Academic Senate Agenda

December 9, 2021
3:00 - 5:00PM
Via Zoom

Happy Holidays!

Fall Meetings of the Senate

8/26
9/9
9/23
10/7
10/21
11/4
12/9

First Meeting of Spring 22
February 3rd

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

Information Items: From FSAC: Summary of faculty survey, Guide to Department RTP criteria

Special Report - Elsiver’s Price hike - M. Weggmann TC 3:05

Business:

1. From FSAC: Department Chair Policy - Second Reading - R. Whitkus TC 3:30

2. Department Name Change Procedure - First Reading - J. Lillig TC 3:45

3. From EPC and GSS: Stacked Course Policy - Second Reading - E. Asencio TC 4:00

4. From EPC and GSS: Course Validation Policy - Second - E. Asencio TC 4:00

5. From APARC: By-Law Change: Update to APARC Charge - First Reading - E. Acosta Lewis TC 4:30

6. From SAC: Revision to the Cheating and Plagiarism policy - Second Reading - K. Thompson TC 4:45

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

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

Good of the Order
Abstract


Proxies: Laura Monje-Paulson for Wm Gregory Sawyer, Steven Winter for Rick Luttmann, Megan Burke for Emily Acosta Lewis

Absent: Richard Senghas and Wendy Ostroff (at ASCSU plenary), Judy Sakaki

Guests: Maureen Loughran, Martha Byrne, Johanna Edmunds, Catherine Nelson, Liz Burch, Melinda Milligan, Dawnelle Ricciardi, Kari Manwiller, Aidan Humrich, Jerlena Griffin-Desta, Christine Shoptaugh, Diana Grant, Leigh McTaggart, Sadie Pettit, Derek Girman, Damien Wilson, Hollis Robbins, Jenn Lillig, Martha Shott, Murali Pillai, Theresa Stone, Ajay Gehlawat, Damien Hansen, Jonathan Smith, Katie Musick, Lynn Prime, Matthew Paolucci, Megan McIntyre, Lisel Murdock-Perriera, Napoleon Reyes, Robert McNamara, Stacey Bosick, Brigitte Lahme, Aja La Duke, Kim Purdy, Laura Alamillo, Christine Cali, Carol Keig

Approval of Agenda - Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 10/21/21 - Approved.
Chair Report - L. Morimoto

(The Chair provided her report after the meeting due to the long agenda.)

Congratulations to the School of Education. SSU, CSU East Bay, and San Diego State have been awarded a $5.9 million grant to develop literacy labs. PI Dr. Ed Lyon, Dr. Kelly Estrada, and Dr. Rhianna Casesa will be representing SSU on the grant.

Graduation Initiative Group (GIG)
GIG budget. Typically, the cabinet establishes it and GIG adopts. This year, the GIG was not comfortable approving budget, and instead will provide feedback on the 2021-2022 GIG budget and try to figure out how to involve the GIG in budget decisions. GIG priorities & 3 taskforces: Improve communication, esp. for students, e.g., naming conventions; Sense of belonging; New student experience

Spring 2022 Scheduling Guidelines
CFA and Chancellor’s Office (CO) met and conferred re: Sp22 schedule. No MOU, but guidelines such as scheduling 70% of our courses face-to-face can be enacted.

Staff have been directed to return to campus the first week of January.

Course Material Availability
Vice Chair Bryan Burton and AS Executive VP Christina Gomez are working together to find a way to improve accessibility to course materials.

Vice Chair Burton is in communication with the campus bookstore manager.

Coffee in the Afternoon
Thanks to Interim VP of A&F Stan Nosek and Assoc. VP of A&R Neil Markley who have arranged for coffee and pastries to be purchased a la carte in The Kitchens from 2-5 pm to meet faculty, staff, and student requests. Insufficient work force continues to limit what can be opened on campus.

Center for Community Engagement
The Provost’s Office will take on supporting faculty in setting up internships, particularly with new policy requirements around risk management. To try and address faculty concerns, the Chair and Provost will host a join Chat on 9 Nov. 21, 2-3 pm, about developing a protocol for instigating change that impacts faculty

President Report - K. Moranski for J. Sakaki

K. Moranski said President Sakaki regrets that she's unable to attend today's meeting. She is attending her first in person meeting as a new WASC Commissioner
today. The President is proud of two recent campus recognitions. The Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities has announced an inaugural group of institutions called Fulbright HSI leaders, and these are institutions that have inspired international education and have worked closely with Fulbright to ensure that our Latinx students have opportunities for international education. There are 35 institutions and 16 Masters institutions in that group and we are one of them. We are still trying to find out the process by which this inaugural group was identified, but we have a close relationship with Fulbright thanks to our Fulbright Language Tutoring group that Michaela Grobbel and the Modern Languages department has been running for some years. We bring students from France and Germany and other countries to be language instructors in our language classes, and we are really proud to be one of that inaugural group of Fulbright HSI leaders. In addition, we have just been informed of our inclusion in the Campaign for College Opportunities 2021 Equity Champions for Excellence in Transfer for Latinx students. We are one of have a number of CSUs that were that were honored with this 2021 Award and we’re very proud of our work with transfer students. We still have the number one spot in the CSU in terms of two year transfer rates. We are very, very proud of our work with transfer students and getting them through graduation in a two year timeframe.

In other news, the search committee for the Vice President of Student Affairs is being convened. The Chair of that search is Dr. Jerlena Griffin-Desta. In addition, we also have a search process for the Vice President for Administration and Finance and that search is proceeding and we have a very dedicated committee that has just completing its first round Zoom interviews and we are in the process of scheduling interviews for our finalists now. We hope to have those finalist interviews take place before Thanksgiving. That is the report from the President.

Provost Report - K. Moranski

K. Moranski said we have a new final report for GI 2025. That GI 2025 report is significantly different from the preliminary report that came out, so we'll make sure that new one is posted and goes out to people. It indicates that we are doing very well on our GI 2025 targets. We have green indicator lights for our equity gaps, in fact, Sonoma State has the lowest equity gap for underrepresented minorities of any of the CSUs this year. We are doing a great job on that equity gap and anticipate reaching our target of zero. She wanted to give Kat Atwood a round of applause because she recognized that something was wrong with the numbers that had been submitted for the preliminary report and she did some digging on her own to find out what was wrong and to correct the report. We are grateful for that initiative and for her keeping close tabs on our GI 2025 numbers.
We have made a hire in the search for the Interim Associate Vice President for Faculty Success. Matthew Paolucci-Callahan is our new interim AVP. He took off running this week after the announcement. We are very pleased to welcome him. He's a Professor of Psychology and is working hard to begin to enact his responsibilities. He is part time this fall, so please keep that in mind, as you bombard him with all the things you’ve been waiting for this position to do. The primary difference between the Faculty Success position and the AVP of Faculty Affairs position is that the Faculty Success position will not do as much with Labor Relations. There will be some collaborative problem solving, listening, conflict resolution, and helping faculty address problems, but this position is intended to support our faculty going through RTP, faculty who are doing hiring processes and faculty development in general. If there are contractual, Labor Relations issues, Jeff Banks as the senior VP for University Personnel is the person to talk to and M. Paolucci-Callahan will be referring people with those kinds of contractual issues to Jeff Banks. M. Paolucci-Callahan will begin full time in January and he has agreed to work part time for us right now.

M. Paolucci Callahan said he would be doing an open forum on Monday. If faculty cannot attend, it's okay. He is going to have slides prepared that will lay out some of the essential stuff that he wants to convey to the faculty, and that will be available to everybody. He will also have his cover letter, which lays out his vision for the position. He can schedule a second open forum before the semester ends.

Time certain reached.

CFA Report - E. J. Sims

E. J. Sims said our purpose today is to deliver a petition to President Sakaki and as we heard she's not here today, so we will deliver it to Karen Moranski as her designee. The petition was emailed to President Sakaki today. 300 people have signed the petition on the Action Network telling President Sakaki to urge Chancellor Castro to settle a fair contract now. The petition has also been signed by 7500 participants statewide. In the petition, we call on Presidents Sakaki to voice her support for Sonoma State faculty by calling on Chancellor Castro to settle a fair contract with CFA. By doing so, you acknowledge the efforts and sacrifice that we have made, and continue to make to keep Sonoma State afloat. You acknowledge our training and planning to move student instruction and support services online. You acknowledge our care in helping students manage their learning, their fears, anxieties, and trauma. We all know that when one hurts, we all hurt. All of us are watching as inflation rises to 5.4% and our salaries are stagnant. Our lecturers are barely surviving, living paycheck to paycheck and working several jobs. Our students,
many of whom are living on the edge, must wait several weeks to see a mental health counselor. Where do you want us to spend our energies due to the impasse at the bargaining table? We are currently expanding our energies and planning for a strike. Will you Presidents Sakaki use your influence to help settle this contract, so we can address the budgetary problems we face together at Sonoma State? President Sakaki, it’s your responsibility to speak up for Sonoma State’s community. You know the diligent and dedicated work our faculty perform to keep student learning and graduating. The CSU proposed a meager, one time 2% raise to faculty. That is not enough even to keep up with the inflation. We need you, President Sakaki to add your voice to ours in our quest for fairness and justice. We are asking, can you can we count on you, Presidents Sakaki, to urge Chancellor Castro to settle a fair contract now? You will also find the 300 signatures from our faculty, counselors, coaches, Librarians and the local community as well as members of the central Labor Council and other concerned Sonoma State community members. Karen Moranski, we have delivered the petition to you as President Sakaki’s designee.

Thank you to the 300 people who have signed this petition and we urge you President Sakaki to urge Chancellor Castro to settle a fair contract now.

K. Moranski said thank you Senator Sims. She accepted the petition on behalf of President Sakaki. She has the petition and K. Moranski said she would make sure that that she knows that the President has it and received it shortly before the meeting today. She will communicate to her the numbers of faculty in attendance and the feelings and support that accompany it. E. J. Sims said thank you for that.

Time certain reached.

From FSAC: Department Chair Policy - First Reading - R. Whitkus

R. Whitkus said this new policy is in your Senate packet. There are three parts of it. The first part is a transmittal letter that was sent from FSAC to the Executive Committee to give some background and rationale to the policy. The policy was first drafted last spring.

There are three main points that were thought to be needed to be included - clarity for Chairs and Deans and the Provost about SSU practices and traditions regarding chairs; to support Chairs in understanding their roles and responsibilities, especially new chairs; add transparency to the process by which chairs are recommended, appointed, and replaced, which was something we didn’t have clarity about on this campus.
The policy is based on three parts in Collective Bargaining Agreement and includes information from two policies - The Lecturers in Departmental Governance and the Faculty Consultation and University Decision Making policy. After some initial editing and at the May 6th meeting, it was presented to the Academic Senate and at that time, it was considered to not be on ready yet for prime time and was sent back to FSAC. At the same time FSAC requested input from Senators or their constituents in terms of any input that they would like to see included in the policy. We received input from about 26 members of the Senate or their constituents and included that in the substantial editing which was taken on this fall. It was then sent out again to Department Chairs and we received feedback on the updated policy from 7 chairs, and their input was also included. At the end of the policies section, there is a question and answer document which arose from some of the input that we received during Ex Com. Hopefully, if you had chance to read those comments, maybe some of the questions that Senators would have will be answered in the FAQs.

The Chair said if Senators have word smithing, please send them directly to Senator Whitkus so he can address them. Unless it substantially changes the meaning of what is being said, if we could focus on the content of the policy rather than the word smithing that would be fantastic.

Suggestions and Comments:

Appreciation expressed for the policy. Two suggestions - term limits on Chair terms and an informal and constructive evaluation of the current Chair before that Chair election.

Making sure that chairs are held accountable for what they're supposed to do in their work with faculty and students and administration. Some kind of an evaluative component, especially if it's anonymous because it's challenging for people who have less power than the Chair to be able to talk to the Chair and tell them the problems that they're having with the Chairs behavior or things the Chair is not doing. It's particularly hard for women, minorities, and junior faculty.

Would like to see a required training component for new Chairs that they have to go to. It helps avoid some of the mistakes that can really be a problem for students, in particular, but also faculty hiring issues.

Would also like to see the vote percentage of getting rid of a chair as a simple majority.
Where it says to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, etc., does that mean that the Department Chair cannot simultaneously serve as Faculty Associate Dean? Correct.

