem will go away with the simple issue of a resolution. We came to the Senators to ask you - where do you stand on this issue. We need to communicate where we stand on a certain issue, so that it serves as guidance for all faculty and for all students on what our values are as an institution.

A student guest said wanted to speak on a student's behalf about the CCJS internship program and everything that has happened. Personally, with her internship program, it is a two semester long internship program. She's actually currently running the entire nonprofit by herself. She is now a paid employee with her internship. She finished her hours and honestly it's one of these best experiences she's ever had despite everything that has happened. She spoke to many, many students and they said this was one of the most stressful times. Not being able to graduate was huge. All the time that she had put into Sonoma - she had been on numerous executive boards, she had helped out the school, she had been a tour guide for three years. She loves Sonoma State, but everything that's happened was very, very stressful. She would go to her mom crying because she might not be able to graduate, she didn’t know what’s going to happen. She had so many calls and so many texts from people very concerned. Then someone came up to me and she told me, I was going to be able to graduate and there would be a solution to everything and honestly, that was probably the most relieving news. She has a job lined up. A week after graduation, she will no longer be in the State of California. If it wasn’t for this internship program she didn’t know if that would have been possible. She hoped there’s a good resolution for the students, because this semester was so incredibly stressful and everything that has happened, has been a big headache, to say the least.

**Motion to add a fourth resolved clause:** We pass this resolution to reaffirm our values as a Senate. Second. Approved.

A member said to the students who have spoken today, we regret the trauma that has occurred in your lives because of this. But there's some policy issues at stake here that are very important, and he asked the students to try to understand. We are discussing some very important principles here that concern the entire university and the whole concept of a university and he hoped they will bear with us as we sort this out.

The student rep asked was there any violation in the Deans contract or was there some place where it states that she could not do this. The Provost responded that the
actions taken are consistent with the contract. It’s one of those things that is so
difficult. When issues arise that put faculty and administration into conflict, the
issue that she thought was the most important was that we make sure that students
are taken care of. That’s where it started and that’s where it should end. We will let
the processes play out but that’s one of the values that is so important here.

The guest from CCJS said he wanted to give a direct answer to the question made by
the student. The University policy on curricular matters, the university policy and
Faculty Bill of Rights, the university policy on Professional Responsibility, the CSU
policy on course designations, all of those were violated by the Dean of the School of
Social Sciences.

A member said could there have been an option to open up another course section?
We did have these 28 students who are unable to graduate. We will have budget
constraints. Every department got cuts 10, 15, 20% WTUs over the course of this year.
Knowing that there was a bottleneck, why weren’t additional seats allocated?

The guest from CCJS said he prepared the scheduled for spring in September. He
told the Dean that the department was expecting that more than 40 students would
need the internship class to graduate. We thought we would get enough resources
for the internships, but she cut it by half, knowing full well that we had 40 plus
students. That’s why those 40 students were not propagated into one section.

Motion to Call the Question. Second. Approved.

Vote on Resolution on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters –
Approved.

Resolution on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters

RESOLVED: That the Sonoma State University (SSU) Academic Senate commits to
protecting the academic standards of all academic programs at Sonoma State
University and to ensuring that all academic policies and procedures are observed
by all parties, and therefore be it;

RESOLVED: That the SSU Academic Senate recognizes the right and duty of faculty
to determine curricula, methods of teaching, appropriate class size, and

RESOLVED: That the SSU Academic Senate opposes all acts of administrative
encroachment into curricular matters, and therefore be it;

RESOLVED: that we pass this resolution to reaffirm our values as a Senate.

