

Executive Committee Minutes
April 1, 2021
Via Zoom, 3:00 – 5:00 with free the fifties.

Abstract

Agenda - Approved. Minutes of 3/11/2021 – Approved. Chair Report. President Report. Provost Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice President for Student Affairs Report. Associated Students Report. APARC Report. Posthumous Degree Request for Lisa Dunwoody – Approved for Senate Agenda. EPC Report – question only. EPC Report. THAR Concentration in Dance Discontinuance – Approved for Senate Agenda. THAR Concentration in Acting Revision, THAR Concentration in Technical Theatre Revision, THAR Concentration in Theatre Studies Revision – Approved for consent calendar. SAC Report. CFA Report. Candidates for Graduation for Senate consent – Approved. From FSAC: Revision to the RTP policy – Approved for Senate Agenda. Senate Agenda approved.

Present: Jeffrey Reeder, Carmen Works, Bryan Burton, Wendy Ostroff, Elita Virmani, Emily Asencio, Paula Lane, Hilary Smith, Sam Brannen, Karen Moranski, Wm Gregory Sawyer, Erma Jean Sims

Absent: Judy Sakaki, Joyce Lopes, Amal Munayer, Laura Krier

Guests: Richard Senghas, Noelia Brambila-Perez, Kevin Fang, Scott Horstein, Tony Bish

Approval of Agenda - Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 3/11/2021 – Approved.

Chair Report – J. Reeder

J. Reeder said he attended the Staff Council meeting earlier this week as a representative of our Senate and they had a lively discussion. The meeting was very well attended. He was very pleased and impressed about how many people were in attendance and the level of dedication as exhibited by the participation and the comments. If there is a silver lining to the pandemic, it's this opportunity to bridge geography, time and space and have the opportunity to participate more wholly and more completely in these kinds of discussions about shared governance. Commencement planning is moving along. SSU has a commencement page and the messaging is starting to go out to students. (<http://commencement.sonoma.edu/>) We will have this year, for the first time ever flags, which are part of the commencement ceremony, indicating international students. We will also have flags indicating and honoring the Native nations, to which our graduates and the space where are our university is located that will be part of our ceremony. He was pleased and proud about that. Today there was an open forum on the implementation of area F and how we respond to AB 1460 and the changes in the Title V code and there was again lively participation and lots of folks in attendance. The meeting itself was recorded and as soon as it's ready, it will be uploaded to our

AB1460 page (<https://ge.sonoma.edu/ab-1460>). If you missed it and you'd like to watch it, that's where it will be.

President Report – K. Moranski for J. Sakaki

K. Moranski said the President asked her to note a couple of things as part of her report. She'd like to recognize the new Academic Senate and Associated Student officers. Congratulations to Professor Lauren Morimoto and Brian Burton, the new Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty and the new Secretary to the Senate, Emily Clark. Congratulations to our three new officers. We are very excited to welcome all into these leadership roles and on the Associated Students side, President elect Noelia Brambila-Perez, Executive VP elect Christina Gomez and Vice President of Finance elect Justin Aronson. We look forward to working with them next year as well. We are lucky to have such a rich array of talent leading next year. The President also asked her to note that we have celebrated Cesar Chavez day this week and that he is one of our greatest champions of social justice. We know that that he would be telling us that there is more work for us to do, but we want to thank everyone in the campus community for continuing to speak out when the circumstances, the environment, or the world in which we live is unjust. We need to continue to fight to show that every student, every employee and every person has value as we work on our campus and work to move back into normalcy. We need to remember that social justice is one of our core values and diversity in social justice, and that is the report from the President.

The Chair said thank you and he meant to mention that as part of his Chair's report that one of the things that Cesar Chavez did to raise awareness and to raise engagement in California was his march from Delano, which is more or less between Bakersfield and Fresno, to Sacramento. Those of you that know California geography are aware that that's about 300 miles, which is a long way. We have a lot to do as a university, not only in terms of our academic planning, but also our social justice work, but each one of his steps was a positive step, leading toward the overall goal. We have a million baby steps or hundreds of thousands, or however many it is, but all of those work together and reach that eventual goal.

A member said she thought that Cesar Chavez Day is an opportunity to think through the flawed nature of human beings. One can be a hero, and also be flawed. Chavez was in some ways, racist. He was many weird and ugly things and yet she couldn't imagine where our state would be and farm workers themselves without his advocacy. He did lots of good and the details of his life are very messy. As scholars, she thought this is an exciting time to help students think about the mixed bag of all of these very famous people who have contributed so much. She wanted to say this, since no one else was bringing it up. It's a mixed bag and she certainly celebrated the day and is very proud to be a Californian.