At the very beginning and in the definitions, it says all references to the university President should be understood to read the University President or designee. The footnote says currently, this responsibility is given to the School Dean. Does that mean currently the designee is always the School Dean, or does it mean currently everything that says the President is really the Dean. R. Whitkus said this is only pertinent to the policy. Currently the President’s designee is the School Dean on this campus because it is still up to the President to make a final decision as to whether that stays there or not. A suggestion for the policy to say "currently the designation is always the Dean."

There's a reference to 10 business days to remove a Department Chair and then it says to appoint a new Chair in part V, do the 10 days include the appointment of the replacement chair? R. Whitkus said it’s not clarified, one way or the other, it's open.

What happens if a department removed in 10 days and then had no chair?

R. Whitkus said based on policy, the department would have either an interim chair or the Dean steps in and appoints a chair. That is one thing to consider when a department is going to do this - what they will have to do in terms of that interim point where there will not have a chair. It is up to departments to make that decision and, therefore, while they're deciding if they're going to remove a chair, they need to think about the implications it has on the department and to be proactive, rather than to have someone come in, like a Dean, and appoint a chair for them.

It says the Department shall forward its recommendation to the University President no later than the last instruction week of the fall semester in the third year term of the current chair. Does that mean in the third year of the current chairs term? R. Whitkus said that's correct.

Somewhere in the policy it emphasizes that chairs should be consultative and collaborative with their faculty, is that in the policy? R. Whitkus said it should be. C. 1. says faculty are encouraged to be collegial with full participation of all faculty members and department in the spirit of shared governance. The Chair is a member of the faculty, so that would include the Chair.

Regarding 5.2, the recommendations for Department Chair are done no later than the last week of instruction, etc., in this version the phrase about training and
mentoring opportunities that preceded that text was dropped and she was wondering why that was done. R. Whitkus said we dropped it into a footnote. The reason why we dropped it as a footnote is because it isn't policy, it is a recommendation. If Senators would look at the question and answer section, we did address number of these question in the questions and answers. Specifically, in terms of things such as term limits and the evaluation process. We provided a substantial response to those which were given to us at the Executive Committee.

Return to Questions for the Provost

A guest said she was wondering when the Provost talked about these data for GI 2025, and that we have the lowest in terms of the equity gaps, how is that measured and what can we take from that, what does that actually mean?

The Provost said the equity gap is measured in terms of six year graduation rates. It’s measuring the graduation rate of our whole population of students against our population of students from underrepresented groups. Those groups, as the GI 2025 folks define them are Latinx students, Black and African American students and Native American students. It does not include Asian students for good or ill and there are various arguments that say that that lack of inclusion is a problem, but that’s the way that’s done. When they’re measuring the gap, it’s the gap between the graduation rate of our White students against the graduation rate of our students from those three groups and the lower the gap, the better we are. The guest said presumably the difference is between the gap between White and Asian students. The Provost said correct.

The Chair of SAC said the Provost was saying that the preliminary report we got at the last meeting was inaccurate. Does she need to go back and tell her committee? The Provost said she believed that SAC should know. They are significantly different because there was a block of graduations that were not counted in the report that the Graduation Initiative folks at the Chancellor’s Office used to create the preliminary report. There was always some difference between the preliminary report and the final report, but this year, because that batch of graduations was not in the system at the time that the preliminary report was done, our report is significantly different. It did make a significant difference in terms of the two year transfer, the four year transfer and the four year graduation rates.

Will the Faculty Success position become a permanent position going forward and what is the advantage of having this new position over the old position? The Provost said she didn’t know yet about a permanent position. She is still working on finding the permanent funding for that position. What the position does is pay more
attention to faculty success, to being a support to faculty. This is the aspect of the former AVP of Faculty Affairs job that she was not able to do because she spent so much of her time on the Labor Relations pieces. The advantage of having this position in place is that faculty get more attention for the particular aspects of their work that our faculty related, no one else on campus does RTP. It provides additional support to faculty.

Time certain reached.

From EPC and GSS: Stacked Course Policy - E. Asencio and D. Girman

E. Asencio said EPC sent these policies around to our schools before our first reading, and we did get some feedback primarily from Social Sciences and that feedback was presented to D. Girman and GSS incorporated it. EPC approve this policy unanimously after the second reading.

D. Girman said this is a policy that's been a long time coming. Back in the fall of 2019, a number of our faculty from our Graduate programs argued that because Title V requires only 50% of graduate degree course be a 500 level or higher course, that about half of our graduate programs rely on some undergraduate coursework to allow fulfillment of the Master’s degree. Faculty, on behalf of their students, inquired as to how we could generate a version of a course as we've outlined in this policy. At other universities, where this is done, they're called co-located courses, cross level courses, cross listed courses, double numbered, dual listed, paired and stacked. We've chosen stacked for Sonoma State University. These courses would allow, particularly for those classes that can only be run when graduates and undergraduates are combined together to get enough students. They can allow graduate level components in that course to allow the graduate students participating in that course to get a graduate level experience and also graduate level credit towards their degree.

We initiated the policy in the Graduate Studies subcommittee and eventually had a first reading by early March of 2020 and by the next meeting, we were talking about nothing but the pandemic. We are finally coming with the proposal and it's gone through the various levels of review. At the Executive Committee last week, they asked for additional rationale and the series of frequently asked questions with answers that those have been added Senators to review. Hopefully, we've addressed some of the questions.

Questions and comments
A member wanted to point it out that a department without a graduate program can develop a stacked course and he was glad to see that. D. Girman said graduate students in one department are taking undergraduate courses in other departments already and counting them towards their degree, so there would be no reason why they couldn't create a stacked course.

A member said she wondered, if in the end, this will have a negative result on what courses are being offered at the graduate level and if it will ultimately cause there to be less courses offered at the graduate level. She also had concern about the difference in the discussion in the class. While the assignments can change and there is difference in syllabi, if the class counts as two different courses, she worried that the discussion itself in class at the graduate level could be impacted. It is supposed to be a more advanced level and a more advanced discussion. D. Girman said this is one of the things that we discussed quite a bit in GSS. One of the things that we've made sure is going to happen is these stacked courses are going to be developed by faculty in that program and reviewed by that department or the department which it is housed. It's also going to be reviewed by the School Curriculum Committee and it's also going to be reviewed by the collection of Graduate coordinators or Graduate faculty. At GSS all of us worried about exactly what you just expressed. For this kind of stacked format at each level they will ask - is it meeting the requirements of the true graduate level experience? Our hope is that, because each of these courses has to go through this very detailed review process that that those concerns will be evaluated as part of the process for every single course.

What about the workload for having two syllabi in one class? D. Girman said this is an expectation of developing these courses. GSS was not concerned about that, but other faculty might be concerned about it if you are forced to develop or teach one of these courses, but we did not address the workload component.

The Provost said on that issue, faculty who are teaching graduate programs and are teaching graduate students in 400 level classes currently are already dealing with this issue. This is an expectation of WASC, so sometimes that gets missed and that we're not always compliant. It's a best practice when undergraduates and graduates are commingled in the same learning situation, whether it's a stacked course or a 400 level class that has graduate students. Separate assignments and separate expectations for those two populations are a requirement, they are a standard for WASC. She just want to point out that that that differentiation is required by our accreditor.

First Reading completed.
K. Moranski noted that the Chair asked her to speak about the Center for Community Engagement (CCE). As many of you may know, part of what precipitated the concern about whether support continues in the Center for Community Engagement is that the Director, Merith Weisman, is on leave. Leaves are confidential processes that we are not at liberty to discuss. Only Human Resources handles leaves, that is their work. Leaves are not at the behest of appropriate administrators, they are not at the behest of the Provost, they're handled by Human Resources at University Personnel. The appropriate administrator for the Center for Community Engagement is Jerlena Griffin-Desta and Dr. Griffin-Desta is maintaining daily supervision of the activities of the Center. She is supervising the two employees in M. Weisman’s absence and is ensuring that the work that is done for diversity, equity, and inclusion continues in that unit. Since the move of the CCE to the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, there has been a dotted line to the AVP for Academic Programs, Stacey Bosick who meets regularly with the Director and is continuing service to supervise the work that is academically related.

A lot of the work done in the Center for Community Engagement is work to foster service learning, work to foster community engagement in classroom classes, work to foster internships and that work is continuing. We have faculty fellows and Missy Garvin is the lead faculty fellow in the Center for Community Engagement. M. Garvin is taking on answering questions that faculty may have about the support in the Center for Community Engagement, but the Provost did want to stress that there should be no change in service. Faculty should not notice because that work is being picked up and handled and the work to foster service learning continues. If faculty find that service is not at the standard to which you are accustomed, they should let the Provost know on the faculty side and let Dr. Griffin-Desta know on the diversity, equity, and inclusion side, and we will take care of it. We have a tool, beginning in the Center for Community Engagement called SSU Engage and that is a risk management tool, it is also the communication tool between faculty, students, and administrator and community partners. That tool was rolled out during COVID, which is why some faculty don’t know about it. We are continuing to roll out that tool and she will be providing some further information to departments and getting some information from departments about internship sites, so that we can complete those risk assessment processes. Why the CCE reports to the President’s office now was that in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd, following the anti-racism protests and the huge explosion of racial justice initiatives, the then Provost Vollendorf put out a call to action. As Dr. Griffin-Desta began to respond to the calls for action around racial justice, the Community Engagement piece of Community Engagement was seen as critical to those equity and inclusion initiatives. Dr. Griffin-Desta always knew that faculty and academic initiatives happening in the
Center for Community Engagement needed to be maintained by Academic Affairs, and hence the dotted line. The Provost emphasized that services should not diminish and if they do, tell her and she will fix it.

Time certain reached.

From EPC and GSS: Course Validation Policy - First Reading - E. Asencio and D. Girman

E. Asencio said from EPC’s perspective, similar with to the Stacked Course policy, this policy came through EPC for our first reading and was circulated around to the schools. EPC reps had minimal feedback and again primarily from Social Sciences, that was relayed to D. Girman and then addressed. In the second reading, this policy passed unanimously through EPC.

D. Girman said this is an update of an existing policy. For graduate degrees, there is an expiration date on course work. Title V says that there needs to be an expiration decided by the campus between five and seven years. Our campuses decided that courses that students have taken more than seven years ago no longer count towards the degree. However, there’s a provision that allows a course to be revalidated or invalidated by examination and the Faculty examiner based on special circumstances. Campus authority has the authority to grant that. Our policy exists on the course validation form, so unfortunately students or their advisors have to already know about this policy and know that this is an option that can be done. One of the things that we’d like to do is to put this policy in the catalog where there’ll be greater equity in terms of being able to access and know about this option to validate courses. Then the second part is to come more in line with our sister CSU campuses. At the moment revalidation is entirely at the discretion of the Associate Vice President of Academic Programs and to be more in line, we decided to put a limit on how much of the coursework could be revalidated. Most of the CSUs use the one third of course work. The most restrictive is Northridge that only allow six units to be revalidated. Some campuses have left it entirely at the discretion of the VP. We’re adding to the policy the restriction that one third of the total coursework can be revalidated instead of an entire degree. We chose that because some degrees are 30 units and other degrees are as much as 42 units, so we wanted there to be just a one third.

Questions and comments

Is it one third of the coursework or one third of all total units for the degree? D. Girman said only those courses that are actually being used for the degree is what we're counting.
The form changes the process, so are we also discussing that the process is changing slightly? D. Girman said the process remains similar. The form already exists and the form also already requires that the Faculty examiner explain how the examination was done and verifies that they passed. It’s also signed by the Graduate coordinator and it’s also finally signed by the VP of Academic Programs. We are explicitly saying that now, in the policy, since we never actually said that before. It was just on the form.

Do we think that the one third is what we want to do? Do we feel that that is an appropriate maximum number of credits for someone to be able to count from earlier. Why a third? Are we potentially penalizing someone who wants to come back and has done maybe half and wants to have that half count? These are larger questions. D. Girman said GSS discussed that the one third is probably the most common among all the other CSU that have this these limits. We’ve seen nine units, we’ve seen six units, we’ve seen leaving it entirely up to the campus authority, so that there wasn’t actually a limit, but that the campus authority would likely limit themselves. One of the issues we’ve had is that students can take a long time. The longest time to degree in graduate degrees is 33 years that we know of. We’re trying to put this in place to incentivize students to complete their degrees in seven years. We’ve gone to the maximum that Title V allows us to give them. On top of that we’re giving them a little bit extra opportunity for those that maybe were in special circumstances and couldn’t quite do it within the seven years. But we really are trying to encourage our students graduate in nearly seven years for their two year degree.