RESOLVED: That this resolution be distributed to the SSU President, Interim
Provost and Associate Vice Provost, all School Deans, Department Chairs, Program
Directors, RTP Chairs, the ASCSU Chair, the CFA Statewide President, and the CFA
SSU Chapter President.
EPC Report – E. Asencio, submitted via email

EPC approved a memo today from Ethnic Studies faculty in support of Academic Programs suggestion to provide temporary tags for ten existing Ethnic Studies courses as area F in order for SSU to be in compliance with the legal part of AB1460. These temp tags will last through the end of AY 2023 to give campus the time to establish the best way for our campus community to work out the implementation of area F while still being in compliance with the legality of it. Campus forums on AB1460 will start happening in April so look for those dates to be announced to faculty soon. These forums will provide an opportunity for the campus community to weigh in on how SSU implements AB1460 curricular requirements.

Good of the Order

S. Brannen noted that Saied Rahimi said he was very pleased to see Norouz recognized on the SSU website banner. J. Griffin-Desta said that is part of our continued commitment to routinely acknowledge culture and expression and identity throughout the year from now on, particularly through our website. The Chair said it’s also a pleasure to acknowledge at the national stage that Deb Haaland has been named as the Secretary of the Interior, the first Native person to hold a cabinet level appointment and first Native person to be in charge of the Department of the Interior.

Adjourned.
February 18, 2021

From: Educational Policies Committee, Sonoma State University (approved unanimously)
To: Academic Senate, Interim Provost Karen Moranski, President Judy Sakaki
Re: Administrative Encroachment Into Curricular Matters

In EPC’s capacity as the faculty governance committee responsible for “the curriculum and academic standards of the University," we are committed to ensuring the academic policies and procedures set forth through shared governance are adhered to by all parties. The CCJS Department presented the included statement below regarding a recent incident to EPC, in which the Social Sciences Dean (Dean Troi Carleton) violated long established policies and procedures related to making changes in curriculum when she appointed herself as the CCJS Department’s Internship Coordinator, created a new section of a major core required course, and appointed herself as the instructor of this new course.

In addition, Dean Carleton indicated to CCJS that she would change the CS code of this course section unilaterally without regard for any of SSU’s established policies and procedures for curricular changes. EPC views the CS code associated with an approved course as fixed unless changed through the usual course revision processes. An administrative change to a set CS code is a violation of shared curricular approval processes. Even with a code of CS 36, the new section of the course is being offered with an enrollment that far exceeds the enrollment the CCJS Department sees as suitably corresponding to workload and pedagogical standards.

Dean Carleton has enrolled students in her new section of the course she created despite not being qualified by the department to teach a CCJS course. She is not adhering to the academic requirements or CS code for the course, which were approved through the required curricular policies and procedures when the course was originally established over ten years ago. EPC has grave concern about the actions of Dean Carleton as they not only infringe upon faculty’s right to establish curriculum and to set and maintain academic standards, but they also violate the very premise of shared governance by indicating administration can make unilateral decisions about curriculum.

EPC stands with the CCJS Department, and urges the Academic Senate to stand up against this egregious overstep into curricular matters, and protect faculty’s purview over curriculum. EPC also calls upon SSU Administration to reverse Dean Carleton’s actions and to reaffirm President Sakaki’s commitment to shared governance and faculty purview over curriculum.
STATEMENT ON ADMINISTRATIVE ENCROACHMENT INTO CURRICULAR MATTERS

Faculty of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice Studies
February 18, 2021

On February 5, 2021, Dean Carleton removed Dr. Emily Asencio as Internship Coordinator of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice Studies (CCJS) because of her refusal to accept additional students in CCJS 499 (Internship) over the enrollment cap. Without the consent of the CCJS Department, Dean Carleton –

1. appointed herself as CCJS Internship Coordinator,

2. opened an additional section of CCJS 499 (Class Number 4419) with her as class instructor, and

3. changed the CS code of CCJS 499 from the CS36 to CS78 to circumvent the enrollment cap under CSU and SSU policies.

Since then, Dean Carleton has approved internship applications and allowed students to enroll in CCJS 499 without considering whether the proposed internships meet the standards set by CCJS for internship placements. Students were also told that “projects” would be allowed as substitute for an actual internship required under the CCJS B.A. curriculum.

