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

Consent Items: From EPC: Revision to Spanish MA
(https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:930/form)

Business
1. Engineering A3 Waiver request – First Reading – E. Asencio TC 3:20
2. Motion that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University endorse the EPC Statement on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters – was postponed to this meeting. TC 3:35
3. From S&F: By-Law Change – membership of URTP subcommittee – L. Krier - Second Reading TC 4:00
4. From FSAC: AFS/PDS Statement on Teaching Sensitive Materials – Request for endorsement - P. Lane - Second Reading TC 4:10
5. Resolution on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters - S. Brannen - Second Reading TC 4:20
7. From APARC: Letter regarding Syllabus Policy and Syllabus Policy revision –E. Virmani - Second Reading TC 4:40 (please see also: https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/6629496/latest/)

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

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

Good of the Order
Academic Senate Minutes
March 4, 2021
3:00 – 5:00 with free the fifties
Via Zoom

Abstract


Absent: Angelo Camillo

Proxy: Laura Monje-Paulson for Wm Gregory Sawyer

Guests: Kaylah Sanders, Megan McIntyre, Katie Musick, Victor Garlin, Jerlena Griffin-Desta, Joel Gould, Karen Schneider, Merith Weisman, Elizabeth Wade, Damien Hansen Sandy Ayala, Napoleon Reyes, Hollis Robbins, John Lynch, Jonathan Smith, Kari Manwiller, Barbara Moore, Laura Alamillo, Sergio Canavati de la Torre, Christine Hayes, Ajay Gehlawat, Brent Boyer, Jenn Lillig, Stacey Bosick, Theresa Nguyen, Noelia Franzen, Catherine Nelson, Lisel Murdock-Perriera, Krista Altaker, Suzanne O’Keefe, Jean-Francois Coget, Matty Mookerjee

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 2/18/2021 – Approved.

Special Student Report – Kaylah Sanders
“My name is Kayla. I’m a third year here at Sonoma State and I’m an EOP student. I’m also involved in REACH, as I was an RA in my sophomore year and I’ll be an RA for my senior year. My journey was a little bit atypical, but I cherish it nonetheless. I remember coming to Sonoma State on SeaWolf day while I was still in high school. I wanted to go to the financial aid seminar and the EOP seminar. That was all that was on my list because I wanted to make sure, as a first-generation college student, that I got as much information and resources as possible. Listening to Andre speak about EOP, it became my whole vision for Sonoma State. I thought want to go here; they have the best to EOP program, they have all of these benefits for first generation students and so after that I was dead set, and when I found out I got into EOP, it was one of the most exciting moments of my life. It’s really great. It’s provided me with so many resources and great connections, even speaking to my advisor, Amal, is just wonderful. She never ceases to give me encouragement. Even my professors here at Sonoma State are so encouraging and so flexible, especially given the current pandemic and our Zoom life. I was talking the other day about a professor I have in the English department, I’m an English major with literature concentration, and there was a student who couldn’t come immediately to class because they had to answer the door for the person who’s coming to the door and he just said, this is our life now, this is what we have to do. I’m understanding of that, so don’t feel guilty, don’t feel pressured, just do the best you can, because this is the life we have to adapt to now and that really shifted my perspective and lifted a lot of pressure off of me. That is really what going to Sonoma feels like to me. It’s like a breath of fresh air, and it really feels like family, just walking across campus and seeing people that you know and before COVID, giving them a hug and just talking to them for a moment, giving them a source of encouragement and a sense of community. That’s what Sonoma State EOP and REACH is all about to me is a sense of community and just belonging on campus. I have had a little bit of difficulty with a disability and everything, but EOP has really helped me, connecting me with DSS and connecting me with the right people to get the accommodations I needed. That’s one example of how much EOP helped me, so thank you guys so much for inviting me it’s a pleasure to speak to you and I appreciate the opportunity to come on today.”

The Chair thanked Kayla for attending and said we will use her story to ground our meeting today and to remind us what we’re doing here.

Chair Report – J. Reeder

J. Reeder noted one of the general topics of his chairs report from a few weeks ago, four weeks ago, to be precise, was talking about students and, in particular those students who were among the hundreds of students who chose not to come to Sonoma State and what might have been their reasons for that choice. Two weeks ago, we talked about self-care, making sure that we take care of ourselves, making sure that we’re in a position where we give ourselves permission and understanding and grace to do that 100% without requiring of ourselves at 110% or 120%. For today he invited thought over the next few weeks or the rest of the Semester, or forever, on the topic of collegiality and civility and how important that is. He thought there were a couple of things that we can all agree upon and one of those things is that all of us are here and by all of us, he meant all faculty all staff and
administrators are here because we have a connection to either this job or this profession or this work or this place, or in some of our lives, all of those words blend together. We’re not here for the great stock options. We’re not here for the fame and fortune or the donuts or the any of those other corporate things that you might get somewhere else. We’re here because we work with people, we work with students, we have an important job to do, it’s important to society, and we know that we can do it well. It’s honorable, but we know that sometimes it’s complicated, and this is one of those complicated times. There’s never a non-complicated time, but this is definitely a particularly complicated time. We thought it was complicated a year ago, when we had to suddenly move off campus and transition to virtual online instruction. Nobody had ever done that before. There was no playbook. We didn't have any models to follow, so that was all brand new. It was difficult, there were a lot of a lot of adaptations, a lot of innovations, a lot of mistakes, a lot of inefficiencies, and a lot of a lot of great things happened, a lot of not-so-great things happened. But we were all doing that together, and we all had clear direction and clear guidance - this is what we’re doing, we have to get off campus, we have to keep teaching, we have to keep meeting students, we have to keep governance moving. As we come back, it’s not so clear. As we come back, we’re most certainly not going to be all unified in one playbook which says this is exactly what we’re going to do, and this is how we’re going to do it. Look at your Zoom screen. Look at all those people. At some point in the next semester, you will have, he believed, a disagreement with every single person, probably, on that screen, or at least every single person who speaks or declares or opines something. What’s important is not that we try to minimize these disagreements, that would be the wrong type of goal to not have disagreement, but how we can disagree with each other in a positive manner, as we move forward. This is challenging and difficult, because we all come from different backgrounds, different histories, different cultures and many of these backgrounds are intersectional within the same individual. How we express and how we manifest and how we internalize disagreement is going to vary greatly. He was calling this to the Senate’s attention because this has a lot to do with our campus climate such as program meetings, departmental meetings, staff meetings or our faculty interactions with staff, faculty interactions with administration. If we can center in our minds on the fact that everyone wants what's best for the university and then work through our disagreements with that as our grounding and centering point, he thought that’ll help us. He thought that this could be a discussion for the next few weeks and months. He noted one other thing which is, generally, on the topic of civility, two weeks ago, we were attacked. He said “we were attacked” and not “they were attacked,” because we are all in this together. As we go through our business and work, we need to keep in mind the fact that we were attacked in a hostile manner in our campus space and keep that in mind also as we work through our differences, our sensitivities and our awareness, with each other, that we need to do whatever we can to make sure to do the best that we can so that this doesn’t happen and that everybody feels protected and safe.
President’s Report – J. Sakaki

J. Sakaki thanked the Chair for his words and his thoughts. She resonated with it and appreciated the reminders. We were attacked. The Zoom bombing occurred on our campus. We weren’t isolated in that. She was aware of two other CSU that receives similar attacks at Black History Month celebrations. There are conversations going on and we need to do whatever we can electronically. She was sorry and hated that that happened. We do need to look out for each other and we need to be sensitive to how each of those attacks feels, if you are either in that space while it happened, or if you heard about it later. Each of us reacts differently to those kinds of things, but it was extremely hurtful and offensive. We’re still in the midst of that investigation and there’s a larger investigation that is continuing. Planning for fall 2021 continues and she appreciated everything that the different groups are doing to help us get ready. For our coming back, and she looks forward to it. She was excited about the potential and the possibilities. We are already getting students who are signing up to come back into our housing.

She thanked everyone who was a part of the WASC visit. Provost Moranski will talk more about that. The President had her meeting this morning with the Chair, Chancellor Emeritus Dorothy Leland formerly from UC Merced. We had a great conversation, and she was part of that team that was here, two weeks after the fire and so she was really pleased that we’re all back and we’re doing great things and we’ll hear more from that team tomorrow.

Consent Item: From EPC: Revision to the BA in Philosophy – Approved.

Provost Report – K. Moranski

K. Moranski thanked everyone who has already participated today or participating this afternoon in our last meetings with WASC. As a reminder, those meetings are focused on the seven recommendations that were made in 2017 and 18 as they finalized our institutional self-report and came to campus. There’s a great deal of pride she has been hearing and great conversations that are happening all across campus. She thought people were eager to participate and tell the stories about what we have done over the last three or four years. She felt very proud of Sonoma State
and of what we've achieved together and of the stories that we're telling today that are about resilience and collaboration and making progress in very difficult circumstances. She congratulated the campus for everything that everyone has done to take this institution forward over the last three or four years. We'll know more tomorrow when they provide a report out with the folks are who are on the WASC team and with some of the cabinet about what their recommendations are for the next period. Our next institutional review is in 2025. We are moving forward with planning for the fall and that is a huge topic of conversation. She thanked the folks who participated in and worked through issues in the faculty exchange yesterday. It was powerful and informative.

Time certain reached.

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

E. Virmani said she appreciated the tone and the message that the Chair started us off with, and in that spirit, we continue with introducing the proposed syllabus policy revision, keeping the bigger picture in mind of who we're serving. On behalf of all of the faculty members on APARC, we are hoping that we can revise the syllabus policy. For a couple of years, ATISS and APARC, have been working to bring the campus into compliance with the CSU policy that requires SSU to use the learning management system to disseminate course information to all students and also to ensure accessibility of and to the syllabus. The main proposal is that the language of the syllabus policy be revised so that it requires all faculty to provide syllabi in a format that's accessible to all students with the content built into the learning management system.

S. Ayala said she wanted to begin by thanking everybody who's been working towards this initiative or towards this work. She thanked everyone for their continued support of ATI and the work to make a valuable change for Sonoma State University and the accessible syllabus policy.

The Accessible Technology Initiative is a President’s committee. For the past 10 years since S. Ayala had been sitting on this committee, we’ve been working towards the ATI goals and indicators. We report 178 indicators to the Chancellor's Office. We do that across three areas, which are the Web, procurement on campus and instructional materials. It is the area of instructional materials which we're addressing today. We have nine specific goals that we address, with 58 total indicators that we address annually on this campus. The top three over the past two years that we've been working hard to make some changes towards are book orders, which is ordering our textbooks in a timely fashion, so that they can be converted into alternative formats for students and the accessible syllabus. We've been working over two years on the Syllabus policy. What makes the syllabus accessible, just to give us all common ground, are two things - it's the formatting, which includes text font, size, headings, headers, lists, alternative text for graphics, aligning tables and the contrast. And it's the digital distribution. It has to be distributed to students in electronic or digital format. ATI worked very hard with CTET over the last couple years to pilot and then bring Canvas to campus because
canvas as a learning management system was the strongest in making materials more accessible for students. They also piloted Ally, which is an accessibility checker. If you use Canvas to build your syllabus, or post and copy and paste into Canvas, you have the best chance of having an accessible syllabus because Canvas will do a lot of that work for you. Ally is a great tool that points out quickly where you might have to make some changes. These two things together were the first steps in working directly towards getting accessible syllabi on campus. What we’re asking of you today is to make a small change to the current syllabus policy from requiring faculty to have an accessible syllabus to requiring faculty to also post that syllabus on the learning management system.