There may be extreme or unusual circumstances. The member had one last year, where the one third would have limited the student's ability to come back. Is there is a way for them in extreme or unusual circumstances for the faculty members to advocate for the student? There other ways that they have maintained their currency and they can increase their currency to facilitate their graduation, and that is a faculty decision. She was talking against the one-third limitation.

D. Girman said the spirit of the Title V is that even the “one third” should be under special circumstances. It’s not just the student can take seven years and then we will reevaluate. They should already be in that space of having a compelling sort of waiver issue going on in that case. But the other thing is that one of the ways that the course can be validated is through professional practice. It’s the Faculty examiner who determines whether this is valid or not.

In ED leadership we often have students that have finished their certificate and then they go get a job and become a principal and then that has kept them from coming
back and returning and we've had to do several revalidations. In those cases, she didn't want to penalize them for going out into the field and doing the work so if there is any way to leave that more open, she would argue for that.

First Reading completed.

Associated Students Report - K. Shipton for C. Gomez

K. Shipton reported that Christina said at the last AS Senate meeting, we discussed the IRA Vote No resolution. This resolution states, the Associated Students of SSU ask all voting members of the Student Advisory Committee to cast a no vote on any recommendation of funding to an IRA program that has not explicitly met all the criteria established to be an IRA Program. It goes on to say that any application that is not filled out correctly will result in a vote of no. Students want to be clear that this funding comes from a student fee and approval of the program cannot happen when the guidelines are not followed.

Christina was able to do a first reading on a resolution about accessibility to course materials. Hopefully, by our next meeting, she'll be able to tell you about its passage. In the meantime, please remember that course materials need to be accessible and the video captioning should be on. She mentioned that as peak advising is on the horizon students have some requests from advising with faculty. Students who have the most positive experience with advising say that it is helpful to look at their ARR with their faculty advisor to ensure requirements are being met.

Question: Is there a track record or evidence that shows that IRA applications have been getting approved that don't fulfill the requirements and rules? The Chair said she was going to add that she didn't have the quantitative numbers, but she sat on the IRA committee and yes, there are number of badly conceived proposals or filled out proposals and usually if they've historically gotten funding, it's just been renewed. This is an attempt by AS to ask people to read the directions and fill the form out: how they expect it would serve students, how many students they expect that to serve. It's those questions that have been problematic and then also they've added on to the application a question about Department chair or Dean approval because a few chairs and Deans have mentioned they were completely surprised when IRA funds came through and had no idea it was happening.

From SAC: Revision to the Cheating and Plagiarism Policy - First Reading - K. Thompson
K. Thompson said that SAC has been working on this revision to the Cheating and Plagiarism policy. The edits are generally minor. We have updated web links that have changed over the last several years since the last policy revision was done. We updated the Executive Order that is relevant to the policy. We updated the name of the form that’s used by faculty to work on informal resolutions of cheating and plagiarism cases that was actually changed last year. We did changes to make the language gender neutral. We fixed some typos and we added a couple of other examples of proof of cheating/plagiarism to section to C.

The Senate Analyst said from the perspective of the Dispute Resolution Board, we also looked at this and approved it.

Questions and comments

A member said he was a little confused - repeated instance of plagiarism is proof of cheating. How does that work? Are you saying that if people have been accused of plagiarizing before, we should be more likely to believe they cheated this time?

K. Thompson said the Committee was really concerned that faculty sometimes penalize students for plagiarism when students really don't even understand what plagiarism is. They wanted to make sure that there was something in the policy that highlighted this idea. Maybe the first instance of plagiarism is an educational moment where you teach the student what they should have done right or make sure that you included the right information in your syllabus so they understand what plagiarism is. If students keep doing it after you've trained them or have given them good information that is, one piece of evidence that you could use that students are really committed to plagiarizing and not just ignorantly plagiarizing.

The member asked if when you say “keep doing it,” do you mean keep being accused of doing it? Because they haven't really done it until they go through this whole procedure, and then they been found guilty. Until then they're just a series of accusations. How would you use this to prove someone cheated, this time?

K. Thompson said she was trying to explain the complicated conversation we had in SAC about this, and remember this is a list of things that could be proof of cheating and plagiarism.
The Chair of the DRB said having reviewed the policy, she wanted to speak to the Senator’s the concern. Frequently in the DRB, we receive an initial accusation of plagiarism and we review the case. We determined that it is plagiarism and then we have a second case against the same student. Perhaps some of the language in that policy comes from the fact that very frequently, we are looking at a case where there has been proven case of plagiarism and now we’re looking at a second case against the same student, determining whether that is plagiarism or not. That is something that happens very commonly in the DRB.

It was noted that grammatical singular and plural instances need to be reviewed for consistency.

First Reading completed.

**Vice Chair Report - B. Burton**

B. Burton said some faculty members were concerned about the Bookstore’s email. Neil Markley told him that type of email was auto generated and won’t happen in the future. He also asked out of curiosity if the bookstore is does price matching with Amazon, and the answer was yes, as long as it's through Amazon. He also asked if the profits go back to university and the response he got was yes. Some funds go back to clubs and organizations and also capital projects, including the Wine Spectator Learning Center. One of the things we suggested to the bookstore in terms of encouraging faculty to submit stuff besides ADA and accessibility, is that this money goes back to university. We can say in it’s in house. Not many faculty know this.

He has been working with Structure and Functions revising the by-laws of the Academic Senate. We've also been working with ERFSA to work on some of the updates for them and with some time release items. We’re all making good progress on trying to improve some internal communications. He has been working with the Staff Council to keep on trying to improve that internal communication which will prevent confusion and help us to be able to do what we want to do. We want to do exciting things and with less conflict.

**Vice President of Administration and Finance Report - S. Nosek**

S. Nosek said we met as a feedback group this morning beginning our conversations on planning for the 22-23 budget year. We also talked about the upcoming forum on November 15th and we will be discussing it that form - how we will manage the
budget deficit for this year? And then later in the spring forum will be talking about 22-23.

We have set up a group to look at Marina Crossing, to see if Marina Crossing has met its goals. It was first purchased a number of years ago. We will have an initial report before the end of the year to look at how we’re doing, if it is meeting the goals and what should we do going forward.

The Vice Chair said after the meeting this morning, how do we get a budget that will be sustainable for university, so we can do the work we need to do? S. Nosek said that is the big question. We need to increase our enrollment. In the interim, we have to find a way to reduce our expenses. The "when" is going to depend upon our ability to further market the campus, identify areas out of the state and the West Coast that we believe students would love to come to a campus like ours, which is very unique and very exceptional in so many ways. We have to get out there more and get the word out. It will be several years for us to get our enrollment to the point where we will have a clearly balanced budget. Growing to 10,000 students, which is still part of our goal and that’s what our campus facility itself is built for, should bring us then to the next level.

A member asked is Marina Crossing our apartment building in Petaluma and is it making money, are the rents competitive, how many faculty, staff, and admins live there? What's the status of the land north of campus? Is there any progress on trading that land for the land adjacent to campus? S. Nosek said we had a bid on that land and that sale went through. At the last minute they decided not to purchase that property, so that property is still for sale. We’ve talked to local real estate agents and builders about trading that land, trying to get land closer to the campus. There have been discussions about it, but they have not borne fruit. Money from the sale of that land would go back into the corporation, to SSE, to provide more services for the campus. Marina crossing is the Petaluma apartments. In June, we were at about 47% occupancy and since then we've gone to 97% occupancy. There’s one apartment available now. That being said, only a little over 27.5% are associated with the university. The rents over the last 18 months have been reduced, so that helped increase that occupancy. Reducing the rents means we’re barely breaking even. We need to take a step back and ask ourselves about the original intent of that purchase. What can we do to reach that goal? The group is discussing that now. He was anticipating that during the spring semester, the campus will have a discussion and the President and the Cabinet will look at it as well as the Senate.

A member asked how we’re doing with vaccine compliance with faculty and staff. S. Nosek said he didn’t have those updated numbers. The Provost said we had a report
at the Deans Council this morning and the student rate was at 94%. The faculty and staff rates are lower, because some of the unions are not yet required to come into compliance until later in the semester. The updated numbers on faculty and staff will be on the website tomorrow. https://covid19.sonoma.edu/general-information-0/covid-dashboard.

Posted in the chat: I heard that a 21% increase in enrollment would only yield us $2 million. With an almost $12 million anticipated deficit, enrollment would help, but it seems like we need to look at some other areas. S. Nosek said a 100% increase in enrollment will get us near or back to what our target figure is - the 8500 - and that will generate well over $8 million. There’s about $5500 in tuition that we get with every new enrollee. We get $8500 per target FTES from the Chancellor’s office, but every new student, we get about $5500 just in tuition. There are also other fees and that would help support other parts of the campus. The Provost said to clarify, the $2 million discussed was if we had the same yield rate on 20,000 applications that we had last year on 16,000 applications, which was higher than normal, that would equal the additional $2 million.

S. Nosek said the best news of the day is our women’s soccer team just beat San Francisco State about 10 minutes ago to win the League championship. Our women student athletes are terrific, so now we go to the playoffs. The Chair said that’s great news and a Kinesiology major is the Assistant Coach, and we have to always brag about them.

Lecturer’s Report - W. St. John, C. Torres

W. St. John said we want to give a brief update about the issues that we’re thinking about and goals that we’re working towards in the hopes of starting some conversations that are going to help us to make progress. She highlighted the importance of lecturers on our campus. According to data that is posted to the SSU website by the office of Institutional Effectiveness, from fall 2019 42% of our faculty on campus were permanent, which means that 58% of the campus were temporary. Right off the bat, we can see how important the important role of lecturers is, and working conditions for all faculty are directly tied to student success. Even though lecturer faculty makeup a majority of faculty, our concerns are not always promoted equally, or at least that’s the perception that we have. There are some different issues that we wanted to tackle. We need job security and opportunities for professional development. Everything that we are wanting to do falls under the umbrella of having more inclusion of lecturers and being integrated fully into the campus life and opportunities. One of the things she was extremely interested in looking at are ways to ensure that lecturers have opportunities for professional
development and the ability to fully participate in faculty governance and that we are fairly compensated for that work. There are many of us who want to be more involved in activities outside of the classrooms. In addition to being able to find the time to do things like sit on committees or take professional development workshops, we also are hoping that we can start looking for funding to make sure that that lecturers are offered these opportunities and that we are compensated for that. The other thing that is very much in the forefront, especially right now, given the current contract negotiations, is on ways to increase job security for lecturers. The current contract proposal does include an increase to five-year contracts for lecturers, which is absolutely a step in the right direction and we have some additional ideas that we are currently researching too in terms of their feasibility. One of these would be the creation of a permanent teaching track that would be parallel to the tenure track and but focus more on pedagogy than on research. There are programs like this that exist at number of other institutions and we're looking into the feasibility of this right now, here at Sonoma State.

C. Torres said there's a pathway from lecturer to tenure track conversion provision in the proposed CFA contract. This is a foot in the door opportunity, which is a way to potentially promote qualified lecturers, librarians and counselor colleagues to tenure track positions to take some of the structural precarity out of the lecturer position. We would love your support of the CFA proposal. This conversion proposal and the five-year contract proposal are fitting into a much needed pathway for lecturers. A pathway that includes continued involvement in pedagogy workshops at the Center for Teaching and Education Technology. Those workshops help our careers and make us much better teachers for students. We could have continued opportunities to grants and research through the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. He will be getting the word out to lecturers about continuing subsidized education through a terminal degree program through the Chancellor's office incentive program which encourages CSU faculty to pursue a post doctorate or a doctor terminal degree with some of the cost of the tuition refunded to qualified working CSU lectures, so these opportunity are pathways for lecturers which ultimately benefit our students as well because temporary faculty will increase their tool set for teaching and their knowledge of the subject.