We are deeply concerned by Dean Carleton's actions. They violate several CSU and SSU policies and the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). More importantly, they constitute an unprecedented and egregious encroachment into curricular matters. Among others:

- Appointing herself as CCJS Internship Coordinator and a CCJS 499 class instructor encroaches on faculty's control over curricular matters given that she (1) is not a CCJS faculty member, (2) has not been deemed qualified to teach CCJS 499, and (3) has not been selected by the CCJS faculty to serve as CCJS Internship Coordinator.

- Unilaterally changing the CS code of CCJS 499 from CS36 to CS78 violates the well-established process for changing course classification at SSU and infringes on the university's policy of shared governance. CCJS 499 has always been classified as a CS36 course in the CCJS curriculum; a CS78-classified CCJS 499 does not exist. Administrators do not have the authority to unilaterally change CS codes.
• Disregarding course requirements and evaluation criteria in CCJS 499, which were developed by the CCJS faculty in more than 2 decades of offering the course, infringes on the faculty's right to determine the appropriate methods of teaching and grading and to set academic standards.

• Removing Dr. Emily Asencio as CCJS Internship Coordinator for adhering to CSU and SSU policies on enrollment cap for a CS36 classified course constitutes an act of reprisal under Article 10.33 of the CBA, especially since the issue is the subject of a pending statutory grievance against Dean Carleton and Sonoma State University (CFA Case No. 2020-331 and CSU Case No. R03-2020-361).

We, the undersigned CCJS faculty, stand behind our colleague, Dr. Emily Asencio. We condemn in the strongest terms this unprecedented and egregious encroachment into curricular matters.

We ask President Sakaki to show leadership and reverse Dean Carleton’s actions.

We urge the Academic Senate to exercise its duty to protect faculty’s right to determine curricula, methods of teaching, appropriate class size, and academic standards.

We call upon all SSU faculty and academic departments to share their voice on this important issue and protect the integrity of our academic programs by signing the linked Statement of Support.

This is not just a CCJS issue. Dean Carleton’s actions set a bad precedent for all faculty and academic departments at SSU. We must not allow them to stand.

Signed:

Emily K. Asencio   Christopher Hansen   Napoleon C. Reyes
Bryan Burton       Caitlin Kelly Henry  Eric Sinrod
Robert Faux        Michael Hooper       Anastasia Tosouni
Diana Grant        Patrick Jackson      Judith Volkart
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Outline</th>
<th>Suggested Outline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preamble</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preamble</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definitions</strong></td>
<td><strong>I. Definitions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Procedures</strong></td>
<td><strong>II. Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Dissemination of Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>A. General:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. RTP Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)</td>
<td>B. Teaching Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. RTP Evaluation Document</td>
<td>C. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>D. Service to the University and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Evaluation Procedures: Reappointment</td>
<td>E. Department Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Evaluation Procedures: Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>F. Eligibility for Tenure &amp; Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Levels and Sequence of RTP Review</td>
<td><strong>III. Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Communication of Action Taken</td>
<td>A. Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Candidate’s Right to Respond and Opportunity to Confer</td>
<td>B. Committee Membership and Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Reports and Recommendations</td>
<td>C. WPAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Appeals and Grievances</td>
<td>D. Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured and Probationary Faculty</strong></td>
<td>E. Levels of Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Department Criteria</td>
<td><strong>IV. Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Criteria and Methods for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness</td>
<td>A. Personnel recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship, Research, and Creative Achievement</td>
<td>B. Record of Action Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Criteria for Evaluating Service to Both the University and Community</td>
<td>C. Candidate’s Right to Respond and Opportunity to Confer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calendar</strong></td>
<td><strong>E. President</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline Summary</strong></td>
<td>F. The President’s Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Section</td>
<td>Draft Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preamble</td>
<td>Preamble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>I. Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>II. Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.1, 3</td>
<td>A. General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.1</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.2</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B</td>
<td>B. Teaching Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.1</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.1, 2, 3</td>
<td>C. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.D.1</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1</td>
<td>E. Department Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.4</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.6</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.D.1</td>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.D.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.D.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>F. Eligibility for Tenure &amp; Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.G.1.a</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.G.1.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.G.1.b</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.G.2.a, b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.G.3.a</td>
<td>B. Committee Membership and Eligibility</td>
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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).