Why we’re asking you to do this? Accessibility is a human right. We also want to comply with the laws, with the American with Disabilities Act and section 508, which state that on university campuses all course materials are made accessible for students. We also want to comply with the expectations of the Chancellor’s office that all course content is made accessible for students. We also want to avoid preventable lawsuits. We worked really hard in the past year because we underwent an audit on this campus and there were a number of things we had to address and change quickly towards our accessibility of all materials on campus. In all three areas, web requirement and instructional materials, there are right now currently a number of lawsuits out on other CSU campuses, so we also want to account for the number of accessible syllabi on campus. We submit a report to the Chancellor’s Office annually and report to the President. When they asked us to the question - how many syllabi are accessible on campus, we need to be able to answer that question for both the annual reports and the audits. We also believe this action is aligned with our strategic plan of being an inclusive campus. We work hard towards equity, accessibility, and inclusion and Universal Design. These are all important things for us. Lastly, this change will help us to be prepared for remote learning in case of emergencies, such as the pandemic and all the fires that we’ve had. It was challenging last year moving to remote learning so quickly and not knowing if we had a syllabus for all courses online. The Chancellor's Office has an Executive Order 1111 with a coded memo and it says in priority area two, it’s the policy of the CSU to make information technology, resources and services accessible to all students. It says each campus will establish a plan that includes the use of the LMS for delivering instructional materials online. This is all supported by the policy, and by the American with Disabilities Act.

The current syllabus policy on this campus states that all syllabi should be provided in a format that’s accessible to all students. It's recommended that you use the accessible syllabus template that we provide on the ATI website. The proposed policy is asking that the syllabus be providing in a format that’s accessible to all students and the content built into the learning management system.

A member said he had no objections to the policy revision. He asked for clarification about the coded memo that says that the syllabus needs to be in the learning management system, but when he clicked on the link to that actual memo,
it says by June 2007, so 14 years ago. He wanted to clarify that we are 14 years out of compliance.

The Chair of EPC said EPC did have a chance to look this over and discuss it at our meeting this morning, and there were no particular objections. There was a suggestion in the messaging that it’s very clear that this is a CSU level policy that’s being addressed. That might help with some hesitancy if there is any. In general, EPC was supportive and our student member was also very supportive. The only other thing he added, which isn’t directly related to this, is that there’s an inconsistency with professors across campus using Canvas as their learning management system, so that might be an issue going forward to think about.

A member said having chaired the Dispute Resolution Board previously, one of the big things that comes up on occasion, is that faculty members will alter their syllabus, particularly when it’s in an easy to alter format, such as only electronic and without any documented changes of what’s been done and that can make a grievance very difficult to resolve for a student or for a faculty member. She wondered if somewhere within this policy we could add that syllabi should have a date or version on it, if it’s posted electronically.

A member also didn’t have objections to the revision and had a clarifying question. If we can copy and paste our syllabus into Canvas, that’s the best, but would that be enough? Do we still have to have a Word or PDF file attached to Canvas or is the syllabus the only thing. E. Virmani said basically, it can be posted as a Word document or Google document in Canvas because Ally can still check that or it could be uploaded into one of your modules. There’s a lot of flexibility, as long as it’s in Canvas. It doesn’t have to be built into the syllabus tab. S. Ayala said you can you can either upload a Word doc or Google doc and attach it in any one of your modules or you can just build it directly into the syllabus tab. Many people do both. She tended to do both, she avoided pdfs, of course, that’s important to do and she tended to copy from Google docs because it transfers more easily. First Reading completed.

From SDS: Syllabus Checklist for Diversity/Inclusivity – K. Altaker – Request for Endorsement - First Reading

K. Altaker said this is an important topic on our campus and several members on SDS brought to our attention that faculty were wanting and needing mentorship, support, and guidance around how to build out a syllabus that addresses diversity and inclusiveness due to all of the work that we’re doing on anti-racism on campus. They took the time to develop some guidelines in a module format. She introduced Theresa Nguyen and Megan McIntyre to discuss the checklist.

T. Nguyen said this resource is intentionally designed to be self-paced and modular so that faculty can choose to focus on certain modules related to inclusion and social justice, one at a time, or as they choose. In total, there are 12 independent modules related to inclusive syllabus and course design and in each module, faculty are prompted with self-reflective questions, suggested guidelines, and templates that we provide and additional resources. We want to make this resource known to
faculty members, as well as other campus entities, who may be interested in combining efforts with SDS. We want to stress that this syllabus review is not a requirement for faculty, rather it is meant to support those who are interested in addressing issues of inclusion in their syllabus.

L. Murdock-Perriera said one thing that we wanted to highlight is that this remains a living document. It’s definitely something that we’re interested in continuing to receive feedback on. It’s by no means perfect. We do have some collective expertise in our fields in this area, but it’s certainly not the only expertise and we fully embrace the fact that this is a learning process for us as well. We want to emphasize that element and also that the document was created as a cross departmental collaboration. We’ve had input from folks across the university.

M. McIntyre said she thought it was important to know that we solicited feedback from folks in Academic Programs, as well as the Hub, as well as student representatives on SDS and elsewhere, to make sure that students views are represented. We also got feedback from the from advisors, because we think that’s an important voice as well, to make sure that as faculty we’re thinking about the experiences of our students from as many perspectives as we can.

**Motion to waive the first reading. Second. Failed.**

A member said she would love to hear more from the committee about their thoughts about training, how that might happen or how faculty can engage in this in a meaningful way. Maybe the training would be something that we would offer through CTET. She wanted to hear the thinking about all the details of where it’s housed and how people get trained during the second reading.

A member asked what exactly SDS was asking for the Senate to do. K. Altaker said SDS was asking for input around dissemination. She wanted to hear a little bit more clearly the response to the suggested dissemination that was listed on the last page of the document and offer some suggestions, if that doesn’t seem clear. She was happy to receive email feedback from anyone who has thought about that after today. There was some procedural discussion about whether this needed a first and second reading. The Senate Analyst said if it’s a business item on the Senate, it has to have two readings and even if the intent to endorse something, Senators should still go back to their departments and ask the department - do you want us to endorse this.

A member said she was looking at the dissemination options in the document wanted to know a little bit more about the training of the folks who are disseminating the document. In work related to justice, equity and inclusion, it is as important as the what. For her, it was not enough to say this one entity is doing this. What are the qualifications, what are the requirements of the person delivering the training. That would be something that she would be interested in knowing at the second reading.

M. McIntyre said as a member of SDS she wanted to respond to the member’s point. We would be happy to provide some context around what we’re hoping for, what
the guided implementation would look like. She wanted to emphasize that this is built to be asynchronous, if that's how folks want to use it. It's modular and it's set up in those three sections, so that faculty can work through it in a way and at a time that is comfortable for them. We imagined that as a resource it can be used synchronously to support professional development in various places, but we also want to make sure that faculty will have an opportunity to access it in times that are reasonable to them, which may not be at the same times as professional development opportunities are often offered. First reading completed.

3:50 free the fifties reached. Natalie Hobson provided desktop yoga.

From FSAC: AFS/PDS Statement on Teaching Sensitive Materials – Request for endorsement - P. Lane - First Reading

P. Lane noted that this document has been worked on for many years. She brought different version of this joint statement by Academic Freedom subcommittee and Professional Development subcommittee to Ex Com. There were several suggestions, and it was rejected to bring forward to the Senate. Last week, this document was accepted by Ex Com to bring forward to the Senate. She noted that the Chairs of AFS and PDS were present and they can speak more specifically to the intent and why they think is important.

A. Gehlawat provided a quick overview. The statement has undergone extensive vetting over a period of years, with input now from CAPS, from DSS, from PDS from FSAC and from Ex Com. All of those committees and subcommittees have provided useful input to the final version. The statement is based on a report that was issued by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) regarding trigger warnings which itself is informed by numerous studies on this issue. AFS also received additional input from qualified experts, for example, Dr Matthew Paolucci-Callahan of our Psychology department, who met with us concerning this issue. Finally, we also receive a useful input from Chair Reeder who previously characterize this statement as a best practices statement intended for faculty not as a Senate resolution. We have included a preamble now to the statements, making that clear and we’ve also included a hyperlink to the AAUP report.

The Student Rep said she thanked those who have worked on this and she believed the committee's statement about trigger warnings is responding back to the Associated Students resolution. The resolution asks professors that if they are revealing sensitive content, that they give the students a warning beforehand. While she appreciated all the time and effort that put into this, she thought that many people are missing the purpose of why we did this. We're not asking you to remove content from your lectures or to change the way that you teach. We’re just asking you that when you are going to preset anything that can be a trigger for someone that you make it known to the student beforehand. That's where the Associated Students is coming from. We do not feel that this is responding to what we were working for and what we intended.

The Chair provided a little bit of historical context. The Associated Students resolution which came this year and the project of AFS and PDS to craft a statement
on teaching sensitive materials, are related and they both deal with trigger warnings. AFS and PDS have been developing the statement for several years now, and so it’s not necessarily in response to the AS resolution.

A member said it further complicated her thinking now that the Chair just added that new information, that this has been a work in progress. The intention of providing students with support or information that they may need to make the best decision for their own mental health is noted and she wondered if there a way that we can acknowledge that in a more explicit way while still staying within what PDS and AFS are striving for in the statement.

A member noted that what is unpleasant to some people, and what triggers bad reactions, for some people, doesn't for other people and it's impossible to be completely aware of all the possible triggers that might occur. He didn't think it is the faculty's job to be aware of that, so he thought if someone has PTSD, they should get an accommodation from Disability Services. The accommodation should say for this student, you must tell them if you're going to talk about this that or the other, and then for that student you could do that, and then they wouldn't be triggered, but to somehow be aware of everything that might offend, that's not possible and he didn’t even think that's appropriate in a college setting.

A. Gehlawat said it would be a mistake to see this as directly responding to the student's resolution. The preamble is making this explicit. We are here to support our fellow faculty with a statement from the perspective of academic freedom and just to echo what was just said, in order for faculty to be empowered to help and provide the best resources to their students, faculty in turn need to be supported. That is what our primary mission is here. If you look at the document that we're providing here, for your endorsement, it actually leads to other useful resources that faculty can consider. In a lot of ways, by providing and disseminating this document amongst faculty, they can turn to a number of other resources on campus and they can direct students to those resources. This is not in any way trying to dismiss any concerns people have. It is trying to empower and support faculty to make the best practice decisions that they often need to make.

A member said she has been hearing this debate go on for probably four or five years and thought everybody probably has some opinion or another, and she wanted to note that her opinion is absolutely irrelevant and everybody's opinion here is irrelevant because none of us are experts in what causes trauma or triggers and what she has heard over the years, again and again, is that the appropriate people to deal with such issues are DSS and CAPS. They would be the first people to make that determination. The AAUP has similarly stated that we could potentially do more harm as faculty trying to mediate or ameliorate some kinds of negative experiences or feelings, so she was concerned that we overstep our role as faculty when we try to decide what will or will not be triggering to students. She defers to those who are professionals who deal with PTSD, who deal with disability services, who deal with counseling, and she hoped that all of us also set aside our own thoughts and feelings and listen to those who are experts.
S. O’Keefe said she wanted to give a little bit more historical context to this statement. When this was developed there were students who were complaining and saying that there were issues in their classes as far as trigger warnings. As this was being developed, we had a lot of conversations about how can this be the most useful. The initial intention was not to make it mandatory or force it on anyone, but to say why don't we create a resource, something that could potentially be put in a syllabus or be put on a website. Faculty would have an option to use it. This was never intended to be an across-the-board thing. It was - let’s develop a resource and then people who are interested can use it.

A member said she wanted to make sure that she had a clear understanding of what our students are saying. It sounds like it’s being interpreted differently than what she was interpreting. What she heard being asked from the students is to make it known that it may be a possible trigger and that’s what the trigger warning is. It is not a determination, on behalf of the faculty, about what will or won't trigger their students. She thought the conversation about it being left to experts is more about the treatment of the trigger or what is determined triggering for specific students, but the what the students seem to be asking for is just a general warning about something that could be triggering, specifically to our larger group of students. It could be gender bias, it could be racial bias that is triggering for a large group of people, and we know that those things are possibly triggering, and she thought that is what the students are asking for. If you have some type of content in your curriculum that could be triggering for a specific population of students, and we are not asking you to go research and find out everything that could be triggering, just be responsible for the information that you are providing that you know could be triggering. Especially for the students that are taking part in that education, in that particular setting, to let them know that, so that they can respond how they need to take care of themselves and be as healthy as possible in this space. First reading completed.

