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Chair Report – J. Reeder

J. Reeder said his report was a little bit different today because this is our next to the last Senate meeting of the semester. It's the last meeting before we start our Thanksgiving holiday. He talked about things that we could give thanks for. One of those things that we should give thanks for is that we lead the CSU in two year upper division transfer student graduation rates. We're number three in the entire CSU in our graduation rate among underrepresented minority students. We're number four overall across the whole system in four year graduation rates, only behind Maritime, SLO and SDSU. Another thing related to graduation rates over the past 10 years, we've lowered our four year graduation gap for first generation students, for underrepresented minority students and for Pell eligible students. In fact, our students who do receive Pell grants have a six year graduation rate that is slightly higher than that of the overall University. We have three NCAA division II national championships throughout the university's history. You've had women's soccer, men's soccer and men's golf. We also see that our student athletes regularly topped the charts in the NCAA Athletic Conference in graduation rates and in their GPA. We are number one in the state in CSU International Programs study abroad. Does that mean we have things to work on? Of course. We have a lot of things to work on and in the spirit of continuous improvement will keep working and will
keep improving, but meanwhile, let’s not forget to give thanks. Next week is Thanksgiving and we’re all sophisticated enough and educated enough to know that, just like the celebration of Columbus Day, just like the story of Pocahontas, the myth and the reality behind Thanksgiving holiday doesn’t even come close to reflecting a historical reality. But still, as time moves toward the solstice he urged the members to find and contemplate those things in their lives that they can give thanks for, such as friends, family, the sublime beauty of nature, the fascinating complexity of human culture, the taste of your favorite food, the sensation of a cool breeze or raindrops on your skin, our own amazing ability to ponder, to be critical, and to be curious. He asked that if anyone thinks of some of those things that they are thankful for and is in a sharing mood, to please share them with him. It’s good to appreciate those little reminders of the good things that surround us and remembering to be in the spirit of giving thanks next week. Let’s take advantage of that to practice some true Thanksgiving and practice some deliberate self-care, wearing a mask and socially distancing. He noted members may have seen in email that the CSU is partnering with one of our larger health care providers to provide a wellness activity over the holidays. It’s called the coast to coast challenge. It’s a socially distant virtual wellness challenge to promote health and wellness over the winter break. He signed up and it’s something that can be done individually or in a team. And I’ve already started a team called SSU Senate. Members can look for that once they sign up or people can ask the Chair for the details. So far, the team has nobody in it, except for him. He would be happy and honored and grateful if people would join him.

Within the Senate, we’re talking about how we can prepare for the post pandemic reality in terms of online education. So we’re having some strategic meetings and discussions around that and we’ll continue those discussions. He introduced the guest student speaker, Tomas Barrera-Lozano.

“Hi, my name is Tomas. I currently live in Dublin, California. I’m a first generation student. I’m Mexican. My major is criminal justice. I changed that my second semester of my first year at Sonoma State University. I was doing Spanish and Kinesiology. The reason I came to Sonoma is because since I was young I’ve always been involved in soccer and I’ve been playing at a pretty high level. I had two tournaments at Sonoma when I was 10 and 12 years old and I always thought the campus was really cool and Sonoma was always behind my head as an idea as a place for me to go to school. This one friend named Alexis Paris, who's in a fraternity called NAK, the Latino fraternity is year older than me and during high school, he told me a lot about Sonoma and encouraged me to apply and to try it out so the main reason I went to Sonoma was because he convinced me. The tuition was not that pricey for me and when I went to check out the school, I kind of liked it, and especially the thing I liked the most was the dorms and overall just walking around the campus, it felt like a pretty good fit for me because it seemed very peaceful and it seemed not like traditional college, but more calm. My first year at Sonoma State was awesome. I got to meet a lot of people, especially because of my friend Alexis, because of the fraternity and joining clubs such as Sonoma State men soccer club, that’s one thing that really helped me a lot with Sonoma just meeting new people. What else I liked about is that I received a lot of like information about stuff I needed to succeed in college and right now I still use those sources, such as when I
was on campus I liked how are RAs were very caring and always came to my dorm and always provided us with information that we needed especially information about meeting new people and all the events. We have so many resources at our school such as the LARC and other resources which actually help us, but not that many students take that into account. “

The Chair thanked Tomas very much and said we’re grateful that you chose Sonoma. We're grateful for Alexis too for talking you into choosing Sonoma or for explaining it and we will use your words and your feeling of appreciation for the different parts of the campus that will help us guide our meeting as we make our decisions. One thing that he thought that came to mind immediately was that not all students know about all the resources that are available. So we can remember as faculty members, as administrators and staff to the extent possible, spread the word among our students.