**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**
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
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.

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.

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.

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.
(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.


      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.
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:

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.
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.
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
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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.

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.

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.

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

https://policies.sonoma.edu/policies/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion-procedures-criteria-and-standards-tenured-and
• **Candidate** – Faculty member applying for reappointment or promotion.

• **CBA** – Collective Bargaining Agreement, Unit 3, between the Trustees of the California State University and the California Faculty Association

• **Day** – A calendar day. The time in which an act provided in this policy is to be done is computed by excluding the first day and including the last day, unless the last day is a holiday or other day on which the campus in not regularly open for business, and then it is also excluded. (cf. CBA 2.11)

• **First Probationary Year at SSU** – The first 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.

   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 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, 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probationary Year</th>
<th>Evaluation Level</th>
<th>Levels of Review</th>
<th>Date of Presidential Notification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year at SSU</td>
<td>Periodic Evaluation</td>
<td>Department &amp; Dean</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd PY/2nd @ SSU</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd, 5th</td>
<td>Periodic Evaluation</td>
<td>Department, School and Dean</td>
<td>No later than June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th, 6th, tenure &amp; promotion</td>
<td>Performance Review</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>No later than June 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
March 16th 2021

To the Sonoma State Academic Senate,

The Dept of Geography, Environment, and Planning are nominating Lisa Dunwoody for a Posthumous Bachelor’s Degree in Environmental Studies, with a study plan in Conservation and Restoration.

This is, perhaps, an unusual request as Ms. Dunwoody was a student in the ENSP dept. from Fall 2000 until Fall 2003. In the Fall of 2003 she needed to take an incomplete in the four remaining required internship units she needed to graduate. Unfortunately, Ms. Dunwoody was unable to complete her internship and subsequent financial and health issues precluded later completion. Ms. Dunwoody passed away unexpectedly in 2019. Her husband is hoping to fulfill her wish of obtaining her Bachelor’s degree.

- Ms. Dunwoody was a transfer student to SSU, entering with 76 transfer credits.
- She completed 63 units in residence at SSU of which 57 were GPA units.
- Twenty-nine units were completed within ENSP and an additional 24 were in required electives from Biology.
- Her SSU GPA was 3.5 and she made Dean’s List several times.

It is distressing that the conferral of a degree was something that could not be achieved during Ms. Dunwoody’s life. Today, a student in this situation would be provided with alternate options to achieve graduation if they were unable to complete an internship due to health reasons.

The Geography, Environment, and Planning Dept. respectfully requests that the Academic Senate consider Ms. Dunwoody for a Posthumous Bachelor’s degree.

Sincerely,
The Faculty of the Dept. of Geography, Environment, and Planning

Michelle Goman (Chair)
Jeff Baldwin
Matt Clark
Kevin Fang
Jose Hernandez Ayala
Reyna Laney
Daniel Soto
Laura Watt
To: Members of the SSU Academic Senate

From: Megan McIntyre, Chair GE Subcommittee and Emily Vieira Asencio, Chair EPC

Date: March 9, 2021

Subject: Engineering A3 waiver request

The members of the General Education Subcommittee and Education Policies Committee overwhelmingly support the attached GE A3 waiver request from the Department of Engineering Science. This waiver allows students in Engineering to advance toward degree completion at a reasonable pace while still receiving the benefits of SSU’s general education experience. As Engineering persuasively argues in their attached rationale, the engineering design process (a significant component of Engineering’s coursework) involves complex critical thinking and “provide[s] an applied, problem-solving approach to developing the necessary critical-thinking skills and reasoning techniques” (p. 2). This waiver will also provide equity for transfer students (who currently request individual A3 waiver exceptions) by automatically granting an A3 admissions waiver to all incoming transfer students. This waiver will allow the engineering department to maintain a degree program of 120 units that also remains congruent with ABET accreditation requirements and GE requirements, including the GE learning outcomes of the SSU GE program.