Time certain reached.

From S&F: By-Law Change – membership of URTP subcommittee – L. Krier - Second Reading

L. Krier provide a quick overview of the bylaw change. The request is to change the composition of the RTP subcommittee to be composed of seven members with one member each from of the schools and the library and one at-large member. At the first reading, the question was raised that due to any seat that cannot be filled by a member of a school would be elected at-large, this would possibly result in many at-large members and therefore uneven representation across the schools. That is already the case on this committee. That’s going to be an issue, whether we change the bylaws or not.

A member said he expressed some concerns on the Senate talk and wanted to make sure it’s clear that neither himself nor his constituency, which is the retired faculty, have a pony in this race. We don’t particularly care whether there are five or seven members, and we have no objection to the idea of spreading the membership around, but he did bring up some matters that he thought need to be addressed.
One of them is the use of the word majority. It’s a warm and fuzzy word. It sounds very democratic and so on, but the fact is that, in many cases it doesn’t have any meaning. A simple solution to this would be to replace the word “majority” with “plurality” majority means more than 50% which means more than all the other candidates, whereas plurality just means more than any other candidate.

**Motion to replace “majority” to “plurality” in the by-law amendment. Second.**

The Vice Chair noted she looked through the bylaws this afternoon and discovered that in any place in the bylaws where there’s discussion of an election for an at-large position, the word majority is used. Structure and Functions is, separately, looking at the bylaws as a whole to find places where there are in consistencies or things that need to be updated. She thought that this change would be better made across the board, so that it’s consistent for any election that’s for an at-large Senator rather than making it in just this section and then having inconsistency.

A member said maybe we should make this change now to remind us to make the change to all the others.

**Vote on amendment. Approved.**

A member said it’s not clear at all in the proposed revision who gets to vote on these numbers from schools and library. He thought that that needed to be clarified. (The Senate Analyst noted in the chat that only tenured and tenure track faculty can vote on membership to the URTP subcommittee.)

**Vote to postpone item to next meeting. Second. Approved.**

**Time certain reached.**

**Resolution on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters - S. Brannen - First Reading**

S. Brannen said this resolution is in response to what EPC brought with their memo to the Senate at our last meeting and it supersedes our endorsement of that memo, but that endorsement is still on our agenda because we postponed it to this meeting. It belongs to the Senate, so we have to vote to remove it if we decide to do so. He had been informed that the issues at question in the resolution have been informally resolved or an agreement has been reached that addresses most of these concerns, but it is not in writing yet, and therefore we should not change this resolution at this time. What he wanted to see happen was that if the resolutions stays at a first reading this time and then comes back as a second reading, next time, and at that time, if there has been a formal agreement, we can modify and maybe remove the last three resolve causes, four, five and six. He was happy to answer any questions and to hear from the involved parties that were present at the Senate meeting.

A guest said he was representing EPC’s point of view. We certainly are speaking in favor of this resolution, and it may ultimately change as just mentioned, but he wanted to bring up what EPC thought were the three points that need to be
addressed in both endorsing our letter or in this resolution and those three things are: one, that we want to take CS codes seriously. To either willy-nilly, change a CS code which bulldozes over faculty governance is wrong and to disregard CS codes is equally wrong because it gives them no power. EPC thinks of CS codes as being part of faculty governance. The Chancellor’s Office might have a different opinion of this, but we think of it when we approve a course, we approve it for a specific CS code, and that is part of pedagogy, it’s part of curriculum and the curriculum belongs to the faculty. We want to speak very strongly in favor of not allowing administrators to either disregard or unilaterally change those CS codes. We also have problems with depriving a Department Chair of the rights to staff their own courses with faculty who are actually qualified to teach that particular curriculum. Particularly assigning somebody who’s even outside the discipline in which you are teaching is very problematic. The third issue is workload. Having an administrator displace a faculty member from a particular teaching assignment and hire themselves or hire any other non-faculty member to take that teaching assignment away is really problematic and he hoped that CFA would have a lot to say about that. That’s the perspective from EPC, and we hope that this ultimately gets passed, as well as endorsing the EPC letter, which is coming up next on the agenda.

The Provost said in terms of where we are in process, and there have been discussions about resolving the issues that that have led to the resolution and the EPC memo. There are meetings scheduled tomorrow that should finalize this, so her suggestion would be to let the process play itself out, so that everyone knows what the situation is. She thought there might be some misunderstanding. There was no removal of workload of work for a faculty member. No one lost work. As a result of what happened, we’ve got issues that that can’t be fully addressed in the Senate and are confidential personnel issues, but in the meantime, the main point is that these issues are in the process of being formalized and we do need to let that process play itself out. She suggested that we see what the final agreement is before moving forward on a resolution.

A member said he didn’t believe that the Dean actually changed the CS number for the course. He thought the Dean just claimed to change the CS number for the course because the number actually doesn’t get changed until it goes through faculty governance, so the CS number was never changed.

The Student rep said the Associated Students also took a look at this because in the beginning of the year, the CCJS program was cut and a lot of students were upset over this cut. She agreed with the Provost. She thought that Associated Students will also bring out a resolution.

A member said because one of the things that he was hearing is that we should wait until the process plays itself out, which he appreciated some of the merits of that argument, on the other hand, he wanted the resolution be timely enough that it might help in how it all plays out. He thought that this is one of the trickiest things he has seen come to the Senate in a while, and he advocated the Senate deliberating on it.
The Chair noted that regardless of whether we take action now or in two weeks or not at all, it is quite clear that the discussion has brought these issues to the fore in a public and appropriate forum.

A member said faculty governance has procedures, the setting of the CS code, the process by which faculty at EPC approves curriculum that we want to defend. One thing that has still been troubling him about this whole situation was this didn’t happen in a vacuum, something had to have triggered this. He acknowledged that his facts may be sketchy on this, but he thought it relates to this internship class and presumably not enough seats being available for graduating students and so that’s where this extra class came from. He was troubled by the idea that we’re prioritizing CS code decisions, as important as they are, over getting students out in a timely manner. He wondered if there’s something that we could incorporate that tries to resolve that underlying situation. If funding was not available to get the sufficient number of seats or if it is the CS code itself, we need to address it. He didn’t think anybody wants the situation to repeat itself.

A. Gehlawat said on behalf of AFS, the Academic Freedom Subcommittee, he wanted to let everybody know we have not heard back from the Dean of the School of Social Sciences, and this is despite following up with her again last week, urging her to reconsider her refusal to take part in an informal conversation with AFS and CCJS regarding this issue. He did find this to be flagrantly disrespectful and not only to faculty, but of the governance process. Despite calls by both himself and Chair Reeder at the last Senate meeting for all parties to engage in good faith, this clearly is not happening on the part of the administration. It is a bit ironic when the interim Provost is saying we need to let this process play itself out, because that’s precisely what AFS has been trying to do with CCJS. If good faith were being practiced all around the table, that would really expedite this the resolution of this serious and compelling issue.

The Chair said he had heard that AFS had heard back from the Dean. He asked for clarification from AFS. A. Gehlawat said the response we received, she could not speak with AFS as a whole, because this is in reference to a personnel issue and therefore confidential. However, in the same email the Dean said she was happy to speak with me as Chair about all of these issues. AFS found that strange because if she’s bound by these personnel issues and she can’t talk about them with AFS, why would she want to talk to me about them. That speaks to the heart of the issue, which not negotiating in good faith. First Reading completed.

Time certain reached.

Motion that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University endorse the EPC Statement on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters – postponed from Senate meeting of 2/18 – S. Brannen

S. Brannen said he did not think the Senate should reach a decision today on this motion. He thought the Senate should hold it abeyance to see what happens. An argument could be made that we should pass this because all we would be doing is endorsing it. He would leave it up to this body to decide.
A member said she was encouraged by the fact that everyone seems to be saying that a resolution has a lot of power. We pass resolutions to make statements, they are not always acted upon, and as a body we make resolutions to make a point. It's not about whether this is resolved or not. It's about that it happened. She believed everyone is earnestly working on this and it will be resolved. She didn’t think that has anything to do with the resolution. The resolution is about something that happened and it shouldn't happen. That it gets fixed is irrelevant. This is about power, this is about what someone sees as their job, that faculty governance sees is their ability to do, and so she supported the resolution to do what the Senate does, which is to make a statement.

A guest said he wholeheartedly agreed that it's really about making a statement, and he thought the resolution that was put forward puts things into a positive light, that we want to reaffirm faculty rights with regards to curriculum and those statements are good statements to make in a vacuum in regardless of this particular context.

A guest from CCJS said he wanted to acknowledge that we have been working with Provost Moranski on this to find a resolution, but no formal agreement has been reached. What happened was that our department resources were reduced last semester and we were being asked to increase the class sizes over what the CS code requires. That's the story behind that. The CS code represents the class size required under CSU policy and therefore involves getting students to graduate in a timely manner.

The Provost said she disagreed with the representation of the issue about good faith and said that the administration has worked in good faith to try to resolve the issues and that we have worked in the best interests of the students and of the institution and as well as trying to work with the department to resolve these issues. She disagreed strongly with a representation that says that anybody was acting in bad faith. She thought that the situation with the internship course is one that we face as an institution, because of the way that we have handled internships on this campus. As was suggested, we need to look into broader issues about how we’re handling internships and that internships are not properly signifying either the process by which students graduate in a timely fashion, nor are they working to ensure that faculty workload is appropriately tracked and acknowledged. The CS codes that we have from 1976 do not appropriately reflect the kind of work that's now done. It has had little effect on the Chancellor's Office to do that. She thought we need to look at other mechanisms for dealing with internships. The good thing that this has raised is that we need to address that issue campus wide and find a different way forward, both to move forward with student graduation, and also to address the workload issues. We're conscious of all of those issues, both the budgetary issues of needing programs to meet target and to make sure that we're able to move forward in a fiscally conscious way, but also to make sure that we're graduating students and departments have the mechanisms to do the kind of work that they want to do. Those were the goals in moving forward with resolution.
The Chair said we can either postpone this until the next meeting or call the question and vote on it, or have a motion to extend the meeting by a number of minutes. He recognized the Vice Chair to talk about the election.

L. Krier said the by-laws require that when an election does not have the required number of nominees the Senate has to vote to run the election with only one candidate for each position. Our current roster has only one nominee for URTP.

The Chair said is there any objection to running the election in the manner Vice Chair Krier described. Seeing no objection, so it shall be.

Motion to postpone motion that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University endorse the EPC Statement on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters to next meeting. Second. Approved.

Adjourned.