We do have some concerns from lecturers that in the fall 22-23, our funding will be directly tied to enrollment and there may be dramatically less work for lecturers starting in fall 22-23 unless we increase enrollment. How can faculty do our part to increase enrollment? He will be seeking to have those discussions with faculty in the next month. He is the father of a CSU student and sometimes what he sees in our marketing about our programs and departments, doesn't give a completely clear track to a job or research that he sees at other universities. Here is a good example.
of how curriculum has been updated successfully. In the History department, they have two certificate programs - the Public History certificate which explicitly teaches the skills that are applicable to a number of professions, including museums and libraries. The Dual Language Historical Research certificate provides language training and its interdisciplinary which affords a student the opportunity to get a history degree and then go into English as a Second Language school. There are other universities like Western Washington University that have interdisciplinary research programs, with clear occupational trajectories. Within one department like Anthropology, there are five different research and interdisciplinary tool sets for occupations. He was hoping to have a conversation about this because the clock is ticking, and perhaps we can do our part to increase enrollment.

A member said when pointing what an important role the lecturers play, it would be nice to show us also the percentage of FTES taught because then the disparity is much greater than just the 48%/52% and that would bolster your case. C. Torres said unfortunately, Sonoma State has the lowest permanent lecturers to part time lecturers statistically in the system. Our FTES are not that great actually because we have so many lecturers with part time positions and many full time. The member said lecturers teach far more many students than tenure track faculty do, far more than the 48/52 split.

Time Certain reached.

Staff Representative Report - K. Sims, S. Pettit

K. Sims said at the Staff Council meeting on October 26 Katie Musick reminded everyone that she is staff representative on the Continuity Planning group and is committed to representing the voice of the staff. She welcomes staff to contact her if they had any thoughts or concerns they would like brought to the Continuity Planning meeting. During his report interim Vice President Stan Nosek said that January 3rd is the return date for all staff working remotely and there will be scheduled days for people needing to move items back to campus from home. He also reminded everyone about the November 15th budget forum and said that after the Budget part, they will talk about ideas for increasing student recruitment and retention. There was a visit from Brad Starkey Owens who works with Accessibility Services and within the Universal Access Hub. He gave a very thorough and helpful presentation on the accessibility basics when it comes to developing digital content. Our next Staff Council meeting is on November 9th at 1pm and will feature a visit by Dr. Griffin-Desta and Tramaine Austin Dillon from the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. She turned her time over to Sadie Pettit.
S. Pettit said thank you, for reaching out with this invitation to present this open letter, as well as continuing to build bridges between the Academic Senate and the Staff Council. Your efforts are appreciated. This was presented on October 29, 2021 to the SSU Continuity Planning group.

"To the SSU Continuity Planning Group - The Sonoma State University Staff Council is committed to being a voice for the non-faculty staff within the realm of shared governance at Sonoma State. In that capacity, we feel obligated to present concerns we are hearing from staff regarding inconsistent messaging from across campus leadership around staff repopulation in the spring of 2022 semester. Since the start of the pandemic staff have consistently and repeatedly received the message at all levels of our organization that SSU recognizes that the global COVID-19 pandemic has changed how the university functions and that the change presents an opportunity for us to reimagine how we conduct business. In response, the entire campus community innovated, redesigned processes, and found new creative ways to support our students. Staff were led to believe that supporting multiple work modalities was part of reimagining the university and was integral to ensuring that SSU would continue to thrive, as we move forward together. We made personal and professional decisions based on consistent messaging that we received. Each time the issue of telecommuting was raised over the last 20 months, staff were assured that SSU is committed to pursuing remote work as a long term modality. As the SSU Staff Council, our focus over the course of the pandemic has been on clear and consistent messaging from SSU.

Recent communications from campus leadership suddenly seem focused on full onsite staff repopulation and this represents the significant deviation in tone and substance from all previous messaging received throughout the course of the pandemic. This dramatic tonal shift and inconsistent messaging across departments has created a campus climate of uncertainty, which has understandably upset many staff members who have proven that they can support the university with dedication and proficiency regardless of modality. We keep hearing from staff who have been made anxious by the dramatic shift and approach to repopulation staff, not knowing what to expect in the spring Semester and staff leaving for other opportunities, including other CSUs that provide more certainty and flexibility. Each lost staff member represents lost institutional knowledge and an increased burden on those who remain, which further exacerbates feelings of uncertainty. We ask that you hear these concerns in the spirit of shared governance and transparency. We ask for consistency and communication and a recommitment to the shared understanding that as SSU remains dedicated to multiple work modalities for staff as we move forward. We appreciate your time and attention to this matter."
A member said thank you for raising our awareness of these issues. She was curious about when staff are supposed to return to campus. What's the messaging on that? S. Petitt said we have been told to prepare for a full on campus repopulation effective January 3rd. Another member said for those who have made the decision to order them all back, can someone speak to the rationale? S. Nosek said he personally was not familiar with the inconsistent message that a staff have heard over this time. The discussion was relative to COVID and what it would be safe to bring people back and what the Chancellor's office policies would be. In this process, January 3rd was identified as we believe we're in good control. He appreciated the fact that people have been hearing inconsistent messages. The Provost said part of what the inconsistency is about is what the telecommuting policy is going to be, and the confusion lies partly around the CSU Telecommuting policy ending at the end of December, that's why people are hearing the January date for return. What's also not clear is what the telecommuting policy is going to be moving forward. That has to do with the meet and confers that are happening with every single Union. Some of those unions have not come to agreement yet, but we are getting closer to agreement and getting closer to putting out a Telecommuting Policy for the campus. Part of the confusion is the confusion between a Telecommuting policy related to COVID and a Telecommuting policy that is a going to be a continuing practice of the CSU and Sonoma State. S. Nosek said we heard this morning that the APC has agreed to the Telecommuting policy, and he understood that is very close to what the CSUEU agreed to. Jeff Banks indicated today he would be putting together a draft policy based upon those meet and confers approved already. Within the next several weeks, we will be reviewing that at the Cabinet level to better understanding what the options are and hopefully sooner than later that policy will be known and how that policy will be applied on the campus. That will give people a better idea of what the telecommuting options and conditions would be. As the Provost mentioned, we haven't been able to even talk about the potential policy yet until the meet and confers have been completed.

**Motion to extend meeting by 10 minutes. Second. Approved.**

A guest said she has been sad about what she has been hearing from staff across campus and across divisions that are looking at leaving SSU. We all know that the current labor market offers higher wages and more remote options. She heard from a lot of staff across campus that want telecommuting and are looking at the private industry or looking at other campuses even. There are many staff on campus that can do their jobs and have done their jobs well for nearly two years now remotely and they're not student facing. We're hearing the message that the campus needs to be revitalized and we need to be an on ground institution, and we want to repopulate for campus tours and get our enrollment up. In fact, the Staff Council just
invited Dr. Lopez to come and speak with us, so we can help out with the enrollment issues. But if we continue to lose more staff who have other options she was concerned about our staffing levels on campus, particularly in a few departments where there are one or two people or even three that might retire if they can’t continue to telecommute or are already applying for other jobs. We should do everything we can to retain the amazing staff that we have and who work hard.

The Vice Chair said from a faculty point of view, we have to find ways to support our staff. He has been working with the Staff Council, and they are very amazing. One of the things that we’ve been looking at is what role can staff play in terms of helping us make informed policy decisions. On this last comment you can see a possible feedback loop that staff and certain faculty are uncertain and the administration is again feeding the flames of a climate of doubt or concern. We want to move forward in a way that we can make things more predictable. We don’t want to lose our staff; we don’t want to lose our faculty, and we don’t want to lose good administrators.

The Chair said hopefully more people are now aware. She knew awareness doesn’t always lead to action but let’s hope, it starts some brains percolating on it because she understood the frustration of going to a meeting and just being told, over and over work, we have to be front facing, we have to be live, we have to do this and we get it, we’re not idiots. We’re also people.

A member asked what percent of staff members would prefer to work remotely? We so much value your work. Departments, programs, and students all suffer when a person leaves and then we get new people and they need to be trained on the job, and very often, we have a part-time people doing their best and we’re all struggling. It’s not helping anyone and she fully supported retaining and fully supporting staff members. K. Sims said she didn’t think that there has been any research on that. There’s a difference between would like to work off campus and can work off campus. It’s a complicated question.

A member was posting to the chat how telecommuting helps with sustainability issues. A guest said when VP Lopes was here there was quite a bit about sustainability goals and telecommuting helping towards our sustainability goals, and she missed that voice.

Vice President for Student Affairs Report - L. Monje-Paulson for Wm. G. Sawyer

L. Monje-Paulson said next week is the Western regional conference for the NASPA Student Affairs Association, which is the professional association for Student Affairs
professionals. It’s a great space for professional development, but also to learn about the most current research around student development and community in the higher education setting. She was happy to report that we have two employees in the Division of Student Affairs who will be recognized at the regional conference Rachel Carbone, who is the administrative assistant to the Vice President Dr. Sawyer for Student Affairs and is going to be recognized as the Support Staff of the Year for NASPA region six and Mendell Murray, who is an Academic Advisor with Student Affairs is this year’s recipient of the NASPA region six Dorothy Keller New Professional Award, so we're excited to have the incredible work of our two beloved staff members being recognized in that space. Next Wednesday we have our third event in our Black and Brown and Blue series.

Good of the Order

The next Chair Chat on November 9 will be a shared with the Provost. We're going to be discussing how to manage change, and if can we set up a way to manage change without losing our minds. We will be try to talk through what these processes look like when there's change, so that we're not reacting all the time because it's exhausting.

International Education week is coming up from November 15th through the 19th. Please announce it to your students. We're doing it together with a Santa Rosa JC and our participation with Fulbright. Two events are organized by our current Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistant from Germany.

Adjourned.
Earlier in the semester (September 10th and October 8th), all faculty were sent an email to announce the survey. After 5 weeks 61 responses were received from 17 probationary and 44 tenured faculty. Of the respondents, 37 had served on department, 19 on school, and 9 on University RTP committees. 21 did not serve on any of these review committees.

Many thoughtful answers were received on different aspects of the RTP process and policy. There appears to be consistent concern on how the review process seems more of a judicial, gatekeeping exercise rather than a supportive, holistic process. Also concerns were raised on the appropriateness or consistency of a number of inputs, such as SETEs, peer evaluations of teaching, or department chair letters. Additional concern was given that the different levels of review do not consistently apply the department RTP criteria, especially administrative review, but also at the school and University level. A number of the concerns are beyond the prevue of FSAC as they focus on actions by administrators or aspects of personnel policy.

Following are summaries of what FSAC sees as recurring themes which arose from the input for each question. We focus only the information requested from the question, but take all comments provided as input for the development of guidance documents.

**Question 1:** In the URTP policy, the departments are required to provide the minimum criteria for tenure and promotion (Section II.E), with promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor as separate criteria. FSAC reviews the criteria and insures they are consistent with the CBA and URTP policy. FSAC may also make suggestions to departments on consistency and clarity. To help with revising or drafting new department criteria, FSAC will provide a document with suggestions. From your experiences in using or drafting department criteria, do you have any thoughts on what would be helpful in such a document?

46 responses. Some responses provided input on two or more of the listed themes. Other responses are comments and do not directly address the question.

Themes/ideas emerged from the responses

1. Provide clarity / specificity / flexibility in all criteria (including advising and service) 51.2%
2. Provide separate criteria for promotion to associate professor and to professor 14.6%
3. Define criteria for early tenure / early promotion 10.0%
4. FSAC provide language to guide departments in drafting their criteria 10.0%
5. Give more autonomy to departments in articulation of criteria with minimal input from FSAC 4.9%
6. Discuss how the criteria are based on the discipline (aids candidates and higher levels of review) 4.9%
7. Indicate timing of the department RTP criteria review process 2.4%
8. Criteria should consider resources/environment during the review cycle 2.4%

Question 2: The contents of the working personnel action file are the key evidence used in the review of candidates. The URTP policy (Section III.C.2) provides an outline of the required materials. Is this sufficient? Or would candidates, departments, or review committees prefer to have more examples or suggestions that would be provided in a separate suggestion document? If so, what type of input would you like to have?

47 responses. Some responses provided input on two or more of the listed themes. Other responses are comments and do not directly address the question.

Themes/ideas emerged from the responses
1. Provide examples, often with emphasis on examples for specific disciplines. 43.2%
2. Current information is sufficient 40.5%
3. Provide a format of materials in WPAF, e.g., CV, self-assessment, etc. 5.4%
4. Provide narrative on “value” of WPAF materials to guide candidates and review committees 5.4%
5. Rather than examples, provide a detailed checklist 2.7%
6. Standardize how information is presented, especially SETEs 2.7%

Question 3: The review of teaching effectiveness includes peer observations, SETEs, and the candidate’s self-assessment (Section II.E.1.a). Would suggestions on how to utilize the information from these sources be helpful for candidates or review committees (e.g., interpreting the results of SETEs, what could be included in a self-evaluation, etc.)? Provide any suggestions you may have.