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 11/5/2020 – Approved.

President Report – J. Sakaki

J. Sakaki said she appreciated the Chair’s opening comments and also the comments from the student. We received our approval for our spring plan from the Chancellor's Office. The plan is from the work of a very large group that VP Joyce Lopes and Provost Karen Moranski co-chair and the report was submitted and approved. It’s very similar plan to what we have currently in regards to the of range of courses that we’re offering. She appreciated all the work of all the members in helping us get to that plan submitted and ultimately approved. This past week was the November Board of Trustees meeting and there were a couple things she wanted to mention. There was a presentation on student veterans across the CSU. There are 18,000 military affiliated students and now all 23 campuses now have a dedicated space for military and veterans and we have our own military focused Maverick Program Resource Center. Across the system, there’s a range of from 94 veterans at Maritime to 2820 at San Diego. We have 371 Veterans members and their dependents. She thought it has been great that we’re serving that group of students. There was also a presentation at the Board of Trustees on the operating budget for 21-22. We had three new trustees added to the CSU board. This was their first meeting. We have two interim presidents named, one at Fresno State, Dr. Saul Jimenez Sandoval and at Channel Islands, Dr. Richard Jau, both of them currently serve on their respective campuses. This was the last Board of Trustees meeting for Chancellor White and also for two CSU presidents. There was a virtual toast for Chancellor White for his service as Chancellor and she noted that Sonoma State received quite a lot of kudos because one of the members of our community, Gary Heck, who owns the Korbel winery provided the champagne for that virtual toast. Our wine business program was given a major shout out as well as our School of Business and Econ, so it’s nice to have our region, our campus and our programs noted at the Trustees level. In the spirit of Chair Reeder’s remarks, she was reminded of a poem that’s very special to her by Gwendolyn Brooks. This is the second section of it:
We are each other’s harvest.
We are each other’s business.
We are each other’s magnitude and bond.

The President said she was so grateful for everyone’s service every single day to students and our campus and our community. Campus members really do make a difference and even in these tough unprecedented times she felt strength and inspiration from such service.

A member noted it was reported our last Senate meeting that at the ASCSU plenary that Chancellor White said he thinks the CSU should consider embracing remote learning going forward and gave a lot of reasons. It really sounds like he envisions us teaching quite a few of our courses online and he asked the President to comment on that. The President said one of the things she thinks about is, how do we come out of the pandemic, how do we best serve the students. The Governor’s task forces are looking at us recovering with equity. She thought there are aspects that we hear constantly that we’re getting more participation at some meetings and some conferences than before because it’s easier. You don’t have to travel and it’s less expensive, but she was not hearing anything about a wholesale move to more online. It hasn’t been a topic of discussion amongst the Presidents. We talk about how do we make the best of this situation, how to involve and engage staff and faculty and students and the best ways possible and make sure that we’re serving students who may not have access to the technology or WiFi. There was a request in the new operating budget to look at how we might add some funds for continued training to allow faculty who want to develop new ways or changing how they might be delivering something in this environment. We have a new Chancellor coming in starting January 4th as well. She will be on alert, because that hasn’t been in any of the conversations that she’s been participating at the system level. She asked the Provost if she was hearing anything about this. The Provost responded, no, we have not been hearing that at the Provost meetings and she agreed with the President. We have for the last two years been planning a major revision to one of our buildings. Our physical facilities are critical to our success and we are running a residential campus, so which we are hoping to fill those beds. She noted that as a COPLAC institution, that is in many ways, defining itself as a liberal arts and sciences institution, face to face impact and face to face coursework are critical to our long term identity and success. We’re very committed to repopulating and using online strategically and intentionally and carefully to further our interests and build our enrollment without jeopardizing that mission.