We ask that the SSU Academic Senate add their support to this waiver request so that it may be sent to the CSU Chancellor’s Office for consideration.
Department of Engineering
Proposal for Adapting Engineering to the New GE Program:
Requesting A3 GE Admissions Waiver Allowing Engineering Students to
Meet A3 Through Completion of the Major

Objective
The objective of this request is to propose that the general education subarea A3 (critical thinking) requirements are satisfied by core courses within the EE program at Sonoma State University under the semester system. This request grants an A3 admissions waiver to incoming transfer students and permits SSU engineering students to meet the A3 requirement through completion of the program.

Background
In January 2013, the California State Board of Trustees approved amendments to Title 5, instituting a maximum of 120 semester units for baccalaureate degrees (AA 2013 02) 1 with exemptions for the degrees of Bachelor of Architecture, Bachelor of Landscape Architecture, Bachelor of Fine Arts, and Bachelor of Music. As part of the implementation of the approved Title 5 Section 40508, the following guidelines were provided:

“Campuses with programs requiring from 121 to 129 units (181 to 192) and unable to reduce counts to the maximum number of units shall submit requests for the chancellor’s exception to each program’s established unit maximum.”

At that time, the SSU campus (without input from the engineering department) instead asked the Engineering Department to reduce the engineering program from 128 units to 120 units; causing a significant change to the program.

In the same year, the majority of the exception requests made by different engineering departments within the CSU were granted. Since SSU campus never requested an exception, the resulting EE program at SSU has one of the lowest total-unit-requirements for graduation and the highest percentage of GE course requirements. For example, at SJSU the engineering curriculum offers 69 engineering units compared to 54 engineering units at SSU. On the other hand, the engineering program at SFSU is a 129-unit program. This has significantly placed our graduates at a disadvantage with other engineering programs in the area.

In 2016, the Chancellor’s Office confirmed that many engineering programs across the CSU have received general education exceptions. Consequently, of the 16 campuses in the CSU system that had accredited engineering programs, 11 campuses initially requested and were granted exemptions for the GE critical thinking requirement. In these cases, the critical thinking requirement was always satisfied by the major core courses in the respective programs.

---

1 Implementation of Trustees Title 5 Changes to Baccalaureate Degrees AA-2013-02
Over the last two years the list of campuses where critical thinking requirement is satisfied through A3 waiver has grown to 17 campuses:
https://www2.calstate.edu/attend/student-services/casper/Pages/high-unit-majors.aspx.

**Justification and Rational to Waive GE.A3**

We understand that the engineering programs do not provide the same formal instruction on the theory of critical thinking as current SSU A3 courses do. However, as demonstrated across the CSU system, engineering programs provide an applied, problem-solving approach to developing the necessary critical-thinking skills and reasoning techniques to satisfy the critical thinking general education requirement for CSU graduates.

For example, the engineering students learn to identify and analyze arguments through evaluating information, evidence, conclusions, language, reasoning, logic, and/or problem solving by Presenting and Justifying a Problem and Solution Requirements in EE 492. In this course the students are expected to clearly establish a “cost” matrix to analyze their purchasing decisions, choice of parts and components, and the design approach. These endeavors offer students opportunities to understand issues beyond engineering in ways that allow them to gain a deeper grasp of the impact of their work on the society and their community.

In addition, throughout the engineering curricula, students learn, discuss, and evaluate the role of engineering in society and nature (as explained below). The “learn-by-doing” pedagogy of Engineering@SSU allows students to directly apply their critical thinking skills to real-world problems, ultimately leading to students gaining a better understanding of their individual roles and responsibilities in society.