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

To: Members of the SSU Academic Senate

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

Date: March 9, 2021

Subject: Engineering A3 waiver request

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. Explanation of issues
II. Evidences
III. Influence of context and assumption, student’s position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)
IV. Student’s position/Thesis

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

5 [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gChVGN2o04GFO9tuHhx_UPd66Dj3vYXh/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gChVGN2o04GFO9tuHhx_UPd66Dj3vYXh/view)
the EE@SSU curriculum to develop and expand students’ critical thinking ability, and to meet the GE critical thinking requirements.
Table 3. Mapping of the engineering design process @ SSU in various engineering courses as met for ABET accreditation and the SSU critical thinking general education outcomes (Levels: I=Introductory, M=Medium, D=Developed). See appendix A for more details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Lower-Division Major Core</th>
<th>Upper-Division Major Core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 1: An ability to identify, formulate, and solve complex engineering problems by applying principles of engineering, science, and mathematics.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 2: An ability to apply engineering design to produce solutions that meet specified needs with reasonable public health, safety, and environmental considerations.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 3: An ability to communicate effectively with a team, individually, and through written and oral presentations.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 4: An ability to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgments, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 5: An ability to function effectively on a team whose members include local, national, and international members.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 6: An ability to develop and conduct appropriate experiments, analyze and interpret data, and use engineering judgment to draw conclusions.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Student Outcome 7: An ability to acquire and apply new knowledge as needed, using appropriate learning strategies.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Outcomes**

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

**GE Area A**

- GE Area A1 - Oral Communication: 3 units
- GE Area A2 - Written Communication: 3 units
- GE Area A3 - Critical Thinking: 3 units

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

**SSU GE A3 Content Area Criteria:**

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

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

---

6 [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gChVGN2o04GFO9tuHhx_UPd66Dj3vYXh/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gChVGN2o04GFO9tuHhx_UPd66Dj3vYXh/view)
involving iterative design and reassessment review that promote critical thinking. In EE 310/L, students must design experiments to investigate and develop a “cost” matrix in order to select a particular electronic component. The cost matrix allows the students to design every aspect of their work based on sound evidence and reasoning.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

SSU GE A3 Required Learning Outcomes:
Below, we elaborate how we the EE curriculum meets the GE.A3 Learning Outcomes.8

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gChVGN2o04GFO9tuHhx_UPd66Dj3vYXh/view
In Summary:

- The Chancellor’s Office has recommended that engineering programs consider GE exemptions in order to ensure program unit cap goals (120 units per semester).
- Over the past several years the Electrical Engineering program at SSU has eliminated 8 semester units from its curriculum.
- A3 Content Area Criteria and required GELOs are met within the B.S. programs in the Electrical Engineering program at SSU.
- Without the A3 waiver, EE transfer (particularly local transfer) students will have to meet A3 before they transfer to SSU. This can severely place our program in disadvantage compared to other 17 CSU engineering programs not requiring A3 in order to accept transfer students.
- Through this A3 exception, coupled with allowing the EE department to have, and students to utilize, two met-in-major courses in different GE distribution areas, we can ensure that the number of units in the EE program is limited to 120 units, while maintaining the spirit of the SSU GE program and the integrity and competitiveness of the engineering degree.
- 17 campuses with accredited engineering programs have received exemptions to GE area A3: Critical Thinking.
- This A3 admissions waiver that allows engineering students to meet the A3 requirement through completion of the major will have no negative impacts on FTEs for departments offering A3 courses because currently EE students are taking an EE course to satisfy the Critical Thinking requirements.
February 18, 2021

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. appointed herself as CCJS Internship Coordinator,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signed:

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

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

Current Language

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

Proposed Language changes – deleted, added

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

Clean Version

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

Justification

This increase serves two purposes: workload and representation.

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

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

2) Representation.

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

approved by Structure & Functions February 2, 2021
Joint Statement by the Academic Freedom Subcommittee (AFS) and Professional Development Subcommittee (PDS) Concerning Teaching Sensitive Material

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

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

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

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

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

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

Faculty who are interested in learning practices that support the teaching of sensitive material may wish to contact the Center for Teaching & Educational Technology (CTET)
which offers customized workshops for departments and schools, in addition to free, confidential, non-evaluative consultations for individual faculty. It is important to note, however, that such workshops and consultations are not mandatory and it is the individual faculty member’s decision to participate in such workshops.
RESOLUTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE ENCROACHMENT INTO CURRICULAR MATTERS

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

RESOLVED: That the SSU Academic Senate recognizes the right and duty of faculty to determine curricula, methods of teaching, appropriate class size, and academic standards as described in the in the SSU Faculty Bill of Rights.

RESOLVED: That the SSU Academic Senate opposes all acts of administrative encroachment into curricular matters.

RESOLVED: That the SSU Academic Senate stands with the Criminology and Criminal Justice Studies (CCJS) Faculty in condemning the Dean of Social Science’s encroachment into the CCJS curriculum and the retaliatory actions against the CCJS Internship Coordinator.

RESOLVED: That the SSU Academic Senate joins the CCJS Faculty in asking the president of SSU to reverse the Dean of Social Science’s actions and to enjoin university administrators from interfering with curricular matters.

RESOLVED: That this Resolution be distributed to the SSU President, Interim Provost and Associate Vice Provost, all School Deans, Department Chairs, Program Directors, RTP Chairs, the ASCSU Chair, the CFA Statewide President, and the CFA SSU Chapter President.

RATIONALE

Professor Emily Asencio and CCJS Department Chair Napoleon Reyes reported to the SSU Academic Senate that Dean Trol Carleton interfered with CCJS curricular matters and violated academic policies and procedures when she removed Professor Asencio as CCJS Internship Coordinator on February 5, 2021 because of Professor Asencio’s refusal to accept additional students in CCJS 499 over the enrollment cap. Without the consent of the CCJS Department, Dean Carleton appointed herself as Interim CCJS Internship Coordinator, opened an additional section of CCJS 499 and assigned herself as class instructor, and claimed to have unilaterally changed the CS code of CCJS 499 from CS36 to CS78, in spite of the fact that changes in CS numbers must go through faculty governance. Dean Carleton has also continued to approve internship applications, allowing students to enroll in CCJS 499 without considering whether the proposed internships meet the standards set by the CCJS Department for internship placements. CCJS students were also told that "projects" would be allowed as substitutes for an actual internship required under the CCJS B.A. curriculum. These actions by Dean Carleton violate long established academic policies and procedures and constitute egregious encroachment into curricular matters.

Approved on __________.
SDS Syllabus Review for Inclusion and Justice

Senate Diversity Subcommittee (SDS)
Chair: Krista Altaker
Task Force Members: Aja LaDuke Monica Lares Megan McIntyre Lisel Murdock-Perriera Teresa Nguyen

Purpose
This document is intended to support faculty in creating more equitable and just course policies and syllabi. The goal is to help faculty revisit and revise their syllabus, policies, and practices through a lens of inclusion, equity, and justice. Below, we offer reflective questions, suggested guidelines and/or templates, and additional resources related to elements of course syllabi for interested faculty. The SDS Syllabus Review is intentionally modular so that faculty can choose to focus on certain areas of inclusion, equity, and justice one at a time (or as they choose). It is intended to be supportive of faculty and department efforts toward equity and inclusion but should not be made mandatory for any faculty.

DISSEMINATION OPTIONS

Asynchronous Dissemination:
We encourage that this document be used asynchronously by faculty members. We intend that this document be used to recognize those doing important equity work. Below is a list of possible methods for SDS to disseminate this resource to the larger campus community. The SDS Syllabus Review is intended to be supportive of faculty and department efforts toward equity and inclusion but should in no way be made mandatory for any faculty.

In addition to use by individual faculty members, we support the document being added to following websites/emails:

- Center of Teaching & Educational Technology
- Resource pages for new faculty
- Peer Observation of Faculty resource pages
- Faculty Affairs resources for faculty

Synchronous/Workshop Dissemination:
If you would like to use this document for a workshop, contact the SDS Task Force members who will coordinate guidance on how to use the document and/or to co-facilitate the workshop. A Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion document such as this one may contribute to continued systemic discrimination if syllabus and practice review are not accompanied by commitments to anti-racist and liberatory practices. Changes to syllabi and policy without accompanied changes to pedagogies and practices can cause significant harm.

Workshop Coordinators / Facilitators: Megan McIntyre Lisel Murdock-Perriera Teresa Nguyen
Structure of Each Syllabus-Review Module

1. Reflective questions
2. Suggested guidelines and templates (e.g. CAPS description)
3. Additional readings/resources (including citations for peer-reviewed publications)

Overview of Modules

1. Assumptions about Prior Knowledge (hidden curricula; linguistic bias; and suggested guidelines around including resources on the syllabus)
2. Student and Instructor Expectations
3. Community Procedures for an Inclusive Classroom Environment
4. Assignments and Grading
5. Reading List and Course Materials
6. Type of Assignments
7. Academic Surveillance
8. Schedule of Assignments and Late Work
9. Fire and Sickness Policy
10. Technology Policy
11. Accessibility/Universal Design for Learning
12. Invitation for Feedback from Students / Co-creation (Module in development)
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Modules

Assumptions about Prior Knowledge

Questions to Consider

- How would I describe my students? What do I know about them?
- What resources do I assume my students know about? Do I make “hidden curriculum” visible (i.e., unspoken or implicit academic, social, and cultural messages, expectations, or knowledge)?
- Do I reassure students that I, along with other sources, am available to help them succeed in this course?
- What kinds of biased language might I be using? What assumptions do I have about “academic” and “professional” language?
- Do waitlisted students know whether they can join the class late in the enrollment period (Week 2 - 4) and whether late work will be accepted once enrolled?

Suggested Guidelines and Templates

Guidelines

- Clearly state your availability and boundaries so that students know when and how to contact you.
- Consider whether the language of your syllabus and other course documents is accessible to all of your students.
- Share resources for students in multiple locations, not just on the syllabus itself.
- Consider creating small groups so that students can support one another.
Office Hours

- You can remove barriers to students meeting with you by offering a variety of times (time of day and length of meeting), formats (e.g., video conference, phone call, text message, email), and structures (e.g., one-on-one and in small groups). Promote your office hours in a way that is visually engaging and encouraging. Continually invite students to your office hours throughout the semester. Preview a sample graphic showing office hours.
- Consider the alternative term of “student hours,” since some students have the misconception, or may have received implicit messages, that “office hours” is the time instructors set aside to work in their offices and should not be disturbed. By referring to the time as “student hours,” you send a clear message that this time is for them.

Resource Templates

- **Office Hours:** The following text is recommended by Fuentes et al., (2021) as a way to invite first-gen students to connect with faculty: “My office hours are an opportunity for you to connect with me, a chance to ask clarifying questions about content, explore what you many want to do after you graduate, and find support.”
- **Contact Procedures:** The following resources can be provided to students as instructions for how to effectively contact and connect with their professor: Email Guidelines for Students and “Re: Your Recent Email to Your Professor.”
- **“How to ask for a letter of recommendation:”** The following example syllabus statement provides information to students on how to identify recommenders. Note that this statement may not work for all instructors nor disciplines, so consider how you would write your own statement to reflect the goals of your discipline and students. “*Who should you ask? A recommender needs to be able to describe your academic abilities (quality of your assignments) and/or work skills. If you are applying to graduate school, your recommender will be asked about your ability to perform and succeed at the graduate level, and the recommender needs to be someone who has academically evaluated you, ideally in an upper-division class. Start by generating a list of professors whose classes you succeed in and who know you well. If you are applying to a job, your previous managers will be able to provide the most valuable insight on your practical skills.*"
- **How can I petition to** withdraw from an individual class (after the deadline), repeat a course, change my major, substitute a class from another university for one of my GE requirements, or apply to graduate?
- **The Tutorial Program:** “The Tutorial Program offers free peer tutoring in over 50 courses each semester and provides weekly drop-in math tutoring. Students can easily schedule tutoring appointments for the Tutorial Program by clicking [here](#) and registering for an account, if you haven’t done so before.”
- **The Advising and Transfer Center:** “Stay on track and achieve your goals by meeting with your advisor at least once a semester. Your advisor will work with you to create an educational plan that meets your goals, help you persist towards on-time graduation, or make adjustments that better fit your career outcomes. Visit the [Advising & Transfer website](#) for more information.”
- **The SSU Writing Center:** “The SSU Writing Center, located at Schulz 1103, helps SSU students become better writers and produce better written documents. The knowledgeable and friendly tutors can help you with a wide array of concerns, from generating good ideas and organizing papers more clearly to learning citation formats"
and using semi-colons correctly. Visit the Writing Center website for more information on how to schedule time with a tutor.”