The Chair added that he just come from a meeting as an external program reviewer. He was meeting with two dozen language program students from CSU Channel Islands and they all said how grateful they were for the opportunity to work education around their schedules that the online modality had afforded them. But they all universally agreed that what they were getting most out of the program were face to face interactions, classes and extracurricular and co-curricular activities. At this meeting we have 50 participants right now. We never had that many people regularly attend the Senate, even when we had cheese and cookies. He referred back to his report at the beginning, noting that all of those points of pride that we can have in the university are because of our experiences in the before times of being
together. It will fall on us to strike the just the right balance of maintaining and enhancing access to students through the virtual realm, but maintaining and preserving the special character that is our residential quality, our COPLAC-ness, and our liberal arts focused institution.

Provost Report – K. Moranski

K. Moranski agreed with Chair Reeder that there was much to be thankful for. Sometimes at Sonoma State, we focus on what's wrong, or what needs to be fixed or what we don't do or haven't done or can't do. She thought we don't often focus on the yeses and on the we can and on what we have and we should be proud of. As we get into discussions about our identity, as we think about how we can utilize our identity to enroll more students and to successfully graduate our students, we really need to be thinking about what it is we do well and telling people what it is we do well. She really appreciate the positive approach. The continuity group met again this week. As we have completed our spring approval of in-person coursework, we have begun to start having a discussion generally about what next year looks like. It's really hard to predict. It's hard to establish parameters right now or to say that we can't know exactly to what degree will be able to be face to face next fall. We are at the worst of the COVID-19 epidemic and in the dark nadir of this infection with more and more infections happening every day and with the holidays coming up as possible ways of spreading COVID, we need to be supportive of one another. But it makes it difficult to think about the fall, even with the news about the vaccines and the news about the instant home tests coming. We're going to have to be patient and wait until the new year to really think about repopulation. But as we noted in the continuity planning group, we're conscious that the Fall schedule comes early in the spring and we want to jump on those issues as soon as possible and begin to think about what it will look like. We'll need to wait to see what our new Chancellor Castro wants to do or thinks is the best thing for the system to do and we will be hoping for the uniformity that has served us well during this strange academic year. That's been one advantage of being a system. She noted she has been in communication with Dean Elyer about next summer in terms of face to face lab sections and that kind of thing. She noted that in regard to AB1460, the Board of Trustees did pass the language which removes “and social justice” from Title Five and that it looks very much like we be implementing an area F and taking three units from area D in our GE pattern as we move ethnic studies courses into that area. Fortunately, shared governance is hard at work already on this in EPC. We'll do our very best to think about ways to mitigate negative impacts. As we actually develop and use our ethnic studies work to really move into this new implementation, we have a great foundation and that helps us tremendously. She spoke again about the interdisciplinary conference SSU hosted on the pandemic and interdisciplinarity and said there was a fine discussion at Ex Com about interdisciplinarity and the barriers and opportunities that exist for interdisciplinary collaboration on this campus. She had begun some discussions to find ways to help us move past some of the perceived barriers that that exist such as the tail wagging the dog with PeopleSoft and the issues that we think have always prevented us from doing the kind of interdisciplinary work that that we already see in Liberal Studies, Hutchins. We'll be having some more discussions about that as we get into the new year.
Vice Chair Report – L. Krier

L. Krier reported that Structure and Functions is looking at a process for subcommittees who want to change their charge. We drafted a set of guidelines and have been considering the question of whether or not subcommittees should be able to appeal if their parent committee denies the change that they want to make. We’re also looking at areas of the bylaws that are confusing still and making a list. If you know of some parts of the bylaws that you find confusing or where you want clarity, feel free to send an email and we’ll add it to the list.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – J. Lopes

J. Lopes offered an update on the COVID virus. In California, we are having an increase of COVID cases. Of the 58 counties, 41 counties are in the purple tier now. That’s 93% of the population in California. 11 counties are in substantial and only six counties are in yellow or orange at this point. So with that information, we did put out a message today encouraging people, as the CDC, the state and the county are encouraging people, to not travel during Thanksgiving. If people do travel, they need to self-isolate upon returning. Just a few moments ago, Governor Newsom put out a message saying that he is issuing a limited stay at home order for all non-essential work and gatherings must stop from 10pm to 5am for any counties in the purple tier. This will take effect at 10pm on Saturday and remain in effect for one month. She knew there were requests to keep buildings open past 10pm for various projects and other work that has been requested, but we will have to close all of our facilities now at 10pm based on this order. In addition, the CDC has put out additional guidance about masks. Handkerchiefs, gaiters and plastic shields are not considered effective now, so people do need to wear a double layered mask, not a gaiter, not a handkerchief, not a shield without a mask. We are asking for everyone to wear masks on campus anytime they’re present on campus to make sure we work on that spread of COVID. VP Lopes reported that the new Chief of Police, Nader Oweis, will be starting on December 7th. We will have a virtual swearing in ceremony on December 10 at 11am and we will send an invitation out across campus. She wanted to publicly think Chief Weaver for assisting us since April. He’s done an amazing job and we’ve really appreciated his help. One of the things she was grateful for, is that the Stevenson Hall renovation is finally started and she is so excited to see that get underway. She added, that in terms of total cases of COVID related to campus, we are still under 45 and only five of those have been people who are on campus. Those are not all active cases right now. That’s been since the start of COVID, but we do have over 30 people under investigation right now. We are seeing an increase as well.