Provost Report – K. Moranski

K. Moranski said we are moving forward on our enrollment processes. We are in the yield part of the enrollment cycles, so our applications have closed. We had about 9200 1st year applications and that is lower than we've had in recent years, but we

are admitting a larger number of those students and working to convert those applications into deposits. We've been working on some messaging to go out from schools and from units across campus and we have people making phone calls, we have people sending text messages, we have people using our customer relationship management software to do the work of trying to help our students and our prospective students see Sonoma State as the right option. The good news is that our transfer applications and our transfer admits are at a seven year high. Our deposits are extremely strong for transfer students, as they are for post bac and graduate students and that may help us if our first year numbers are a little bit less strong than we'd like them to be. It may be that our transfer numbers will be at an all-time high so, that's where we are enrollment wise. In terms of repopulation, we've had a lot of conversations recently and we had a great conversation at the Chair Chat on Tuesday and tried to answer some questions. One of the things that continues to come up is the physical distancing issue, and she wanted to say to the Ex Com that the CDC has issued changes to physical distancing guidelines for K-12 only. We do not yet have any official guidelines at the higher education level. Many of the campuses are planning for less distance and we can allow some sort of flexibility as the summer goes on, but we just don't have any confirmation right now. On a case by case basis, she has allowed departments that want to move particular sections of classes that are in-person from 25 to 35 if they want to get more students into the classroom and be able to teach in person, and we'll certainly make accommodations for them to be able to do that. We're not forcing anybody to do anything. We're trying to make sure that we have enough spaces and enough classes for the students who want in-person and enough classes for the students who want online and those are different populations of students. We will be taking a look at what happens with registration. The schedule went live today. We will see what happens with registration starting on the 12th of April and then we'll take stock. We hope to reserve some of the third set of stimulus funding for adding more sections where we need to in order to make sure that there are enough classes for students. We have been trying to get to the range of between 45% and 55% in-person. We're not quite there, but we're getting closer. People are still changing modes of instruction for classes, so we'll have to be patient with that process and help students to understand that things may change a little bit over the summer.

A member asked if there is a document that clearly explains asynchronous, bi-synchronous and hybrid teaching modes. K. Moranski said that information was on the Registrar's site (<http://registrar.sonoma.edu/how-register>). The member said the schedule could not be searched for the teaching mode right now. K. Moranski it's because it is in the description for the course rather than in the schedule. She offered to help with that or provide some lists to advisors, to faculty and professional advisors. The member said she don't want to make more work. It's not that hard to analyze and to teach students how to scan it for what they need. It would be nice to have a filter she could run if a student says "I'm not able to move back to campus" and what classes can I take. That's a question that's coming up. K. Moranski said she was aware of this issue.

A member said he hoped that when students register for a class that is not going to be face to face that that class is not be allowed to be changed to face to face because students are going to be planning their lives, their schedules and their work

schedules and that would be massively disruptive. He hoped we initiate some kind of policy where, in fact, they are not allowed to do that once students have registered. K. Moranski said we've got 12 days before students start to register, so she encouraged people to make those changes now rather than once the students begin to register and she completely agreed with the member about the importance of that. From her perspective, we could add sections and that would add the flexibility to add another mode.

A member said one other note is that in the schedule, it doesn't ever say face to face. It says Carson Hall 1, so the assumption can be made. It's not unreasonable, but if we want to be ultra-clear to say that it's a face to face class, which might seem too obvious, but with all these options, we might need that. K. Moranski said we looked into that, but there was a problem in the way that it would list face to face courses. It would only list them by room number, but she will talk to Stacey and Dennis about that even if there's nothing we can do. The member said if it's an easier fix, in the face to face class description, say this will be noted in the course as the class number of the room. A member pointed out that the schedule says that if a class is meeting on campus, the room will be designated on the schedule.

Statewide Senator Report – W. Ostroff, R. Senghas

W. Ostroff said we had a very productive plenary last week. She was in 22 hours of Zoom meetings all told and we got quite a lot done. We elected candidates for the Faculty Trustee position. We have two candidates, that we're forwarding on to the Governor, Darlene Yee-Melichar and Romey Sabalius, were elected as nominees. We got to hear from Fred Wood, the interim Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs. He spoke about his strong belief in shared governance. He thanked us for our monumental effort to pivot in this remote environment and he spoke about the GI 2025 goals of eliminating equity gaps. We also heard from our Chancellor Joseph Castro, who is going to be meeting with the Governor with a bold budget request. He had a wonderful question and answer session with us, about including faculty in campus planning and decision making for the repopulation period as well as speaking of equity mindedness and getting rid of cultures of bullying, harassment, and retaliation on our campuses and addressing those on a system wide basis. We heard from our student CSSA liaison who spoke to us, importantly, about racism on our campuses and ways that we can approach stopping systematic racism and one of those was addressed in one of our resolutions. We heard from our CFA liaison Charles Toombs who spoke about the bargaining that's happening right now, especially on workload issues and issues related to lectures, counselors, and coaches. He spoke of academic freedom as being raised as a separate article in our contract, which would be new in this contract. We passed some important resolutions. One was the endorsement and adoption of B4 GE area course guidelines and principles that was approved. We approved a resolution for a moratorium on algorithmic image analysis technologies. That is has to do with facial recognition and that played a role in our conversation about systematic racism and was approved. We approved the faculty emeritus status revocation and appeal resolution. We also approved a resolution on the use of remote processing software for assessment. Again, one of the pieces of racism that

we've been seeing in our in our system, because remote proctoring software is known for being highly racist for signaling out people who have different skin colors as flagged for cheating, so we approved a waiver against the use of remote proctoring software. There was a resolution on ensuring safe campus repopulation that was unanimously approved and one of addressing burnout within the CSU Community. Those are the most notable ones.