- **HUB Cultural Center:** “The HUB fosters connection by cultivating meaningful conversation and building community within and between diverse cultures. HUB programs and events focus on inclusivity, equity, and community-building. Overall, the HUB provides opportunities for students to expand their worldviews, deepen their awareness of who they are in relation to others and place, and to feel at home in a community that cares about and works toward a vital and just society.”

Additional Resources and Readings

- Definition of hidden curricula. For more see Jean Anyon’s “Social Class and School Knowledge.”
- APA: Avoiding Biased Language from APA

Student and Instructor Expectations

Questions to Consider

- What are my expectations for students and what are students’ expectations for me?
- What are my expectations for myself and what are students’ expectations for themselves?
- What do my students need from me?
- What do students need to do well in this course?
- How can I be clear and concise in describing my needs so that all students can understand them?
- How might the language in my syllabus inadvertently convey power and authority in the classroom setting?

Suggested Guidelines and Templates

Guidelines

- Use the syllabus as a method for setting expectations at the beginning of the semester, and reiterate those expectations often.
- Ask students to articulate their expectations as well for you as well as what they understand about your expectations of them.
- Address any unrealistic expectations in class.
- Write expectations clearly. Avoid vague statements and provide language that offers a single interpretation
- Note that power and authority can be signaled in various other ways, from a high authority statement such as “Late homework will not be accepted” to a softer version that
explains why, such as “Because we will discuss the answers in class, I cannot accept late assignments.”

Templates

- Expectation Sheet (adapted from Matthew Paolucci Callahan, Psych Dept.)
- How to Write a Group Compact

Community Procedures for an Inclusive Classroom Environment

Questions to Consider

- Is it clear to my students what my core values are in designing this class?
- In what ways does my teaching philosophy reflect my respect for and engagement with diversity in the classroom?
- Do I demonstrate that I recognize the value of racial or ethnic backgrounds and experiences that all students bring into the classroom?
- How do I, concretely, recognize and value diversity in my classroom? To what extent is that conveyed in the syllabus?
- Do I demonstrate how diversity can be an asset for learning?
- Do I seek input from my students on classroom climate?
- Overall, does my syllabus have a warm and inviting tone?

Suggested Guidelines and Templates

Guidelines

Undergraduates perceive a class environment to be “warmer” if the course syllabus includes a diversity statement (Branch et al., 2018) or some sort of statement that highlights the instructor’s core values related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). Fuentes et al., 2021 articulate several core features of an effective diversity statement (see below), and note that the placement of the statement in the syllabus and the consistency between the statement and the instructors teaching practices can determine whether the statement is overall effective.

- proclamation for the respect for diversity
- an inclusive list of relevant dimensions of diversity
- an explicit valuing of diverse perspectives
- expectations with respect to the classroom climate and behavior
- description of how micro- and macroaggressions will be addressed and used as teaching moments

Beyond the 5 core components, Fuentes et al., (2021) also note other elements that can be included in an effective statement

- acknowledgment of inequities in society, education, or one’s field specifically
- relevant student resources
- an indication of ways that diversity enhances learning
acknowledgment of how a diversity statement aligns with one’s teaching philosophy

Templates

- Sample Syllabus Statements: Please note that these are examples rather than true boiler-plate templates; it is important for you to consider why inclusivity matters to you and your discipline, specifically.
  - Brown University’s Harriet W. Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning
  - Eberly Center at Carnegie Mellon University

- Resources: Provide students with information about the HUB Cultural Center using this template.
  - HUB: The HUB Cultural Center fosters connection by cultivating meaningful conversation and building community within and between diverse cultures. HUB programs and events focus on inclusivity, equity, and community-building. Overall, the HUB provides opportunities for students to expand their worldviews, deepen their awareness of who they are in relation to others and place, and to feel at home in a community that cares about and works toward a vital and just society.

Additional Resources and Readings


Reading List and course materials

Questions to Consider

- Am I including “own voices” in places that are not just about diversity, equity and inclusion (i.e., Do Black authors only talk about being Black?) Do I present a diversity of perspectives (including perspectives from cultural groups to which students belong) in the course material?
- Are DEI issues covered only during one week as opposed to being discussed throughout the course? For blended classes with online components, is DEI discussed only in the online modules?
- How will I support students and their communities via the work of the class?
- Whose voices are heard in my discipline, and in the history of my discipline? Do I include a diversity of perspectives in course material? Where do voices not typically heard in my discipline appear, including in the history of the discipline?
- Cost effectiveness of course texts: Have I worked with my subject librarian to place materials on reserve and determine appropriate availability for students?
Suggested Guidelines and Templates

Guidelines

- Make sure to have representation across weeks, kinds of reading, modalities, and media. Allotting only a single week or day to issues of diversity and multiculturalism can inadvertently convey that such topics are unimportant (Vaccaro, 2019).
- Consider adding the full names and short bios/descriptions of some of the authors.
- Be considerate of cost of other course materials.
- Include a list of different websites/locations to find textbooks with the lowest cost.
- Discuss with students (either on the syllabus or as part of lecture or class discussion) your intentional choice to include readings that provide intentionality around your choice of readings, honoring and recognizing the leading scholarship of BIPOC scholars and scholars whose voices are represented in their writing.

Additional Resources and Readings


Assignments and Grading

Questions to Consider

- How am I demonstrating that the goal of this class is to learn and grow?
- What does it mean to be fair in grading vs. just in grading?
- How can I grade equitably, considering students’ differential needs?
- Do I only use traditional high-stakes summative assessments (tests, exams, etc) OR are there low-stakes growth-based assignments (reflections, clickers, discussion comments, quizzes, and groupwork, etc) that allow students to practice new skills without much pressure?
- Is grading described in a way that is success-oriented rather than failure-oriented?
- Do I take a growth mindset rather than a fixed mindset approach to student learning? That is, do I communicate to students that intelligence is not a fixed trait and that basic abilities are developed through repeated practice and hard work? And do I utilize assignment structures and grading policies that embody that mindset?
- If I am grading participation, am I considering feminist ideals of equity and egalitarianism?
- Have I considered including “high impact practices” (Kuh, 2008), which might include collaborative assignments, learning communities, writing instruction, eportfolios, and service-learning?
- Do I consider identity threat (Steele, 2011) that may make students unlikely to participate?
Suggested Guidelines and Templates

Guidelines

Guidelines for Grading and Providing Feedback

- Providing timely feedback when you grade, including using Canvas comments and direct editing features
- Provide transparency in grading: Make sure the grade displayed on Canvas aligns with students’ actual grades in the course
- Use speed-grader, to-do list, and calendar features on Canvas
- Include at least some revisable assignments or quizzes you can take unlimited times to pass
- Multiple options to demonstrate understanding
- Growth mindset in grading and policies (drop lowest, revise and resubmit, low stakes engagement [e.g., reflective papers, collaborative testing], credit/no credit assignments [interactive activities, etc.])

Guidelines for Fostering Growth Mindset in Large Lecture Classes

- Re-submission of quizzes
- Add assessment and drop lowest score
- Add suggestions/feedback and offer opportunity for revision/resubmission with assignments

Guidelines for Type of Assignments

- Exams: Standardized testing can promote competitiveness among students because higher grades are markers of prestige and monetary prizes that reflect colonial, capitalist, and racist ideals promoted in higher education (Gupta, 2012)
  - (Graded) Participation
    - See Steele (2011) for guidance on how to minimize identity threat during discussions
    - Be flexible with your attendance policy and reconsider requiring a medical note to deem an absence as “excused” given that it assumes students have equal access to health care. A flexible attendance policy will further include those with chronic physical and mental health conditions or students from marginalized backgrounds (Fuentes et al., 2021, pg 76)

Additional Resources and Readings

Academic Surveillance

Questions to Consider

- How am I centering student learning vs. cheating in my courses?
- What constitutes plagiarism to me and how am I making this clear to my students?
- How does my policy differ from the school’s policy?
- Am I using tools like Proctorio or TurnItIn because they advance my goals as a teacher or because that’s how I’ve always done it or seen it done?
- How am I making use of TurnItIn and remote proctoring services? Do these services ask questions of students that I feel comfortable with?
- How do I consider physical or virtual space students need to take tests?
- How am I considering who is harmed by the use of academic surveillance?

Suggested Guidelines and Templates

Guidelines

- Consider ways of encouraging academic integrity without employing academic surveillance systems (like Proctorio and TurnItIn):
  - Scaffold projects so that you review projects more than once and/or require drafts and revision.
  - Ask students to explain their reasoning/process for coming to answer on a quiz or exam.
  - Rotate exam questions/revise projects so that students must do original work.
- Sample syllabus related to academic integrity
  - University Academic integrity: Students should know that the University’s Cheating and Plagiarism policy is available at [http://www.sonoma.edu/UAffairs/policies/cheating_plagiarism.htm](http://www.sonoma.edu/UAffairs/policies/cheating_plagiarism.htm). Your own commitment to learning, as evidenced by your enrollment at Sonoma State University and the University’s policy, require you to be honest in all your academic coursework, which includes doing your work yourself and not claiming that words or ideas written or created by someone else as your own, either directly or by implication.
  - Course Academic integrity: If you feel you need support in completing coursework, feel confused by an assignment or its requirements, or feel overwhelmed, please reach out to me via email or in person during Zoom class. I will support you in completing the work for our class so that it represents your original work.
  - Be sure to cite all sources appropriately, since failure to appropriately cite sources used in a paper can be construed as plagiarism (Citations also bolster your credibility as a writer!). This applies to all sources, including articles, books, movies and other media, including the Internet. APA format is the best way to cite sources for this course.
  - It is your right as a student to bring a case before the Dispute Resolution Board; according to their website, “the Dispute Resolution Board adjudicates grade appeals, student grievances and cheating and plagiarism cases.”
Resources

- Understanding why you may not want to use TurnItIn
- TurnItIn as surveillance tool not a student tool
- How one professor uses TurnItIn as a teaching tool
- Resource guide for alternatives to academic surveillance
- Recommended Integrity blurb; include required code AND recommended language

Due Dates (Schedule of Assignments) and Late Work

Questions to Consider

- Are my due dates consistent enough that students can easily discern when things are due?
- Does my late work policy balance students’ diverse circumstances/needs with my own schedule?
- Does the course calendar represent a reasonable amount of work (including readings, assignments, classwork, and homework) for each week?
- Do I expect students to complete earlier assignments after enrolling in my course during late registration (Add, Drop, Swap Period)?
- Have I considered students’ feedback and perspectives in my late work policy?

Suggested Guidelines and Templates

Guidelines

- Create consistent due dates (e.g., the same day each week).
- Create a clear policy for late work; consider asking students to propose such a policy and vote on it as a class.
- Create an easy-to-follow calendar that gives students enough lead time to complete assigned work.
- Create a clear policy for late work OR accept all late work

Additional Resources and Readings

- Course Workload Estimator from Rice University

Fire and Sickness Policy Examples

Questions to Consider

- Is it clear to my students what will happen if there are power outages, fires that require evacuation, other natural disasters, or sickness due to COVID-19?

Suggested Guidelines and Templates

Templates

- Syllabus Policy Examples
“NOTE: As I’m sure you’re aware, our fall semester coincides with CA’s wildfire season. Although our late work policy asks that you reach out to me before the due date (so that we can make a plan so you don’t fall behind), if you are impacted by fires or power outages, please take care of yourself and your loved ones first and foremost. Once you’re able, we’ll make a plan so you can catch up with anything you miss. And don’t forget: if you need an extension (for any reason), just ask.”

“Natural Disaster Policy: Given the risk for fires in the region as well as prolonged power outages to prevent future fires, I will adapt the course in response to either situation. This may include altering deadlines or changing assignments. Should either situation occur, I will maintain contact with the class via Canvas on a regular basis.”