Regarding general education (GE) subarea A3: critical thinking for the CSU system Executive order 1100 states: ²

“In critical thinking (subarea A3) courses, students will understand logic and its relation to language; elementary inductive and deductive processes, including an understanding of the formal and informal fallacies of language and thoughts; and the ability to distinguish matters of fact from issues of judgement or opinion. In A3 courses, students will develop the ability to analyze, criticize and advocate ideas; to reason inductively and deductively; and to reach well-support factual or judgmental conclusion”

As outlined in the EO 1100, GE student learning outcomes (GE SLO) are constructed to fit within the framework of the Liberal Education and American Promise (LEAP) campaign, which is an initiative put forth by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). The AAC&U defines critical thinking as “a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.”³ The AAC&U has broken down the critical thinking process into the following rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.</th>
<th>Explanation of issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Evidences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Influence of context and assumption, student’s position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Student’s position/Thesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² https://policy.csuci.edu/sp/15/eo-1100.pdf
³ https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/critical-thinking
V. Conclusion and related outcomes (implications and consequences).

The engineering design process, which is an integrated part of many EE courses, is a series of steps that guides students/engineers in the solution of complex problems, parallels the AAC&U process. This critical thinking process is also required by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) from all engineering programs. The SSU engineering program has applied for ABET accreditation and is expecting approval in December of 2021 (or January of 2022).

In our engineering program at SSU, every engineering student is required to learn about the design process in various EE courses, including EE 221/L, EE 231/J, EE 310/L, EE 492 and EE 493. The engineering design process is an iterative methodology where improvements are made along the way as the students learn from failure. In such processes, the students are encouraged to follow the steps of the design/development/test/verification to strengthen their understanding of open-ended design, and it emphasizes creativity and practicality. The design process in our two-semester Senior Design Project (EE 492 and EE 493), as shown below, clearly demonstrates the 5-step evaluation process in which each project goes through.4

Figure 1: Evaluation process of the two-semester Senior Design Project at Sonoma State University in the Electrical Engineering Program.

As shown in the figure above, our EE design evaluation process is outlined into the following activities:

- Presenting and Justifying a Problem and Solution Requirements
- Generating and Defending an Original Solution
- Constructing and Testing a Prototype
- Evaluation, Reflection, and Recommendations
- Documenting and Presenting the Project

Therefore, we strongly believe that in addition to our engineering design process at SSU, formally implemented in EE 492 and EE 493, the learning objectives required to satisfy our student learning outcomes for subarea A3 are fully achieved through EE 492 and EE 493 (the two-semester senior design project course). As shown in Table 2, the SSU GE SLOs for the senior design project and AAC&U’s critical thinking rubrics map well with the engineering design process.

**Table 2. Mapping of the engineering design process @ SSU in EE 492 and EE 493 to the critical thinking and SSU general education outcomes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSU A3 Content Area Criteria</th>
<th>Critical Thinking (AAC&amp;U)</th>
<th>Engineering Design Process in the Engineering@SSU Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Students will learn to identify and analyze arguments through evaluating information, evidence, conclusions, language, reasoning, logic, and/or problem solving.</td>
<td>Explanation of issues</td>
<td>Presenting and Justifying a Problem and Solution Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Students will engage in and apply inductive and deductive reasoning in multiple contexts.</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Generating and Defending an Original Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Students will make a decision: develop and defend arguments through evidence-based premises and conclusions, and develop their own arguments in relationship to counter-arguments.</td>
<td>Influence of Context and Assumption</td>
<td>Constructing and Testing a Prototype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student’s position/Thesis</td>
<td>Evaluation, Reflection, and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion &amp; Related Outcome</td>
<td>Documenting and Presenting the Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of Student Learning Outcomes of General Education Subarea A3 and Major Courses in EE Program**

The development and use of critical thinking skills are embedded in the Electrical Engineering B.S. program at SSU is not just limited to the Senior Design Project course. In fact, throughout the engineering design curriculum, in addition to engineering principles and theories, other design courses, including EE 221/L, EE 231/J, EE 310/L, teach students how to:

1) identify, analyze and understand issues and their complexity;
2) explore ideas and develop conceptual models for uncertainty and practicality analyses;
3) formulate and optimize solutions;
4) assess and prioritize solutions with socio-economic factors and environment impacts included in final design;
5) effectively communicate the solution logic and outcomes to technical and non-technical communities. Critical thinking is the foundation of EE design courses.