39 responses. Some responses provided input on two or more of the listed themes. Other responses are comments and do not directly address the question.

Themes/ideas emerged from the responses
1. SETE interpretation guide 43.2%
2. Self-assessment guide/format 40.9%
3. Peer evaluation guide/format 11.4%
4. Workshops on writing different WPAF sections 4.5%

Question 4: Recommendations from department chair are optional (CBA 15.21, 15.40b). Would it be helpful to have suggestions to department chairs on what they may consider in writing the recommendation? If so, indicate what may be useful.

39 responses. Some responses provided input on two or more of the listed themes. Other responses are comments and do not directly address the question.
Feedback

1. Yes on chair letter guidance. 73.1%
2. No on chair letter guidance. 26.9%

Question 5: Do you have other ideas of suggestions/guidance that could be considered in helping candidates or review committees in undertaking the RTP process?

41 responses. Many responses reiterated ideas expressed in Questions 1-4. Many others commented on policy issues, questioned the goal/purpose of RTP, or on collegiality or professionalism in the RTP process. All input from this question will be incorporated as best as possible while FSAC drafts guidelines. Finally, the AVP for Faculty Success will work with FSAC on developing guidance for developing RTP documents and the equitable interpretation of inputs.
Guide to Preparing Department RTP Criteria
Approved by FSAC 11/18/2021

The Faculty Standards and Affair Committee of the Academic Senate provides the following information to guide departments in drafting and revising departmental Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion criteria.

The University RTP policy recognizes the primacy of departments in determining the criteria for their tenure-track faculty, as appropriate to their discipline. As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the California Faculty Association and the CSU, all criteria and procedures are to be made available for each cycle of RTP. Therefore, all department criteria are posted on the Faculty Affairs webpage.

FSAC understands the challenge departments face in providing a set of clear criteria for diverse faculty experiences and varied opinions in departments about expectation. The following information is to aid departments in drafting and/or revising criteria, and to explain the process of review and approval by FSAC.

1. Department criteria
   a. Department criteria can provide an opportunity for the department to describe its philosophy on how criteria are selected and valued, or how criteria fit within past practices of the department and/or dictates of the discipline. Department criteria should not reiterate information that is already in the University RTP policy.
   b. A clear set of minimum criteria for teaching/scholarship/service must be provided.
   b. Distinct criteria must be provided for tenure and promotion to Associate Profession and for promotion to Professor.
   c. Criteria must include expectations in the following areas (or equivalents, i.e., Library):
      i. Teaching:
         • SETEs,
         • peer reviews, and
         • self-assessment.
      ii. Research, scholarship, creative activities: Department expectations.
      iii. Service to University, community, and public: Department expectations.
   d. Criteria may be quantitative, qualitative, or a combination. In explaining criteria, a list of acceptable types of activities/documents/performance may be appropriate (e.g.: including but not limited to...). However, it should be obvious how a candidate reaches a level of development that the department finds appropriate for a positive recommendation.
   e. If a department wishes to have additional information for candidates on exceptional performance that would be used for early tenure/promotion, these must be clearly separate from the minimum (required) criteria.
2. **FSAC Review**

The review of department RTP criteria will focus on the following:

a. Consistency with CBA, especially Article 15 – Evaluation. FSAC may indicate departmental criteria are out of compliance and must be modified, or provide suggestions on revising criteria to better reflect the dictates in the CBA.

b. Minimum criteria for tenure/promotion at Associate Professor and Professor levels are clearly indicated.

c. Minimal ambiguity in the description of criteria or their application that may lead to confusion among candidates or higher levels of review.

3. **Timelines and Procedures**

New criteria or revisions must be received by FSAC at the end of the last week of March. This allows sufficient time for FSAC to review and make recommendations to departments, for departments to make changes to the document (if necessary), and final approval by FSAC for posting on the Faculty Affairs webpage. Approval will be an email from the chair of FSAC to the department chair and cc’d to Faculty Affairs. To facilitate implementation of the continuity clause in URTP policy (Section II.A.3), approved criteria must include on the first page “EFFECTIVE FALL 20XX”, and departments are required to maintain copies of all previous criteria.
TO: Executive Committee, Sonoma State Academic Senate  
FROM: Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee  
October 28, 2021

Proposed New Policy on the Selection, Appointment, and Duties of Department Chairs

In the Spring 2021 semester, the Sonoma Chapter Executive Board of the California Faculty Association provided a draft policy on the selection and appointment of department chairs to the Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee (FSAC). As stated in the cover letter from the Executive Board, such a policy would be helpful to clarify the role and appointment process of department chairs at Sonoma State, and:

- Add clarity for incoming and returning chairs, deans and provosts about SSU practices and traditions;
- Help and support chairs in understanding their roles and responsibilities; and
- Add transparency to the process where chairs are recommended, appointed and replaced.

The basis of the draft policy comes from three articles in the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement:

20.30 Department chairs shall normally be selected from the list of tenured or probationary faculty employees recommended by the department for the assignment.

20.31 Such department chairs shall perform duties and carry out responsibilities assigned by the President.

20.32 Such department chairs shall be appointed by the President and shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

Additionally, the language in the draft policy is based on existing department chair policies in the CSU as well as referencing two SSU Academic Senate policies: Lectures in Departmental Governance and Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making.

After initial editing of the draft policy, it was presented to the Academic Senate at the May 6, 2021 meeting. At that time, it was determined that the draft policy required additional work and was sent back to FSAC. A request was also made to the Senate to send feedback to FSAC.

During the Fall 2021 semester, FSAC incorporated the feedback from 26 members of the Senate, or their constituents. After substantive editing, an updated draft was sent to all current department chairs for their input. FSAC receive additional feedback from 7 chairs. Based on all the input FSAC received, and careful consideration of the CBA and SSU policy and practices, FSAC presents the attached draft policy to the Executive Committee for its consideration.
I. Guiding Principle
   A. The department chair serves as representative and advocate for the department and its
college in interactions with students, the school in which the department resides, the
university, the community, and the profession. While expected to perform certain
administrative functions, the department chair is a unit-3 faculty member with the duties
and responsibilities outlined in this policy.
   B. Therefore, the selection and recommendation of a department chair is an important
collective decision of department faculty. This policy is designed to ensure that
department chairs are recommended, appointed, and serve in a manner that is consistent
with the spirit of shared governance and that assures continual legitimacy and
effectiveness as they carry out the duties and responsibilities required by CSU and SSU
policies and the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement.

II. Definition
   A. The term “department chair” refers to the chair of an academic department, or other
equivalent administrative unit.
   B. All references to the University President should be understood to read the University
President or designee1.

III. Term of Office
   The department chair shall normally be appointed for a term of three (3) years, which shall
begin at the start of the fall semester of the academic year following the completion of
the department selection and recommendation, and appointment process under Section
V hereof.

IV. Duties and Responsibilities
   The department chair is responsible for leading, administering, and representing the
department. The department chair’s duties and responsibilities include but are not limited
to the following four categories:
   A. Academic Programs
      1. lead in the development and direction of high-quality academic programs,
      2. work with the department faculty in academic program planning and review, and
curriculum development and revision, and
      3. working with the dean, prepare the department class schedule in consultation with the
department faculty.
   B. Students
      1. supervise advising, provide information, sign documents and petitions, and otherwise
facilitate resolution of administrative difficulties students may encounter,
      2. promote department activities,
      3. receive and consider students' comments and suggestions about courses, instructors,
and programs, and
4. facilitate the resolution of complaints, differences, or grievances between students and faculty.

C. Faculty
1. encourage collegial and full participation of all faculty members of the department in the spirit of shared governance,
2. recommend faculty workload to the dean in teaching and service activities (cf. CBA 20.2b),
3. participate in the processes for hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion of permanent faculty members within the department in accordance with CSU and SSU policies and the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement (cf. CBA 15.21, 15.40),
4. evaluate and make recommendation on the appointment or reappointment of temporary faculty members within the department in accordance with CSU and SSU policies and the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement (cf. CBA 15.24, 15.25, 40.17), and
5. promote and support the professional development of the faculty members.

D. Administrative Responsibilities
1. represent the department, its faculty and students within the school, the university, the community, and the profession,
2. convey pertinent information to, from, and within the department and present issues which have potential impact on the department,
3. invite and respond to comments and suggestions of faculty, students, staff and dean in a collaborative manner,
4. work with the dean on management of resources, including the establishment of enrollment targets, allocation of faculty positions, and all department budgetary matters,
5. work with the dean’s office to organize and supervise department expenditures and resources (cf. CBA 20.2b),
6. ensure departmental compliance with CSU and SSU policies and the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement,
7. participate in the hiring and, in collaboration with the appropriate administrator, direct the supervision of department staff, and
8. facilitate the resolution of complaints or differences in the department, and, in collaboration with the appropriate administrator, facilitate resolution of grievances brought by faculty after the conclusion of said grievances.

V. Recommendation and Appointment of Department Chairs
A. Department Recommendation
1. Department chairs shall normally be selected by the department faculty from the tenured or probationary faculty members within the department and recommended to the President (cf. CBA 20.30). When a department is unable to identify potential candidates from within the department, a tenured faculty member from a department within the School may be recommended.
2. The department shall forward its recommendations to the University President no later than the last instruction week of instruction of the fall semester in the third-year of the current chair’s term.  
3. The department shall agree to a fair and transparent procedure for selecting its recommendation of the next department chair and post the procedure such that all faculty in the department are informed, at least two weeks prior to the department finalizing its selection. Consistent with CSU and SSU policies and the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement, temporary faculty shall not be excluded from participating in decisions made by the department, and therefore are included in the selection process for department chairs.  
4. Following the selection process, the department shall, within one business day, forward its recommendation to serve as the next department chair to the University President.  
5. If a department is unable to provide a recommendation for a new chair, the previous chair remains the chair until the department recommendation for a new chair is provided to the University President. If a department is unable to provide a recommendation, the President appoints a chair.  
6. To avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, a unit 3 employee recommended to be the chair will not hold a concurrent position of leadership or authority where an administrator is the direct supervisor.  
7. Rare exceptions to the process outlined in V.A.1-6 may occur in cases of new faculty hires which include a department chair.

B. Appointment  
1. Department recommendations will normally be accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons.  
2. The President appoints the department chair from the faculty recommended by the department (cf. CBA 20.32).

C. Interim Appointment  
In the event of a vacancy in the department chair position, the department may recommend an interim chair. In the absence of a department recommendation for an interim chair, the University President may appoint an interim chair. In either case, the interim chair will serve the remainder of the semester of the interim appointment and until the department recommends and the University President appoints a new department chair pursuant to the processes in Section V.A. and V.B.

VI. Removal of Department Chairs  
Removal of the department chair may be initiated either by the department or the University President.  
A. Removal Initiated by the Department
1. The department may request that the department chair be removed by an affirmative vote of at least three-fourths the majority of the department faculty members voting on the question.

2. After taking such a vote, the department must, within one business day, notify the University President of the concerns about the department chair and its recommendation to terminate the department chair’s appointment.

3. Upon receipt of the department’s recommendation, the University President shall meet with the incumbent department chair to discuss the concerns brought forward by the department. If the University President agrees with the recommendation by the department to terminate the department chair’s appointment, the incumbent department chair shall be removed. The Department Chair should be removed within 10 business days, during which time a new department chair shall be recommended and appointed in accordance with Section V.

B. Removal by the President

1. Department chairs serve at the pleasure of the University President (cf. CBA 20.32). The University President may remove the department chair before the conclusion of the term. Removal of the department chair by the University President shall only occur in rare instances and for compelling reasons.

2. No department chair shall be removed solely for carrying out the provisions of CSU and SSU policies and the requirements under the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement.

3. If the department chair is removed before the conclusion of the term, the University President shall, within one business day, notify the department of the decision and the basis for the decision in writing.

1 *Currently, the* school dean *serves as the President’s designee for this policy*.

2 This deadline gives the new chair the spring semester to learn from the existing chair, and to take advantage of training offered by the administration at SSU, or at the Chancellor’s office.