- Canvas “Home” / Welcome Page Messages
  - Education Example: “You have chosen a dynamic and important time to begin your career as an educator. It is a challenging yet exciting time, given our shift to fully or partially remote instruction in response to the COVID-19 crisis. We have both an invitation and an opportunity to be creative, innovative, and to reexamine our practices, policies, and priorities in the field of education to achieve greater equity, and therefore true excellence, for ALL students in our care and the communities we serve. As some of you have seen firsthand, university faculty and TK (Transitional Kindergarten) through Grade 12 teachers have now taught fully or partially online for several months, learning valuable lessons and refining our online teaching skills along the way. However, it is my personal and professional goal for this semester NOT to lose sight of the fact that we are still in a very complex and challenging situation. We have adjusted in many ways, but the pandemic is still ever-present. Your physical and mental well-being is of the utmost importance. I have designed this course to be flexible and to “meet this moment” in a way that does not compromise rigor or give you a preparation experience that is "less than" in any way. Now that I have shared my commitment to you, I will count on you to be communicative with me in order to accomplish my goal. Please keep me informed of how things are going for you in the course. If you fall behind, please do not disappear or feel like it is "too late" to re-engage. You are part of our learning community and you will always be welcomed back. There is no shame in admitting that you are struggling or asking for help. In this class and as university students/teacher candidates navigating education in this unique moment, your voices, stories, and experiences matter and will continue to matter.”

Technology Policies

Questions to Consider

- Can neurodiverse students and/or students with multiple responsibilities (e.g. caretakers, working parents) complete my class given my technology policies (e.g. blanket laptop bans)?

- What technology (e.g. smartphones, laptops, multiple screens, printers) do students need to successfully complete my course?
- Do I know how many students in my classes are using mobile devices to complete work?

Suggested Guidelines and Templates

Guidelines
- Avoid technology bans.
- Refer students with low connectivity to the library in order to receive wifi hotspots (if those are available).
- Refer students to the University Library to borrow a laptop for their learning or life needs; available to any student on a first-come, first-serve basis.
- Recognize that students may have differential needs for technology use (e.g. some students may need to have a laptop for note-taking purposes while others do-not).

Resources
- Pryal & Jack, “When You Talk About Banning Laptops, You Throw Disabled Students Under the Bus”

Accessibility/UDL

Questions to Consider
- How am I thinking about universal access? For example, can students with a visual impairment use a screen-reader to read my syllabus and other course documents?
- How am I considering accessibility and the hidden curriculum—the ways that college works?

Suggested Guidelines and Templates

Guidelines
- Recognize that accessibility is specific to your class; consider feedback your students give you about what is most accessible for them.
- Recall that affordability is an element of accessibility.

Templates
- Example CAPS statement: The purpose of Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) is to support student mental health and wellbeing. To accomplish this, CAPS offers short-term individual and group counseling, workshops, crisis intervention services, consultation, referral, training, and outreach. All currently enrolled students who pay the mental health fee (a mandatory campus fee paid at registration) are eligible for their services. There are no additional charges. CAPS strives to acknowledge, accept, and support the perspectives of a diverse campus population. This includes, but is not limited to, race/ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, ability, religious/spiritual affiliation, socio-economic status, and immigration status.
- Example DSS statement: If you have a physical, psychological, or learning disability or another special need, you will be fully accommodated in this course. I will work with the DSS to provide equal access for all students. Please contact Disability Services for
Students (DSS) as soon as possible and note that you must be registered each semester. Use of DSS services, including testing accommodations, requires prior authorization by DSS in compliance with university policies and procedures. See SSU’s policy on Disability Access for Students. Additional Resources and Readings

- SSU’s Accessible Syllabus Template

**Resources**

- Make Your Content Accessible (University of Missouri)
- Accessibility at SSU
  - CTET Accessibility Workshops
  - Ally Tool in Canvas: Ally measures the accessibility of each file attached to your course and shows you at-a-glance how it scores. Scores range from Low to Perfect. The higher the score the fewer the issues. For files with Low to High scores, Ally shows you the issues and gives a step-by-step guide on how to fix them.
  - Remediating PDFS
    - (1) You can make a PDF screen-reader friendly by editing a Word version of the document and adding heading levels (Heading 1, Heading 2, etc.)
    - (2) You can use Adobe to remediate documents by adding Heading designations
- University of Arkansas, Little Rock’s “Ten Steps Toward Universal Design of Online Courses”
- The Accessible Syllabus Project
- Microsoft Word and PowerPoint Accessibility Checker

**Terminology and Jargon within Course Content**

**Questions to Consider**

- Am I providing students with opportunities to articulate concepts using new terminology covered in the course?
- Have I offered a glossary of terms or created an assignment so that students can create one of their own?

**Suggested Guidelines and Templates**

**Guidelines**

- Explain and define important terms (preferably in writing so that students can return to it later)
- Use clear, specific language and/or avoid jargon when possible (i.e., when the jargon isn't vital for understanding the subject/topic/theme)
Invitation for Feedback from Students / Co-creation (Module in development)

● Questions
  ○ How can I create an environment in which students feel like full participants in their education?
  ○ What elements of my course might I invite student feedback on?

● Suggestions
  ○ Consider inviting students to give you feedback due dates, readings, and/or assignment requirements.
  ○ Consider whether students might contribute to the structure of the class by suggesting readings, leading class discussions, or helping you build rubrics for particular work in the course.

● Resources
  ○ Dollinger & Lodge, “Student-staff co-creation in higher education: an evidence-informed model to support future design and implementation”
  ○ Lubicz-Nawrocka, “An introduction to student and staff co-creation of the curriculum”
  ○ Bovill, et al., “Addressing potential challenges in co-creating learning and teaching: overcoming resistance, navigating institutional norms and ensuring inclusivity in student-staff partnerships”
  ○ McIntyre, “Co-Creating Assessment Criteria in First-Year and Graduate Classrooms” (forthcoming)

SSU RESOURCES

● SSU Diversity Resources
● Anti-Racism Resources
● CCE Inclusive Teaching Tools

REFERENCES


Dear Ex-Com Committee Members,

On behalf of all of the faculty members on the APARC committee, we request that the syllabus policy be revisited at ExCom so that we can continue to move forward with bringing Sonoma State University into compliance with CSU policy.

The Sonoma State campus ATI committee has been working for two years, trying to bring the campus into compliance with the CSU Policy that requires SSU to use the LMS to disseminate course information to all students. The CSU policy is based upon the ADA section 508. CSU Policy, please see below for more details.

We propose that the language of the syllabus policy be revised such that it requires all faculty to provide syllabi in a format that is accessible to all students with the content built into the learning management system.

Some ways that the syllabus content could be built into the learning management system include, but are not limited to: 1) The syllabus could be posted as a word document or google document in the instructor’s associated Canvas Course. For instance, the file could be uploaded into one of the modules or developed as its own page in Canvas. 2) The instructor could build the syllabi into the syllabi tab on Canvas. We imagine there are other ways to build one’s syllabus into the Canvas Course. The key is that the syllabus is housed in Canvas so that the document is available to all students electronically as well as reviewed to ensure that it meets accessibility standards via Ally.

Sincerely,

Elita Amini Virmani, Associate Professor, Early Childhood Studies, APARC Chair
Megan Burke, Assistant Professor, Philosophy, APARC Member
Puspa Amri, Assistant Professor, Economics, APARC Member
Catherine Fonesca, Outreach and Inclusion Librarian, APARC Member
Kathleen Rockett, Clinical Instructor, Nursing, APARC Member
Emily Acosta Lewis, Associate Professor, Communication and Media Studies, APARC Member
Syllabus Policy Issue
Presented to Provost Karen Moranski by the Accessible Technology Initiative committee
Representative: Sandy Ayala, Chair

The Syllabus Policy Mandate - Background
The Sonoma State campus ATI committee has been working for two years, trying to bring the campus into compliance with the CSU Policy that requires SSU to use the LMS to disseminate course information to all students. The CSU policy is based upon the ADA section 508.

CSU Policy
This coded memorandum sets forth the roadmap for ensuring accessibility of information technology and resources in compliance with federal and state laws and CSU policy.

BACKGROUND
The California State University (CSU) has an ongoing commitment to provide access to information resources and technologies to individuals with disabilities. This commitment is articulated in the January 2005 Executive Order 1111, the CSU Board of Trustees Policy on Disability Support and Accommodations http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1111.html.

"It is the policy of the CSU to make information technology resources and services accessible to all CSU students, faculty, staff and the general public regardless of disability."

Priority Area 2: Each Campus will establish a plan that will include the following:

“Use of the campus learning management system (LMS) for delivering technology-enabled courses, and for posting syllabi and instructional materials online for traditional face-to-face and hybrid or blended courses.”

This policy is premised on federal and state laws including but not limited to Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act; the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; Section 255 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; and California Government Code 11135 of 2003 which applies Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act as amended in 1998 to the CSU.

Sonoma State University
Compliance with the law is our first charge.

ATI Rationale for SSU to move from requiring an accessible syllabus to requiring an accessible syllabus posted on the LMS:
1. To provide a digital version of a course syllabus to all SSU students because it is the right thing to do. (Accessibility is a human right)
2. Comply with the law regarding the ADA and Section 508 that all course materials are made accessible for students.
3. Avoid a preventable lawsuit.
4. Comply with the expectations of the CSU Chancellor's office that all course materials are made accessible (formatting / digital version) for all students.
5. Account for the number of accessible syllabi on campus for required reporting and audits.
6. Representative action aligned with the strategic plan of being an Inclusive Campus.
7. To be prepared in the case of remote learning in light of a pandemic; fire; or other unforeseen disaster. (For all students including those with identified disabilities)

**SSU Syllabus Policy**

Syllabi shall be provided to students within the first full week of classes.

**Current Policy**

C. Syllabi shall be provided in a format that is accessible to all students. It is recommended that faculty use the Accessible Syllabus Template. If the accessible syllabus template is not used, faculty members should consult with the Disability Services for Student office to ensure their syllabus is accessible.

**Proposed Policy**

C. Syllabi shall be provided in a format that is accessible to all students with the content built into the university learning management system.

**Procedure (Not attached to the policy; but following the policy):**

It is recommended that faculty use the Accessible Syllabus Template. If the accessible syllabus template is not used, faculty members should consult with the Center for Teaching and Educational Technology or Universal Access Hub to ensure their syllabus is accessible.

i: Use accessible syllabus template and upload to the LMS
ii: Build natively in the LMS
iii: Seek consultation from the Center for Teaching and Educational Technology or Universal Access Hub

ATI Does not support alternative guidelines for faculty not willing to be in compliance with the CSU policy or the ADA law.
MEMORANDUM

Date: June 14, 2010
To: Presidents
From: Benjamin F. Quillian
Subject: Revision of Accessible Technology Initiative Coded Memo

1. Background
The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 require that qualified individuals with disabilities be provided equal access to programs, services, or activities. California Government Code 11135 applies Section 508 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act, as amended in 1998, to State entities and to the California State University (CSU). Section 508 was enacted to eliminate barriers in information technology, to make available new opportunities for people with disabilities, and to encourage development of technologies that will help achieve these goals. The CSU policy statement on accessibility was articulated in Executive Order 926. Implementation of this policy was guided by the Accessibility Technology Initiative (ATI), outlined in Coded Memo AA-2007-04 issued in 2007. This coded memo revises the overall approach, tasks and timelines described therein to reflect updated implementation steps. It also includes specific guidance regarding governance and roles for the ATI.

2. Vision/Mission/Goals/Scope

Vision: The CSU system will excel and provide leadership in using technology that is fully accessible through universal design (see Principles of Universal Design) to its students, faculty, staff and the general public.