Vice President for Student Affairs Report – Wm. G. Sawyer

W. G. Sawyer reported that, in the spirit of sharing good news about Sonoma State, we had the National Association for Student Personal administrators Western regional conference recently. It was the very first virtual meeting for that group. We had approximately 800 people to attend the conference. We had at least four presentations that came out of Sonoma State. Dean Ryan Henne and Dr. Jerlena
Griffin-Desta both sat on a panel discussion for associate vice presidents and they both were absolutely incredible. Rosa Salamanca, who is our Coordinator for our Dream Center was the recipient of the Innovation Award for the Aspire Fellowship Program she has developed in the Dream Center. She actually made people cry during her presentation and one of our students also presented with her. Audra Verrier, who is our coordinator for our Career Center also presented her research for her dissertation, which she will be defending in January, again, one of those presentations that brought tears to folks. Last, but not least, was a panel of Presidents and our own President Sakaki sat on that panel of all women presidents from private and public institutions, community colleges, four year and private and state. Everyone from SSU just knocked it out of the ballpark. He updated the members about the Dream Center. We are doing our peer to peer training for non-undocumented students. What we're trying to do is create allyship so students will know and understand the experience of our students who are undocumented. The second thing he wanted to bring to the Senate’s attention was our new Keep a Seawolf Safe program. It’s about suicide prevention. We’ve had a slow start to it, but it's starting to pick up. If anyone would like more information, we can certainly provide you with that. In the Student Health Center, we’ve had approximately 506 visits so far this week. And that’s tell-a-health. That’s also for drop-in business visits. We’ve only had about 15 drop-in visits, but most of that is with our nursing students. They are working hard in the Career Center. 237 students registered for our Career Day Fair and we had over 229 employers and student documented connections to look for jobs for the spring and for the summer. Our care team has 52 open cases so far this week and we have had 222 total cases for this semester.

A member wondered whether VP Sawyer could tell the Senate a bit more about the suicide prevention program and how it differs from what as has been presented before. W. G. Sawyer said one of the things that we have discovered is all our first year students are not taking advantage of some of the programs that we have on campus and we felt that we needed to start reaching out a little bit more to them because they wouldn’t know about those services and they would not necessarily know how to access those access them. We’ve learned from one of our consultants EAP that because of COVID we are seeing new intersegmental and intersectionality in regard to students that may be a person who is non binary, or they may have a collective background of being Latinx and African American, and what we’re finding out is those students are not reaching out or leaning into us. We’re now trying to provide resources so the students will connect with us. We’re putting out new promotion to say that we fit all of you. We're hoping that it’s not so much different. It's just how we're marketing it because that does that help.

From EPC: Field Trip Policy – Second Reading – E. Asencio, M. Weisman

E. Asencio noted that the Field Trip policy had its first reading last time. M. Weisman took back some comments and made some adjustments. She addressed several of the questions or comments that had come up and worked with Risk Management to take care of the issue with the language of “unwilling.” M. Weisman was available for further questions.
A member said as those of you who’ve been following Senate-Talk this week know there’s a lot of concern about this policy, with what legal standing it has, and so on. We recognize as a faculty that our administration hands are somewhat tied because they’ve got an Executive Order to deal with. But our hands and students hands or not. If we find serious problems with this Executive Order, we have the right and even then, responsibility to speak up about it.

Motion: That The Executive Committee be directed to constitute an Ad-Hoc committee to be chaired by a faculty member, consisting (at least) of representatives of Student Government, Appropriate Administrators, and faculty knowledgeable about field-trip exigencies, and consulting as appropriate with other campuses’ student and faculty organizations, to craft a position paper on what a reasonable and fair field-trip policy should look like. Second.