3 See Lecturers in Departmental Governance policy.

4 See Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making policy.
Q&A – Department Chair Policy

Review of the draft Selection, Appointment and Duties of Department Chairs Policy by the Senate Executive Committee, raised several issues. This document is provided to address these issues and provided to the Academic Senate as additional background. **New text added in response to input from the first reading of this draft at the Academic Senate is in bold/italics.**

Q: Section III. Term of Office. Although the standard term is 3 years, some chairs have remained in office for a very long time. Should a term-limit be included to provide greater opportunity for other members of a department to serve as chair? Also, an earlier version of this policy included a recommendation that departments develop a schedule of rotation to spread the chair experience among the department faculty. Why is that no longer included?

A: There has been no stated policy on the term of a department chair, so situations where a chair remained in the position for a long period of time could arise. With this draft policy, it is clearly stated that the term of office is 3 years. After the term, the department must undertake a new selection process. If the current chair is reselected, then the department has made a conscious decision to do so. However, if a faculty member feels they are ready to step up for the position, then the department’s process for selection (whatever it decides it to be) will play out. In instances where junior faculty are particularly concerned about voting “against” a standing chair, departments should employ anonymous survey/voting approaches.

If a department, or some faculty in the department, feel that “power politics” will trump a fair selection process, then a discussion with the dean is in order to convey that concern. However, to impose a blanket term limit provision removes the option of a long-serving chair from any department that has no issue with this situation.

Although departments developing some form of rotation among the faculty to be department chair is good practice, this should not be included in policy as there may be instances where no available tenured faculty are available to become chair, nor do all faculty have the desire or interest to serve as a responsible chair. Being a department chair is similar to any other form of service in the university – a choice, not a requirement.

Q. Some departments have had issues with their department chair. Why not include a section of the policy on annual evaluations for department chairs?

A. Informal evaluation of a department chair already exists. Faculty, either individually, or as a department are encouraged to talk with their chairs about the manner in which a chair is performing. Done collegially, this feedback can help a chair become better in their position. Some individuals and/or departments may be worried about the power dynamics between the chair and their faculty, so it would be better to have anonymous evaluations. Departments may desire to institute some form of evaluation of the current chair prior to the selection process as a means of providing information to the selection process. However, other departments
may feel their process of selection does not require a department-wide evaluation. Therefore, this choice is left to departments.

Another form of anonymous feedback of the chair is by faculty conferring with the dean. As the chair answers to the dean, the dean can pass on issues they see arising in the department, again as a means of helping the chair improve their performance.

Formal evaluations add another dimension – documentation of a chair’s performance that can be used in future decisions on reappointment of the individual to the chair position. This raises several issues. 1) Who is responsible for running the evaluation? As the chair reports to the dean, does the dean control the type and timing of the evaluations? Or should evaluations be run by the AVP for Faculty Affairs? In any case, what form of questions will be incorporated into the evaluation? 2) Do the evaluations become incorporated into the chair’s personnel file? If the chair is an associate professor, will the evaluation be considered in the RPT review for promotion? 3) As there are many departments that already have difficulties in identifying candidates for chairs, adding the formal evaluation could reduce the willingness to serve in this critical position.

Finally, in the case of a chair acting egregiously, the draft policy provides a mechanism for their removal if the majority of the department agrees.

Q. How are lecturers involved with the department’s selection of the chair?

A. SSU policy dictates lecturers, as members of the faculty, are not to be excluded from department decisions. This means that whatever process a department uses to select its recommendation for chair, lecturers must be allowed to participate, including voting if that is part of the selection process. The weight of the vote of a part-time faculty member can be worked out by the department. The lecturer participates in the selection only if they are hired by the department in the semester the process occurs.

Q. I am a current chair and the policy says I have to remain as chair if the department cannot come to a decision on recommending a new chair (Sect. V.A.5). I do not want to be chair forever, so why is this in the policy?

A. The department chair sets the agenda for a department and thus incentivizes and guides the faculty in making a selection. Therefore, it really comes down to the current chair ensuring that the selection process proceeds. If the department cannot decide on who to recommend (even from another department within the school), then the department allows the administration (dean) to make the choice – thus abrogating its right to self-governance.

Q. There have been instances of chairs being hired from outside of the university to take over as chair. This needs to be addressed.
A. In the case of a faculty hire, departments are responsible for hiring faculty, in that the department writes and approves the POA, which would include the position of chair. By approving the POA, the department is in effect “selecting” individuals who will be considered for the chair position. This situation is rare, but text is suggested to indicate that this is an exception to the selection process outlined in the policy.
Department Name Change Procedure

Procedure

1. Department prepares a name change request in writing. Requests should include a rationale for the name change and any potential curricular or departmental impacts.

2. The request routes through the following governing bodies. Each body adds their recommendation in support of or against the name change and forwards the packet to the next body. The routing order is:
   a. School Council of Chairs
   b. School Dean
   c. Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (ExComm)
   d. Academic Senate

3. If deemed necessary by ExComm, the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) may be asked to provide additional input on potential curricular impacts of the request.

4. The Academic Senate will add its recommendation to the packet and forward it to the Provost.

5. The Provost will then decide on the Department's request, considering all recommendations.

Approval

This procedure was approved by the Academic Senate and the Provost.
Proposed Policy for Stacking Undergraduate & Graduate Courses

Proposed General Catalog Description

Stacking Undergraduate & Graduate Courses

A course may be stacked between undergraduate & graduate levels if the course meets the following criteria:

• The undergraduate course must be at the upper-division (300-400) level. Lower-division (100-200) level courses may not be used to fulfill post baccalaureate requirements and may not be stacked with graduate (500) level coursework.

• Separate syllabi are required (per WSCUC) for the undergraduate and graduate components of the stacked course.

• Topics (special topics) courses may not be stacked. Each undergraduate & graduate stacked course must be permanent and have appropriate approved course titles, descriptions, unit values, and CS codes.

• Student enrollment in a stacked course is determined by specific programmatic policy for each course as approved through the governance review process. An antirequisite may be used by the program on 500-level courses cross-listed with 300/400-level courses to prevent enrollment in the 500 level course if the student already earned credit in the 300/400 level course.

• It is recommended that the courses being stacked utilize matching course numbers and titles whenever possible. For example POLS 487 & POLS 587.

• When creating new undergraduate courses to be stacked with graduate courses, it is recommended that the undergraduate course be at the 400 level.

1 An undergraduate course and a graduate course offered together, meeting at the same time and place, with a shared class experience and instructor(s), but with more advanced learning outcomes, readings/assignments, grading rubric, and syllabi at the graduate level.

Rationale: The Graduate Studies Subcommittee has proposed a policy for development of stacked courses in an effort to provide a pathway allowing appropriate delivery of common content at both the graduate and upper-division undergraduate levels in a single, stacked course context. Although undergraduate and graduate courses are typically separate and distinct from each other, there are circumstances in which academic units wish to allow a course to have distinct graduate and undergraduate experiences together in the same course. Title V requirements for the Master’s Degree states that “Not less than one-half of the units required for the degree shall be in courses organized primarily for graduate students.” At Sonoma State, SSU graduate students may rely on fulfilling some portion of their graduate coursework by taking courses at the 300 or 400 level. In many cases, this is due to programs being unable to sustain a range of graduate level courses in which only a small number of graduate students will participate for a given offering. Thus, as some programs are currently unable to offer the full suite of courses needed for every Master’s degree at the graduate level, graduate
programs have expressed the need for an option to carefully adapt some undergraduate courses to allow graduate students to receive a graduate level experience that they are unable to obtain under current circumstances. Programs may identify appropriate areas of the undergraduate curriculum that are needed by graduate students as targets of stacked course design and offer students a graduate level experience as defined by the CSU Definitions of Graduate Level Instruction (EP&R 82-39).

To ensure that each approved stacked course has the appropriate content, format, and distinct characteristics to provide a graduate level experience for graduate students, establishment of each proposed stacked course would require a full review through governance structures, including departmental and school level reviews, the Graduate Studies Subcommittee, and the Educational Policies Committee.

**Frequently Asked Questions:**

*Are stacked courses simply achieved by combining existing undergraduate and graduate courses?*

No, each stacked course must be generated as a new course proposal that is evaluated through the full governance review process with opportunities to evaluate the composition and quality of the distinct undergraduate and graduate level components of the new course. Faculty will determine whether a course should be offered as graduate only course or whether an undergraduate course is appropriate for adding a graduate level option.

*Will graduate students in a stacked course receive an appropriate graduate level experience if the course also has undergraduates enrolled?*

The expectation is that any approved stacked course will demonstrate, through a new course proposal, with a separate graduate level syllabus, how the course will meet CSU Standards for a graduate level course as described in the CSU Definitions of Graduate Level Instruction (EP&R 82-39). This evaluation will be part of the review by faculty in the associated department and school as well as in the Graduate Studies Subcommittee, and the Educational Policies Committee.

*Will this policy lead to a loss of graduate courses?*

Projections are that this policy will lead primarily to a small number of undergraduate courses, currently taken by graduate students to fulfill their degree requirements, being converted to a stacked format to provide a graduate level experience for those graduate students who cannot access a separate graduate course in that subject.

*Are stacked courses an accepted mechanism for providing graduate level experiences for graduate students?*

Although empirical research on stacked courses* is minimal, research investigating this course format has shown that both undergraduates and graduate students “perceive many benefits from dual listed courses” (Balassiano et al., 2014) and that “offering dual-level courses in which different-level partnerships are created does not inhibit learning by students of different academic levels” (Miller et al., 2012).” Moreover, in terms of implications for university policy, researchers suggest that “dual-listed courses enhance learning and should not be subject to controls that deter based on administrative rigor or complexity.” But researchers also caution that “review and approval processes should likely examine not only departmental reasons for such courses, but ensure that syllabi differentiate among students and incorporate schema for facilitating interaction” as is required in this policy (Balassiano et al., 2014).
In addition, this stacked course format* is a common practice among many accredited and respected universities with examples that include CSU campuses (e.g., Cal State East Bay, Chico State, Humboldt State, Long Beach, San Francisco State, San Marcos) and many universities across the United States (e.g., Alaska, Boston U., Buffalo, Carnegie-Melon, Delaware, DePaul, Florida Atlantic, George Mason, Georgia Southern, Harding, Hawaii, Iowa State, Kent State, Middle Tennessee State, Minnesota State, Missouri, North Carolina Greensborough, North Florida, North Dakota State, Northern Arizona, Ohio U., Oklahoma State, Old Dominion, Rice, Santa Clara, Texas A&M, UNC Charlotte, Valdosta State, Virginia, Virginia Commonwealth, Western Washington, Winston-Salem).

* format identifiers include: co-located, cross level, cross listed, double numbered, dual listed, paired, or stacked


Will Graduate students become defacto teaching assistants in stacked courses?

Graduate students may not be asked to serve in instructional duties expected of the faculty member. Graduate students should not conduct substantial lecture components or grade undergraduate work in that course. However, graduate students in a stacked course may have distinct learning outcomes where additional aspects of leadership, participation, and/or a deeper understanding of content are expected.

How are distinct graduate level experiences provided in a stacked course?

A distinct set of graduate level learning objectives must be clearly articulated in a separate syllabus and are guided by the existing set of University Graduate Level Learning Goals and CSU Definitions of Graduate Level Instruction (EP&R 82-39).

Distinct learning and assessment experiences can be included for graduate students with expectations that graduate students demonstrate advanced levels of disciplinary knowledge and communication along with integration of course content with professional standards in their field. Such distinct experiences might include:

- Distinct exam experiences: Graduate students are not only measured on comprehension of the lecture material but also the ability to integrate and apply the material at more advanced levels. These may include: hypothesis formulation and experimental design; the ability to analyze and/or interpret raw research data; or additional questions based on reading of research literature
- Distinct reading assignments: Graduate students access research literature and evaluate via written critical reviews and/or oral presentations.
- Distinct writing assignments: Graduate students demonstrate ability to synthesize research fields through integration of course content into experimental design, writing research grant proposals, or oral or written presentation of how the course material informs the student’s own thesis or project research.
- Academic Leadership: Graduate Students may be expected to lead a discussion group or present analysis of primary research.
Can a department without a graduate program develop a stacked course?