Appendix A maps (as partially shown in Table 3, below) the GE subarea A3 learning outcomes to the appropriate EE courses in the Electrical Engineering Program. This appendix demonstrates the efforts of

---

5 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gChVGN2o04GFO9tuHhx_UPd66DJ3vYXh/view
the EE@SSU curriculum to develop and expand students’ critical thinking ability, and to meet the GE critical thinking requirements.
Table 3. Mapping of the engineering design process @ SSU in various engineering courses as met for ABET accreditation and the SSU critical thinking general education outcomes (Levels: I=Introductory, M=Medium, D=Developed). See appendix A for more details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes (Identify all required for accreditation, certification, or licensure)</th>
<th>Lower-Division Major Core</th>
<th>Upper-Division Major Core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 1: An ability to identify, formulate, and solve complex engineering problems by applying principles of engineering, science, and mathematics.</td>
<td>I I I I D D D D M M M M M M M</td>
<td>D D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 2: An ability to apply engineering design to produce solutions that meet specified needs with consideration of public health, safety, and welfare.</td>
<td>I I</td>
<td>M D D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 3: An ability to communicate effectively with a professional and nonprofessional audience.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D D D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 4: An ability to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgments, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions on global, economic, environmental, and social aspects.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D D D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 5: An ability to function effectively on a team whose members together provide leadership, create a collaborative and inclusive environment.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 6: An ability to develop and conduct appropriate experimental and computational investigations, analyze and interpret data, and draw engineering judgment to draw conclusions.</td>
<td>I I I D M M M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 7: An ability to acquire and apply new knowledge as needed, using appropriate learning strategies.</td>
<td>I I I D M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Outcomes

| Design creative solutions to electrical engineering problems. | I I I I D M M | |
| Demonstrate professional ethics. | I | D M |
| Connect to their community and contribute to society. | I | D M D |
| Value lifelong learning and self-improvement as demonstrated by taking part in professional development opportunities. | | M M D |
| Lead and build teams. | | M M D |

SSU GE Area A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Area A</th>
<th>GE Area A1 - Oral Communication 3 units</th>
<th>GE Area A2 - Written Communication 3 units</th>
<th>GE Area A3 - Critical Thinking 3 units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below, we elaborate how some of the EE courses in Appendix A map into the content area criteria and SSU GE learning outcomes for area A3.⁶

SSU GE A3 Content Area Criteria:

1: Students will learn to identify and analyze arguments through evaluating information, evidence, conclusions, language, reasoning, logic, and/or problem solving.

In EE 231/L and EE 310/L, as well as EE 492 & EE 493, students are required to formulate a conclusion based upon scientific experiments and/or analytical reasoning. For the open-ended design problems assigned in class, students must evaluate the feasibility of their proposed solutions based on their accumulated knowledge and experiences in the EE discipline as well as the considerations of socio-economic and environmental impacts. There are essential activities

⁶ https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gChVGNN2o04GFO9tuHhx_UPd66Dj3vYXh/view
involving iterative design and reassessment review that promote critical thinking. In EE 310/L, students must design experiments to investigate and develop a “cost” matrix in order to select a particular electronic component. The cost matrix allows the students to design every aspect of their work based on sound evidence and reasoning.

**#2: Students will engage in and apply inductive and deductive reasoning in multiple contexts.**

In both EE 221/L and EE 310/L, students practice sound engineering principles and creativity techniques on open-ended design projects. Extensive dissections are used to allow students to gain a better understanding of the complexity of engineering design and to explore alternatives for better design. These endeavors offer students opportunities to understand issues beyond engineering in ways that allow them to gain a deeper grasp of the impact of their decisions on society.

**#3: Students will make a decision: develop and defend arguments through evidence-based premises and conclusions, and develop their own arguments in relationship to counter arguments.**

In EE 310/L, students develop the ability to design and implement an experimental program to address open-ended electronic questions, interpret the experiment data, and select the most optimum approach for a specific design.