Highlights of Discussion: The policy could be interim until the issues are resolved. The policy is only about field trips, not about study abroad or experiential learning. EO 1062 requires that we have a field trip policy. The word was domestic inserted in the policy and does not include field trips that go out of the country. Concern was raised about the waiver for students to sign which asks them to accept liability and make no claims against the university. How would this be enforced? Suggestion that the policy include reference to the SEIE policy on international travel and education. The link to the form in the policy does not go to the correct form. Waiver language in the policy is from the CSU, not SSU. It seems the waiver language is most controversial and not the policy itself. EPC was thanked for their work on this policy. Concern voiced about creating an ad hoc committee when staffing committees is difficult now. Affirmation from the administration that they would do the right thing if an issue came up during a field trip. Concern expressed that during this time of COVID-19, the campus needs to mitigate as much risk as possible and the need for a policy is clear. Suggestion that the policy have a sunset clause.

Vote on motion: Failed - 7 Yes, 15 No

Motion to include that it specify in this policy that it only applies to the Spring 2021 semester. Second.

Motion to amend motion: add interim to the title of the policy as well as specify that it only applies to Spring 2021. Second.

Vote on amendment to motion: Approved. 11 Yes, 3 No.

There was some discussion on the policy only applying for Spring 2021.

Question Called.

Vote on ending debate: Approved. 21 Yes, 1 No.

Vote on motion to include that it specify in this policy that it only applies to the Spring 2021 semester. Failed: 20 No, 1 Yes.
Discussion of the policy continued. Background to the written pre-trip evaluation requirement requested.

**Motion:** Add to policy last sentence to second paragraph II - Faculty planning a fieldtrip abroad, should refer to this international policy: [http://web.sonoma.edu/cie/faculty-opportunities/faculty-led-policy030118.pdf](http://web.sonoma.edu/cie/faculty-opportunities/faculty-led-policy030118.pdf). Second.

Discussion: Is this necessary since the policy is not about international travel, should links be in the policy since they go out of date? It was suggested that the language be: Faculty planning a course-based trip abroad, should refer to this international policy: [http://web.sonoma.edu/cie/faculty-opportunities/faculty-led-policy030118.pdf](http://web.sonoma.edu/cie/faculty-opportunities/faculty-led-policy030118.pdf).

**Motion to amend:** change field trip to course-based. Approved.

**Vote on amended motion:** Motion withdrawn by mover and agreed by second.

**Motion:** Amend to policy last sentence to second paragraph II - Faculty planning a course-based trip abroad, should refer to the current SSU policy on faculty-led travel courses. Second. It was noted that as links in polices become more usual, it is important to review polices in every 3 to 5 years.

**Vote on motion – Approved.** 20 Yes, 0 No.

**Question called.** Approved.

**Vote on Field Trip policy as amended – Approved.** 18 Yes, 1 No.

**Associated Students Report – N. Brambila-Perez**

N. Brambila-Perez said this week is Hunger and Homelessness week. The use of Lobo’s Pantry slowed a bit this week due to the upcoming holiday. Our long term AS accountant, Linda Williams, went into retirement. Christina Gamboa who was formerly of the Student Affairs admin team has agreed to join us on an interim basis to help us. She noted that the Provost sent an email at the beginning of the school year for faculty to not require students to have their camera on during class, and there’s a variety of reasons for that. But a lot of students have come to us saying a lot of your colleagues have not been doing that and then they have been enforcing cameras on. She asked the members to check in with their colleagues and let them know that students should not be penalized for having their cameras off and understand the student experience during this COVID situation. She wished everyone a happy Thanksgiving.