Currently some SSU graduate students take undergraduate courses in departments without graduate programs (e.g., some graduate students take GIS courses in GEP) that count towards their graduate degree, so there would not be a prohibition of this similarly occurring for stacked courses. Determination if such a course is needed and appropriate would be part of the review process at the department and school levels, as well as via review by representatives of all graduate programs in the Graduate Studies Subcommittee.
Proposal for Revision of SSU Policy on Revalidation from the Graduate Studies Subcommittee

Current SSU Policy
(Also see associated Validation Form)

POLICY STATEMENT ON OUTDATED COURSEWORK—MASTER’S DEGREES
Courses taken prior to seven years of the date of award of the degree may be validated through passing an examination covering the subject matter involved or through repeating the course. Examinations shall be administered only in exceptional circumstances, when the department deems that serious and compelling reasons have kept the student from completing the degree in the seven years specified in Title V. The nature of the examination will be determined by the department in which the degree is to be granted."

Sonoma State Catalog
General Requirements for the Master’s Degree
Master’s programs require a minimum of 30 semester units of approved coherent coursework. All courses applied to the program must be completed with an overall GPA of 3.00, and no course for which a final grade below C is assigned may be used to satisfy this requirement. Graduate programs must be completed in no more than 7 years, which is computed as 14 semesters. No more than 6 semester units shall be allowed for a thesis project.

Proposed New Policy to be included in the General Catalog
Validation of Expired Graduate Courses
As specified in Title V, coursework must be completed within seven years of award of degree. Courses taken within the program in residence more than seven years prior to the date of award of the degree may be validated through passing an assessment (oral or written) covering the subject matter involved or through repeating the course. Revalidation shall be administered only in exceptional circumstances, when the program deems that serious and compelling reasons have kept the student from completing the degree in the seven years. The nature of the assessment will be determined by the department in which the degree is to be granted, administered by a faculty subject expert, and approved by the Graduate Program Coordinator and the Associate Vice President of Academic Programs. A maximum of one third of all courses used to satisfy program degree requirements are eligible for validation.

Rationale
The Graduate Studies Subcommittee has proposed to update the SSU policy on validation of graduate coursework after the seven-year limit. Updating of this existing policy has two purposes:

1) We endeavor to provide more equitable access to the policy since this policy is currently not found in the General Catalog and is not easily accessible to all students. To this end, we will include the amended policy in the general catalog with an added description of who administers the validation of coursework and who signs off on the validation process.

2) We will bring this policy into alignment with best practices found among sister CSU campuses regarding a limitation on the total number of courses that can be validated through this process. The limitation on the amount of coursework eligible for revalidation is to encourage timely resolution of circumstances that led to non-completion of a graduate degree within the seven-year limit. The current Validation form that serves as the guidance on this process is included. Upon approval of an updated policy on revalidation, the policy statement on the associated revalidation form would also be updated to comply.
Relevant Title V Policy: 5 CCR § 40510 The Master's Degree.
(2) A minimum of thirty semester units of approved graduate work completed within a maximum time to be established by each campus. Such maximum time shall be no more than seven years nor less than five years for each particular program. An extension of time beyond the limit may be granted by appropriate campus authority if warranted by individual circumstances and if the outdated work is validated by examination, in the relevant additional course or subject field of work or such other demonstration of competence as may be prescribed.
APARC Current and Proposed Charge and Duties

- Includes references to ATISS as a subcommittee of APARC
- Cleaned up wording and language
- Changed submitting priority recs from Fall to Spring so that they could be implemented and considered in the summer/fall planning
- Refocused sections to more closely align to the work that APARC has been doing

CURRENT CHARGE AND DUTIES

Charge
The Academic Planning, Assessment and Resources Committee (APARC) serves as the faculty’s primary planning, budget and assessment committee for academic programs and related curricula. The University Program Review subcommittee shall be a subcommittee of APARC. The Academic Planning, Assessment and Resources Committee shall establish other subcommittees as necessary to carry out its charge. The duties of APARC are defined below.

Planning
To recommend to the Academic Senate policies, procedures or position statements that help the University to achieve its long-term academic goals in the light of changing social conditions; to recommend planning priorities including, but not limited to, priorities for faculty hiring, number of students to matriculate (by class levels and disciplines), classroom upgrades and academic technology; to review the annual summary of program reviews for input into the planning and prioritization process; to coordinate long range plans for academic development with campus planning of facilities development; to make recommendations concerning principles and procedures (including procedures for faculty consultation) governing the development, improvement, and use of the academic facilities of the University; to develop and implement mechanisms to determine efficacy of planning and provide feedback to the planning process. To consult, when appropriate, with other faculty governance committees.

PROPOSED CHARGE AND DUTIES

Charge
The Academic Planning, Assessment and Resources Committee (APARC) serves as the faculty’s primary planning, budget and assessment committee for academic programs and related curricula. The University Program Review subcommittee (UPRS) and Academic Technology and Instructional Spaces (ATISS) shall be subcommittees of APARC. The Academic Planning, Assessment and Resources Committee shall establish other subcommittees as necessary to carry out its charge. The duties of APARC are defined below.

Academic Planning
To recommend to the Academic Senate policies, procedures or position statements that help the University to achieve its long-term academic goals in the light of changing social conditions; to review the annual summary of program reviews for input into the planning and prioritization process, and to make recommendations regarding academic resources (e.g. classroom facilities, online technology, faculty hires, etc.) to the Academic Senate in the Spring for approval and then to forward those recommendations to the Cabinet.
Assessment
To provide oversight for academic programs in developing and refining assessment practices guided by research regarding best practices in higher education and promote avenues through which best practices on assessment may be shared. On a consultative basis, the committee will be available to:
- support programs and Schools in examining their assessment practices;
- assist programs in aligning program assessment practices to larger institutional outcomes;
- review final reports of the University Program Review Subcommittee on approved program assessment plans and provide recommendations aimed at strengthening programmatic assessment practices in consultation with the Educational Policies Committee and the University Program Review Subcommittee;
- support accreditation as appropriate.

Resource and Budget
To develop budget priorities that emerge from planning processes and assessment of academic programs and present upcoming academic year budget priorities to the Senate in the Fall; to inform and educate the Senate on the University's budget process and current resource allocations; to review the University's budget, budget process, and resource allocations; and make recommendations to the Senate on academic and instructional priorities making claim on the University's budget.

Assessment
To support the creation and maintenance of a culture of assessment at SSU; to receive program and campus assessments and data based on agreed upon metrics, outcomes or other measures from appropriate entities, as determined by APARC to 1) conduct meta-level analysis of received assessments and data to inform academic planning and resource priorities; 2) develop best practices recommendations on assessment for academic departments; 3) present assessment priorities to the Academic Senate.

Resource and Budget
To review the University's budget, budget process, and resource allocations; to recommend aligning resource allocations with priorities that emerge from planning processes and assessment of academic programs; to present academic budget priorities to the Academic Senate in the Spring for approval and then to forward the recommendations to the Cabinet.
Cheating and Plagiarism

Proposed Revisions to Cheating and Plagiarism Policy from the Student Affairs Committee

Note: Additions are shown in italicized large font, while deletions are shown with strikethrough.

Cheating and Plagiarism

Recommended By: Academic Senate
Approved: Judy K. Sakaki, President
Issue Date: Wednesday, July 1, 1992
Current Issue Date: Thursday, May 18, 2017
Effective Date: Thursday, May 18, 2017
Contact Office: Academic Affairs
Policy number: 2008-4

I. Policy, Authority and Definitions

Note: If a student is in doubt about the nature of plagiarism, he/she should discuss the matter with the course instructor.

A. Policy

It is the policy of Sonoma State University (SSU) to be proactive in dealing with issues of cheating and plagiarism. Faculty members are encouraged to discuss with students academic ethics and the formulation of one's own intellectual material. It is also the policy of Sonoma State University to impose sanctions on students who cheat or plagiarize. Students are expected to be honest in meeting the requirements of courses in which they are enrolled. Cheating or plagiarism is dishonest, undermines the necessary trust upon which relations between students and faculty are based, and is unacceptable conduct. Students who engage in cheating or plagiarism will be subject to academic sanctions, including a lowered or failing grade in a course; and the possibility of an additional administrative sanction, including probation, suspension, or expulsion.

B. Authority

Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 41301 lists various infractions of the code of conduct for which students may be sanctioned. Section 41301 gives authority to the Chancellor of the California State University to establish disciplinary procedures for all campuses. For more information, see the SSU online catalog (https://catalog.sonoma.edu/) or the Student Affairs Division website (https://studentaffairs.sonoma.edu/). The SSU Cheating and Plagiarism Policy and Procedures is established under the authority of Executive Order 1098, "Student Disciplinary Conduct Procedures for The California State University," issued by the Chancellor on August 14, 2020.
C. Definitions of Cheating and Plagiarism

1. Cheating: Cheating is the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work by using dishonest means. Cheating at SSU includes but is not limited to:
   a. Copying, in part or whole, from another's examination, paper, mathematical analysis, research, or creative project, or the like;
   b. Submitting as one's own work an examination, paper, mathematical analysis, research, or creative project, or the like which has been purchased, borrowed, or stolen; or fabricating data;
   c. Consulting notes, sources, or materials, including use of electronic devices, not specifically authorized by the instructor during an examination;
   d. Employing a surrogate to take an examination, write a paper, do mathematical analysis, or complete, in part or wholly, an evaluation instrument;
   e. Falsification of or misrepresentation on class attendance or role roll sheets.
   f. Aiding or abetting any act that a reasonable person would conclude, when informed of the evidence, to be a dishonest means of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work; and
   g. Committing any act that a reasonable person would conclude, when informed of the evidence, to be a dishonest means of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work.

2. Plagiarism: Plagiarism is the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work by representing the work of another as one's own without the necessary and appropriate acknowledgment. More specifically, plagiarism is:
   a. The act of incorporating the ideas, words of sentences, paragraphs, or parts thereof without appropriate acknowledgment and representing the product as one's own work; and
   b. The act of representing another's intellectual work such as musical composition, computer program, photographs, painting, drawing, sculpture, or research or the like as one's own.

II. Negotiated Resolution

A. Rationale: The University recognizes the importance of informal communication between faculty and students and encourages informal communication as a means of resolving concerns over cheating or plagiarism. In many instances, when a faculty member suspects cheating or plagiarism, informal discussion between the faculty member and the student may resolve the concern. Every effort should be made to respect the rights of the student.

B. Definition of a Negotiated Resolution: A negotiated resolution is an agreement between the faculty member and the student to resolve an allegation of cheating or plagiarism between themselves, or with the consultation of a third party by applying an appropriate
sanction as outlined in Section III.D.1. The final phase of the negotiation process is a meeting between the student and the Student Conduct Administrator.

C. Procedures for a Negotiated Resolution: the instructor Instructors should carefully consider the reasons they believe the student cheated or plagiarized. Proof of cheating and/or plagiarism may include, but is not limited to:

1. Documentation regarding the source of the materials used by the student without proper attribution or represented as the student’s own work
2. A demonstrably marked difference in the writing style of the student, as compared to previous work or assignments
3. Testimony from others regarding a student’s use of academically dishonest means to complete the assignment or exam
4. Firsthand observation of the student engaging in cheating or plagiarism
5. Documentation that the student has used notes, sources, or materials, electronically or otherwise, not specifically authorized by the instructor on an assignment or examination
6. An unusual or suspicious degree of similarity in work done by different students
7. Admission by the student that they cheated or plagiarized to complete an assignment or exam
8. Repeated instance of plagiarism after training and/or warning

D. As soon as possible after the discovery of the alleged violation, the faculty member shall arrange an office conference to inform the student of the allegations, discuss the faculty member’s reasons for believing that the student cheated or plagiarized, and allow the student to respond. The faculty member and student may also agree to consult informally with a third party, for example, the Chair of the Department. Charges of cheating and plagiarism must be brought against a student within a maximum of 120 calendar days after the discovery of the alleged violation.

E. When the faculty member and student reach agreement on a negotiated resolution, the faculty member shall fill out the Record of Negotiated Resolution for Alleged Cheating and Plagiarism Allegations (http://senate.sonoma.edu/forms/drb), which the faculty member and the student shall sign. Although the student may choose to agree immediately to an informal resolution, the faculty member must inform the student that she has five (5) academic days to accept the charges and sign the document. Once the form is signed, the faculty member and the student shall each retain a copy of the form. The faculty member then shall assign the student a grade for the course or assignment.
F. If the semester ends without the completion of an informal resolution, the faculty member shall assign the grade RP (Report in Progress) for the student alleged to have cheated and/or plagiarized.