Mission: The Accessible Technology Initiative will provide the resources, tools, training and expertise for the CSU system to ensure that instructional materials and the technology that are used will be accessible to all. Information materials and technologies include, but are not limited to “computer and network access and services, computer-delivered or enhanced
instruction, library electronic information resources, library online catalogs and homepages, campus informational web sites, computer-delivered or assisted administrative services, and voice and video programs and services.” (E.O. 926)

Goals:

- Provide students, faculty and the general public with disabilities access to technology that is timely and as seamless as possible.
- Reduce the need for and costs associated with the provision of individual accommodations for technology access.
- Foster ownership of accessibility throughout the CSU enterprise amongst all stakeholders to ensure that accessibility is designed into CSU operations, rather than addressed by Disabled Student Services through individualized accommodations.
- Improve the usability of technology for all CSU technology users through Universal Design as a basic approach.
- Address accessibility challenges consistently over time.
- Foster collaboration on accessibility issues among campuses.

Scope – The ATI applies to all CSU campuses and to the CSU Office of the Chancellor. It applies, but is not limited to, academic programs and services, student services, auxiliary programs and services, information resources and technologies, and procurement of goods and services.

3. ATI Implementation Approach

Now that the CSU has three years of experience in implementing the ATI, a revised Coded Memo is needed to modify the basic approach. In 2007, Coded Memorandum AA-2007-04 established the basic requirements for implementing the Accessible Technology Initiative in response to legal requirements amplified by experience at four campuses with the Office of Civil Rights regarding accessibility. Since then, the CSU system has made steady progress in implementing the ATI, and much has been learned about what is required on campuses to achieve the goals of the ATI. When Coded Memo AA-2007-04 was written, the CSU had little experience in working towards the ATI milestones and goals on a system-wide scale. The CSU is now integrating the accumulated knowledge and experience of the CSU campuses and the Chancellor’s Office into this revision of the original 2007 Coded Memo.

Technology is constantly improving, expanding and increasing in scope; ensuring accessibility requires continuous attention. Coded Memo AA-2007-04 includes specific goals, requirements and milestones, with a target of 2012 for full implementation. The CSU now understands that implementation of the ATI is a continuous activity, and while many of the milestones in implementing the ATI have been and will be accomplished within the timeframe envisioned in the 2007 Coded Memo, several important activities are more ongoing in nature. The technology in use on campuses is constantly changing, with new updates and innovations.
continuously added to the many campus functions. The ATI will need to evolve to include these improvements in its scope. In addition, new breakthroughs in methods for making technology accessible will also need to be tracked and incorporated into the ongoing ATI effort on the campuses.

The ATI requirements and milestones should be flexible, allowing campuses to follow different plans for accomplishing them. Campuses may not reach the various ATI goals and milestones at the same time. Individual campuses have demonstrated leadership in many of the ATI areas, and others will be able to build upon their successes. Many different factors influence how each campus manages the goals of the ATI. Each campus needs to develop and update its own plan for ATI implementation and measure its accomplishments in each area. The approach of the CSU and its campuses is to demonstrate steady progress in reaching the broad ATI goals set forth in E.O. 926.

For FY 2009/10, the Chancellor’s Office Information Technology Services (ITS) published and disseminated a set of documents to be used by campuses on a voluntary basis for conducting self-assessments of their accomplishments and challenges to date. Campuses should use these self-assessments as the basis for updating existing ATI implementation plans and for determining the current baseline of ATI accomplishments for their campus. Campuses that have elected not to conduct a self-assessment with these documents must still update their existing plans and determine a current baseline of activity for their campus. Campuses are expected to make continuous improvements in the level of ATI accomplishments, based on the campus plan. Campuses are not allowed to cease work on achieving ATI goals. Campuses are still expected to accomplish the ATI goals delineated in AA-2007-04. Through this Coded Memo, campuses are allowed to establish their own timeframes for achieving them (see appendices A and B for more guidance on principles and priorities of ATI).

The Chancellor’s Office ITS must play a vital role in monitoring and facilitating the implementation of the ATI on campuses. With a system-wide perspective, ITS will analyze the overall effort and determine how to support the campuses through provision of guidelines, tools, training and other common resources that can help accelerate the implementation of the ATI and to minimize the economic impact of the ATI for individual campuses. The information submitted to ITS in the annual reports will be used by ITS to identify specific areas where campuses are experiencing challenges and to address them on a system-wide basis through a variety of tools and approaches.

4. Baseline Requirements
The Chancellor’s Office ITS will determine, on a regular basis, at least every three years, which ATI goals and success indicators (from the annual reports) have become adopted by a majority
of CSU campuses and establish a baseline expectation for ATI system-wide implementation that will expand over time. In addition to actual CSU accomplishments, ITS may take into account commonly-accepted and adopted practices and tools that are widely available for establishing the baseline.

Starting in June, 2011, ITS will analyze the data from the prior year’s annual campus reports to ascertain what level of accomplishment, if any, has been reached by a majority of campuses for each goal and success indicator. The collected information will be published in the same format as the annual reports and will become the baseline requirement for the CSU system. When the baseline requirements are published, ITS will also announce the period of time that all campuses will be given to bring their practices up to at least the baseline level for each goal and success indicator. See Appendix I for an example of a baseline requirement and Appendix F for more information concerning the timeline of the ATI process.

5. Responsibilities

Campus Responsibilities

Campuses are required to conduct a self-assessment during their preparation of their annual report for AY 09/10 and to revise their ATI plans according to the results. The revised campus plans should make note of accomplishments to date and also any significant changes in approach with respect to ATI objectives. These revised plans should be used by campuses for purposes of assessment and measuring progress. The revised campus plans should include a separate section indicating when the campus plans to accomplish the broad ATI goals from AA-2007-04, and this section should be submitted to ITS along with the annual report for AY 10/11.

Campuses must submit annual reports to the Chancellor’s Office ITS detailing their progress to their plan, activities and challenges in each of the ATI priority areas: web accessibility, instructional materials accessibility and procurement. Once a baseline is established, campuses will be required to assess their status for the goals and success indicators as required by the baseline and will need to include specific plans for satisfying to baseline requirements, if necessary, in the annual report that is submitted subsequently. Annual reports will be due in November of each year beginning in 2010. ITS will establish the specific date that the reports will be due for each year and will notify the campuses of this date by the end of June of that year.

Chancellor’s Office Information Technology Services Responsibilities

The documentation from campuses of their status and accomplishments in achieving the specific indicators will be collected and published online. Data from the reports will be analyzed by ITS for overall trends and themes, and ITS will identify common areas for which
Campuses have requested assistance, guidance or opportunities for collaboration with other campuses.

ITS will prepare a summary analysis for campuses and for the system as a whole in a version appropriate for high level policy makers with broad observations and recommendations, as well as in a version with more specific details for those involved in ATI implementation. These analyses will be published in March of each year for the preceding year.

ITS will consult with the ATI Leadership Council to develop a recommendation for ATI annual priorities, based on the results of the reports. These recommendations will be presented to the Executive Sponsors Steering Committee (ESSC) for their review and input. See Appendix C for more information concerning the governance of ATI.

ITS will also keep track of system-wide accomplishments for the purpose of setting a baseline set of expectations for the CSU system as a whole. In consultation with the ATI Leadership Council and the ESSC, ITS will develop and publish an ATI Baseline based on AY 09/10 campus reports by June, 2011. Baseline requirements will consist of ATI goals and success indicators that have been met with the same levels of success by a majority of CSU campuses. This baseline will become the ATI requirement, to be met by all campuses within a timeframe to be announced when the baseline is published. ITS will revise this Baseline every three years.

6. Appendices:

A. Principles

B. Priority Setting

C. Governance and Authority

D. Definitions and Clarifications

E. ATI milestones and requirements from AA-2007-04 that have been replaced by the Baseline Approach.


G: ATI FY 2009/10 Self-Assessment Materials, which will be the framework for the FY 2010/11 Campus Reports (found at www.calstate.edu/accessibility)

H. FAQ’s

I. Example of ATI Baseline Requirement
Appendix A: Principles for Implementation of the ATI

- Campuses need to collaborate on common accessibility challenges, share solutions and approaches, as well as resources.
- The CSU’s ATI efforts are enhanced by statewide and national collaboration both through the use of standards, tools and strategies developed by others as well as through sharing CSU strengths with others.
- System-wide guidelines, developed by ITS for specific common challenges and practices, enable consistent and efficient outcomes.
- As ATI implementation on campuses evolves, a basic minimum standard should be adopted, based on widely shared accomplishments. This basic baseline should be revised and adjusted at least every three years.
- ATI implementation should be achieved through continuous progress that is planned, measured and documented.
- Resources for ATI implementation should be utilized based on priorities, with the greatest attention given to objectives with the highest impact.
- ATI processes need to become institutionalized as campus practices carried out by many different stakeholders throughout the campuses. Ongoing communication about the ATI is an important aspect of this principle.
- Campus customization of ATI implementation should be pursued only after standard approaches have been reviewed and the campus has determined an individual approach is more appropriate. Customized strategies must be balanced with the economies of scale that can be achieved through standardization.
- Each campus must establish its own plan for ATI implementation, taking into account its strengths, available leadership, challenges and resources. Each plan must include goals for each ATI priority area (web accessibility, instructional materials and procurement).
- In all cases, if achieving accessibility is either not possible or would constitute an undue burden, then plans to provide equally effective alternative access must be developed, documented, and communicated.
Appendix B: Priority Setting

In determining how to implement the ATI, campuses will need to set priorities for allocating resources and determining which projects should be undertaken before others. The following factors should be considered in setting these priorities:

- How many people are expected to make use of the technology?
- Is it likely to be used again in the future, or repeatedly?
- Is it available publicly, or only to a pre-determined audience?
- Is it required to be used for academic or institutional purposes?
- Is it the sole means for achieving its purpose? If alternatives are available, are they accessible?
- Will it be used by a program or service with a primary audience of persons with disabilities?

ITS should provide campuses with guidance with respect to using these factors for setting ATI priorities.
Ensuring the accessibility of information technology and resources is a shared responsibility that is spread across the campus and will require ongoing, overall institutional attention and commitment for its success. One of the common expectations within each ATI priority area is the identification of roles and responsibilities for each aspect of accessibility. Achieving accessibility will require collaboration among administrators, faculty, disability resource centers, bookstores, academic and student services departments, academic technology and other institutional staff, and students with disabilities. Campuses should institutionalize their accessibility compliance efforts by establishing policies that support the three ATI priorities.

The following expectations and responsibilities are necessary for ATI implementation:

a. **Chancellor’s Office Information Technology Services (ITS):**
   - Provide leadership and assist the ESSC in strategic planning;
   - Monitor the implementation of the ATI on campuses primarily through review of campus reports as well as other interactions and activities with campuses;
   - Find opportunities to advance accessibility in the CSU system as a whole;
   - Define excellence in the context of the ATI and facilitate its achievement on campuses;
   - Support the campuses through provision of guidelines, tools, training and other common resources.
   - Identify and elevate best practices that can be used and replicated by other campuses and provide coaching and consultation for campuses to make use of them
   - Identify opportunities to foster collaborations and take advantage of centralized synergies.
   - Regularly consult with campuses regarding the establishment of an ATI baseline to be achieved by each campus.
   - Provide system-wide support working with vendors and publishers to address the accessibility of materials.

b. **ATI Leadership Council**
   - Provide strategic advice to Information Technology Services
   - Manage development of action plans for policy recommendations, system-wide projects, campus-based projects, resource allocation recommendations
   - Assign and review tasks of ATI work groups
   - Review of system-wide projects and policies
• Make regular reports to stakeholder groups

c. **Campus Executive Sponsors**
   • Convene campus-wide ATI Steering Committee
   • Channel communications from the Chancellor’s Office to appropriate parties on campus
   • Coordinate decisions for campus participation in system-wide ATI events and activities
   • Direct Campus ATI planning and monitoring efforts
   • Represent campus on ESSC

d. **Campus Higher Administration: Presidents, Provosts, CIO’s, Vice-Presidents**
   • Guide ATI vision and goals
   • Communicate the importance of ATI to the campus
   • Participate in Governance of the ATI, as appropriate
   • Review ATI progress on an annual basis and sign off on the campus plan
   • Incorporate ATI priorities into campus priorities
   • Ensure there are adequate resources for implementation of the campus’s ATI plan and provision of equally effective access

e. **Academic and Faculty Senates**
   • Support ATI with appropriate policy changes or additions
   • The Faculty Senate Chair or their designee should be a member of the ATI Steering Committee and be Chair of the Instructional Materials Task Force

f. **Centers for Faculty Development**
   • Coordinate or play an active role, as appropriate for each campus, in providing training in ATI related subjects for faculty
   • Participate in relevant campus ATI Committees

g. **Disability Support Services/Disability Resource Centers**
   • Participate in campus ATI Steering Committee
   • Participate in development of processes and solutions for providing equally equivalent access, when necessary

h. **ADA Compliance Officers**
   • Actively support ATI implementation
   • Participate in campus ATI Steering Committee and working committees
   • Conduct periodic evaluations of ADA compliance with respect to technology
i. Vice Presidents of Student Affairs

- Provide leadership with respect to ATI implementation
- Participate in governance
- Take active leadership with respect to communicating the importance of ATI within their Division
Appendix D: Definitions and Clarifications

Administrative Website or Webpage: A website or webpage is administrative if its primary function is governance, commerce, or navigation to institutional resources or publication of institutional information.