**Statewide Senators Report – W. Ostroff, R. Senghas**

W. Ostroff reported that the Statewide Senate had an extra meeting this past Friday night. We passed an important resolution, which was entitled Acknowledging Campus Senate’s Resolutions on AB1460 Recommendations for Implementing the
Ethnic Studies Requirement. Basically, this resolution was to highlight the 18 plus resolutions that came from campus Senate’s all over the CSU. Mainly campuses have asked for autonomy on how to implement AB1460 including whether it is GE requirement, whether it’s restricted to lower division and whether the reduction in GE area D is done to make the new area F. Campus autonomy was supported by Statewide Senate. It was supported by many campus Senate’s, the CFA and the CSU Council on Ethnic Studies, but nevertheless at the Board of Trustees meeting this week VP Lauren Blanchard reported that the Chancellor’s Office has decided that the new ethnic studies requirement will be a lower division GE requirement. He mentioned that placement in lower division highlights the importance of the ethnic studies requirement and that it becomes foundational to the educational experience. He said that it has the most clarity for students if it’s in the lower division GE and it meets the needs of both transfer and native students. He did answer some questions at the Board of Trustees meeting. One question was, can an upper division course meet that lower division requirement. He said, yes, students may take an upper division course to meet a lower division requirement, including this one. Another question was can courses approved for this count for other major or minor requirements. The answer was also yes they could be approved for major requirements and cover ethnic studies and he did mention the faculty have autonomy and determining which courses on the campus meet the requirement. There may be additional learning outcomes in addition to the core competencies that were developed by the Ethnic Studies Council and by the Statewide Senate. This new ethnic studies lower division GE requirement will be for new students only beginning in 2021. A member asked was there any discussion about transfer students coming and needing ethnic studies requirements and, also in terms of visibility, if proper advising isn't done then a lot of students may add extra time, especially for students who are not aware of that other courses can be substituted for that requirement. W. Ostroff said there was a lot of discussion on those issues both at the Statewide Senate and the Board of Trustees Meeting. The representatives from the Chancellor's Office held strong that the most efficient way, including for transfer students, was to have it be a lower division GE requirement, but that other courses like upper division courses could be used to satisfy it once folks transferred. It was quite a controversial conversation in both of those meetings which she attended. Again, it really went against what 18 or 19 of the campus Senate's voted for. It was very much a top down decision in her perspective. A guest from SEIE asked would the requirement be for anyone coming in and fall 2023 and beyond? W. Ostroff said she was under the impression that any student beginning in 2021 will be required to take ethnic studies.

Staff Representative Report – K. Sims

K. Sims did not have a report for today, but told the members that staff have been asked to provide feedback about practical, on the ground, obstacles that are coming up during their work. She will have a report about that next time.

APARC Report – E. Virmani

E. Virmani reported that APARC continues to work on looking at the integration of core values and the strategic plan and trying to decide how to do that in the self-
study guide for program reviews. We are also actively working on revising the syllabus policy in the hopes to bring it back to this group when that is more ready.

**EPC Report – E. Asencio**

No report.

**FSAC Report – P. Lane**

P. Lane reported that FSAC met today as a committee of the whole, not with an official agenda and we worked for one hour and 45 minutes on URTP revisions. It was a lovely working meeting. It is our intention to be have the revisions as a first item of Ex Com in the Spring to start the feedback procedure.

**SAC Report – H. Smith**

No report.

**CFA Report – E. J. Sims**

E. J. Sims reported that CFA had a very successful lecturers range elevation workshop last Friday November 3rd and had a good turnout of lecturers among those who are eligible to apply for range elevation. We shared a PowerPoint presentation with them spelling out the requirements for applying and shared why a range elevation is so important. Lectures who are eligible and apply for range elevation can get a 5% increase in their salary, so we don’t want to leave any money on the table. Lecturers can negotiate a higher percentage as part of this process and there is an appeal process for anyone who might be denied range elevation. The good news is that the for the lecturers, who have applied for range elevation, they have been successful in receiving it. It was a wonderful collaboration between CFA and the Faculty Affairs office. She thanked AVP Deborah Roberts for working in collaboration with CFA to provide this information to the 23 lectures, who are eligible to apply for range elevation. CFA is back at the bargaining table with the CSU and we’ve had two meetings already. We have a total of five we’ve already scheduled for bargaining and there is a website for those of you who are interested in finding out what the CFA proposals are in this round of bargaining at https://www.calfac.org/pod/cfa-bargaining-proposals, that's on our statewide website. The proposals are being shared with our CFA members in an effort to share information and for purposes of transparency.

**Good of the Order**

Many Happy Thanksgivings were shared.

**Adjourned.**

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

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

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

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

3. The final suggestion is to address a number of issues that currently reside in the current policy, but would better serve as separate documents. A number of these may need to become policy, updated policy (SETE), or at least approved procedure/recommendation.
### Side-by-Side Comparison of Current and Suggested RTP Policy Outline

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

Associated documents – not part of policy, but would help to have as reference within. Currently, most or some of this text is folded into the current policy.