G. If the student denies the charges or does not sign the Record of Negotiated Resolution for Alleged Cheating and Plagiarism, the matter must be resolved through the adjudication process (see Section III).

H. Faculty must report the infraction and the action taken to the Student Conduct Administrator. The faculty member shall send the Student Conduct Administrator a copy of the Record of Negotiated Resolution for Alleged Cheating and Plagiarism within five (5) academic days of the faculty and student signing the document.

I. The Student Conduct Administrator shall schedule a meeting with the student to issue a warning. Adjudicated resolution is required when the faculty member requests administrative sanctions. The Student Conduct Administrator maintains a list of students found responsible for cheating or plagiarism in order to detect students who are repeat offenders. If the student has more than one violation of the Cheating and Plagiarism Policy, the Student Conduct Administrator will determine if administrative disciplinary action is warranted.

J. As per the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), all proceedings, notes, and discussions between the faculty member and the student shall remain confidential. The faculty members may consult with his or her department chair, dean, or other appropriate administrator.

K. Sanctions may include, but are not limited to, those listed under Section III.D.

III. Adjudicated Resolution

A. Rationale: The faculty member may initiate an adjudicated proceeding when, (1) the student fails to attend the scheduled conference to discuss the allegations; (2) the alleged cheating or plagiarism is detected at the close of the semester and the instructor’s good faith effort to contact the student is unsuccessful; (3) negotiated resolution fails; or (4) the faculty member feels the gravity of the situation demands University disciplinary action. The faculty member shall wait to assign the student a grade for the course or assignment until the adjudicated proceedings are concluded.

B. Definition of Adjudicated Resolution: The adjudication procedure is the submission of a written allegation of cheating or plagiarism to the Dispute Resolution Board and resolution of the allegation by the Dispute Resolution Board, in addition to any decisions related to sanctions. An adjudicated procedure occurs when the faculty member and the student are unable to reach agreement on the alleged violation and informal sanctions in negotiation or when the faculty member believes that the alleged violation is of a particularly serious nature as to warrant formal proceedings.

C. Adjudication Cheating and Plagiarism Procedure
1. To initiate adjudication procedures, see the Formal Dispute Resolution Procedures (https://www.sonoma.edu/policies/formal-dispute-resolution-procedures http://policies.sonoma.edu/policies/formal-dispute-resolution-procedures)

2. The Cheating and Plagiarism Complaint form must be submitted to the Chair of the Dispute Resolution Board within 120 calendar days after the discovery of the alleged violation.

D. Sanctions for Cheating or Plagiarism

1. Academic Sanctions: One or more academic sanctions may be imposed for cheating or plagiarism. Academic sanctions may be imposed by a faculty member through the negotiated process or may be recommended by a faculty member in their submission to the Dispute Resolution Board. Academic sanctions may include, but are not limited to:

   a. A redoing of the examination, paper, mathematical analysis, research or creative project, or the like;

   b. A failing grade on the examination, paper, mathematical analysis, research or creative project, or the like;

   c. A specified reduction in the course grade;

   d. A failing grade in the course;

   e. Multiple Sanctions: More than one of the sanctions listed above may be imposed for any single violation.

2. Administrative Sanctions: When there is an allegation of a particularly serious violation of the Cheating and Plagiarism Policy, administrative sanctions may be requested by a faculty member in their submission to the Dispute Resolution Board. Student discipline sanctions, per CSU Executive Order 970, may include expulsion or suspension from the University, probation, and other sanctions. If the Dispute Resolution Board finds administrative sanctions appropriate, the Board will forward their recommendation to the Student Conduct Administrator. Formal administrative sanction hearings for cheating or plagiarism are administered through the Student Conduct Administrator.
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I. Policy, Authority and Definitions

Note: If students are in doubt about the nature of plagiarism, they should discuss the matter with the course instructor.

A. Policy

It is the policy of Sonoma State University (SSU) to be proactive in dealing with issues of cheating and plagiarism. Faculty members are encouraged to discuss with students academic ethics and the formulation of one's own intellectual material. It is also the policy of Sonoma State University to impose sanctions on students who cheat or plagiarize. Students are expected to be honest in meeting the requirements of courses in which they are enrolled. Cheating or plagiarism is dishonest, undermines the necessary trust upon which relations between students and faculty are based, and is unacceptable conduct. Students who engage in cheating or plagiarism will be subject to academic sanctions, including a lowered or failing grade in a course; and the possibility of an additional administrative sanction, including probation, suspension, or expulsion.

B. Authority

Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 41301 lists various infractions of the code of conduct for which students may be sanctioned. Section 41301 gives authority to the Chancellor of the California State University to establish disciplinary procedures for all campuses. For more information, see the SSU online catalog (https://catalog.sonoma.edu/) or the Student Affairs Division website (https://studentaffairs.sonoma.edu/). The SSU Cheating and Plagiarism Policy and Procedures are established under the authority of Executive Order 1098, "Student Conduct Procedures," issued by the Chancellor on August 14, 2020.

C. Definitions of Cheating and Plagiarism

1. Cheating: Cheating is the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work by using dishonest means. Cheating at SSU includes but is not limited to:
   a. Copying, in part or whole, from another's examination, paper, mathematical analysis, research, or creative project, or the like;
b. Submitting as one's own work an examination, paper, mathematical analysis, research, or creative project, or the like which has been purchased, borrowed, or stolen; or fabricating data;

c. Consulting notes, sources, or materials, including use of electronic devices, not specifically authorized by the instructor during an examination;

d. Employing a surrogate to take an examination, write a paper, do mathematical analysis, or complete, in part or wholly, an evaluation instrument;

e. Falsification of or misrepresentation on class attendance or roll sheets.

f. Aiding or abetting any act that a reasonable person would conclude, when informed of the evidence, to be a dishonest means of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work; and

g. Committing any act that a reasonable person would conclude, when informed of the evidence, to be a dishonest means of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work.

2. Plagiarism: Plagiarism is the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work by representing the work of another as one's own without the necessary and appropriate acknowledgment. More specifically, plagiarism is:

a. The act of incorporating the ideas, words of sentences, paragraphs, or parts thereof without appropriate acknowledgment and representing the product as one's own work; and

b. The act of representing another's intellectual work such as musical composition, computer program, photographs, painting, drawing, sculpture, or research or the like as one's own.

II. Negotiated Resolution

A. Rationale: The University recognizes the importance of informal communication between faculty and students and encourages informal communication as a means of resolving concerns over cheating or plagiarism. In many instances, when a faculty member suspects cheating or plagiarism, informal discussion between the faculty member and the student may resolve the concern. Every effort should be made to respect the rights of the student.

B. Definition of a Negotiated Resolution: A negotiated resolution is an agreement between the faculty member and the student to resolve an allegation of cheating or plagiarism between themselves, or with the consultation of a third party by applying an appropriate sanction as outlined in Section III.D.1. The final phase of the negotiation process is a meeting between the student and the Student Conduct Administrator.

C. Procedures for a Negotiated Resolution: Instructors should carefully consider the reasons they believe the student cheated or plagiarized. Proof of cheating and/or plagiarism may include, but is not limited to:

1. Documentation regarding the source of the materials used by the student without proper attribution or represented as the student's own work
2. A demonstrably marked difference in the writing style of the student, as compared to previous work or assignments

3. Testimony from others regarding a student’s use of academically dishonest means to complete the assignment or exam

4. Firsthand observation of the student engaging in cheating or plagiarism

5. Documentation that the student has used notes, sources, or materials, electronically or otherwise, not specifically authorized by the instructor on an assignment or examination

6. An unusual or suspicious degree of similarity in work done by different students

7. Admission by the student that they cheated or plagiarized to complete an assignment or exam

8. Repeated instance of plagiarism after training and/or warning

D. As soon as possible after the discovery of the alleged violation, the faculty member shall arrange an office conference to inform the student of the allegations, discuss the faculty member’s reasons for believing that the student cheated or plagiarized, and allow the student to respond. The faculty member and student may also agree to consult informally with a third party, for example, the Chair of the Department. Charges of cheating and plagiarism must be brought against a student within a maximum of 120 calendar days after the discovery of the alleged violation.

E. When the faculty member and student reach agreement on a negotiated resolution, the faculty member shall fill out the Record of Faculty Attempt for Resolution of Cheating and Plagiarism Allegations (http://senate.sonoma.edu/forms/drb), which the faculty member and the student shall sign. Although the student may choose to agree immediately to an informal resolution, the faculty member must inform the student that the student has five (5) academic days to accept the charges and sign the document. Once the form is signed, the faculty member and the student shall each retain a copy of the form. The faculty member then shall assign the student a grade for the course or assignment.

F. If the semester ends without the completion of an informal resolution, the faculty member shall assign the grade RP (Report in Progress) for the student alleged to have cheated and/or plagiarized.

G. If the student denies the charges or does not sign the Record of Faculty Attempt for Resolution of Cheating and Plagiarism Allegations, the matter must be resolved through the adjudication process (see Section III).

H. Faculty must report the infraction and the action taken to the Student Conduct Administrator. The faculty member shall send the Student Conduct Administrator a copy of the Record of Faculty Attempt for Resolution of Cheating and Plagiarism Allegations within five (5) academic days of the faculty and student signing the document.

I. The Student Conduct Administrator shall schedule a meeting with the student to issue a warning. Adjudicated resolution is required when the faculty member requests administrative sanctions. The Student Conduct Administrator maintains a list of students
found responsible for cheating or plagiarism in order to detect students who are repeat offenders. If the student has more than one violation of the Cheating and Plagiarism Policy, the Student Conduct Administrator will determine if administrative disciplinary action is warranted.

J. As per the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), all proceedings, notes, and discussions between the faculty member and the student shall remain confidential. Faculty members may consult with their department chair, dean, or other appropriate administrator.

K. Sanctions may include, but are not limited to, those listed under Section III.D.

III. Adjudicated Resolution

A. Rationale: The faculty member may initiate an adjudicated proceeding when, (1) the student fails to attend the scheduled conference to discuss the allegations; (2) the alleged cheating or plagiarism is detected at the close of the semester and the instructor’s good faith effort to contact the student is unsuccessful; (3) negotiated resolution fails; or (4) the faculty member feels the gravity of the situation demands University disciplinary action. The faculty member shall wait to assign the student a grade for the course or assignment until the adjudicated proceedings are concluded.

B. Definition of Adjudicated Resolution: The adjudication procedure is the submission of a written allegation of cheating or plagiarism to the Dispute Resolution Board and resolution of the allegation by the Dispute Resolution Board, in addition to any decisions related to sanctions. An adjudicated procedure occurs when the faculty member and the student are unable to reach agreement on the alleged violation and informal sanctions in negotiation or when the faculty member believes that the alleged violation is of a particularly serious nature as to warrant formal proceedings.

C. Adjudication Cheating and Plagiarism Procedure

1. To initiate adjudication procedures, see the Formal Dispute Resolution Procedures (http://policies.sonoma.edu/policies/formal-dispute-resolution-procedures)

2. The Cheating and Plagiarism Complaint form must be submitted to the Chair of the Dispute Resolution Board within 120 calendar days after the discovery of the alleged violation.

D. Sanctions for Cheating or Plagiarism

1. Academic Sanctions: One or more academic sanctions may be imposed for cheating or plagiarism. Academic sanctions may be imposed by a faculty member through the negotiated process or may be recommended by a faculty member in their submission to the Dispute Resolution Board. Academic sanctions may include, but are not limited to:

   a. A redoing of the examination, paper, mathematical analysis, research or creative project, or the like;

   b. A failing grade on the examination, paper, mathematical analysis, research or creative project, or the like;

   c. A specified reduction in the course grade;
d. A failing grade in the course;

e. Multiple Sanctions: More than one of the sanctions listed above may be imposed for any single violation.

2. Administrative Sanctions: When there is an allegation of a particularly serious violation of the Cheating and Plagiarism Policy, administrative sanctions may be requested by faculty members in their submission to the Dispute Resolution Board. Student discipline sanctions, per CSU Executive Order 970, may include expulsion or suspension from the University, probation, and other sanctions. If the Dispute Resolution Board finds administrative sanctions appropriate, the Board will forward their recommendation to the Student Conduct Administrator. Formal administrative sanction hearings for cheating or plagiarism are administered through the Student Conduct Administrator.