**#1, #2, &# 3: Meaningful Writing Component**

Throughout the B.S. in Electrical Engineering Program, students are required to submit lab reports and project reports. Students are provided with timely feedback on these reports with critiques on the soundness of their drawn conclusions and the writing style. Aside from the aforementioned courses, EE 497 (required by all engineering students) has been identified as a writing-intensive course and is a substitute for the WEPT.⁷

---

⁷ https://web.sonoma.edu/writingcenter/wic/
SSU GE A3 Required Learning Outcomes:
Below, we elaborate how we the EE curriculum meets the GE.A3 Learning Outcomes.\(^8\)

**#1: SSU A3 GELO: Argument- Advance cogent and ethical arguments in a variety of genres with rigor and critical inquiry**

In both EE 221/L and EE 310/L, EE students are required to formulate questions by gathering diverse types of information. For example, in EE 310/L, students must design experiments to investigate and develop a “cost” matrix in order to select a particular electronic component for their project. The cost matrix allows the students to design every aspect of their design based on sound evidence and reasoning. In addition, as part of the ABET accreditation process our engineering program is required to ensure its EE students fully understand and review engineering ethics, a system of moral principles that apply to the practice of engineering. Through various discussions, lectures, and exercises, the engineering ethics examines and sets the obligations by engineers to society, to their clients, and to the profession.

ABET (the engineering accreditation body) requires that in various courses, engineering students are lectured and reminded that the services provided by engineers require honesty, impartiality, fairness, and equity, and must be dedicated to the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare. For example, students in EE 220/L and 310/L are given one individual and one group exercises to discuss a case study and elaborate on ethical issues involved in the case study. A popular example is reviewing the Volkswagen Emissions Scandal in 2018.

**#2: SSU A3 GELO: Information Literacy- Iteratively formulate questions for research by gathering diverse types of information; identifying gaps, correlations, and contradictions; and using sources ethically toward a creative, informed synthesis of ideas.**

Almost in every engineering course requiring a project, including EE 231/L and EE 310/L, as well as EE 492 & EE 493, EE students are asked to conduct a literature review summarizing the knowledge of the field of study, relevant to the project. Through the literature review students are expected to evaluate what has been done, what still needs to be done and why all of this is important to the subject.

Depending on the course the literature review may stand alone as an individual document in which the history of the topic is reported and then analyzed for trends, controversial issues, and what still needs to be studied. In EE 310/L the review could just be a few pages. On the other hand in EE 492/493 the review is expected to be quite extensive with long bibliographies for in-depth reviews.

\(^8\) [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gChVGN2o04GFO9tuHhx_UPd66Di3vYXh/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gChVGN2o04GFO9tuHhx_UPd66Di3vYXh/view)
In Summary:

- The Chancellor’s Office has recommended that engineering programs consider GE exemptions in order to ensure program unit cap goals (120 units per semester).
- Over the past several years the Electrical Engineering program at SSU has eliminated 8 semester units from its curriculum.
- A3 Content Area Criteria and required GELOs are met within the B.S. programs in the Electrical Engineering program at SSU.
- Without the A3 waiver, EE transfer (particularly local transfer) students will have to meet A3 before they transfer to SSU. This can severely place our program in disadvantage compared to other 17 CSU engineering programs not requiring A3 in order to accept transfer students.
- Through this A3 exception, coupled with allowing the EE department to have, and students to utilize, two met-in-major courses in different GE distribution areas, we can ensure that the number of units in the EE program is limited to 120 units, while maintaining the spirit of the SSU GE program and the integrity and competitiveness of the engineering degree.
- 17 campuses with accredited engineering programs have received exemptions to GE area A3: Critical Thinking.
- This A3 admissions waiver that allows engineering students to meet the A3 requirement through completion of the major will have no negative impacts on FTESs for departments offering A3 courses because currently EE students are taking an EE course to satisfy the Critical Thinking requirements.