- CV template (not accepted by Senate)
- SETE policy (update) Include something about SETE table?
| **Peer observation document (see CTET information) (new)** |
| **Colleague letters (as per CBA15.12.d)** |
| **Chair report outline (guidelines on what should be included)** |
| **University RTP schedule (Faculty Affairs)** |
| **Periodic Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty Form (new)** |
FSAC has undertaken a review of the URTP Policy and incorporated input from the URTP subcommittee and a survey of faculty conducted in February of 2020. The rough draft of a revised policy is provided for comment and feedback. This document includes explanation of the main changes that have been incorporated.

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

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

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

   ● On issue of number of full (performance) reviews during TT cycle:
     o FSAC expressed concerns about faculty coming in with 2 years of service credit and beginning first year at SSU with a performance review. For faculty starting with no service credit, they must wait until 3rd year at SSU to get a full review. Thus, an issue of aligning a 3/6 split with years at SSU and adequate feedback to tenure-track candidates.

     o If the impetus for 3/6 split of performance reviews is workload driven, then can an alternative be found for reducing workload but maintain adequate feedback to candidates?

     o FSAC recommends keeping current 2/4/6 cycle for performance review, but reduce workload for periodic reviews. To this end a periodic review template, similar to that used for periodic review of temporary faculty, has been drafted (attached).

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

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

Vs. a 3/6 split for Performance review

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

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

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

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

3. New text/sections on current draft:

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

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

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

Other issues that remain open to input:

- Evaluation III.C.4 – Should a candidate be given more direction on requesting delay in promotion?
- Evaluation III.D.2 – School RTP Committee: Should this level of review be reconsidered?
Preamble

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

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

I. Definitions

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

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

Deleted: -

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Criteria
A. General:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. Research, Scholarship, and Creative achievements

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

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

E. Departmental Criteria

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

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

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

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

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

F. Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion

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

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

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

III. Evaluation

A. Committees

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

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

1. Committee Membership and Eligibility

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

a. Department RTP Committee:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

● Current curriculum vitae.

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

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

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

● Two peer observations of teaching since the last Performance Review.

● Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETEs) are required for two classes. Summary copies of SETE’s for all classes are supplied by the Office of Reporting & Analytics.

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

2. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for the completeness of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), which consists of:

- Department RTP recommendation included on University Record of Action Taken form.
- Candidate’s materials (see above)
- Evaluation document prepared by the Department RTP committee (see III.C). The Department evaluation document shall not exceed two pages for Periodic Evaluations (brief) and ten pages for Performance Reviews (full).

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

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

C. Evaluation

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

1. A Periodic Evaluation (cf. CBA 15.20) is used for candidates in their 1st year at SSU regardless of service credit, 3rd and 5th years. This "brief" evaluation shall typically be 2 pages in length, and answer the following questions:

- What are the candidate’s strengths? Explain.
- Does the RTP committee have any concerns or see any areas for growth in the candidate’s performance? Explain, especially as related to the department criteria.
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2. A Performance Review (cf. CBA 15.31) is used for candidates in their 2nd, 4th, 6th probationary years and for tenure and promotion. This full evaluation document shall not exceed 10 pages and will include:
   - An overview or introduction.
   - An evaluation of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness (or equivalent for librarians, counselors and SSP-ARs).
   - An evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship, research and creative achievements.
   - An evaluation of the candidate’s service to the University and community.

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

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

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

D. Levels of Review

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

a. Teaching Effectiveness

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

i. Peer Observation of Teaching

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

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

ii. Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

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

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

b. Scholarship, Research, and Creative Achievements

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

c. University and Community Service

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

2. School RTP Committee

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

3. School Dean

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

The University RTP Subcommittee shall make formal recommendations to the President concerning reappointment in the 2nd PY/2nd at SSU, 4th, and 6th years, tenure, and promotion. The University RTP Subcommittee may forward a separate ranked list of candidates recommended for promotion to the President.

IV. Recommendation

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

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

A. Candidate’s Right to Respond and Opportunity to Confer

1. At any level of review, within ten days of receipt of the recommendation and reappointment expectations, a candidate may submit a response in writing and/or request that a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation and the reappointment expectations.

2. Upon such request, the candidate shall be provided an opportunity to confer with the Committee at each level of review and the School Dean. This provision shall not change the evaluation timelines.