Critical Administrative Websites: These are websites determined by the campus to be important for its mission and operation.

Instructional Website or Web Content: A website or webpage, as well as the contents of such pages, is instructional if its primary function is as an informational resource for course completion. This includes but is not limited to items such as course syllabi, reading materials, test materials and multimedia.

Instructional Materials Priority Area: The Instructional Materials Priority Area encompasses all materials that are used as an informational resource for course completion, as well as administrative materials that are disseminated in electronic form to faculty, staff, students and/or the public. This includes documents, multi-media, software and equipment. The timely adoption requirement applies to documents and multi-media.

Learning Management System: A Learning Management System (LMS) is an administrative website. Content placed within the LMS may be either administrative (committee materials) or instructional (course materials) depending on its primary function.

The Procurement Priority Area includes, in addition to procurement as it is understood within the CSU system, the development, adoption (including when no funds are exchanged), maintenance or usage of electronic and information technology. Section 508 specifically includes all of these functions.

Equally Effective: Equally effective communication for persons with disabilities is based on:

1. timeliness of delivery,
2. accuracy of translation, and
3. delivery in a manner and medium appropriate to the disability of the person.

Equally effective communication for persons with disabilities is based on:

Aids, benefits, and services, to be equally effective, are not required to produce the identical result or level of achievement for disabled and non-disabled persons, but must afford disabled
persons equal opportunity to obtain the same result, to gain the same benefit, or to reach the same level of achievement, in the most integrated setting appropriate to the person’s needs.

Fundamental Alteration: A modification to a university program or service may constitute a fundamental alteration if it changes the essential purpose of the product or service or any of its components. In situations where a fundamental alteration can be documented, an equally effective alternate form of access must still be provided.

Undue Burden: A modification to a university program or service may constitute an undue burden if it involves “significant difficulty or expense”. Because the Office of Civil Rights generally considers the institution’s entire budget when reviewing claims of undue burden, the decision to invoke undue burden should be carefully weighed and sufficiently documented. In situations where an undue burden can be documented, an equally effective alternate form of access must still be provided.

System-wide guidelines: ITS will publish guidance or guidelines that campuses can follow for addressing common challenges and tasks. These might take the form of recommended processes or practices, a recommended approach to analyze and address a need or, principles to apply.

Annual priorities: Within the annual report form, each campus will list key plans for each goal. Taken together, these goals become the campuses annual priorities for the upcoming year.

Success Indicators: Within the annual report form for each ATI priority area, there is a list of goals for which campuses provide information. Under each goal, there is a list of indicators of success about which campuses are also asked to supply information as to their status and completion.
These requirements are no longer required to be accomplished by the indicated dates. Along with the required annual report for AY 09/10, campuses are required to submit a statement indicating which of these requirements have already been met by the campus and when the campus plans to meet those that have yet to be accomplished.

**Web Accessibility:**

- **September 1, 2007** New and updated administrative websites, web applications and web content produced by the CSU or by third-party developers should, at a minimum, conform to baseline accessibility standards as defined in Section 508.
- **May 15, 2009** (Extended to June 1, 2010 by AA-2009-19) All administrative sites that are critical to institutional access (as established in the Web Accessibility Implementation Plan) should, at a minimum, conform to baseline accessibility standards as defined in Section 508. If remediation or replacement of the website is not possible or would constitute an undue burden, then a plan to provide an equally effective alternate form of access must be developed, documented, and communicated.
- **May 15, 2012** All websites at the CSU should fully conform to Section 508. Once again, undue burden plan requirements (as described above) apply.

**Instructional Materials Accessibility**

- **July 1, 2007** Campuses will implement the IMAP provisions related to timeliness of alternate formats for print-based instructional materials such as those reflected in points #1 to #4 above. These provisions should impact the timeliness of materials for the first academic term of Calendar Year, 2008.
- **Fall Term, 2008** (Extended to June 1, 2010 by AA-2009-19) new courses and new course content, including instructional materials and instructional websites, will be designed and authored in a manner that incorporates accessibility. If incorporating accessibility is not possible or would constitute an undue burden, then a plan to provide an equally effective alternate form of access must be developed, documented, and communicated. Existing course content will be made accessible at the point of course redesign or when a student with a disability enrolls in the course.
- **Fall Term, 2012** Instructional materials and instructional websites for all course offerings will be accessible. Once again, undue burden plan requirements (as described above) apply.
Accessible Electronic and Information Technology (E&IT) Procurement

- **No later than September 1, 2007** Implementation of an accessible procurement process for E&IT formal solicitations and acquisitions greater than $50,000.
- **September 1, 2008** Implementation of an accessible procurement process for E&IT acquisitions greater than $15,000. All procurement card purchases are exempt from the accessible procurement process at this point in time.
- **September 1, 2009** (Extended by June 1, 2010 by AA-2009-19) Implementation of an accessible procurement process for all E&IT procurement card acquisitions greater than $2,500.
- **September 1, 2010** Implementation of an accessible procurement process for all E&IT acquisitions less than or equal to $2,500 to be determined by this date, following evaluation of campus progress reports.
### Appendix F: Timeline for ATI process for 2010 – 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2010</td>
<td>Publication of AY 09-10 Campus Report Framework. This framework will be updated at least every four years to keep it up-to-date. Updates will not be a major revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>AY 09-10 Campus Reports Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>Publication of High Level Summary Analysis of Campus Reports and Detailed Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2011</td>
<td>(One time only) Revised campus ATI plans are due, along with this year’s annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2011</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Office ITS consultation with ATI Leadership Council and Executive Sponsors Steering Committee (ESSC) regarding priorities for FY 11-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This schedule will repeat annually. The Campus Report Framework will be published annually, whether or not it has been updated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>Publication of 1(^{st}) Baseline, followed by revised Baseline every three years thereafter. The deadline for system-wide implementation of Baseline goals will be established when the Baseline is published. Each new Baseline will be accompanied by a deadline for system-wide implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Publication of the 2(^{nd}) Baseline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Self-Assessment Materials

The ATI Self-Assessment materials can be found on the ATI public website.
Appendix H: Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) about the new ATI Coded Memo

1. Under the new ATI Coded Memo, what is the status of the past milestones and goals?

These are the milestones from Coded Memo AA-2007-04 that have already gone into effect:

- **September 1, 2007** New and updated administrative websites, web applications and web content produced by the CSU or by third-party developers should, at a minimum, conform to baseline accessibility standards as defined in Section 508.

- **July 1, 2007** Campuses will implement the IMAP provisions related to timeliness of alternate formats for print-based instructional materials such as those reflected in points #1 to #4 above (see AA-2007-04 for these points). These provisions should impact the timeliness of materials for the first academic term of Calendar Year, 2008.

- **No later than September 1, 2007** Implementation of an accessible procurement process for E&IT formal solicitations and acquisitions greater than $50,000.

- **September 1, 2008** Implementation of an accessible procurement process for E&IT acquisitions greater than $15,000. All procurement card purchases are exempt from the accessible procurement process at this point in time.

If a campus has not yet reached any of these milestones, this should be noted in the updated ATI campus plan, and the revised plan should describe how and when these milestones will be met. A separate statement accompanying the AY 10/11 should indicate which have been met and when the campus plans to accomplish those that have not yet been met.

2. What is the status of the milestones and goals that had not yet gone into effect (i.e., the Procurement milestone that all procurement card acquisitions greater than $2,500 be included in an accessible procurement process)?

Some milestones were deferred until June 1, 2010 by Coded Memo AA-2009-19. Others would have gone into effect on future dates. It is expected that campuses will include these goals in their revised ATI plans, and that campuses will assign their own target dates for accomplishing them. A separate statement accompanying the AY 10/11 should indicate which, if any, of these have been met and when the campus plans to accomplish those that have not yet been met.
3. What will the baseline requirements look like and how will the baseline approach work?

The baseline requirements will use the same format as the campus reports. Each goal statement and each indicator of success will reflect the status level that has been reached by a majority of the campuses. See Appendix I.

4. Won’t campuses be developing plans that result in an inconsistent approach to ATI implementation? Will vendors have a negative reaction to that? Could it prompt challenges?

The CSU Procurement Manual establishes basic processes for campuses, but within that structure, campuses have latitude to adopt their own practices. It is not unusual for campuses to develop different technical or other requirements for the same product. Campuses operate differently in many ways and also have developed different procurement procedures within the structure of the more general CSU system-wide requirements. Vendors, like many others, may have an initial expectation that all campuses operate in the same way. However, our campuses function with a large degree of autonomy. This would not be the basis of a procurement challenge, so long as each campus follows its own published procedures.

5. What should campuses do to revise their plans and bring them up to date?

Campuses will assess their current status for ATI implementation as a part of the process of preparing the annual report for AY 09/10. They should revise their plans for each ATI priority area based on the results. This should include a section, to be submitted along with the annual report for AY 10/11, on overall goals. That section should set forth which of the goals in Coded Memo AA-2007-04 have been met and when the campus expects to reach unmet goals.

6. In Appendix B, there is a list of factors to consider in determining the establishment of priorities for ATI implementation. The last question reads “Will it be used by a program or service with a primary audience of persons with disabilities?” Does this mean that technology that will not be used for an audience of persons with disabilities does not need to be accessible?

The sixth question is only one of six factors, all of which will need to be considered in determining campus ATI priorities. This question is a statement of an obvious consideration, that if a program or service using technology is known to be used by or intended for an audience of persons with disabilities, it must be accessible. Other factors can also lead to this conclusion, as well as positive answers to several of these questions. The CO will issue more detailed guidance regarding how campuses should use all of these factors.
Appendix I
Example of ATI Baseline Requirement

Background
This is a theoretical example of the ATI Baseline requirement for Goal 1.1 of the Web Accessibility priority and the success indicators within that goal. It is provided in order to illustrate the form of a Baseline requirement and is not an actual requirement. Placeholder for text indicating that the ATI website will host recommended resources, practices, and names of campuses who have offered assistance with specific success indicators...

1.0. Web Accessibility

1.1. Web Accessibility Evaluation Process

Goal
Identify and repair or replace inaccessible websites, web applications, and digital content.

Required Status Level
Defined

Success Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Indicator</th>
<th>Distribution of Campus Status Levels (09/10 AY)</th>
<th>Required Status Level (12/13 AY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1.1 Assigned responsibility for the evaluation process to a body (person(s) or business entity). | Not Started: 1
Initiated: 2
Defined: 1
Established: 6
Managed: 12
Refining: 2 | Managed |
| 1.1.2 Inventory all campus administrative websites.                              | Not Started: 1
Initiated: 2
Defined: 1
Established: 12
Managed: 6
Refining: 2 | Established |