3. The Committee or School Dean shall notify Faculty Affairs of any request by a candidate for rebuttal or meetings.

4. The Committee or School Dean shall summarize the conference in writing, and include in its recommendation matters discussed at the conference that affect the recommendation.

B. Reports and Recommendations

1. Positive Recommendation. At each level of review a report shall be written in sufficient detail to impart a reasonable understanding of the grounds for the positive recommendation to members of the academic community.

2. Negative Recommendation
a. If, at any level of review, the candidate receives a negative recommendation, this recommendation shall be detailed in writing to a degree sufficient to communicate a reasonable understanding of the grounds for the negative recommendation to members of the academic community.

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

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

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

C. President

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

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

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

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

V. Grievances

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

VI. Timeline Summary

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

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

Commented [23]: Then what?
| 4th, 6th, tenure & promotion | Performance Review | All | No later than June 1 |
The SETE is a standardized university-wide form administered at the end of each term. Each Department may add quantitative and qualitative questions to be used department-wide.
Student evaluations are required for all faculty who teach. Summaries for all classes are included in the WPAF.
Each Department shall provide for full student participation in the evaluation process and preserve the anonymity of student participants. Administration of student evaluations of instruction shall take place for all faculty within the last three weeks of the semester. The instructor shall not have access to or any knowledge of the contents of these evaluations until grades have been submitted to the Admissions and Records Office.

Peer observation policy (new)

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

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

Colleague letters
Chair report outline (guidelines on what should be included)
- University RTP schedule (Faculty Affairs)
- Periodic Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty Form
**Associated Documentation**

Text in normal font is from the current URTP Policy. Text in italics is discussion provided from FSAC.

The following text is extracted from the current URTP policy and is taken out of the current draft. This material represents recommendations in the current policy and are not germane to the policy. However, they do provide useful information to candidates and committees. Therefore, FSAC is saving this material to be used in the formulation of documents that will be available to guide candidates and committees. A number of these are listed below.

The University RTP Subcommittee shall provide to candidates, departments and schools a format to be used for submission of recommendations and supporting materials.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- **CV template.** This suggestion did not receive positive feedback from the Academic Senate.

- **SETE policy.** The University SETE policy should be reviewed and updated if necessary
  
The SETE is a standardized university-wide form administered at the end of each term. Each Department may add quantitative and qualitative questions to be used department-wide.
  
  Student evaluations are required for all faculty who teach. Summaries for all classes are included in the WPAF.
  
  Each Department shall provide for full student participation in the evaluation process and preserve the anonymity of student participants. Administration of student evaluations of instruction shall take place for all faculty within the last three weeks of the semester. The instructor shall not have access to or any knowledge of the contents of these evaluations until grades have been submitted to the Admissions and Records Office.

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

Peer Observations of Teaching

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

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

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

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

TO BE COMPLETED BY DEPARTMENT

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

Evaluation is for (choose one)

☐ 1st year at SSU (evaluation by Department and Dean)
☐ 3rd year at SSU (evaluation by Department, School, and Dean)
☐ 5th year at SSU (evaluation by Department, School, and Dean)

Department Evaluation

Maximum of 2 pages. Must address the questions:

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

Attach evaluation to this form.

________________________________________________________________________

Department RTP Committee Chair Signature   Print Name
________________________________________________________________________

TO BE COMPLETED BY CANDIDATE

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

________________________________________________________________________

Candidate Signature   Print Name
________________________________________________________________________

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE SCHOOL RTP COMMITTEE

Based on our review of the candidate’s WPAF and Department RTP Committee Evaluation (choose one)

☐ The School RTP Committee agrees with the Department RTP Committee evaluation.
☐ The School RTP Committee provides additional input to the candidate’s evaluation (max. of 1 page, attached).

________________________________________________________________________

School RTP Committee Chair Signature   Print Name
TO BE COMPLETED BY CANDIDATE

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

________________________________  ______________________________________
                                            Candidate Signature                  Print Name

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE SCHOOL DEAN

Based on review of the candidate’s WPAF and Department and School RTP Committee Evaluations (choose one)

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

________________________________  ______________________________________
                                            Dean Signature                        Print Name

TO BE COMPLETED BY CANDIDATE

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

________________________________  ______________________________________
                                            Candidate Signature                  Print Name