R. Senghas said since the plenary session, he met with the ERFSA folks because they were very interested in the emeritus status potential rescission. The resolution that passed at the CSU level was not about any particular positions, it was just asking all the campuses to revisit their policies and make sure that several things are explicitly dealt with so that there isn't confusion around who can or cannot or whether emeritus status can or cannot be rescinded, and so they wanted to know a bit about it. He thought FSAC would take this up in the future.

The Student rep said the CSSA student talked about systemic racism. Were there any recommendations given that the campus could start implementing regarding that. W. Ostroff said she believed that the CSSA rep was when she was speaking. She was speaking in particular about that those kinds of software that faculty have been using, those kinds of remote proctoring software and some of the facial recognition, so it was a pointed comment that she had made about that, but all of us are eager to find all kinds of ways to address the kinds of racism that we're seeing on our campuses. Chancellor Castro was mentioning these issues as well, so we're hoping that that starts the ground swell of these conversations to address these kinds of issues.

R. Senghas said he forgot to mention that there was a lot of commentary amongst the Senators about how positive the session with interim EVC was. He was very open. We had a good conversations and that was a good sign. He's definitely somebody jumping in who looks prepared for the position and he's following somebody who we had a very productive working relationship with and so to see EVC Wood coming in with such a good foot forward, it made a lot of people quite hopeful.

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

Wm. G. Sawyer said he wanted to make sure that we recognize also that this week is our National Trans Visibility week. We have had programs all week. We want people to know that our campus is open and accessible to all of our students, as well as faculty and staff. On Friday, the President of Student Government, Melissa Kadar and myself put out a pledge to students to support our Asian Pacific Islander Community making sure that we highlight at least three different activity areas with multiple programs and events, as well as readings that faculty staff and students could engage in. We wanted to make sure that we sent that out to support our Asian community. Today, we got a report that one of our former students Courtney Shota, who was a three year soccer player on campus, 25 years old, went into cardiac arrest and is now in the hospital down south awaiting a heart transplant. In 2017, she collapsed on the field when she was hit with a soccer ball in her chest. She's actually a paramedic now and she's going to nursing school. She graduated in 2018 with a

degree in Kinesiology and he wanted to make sure that the faculty knew this because she is on life support and she's waiting for a heart. We are putting in the efforts that the Provost talked about, Herculean efforts, to make sure that we are filled in housing. Our goal is to have 1800 students in housing and he's hoping for around 2000. The goal is to bring our campus back to normality and how we can bring people back to housing in a safe way. It looks like our numbers, right now, in terms of applications, which does not necessarily mean that they are in contract, but we have around 2000 right now, and we're hoping that we can convert as many of those as possible. We are providing opportunities for free parking for the first semester, that if students decide that they want to come with us and live in housing, we won't change their lease, and a \$250 bookstore voucher and bunny slippers for wearing around campus. We're trying to make sure that we provide as many incentives as we can for the students to come back.

A member said he was wondering, because he had heard this has been done in other campuses, about the contact tracing apps. He knew that the android and the iPhones all have this capacity and asked if we are considering encouraging or requiring use of this. If we do get an outbreak, wouldn't that be one of the best ways to track down and isolate it as quickly as possible.

Wm. G. Sawyer said we are looking at that. There is one app we have hunted down that is currently at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. He believed the program is called Clearance. It reminds him of our dual authentication system on our campus. If it pops up to green, it also will show you 83% of the people that are on campus and have that authorization to be on campus. It will also show you in red that 16.3% of folks have been asked to stay at home. We're looking to see what different kinds of apps can be used and can they be used on all devices. We are trying to determine the total cost. A couple of campuses are doing that, and it would help us with contact tracing. We're also looking at, as students move on campus, we want to make sure that they have their verification of vaccination. For those who cannot verify that they have been inoculated, we are looking at making sure that we test once a week. We have to see. Some of those tests, the cheaper rapid testing, can be anywhere from \$5 to \$15 bucks and the more expensive PCR is going to get us somewhere neighborhood of \$50 to \$70. All campuses are wrestling with these issues, but we're also seeing how much of the money that we're getting can we apply to what we need on campus.

Associated Students Report – N. Brambila-Perez

N. Brambila-Perez said we have our new representatives and now we have seven Board of Directors, so it's much smaller than what we usually have and we're going through a whole restructure of the Associated Students. We're already working actually, so if anyone wants to meet with us, we're more than happy to present the rest of the team. The Associated Students is working on a bunch of different resolutions that they're hoping to pass and then forward to Academic Senate. Because it's not approved by Associated Students yet, she couldn't release any information, but the Associated Students think that the Academic Senate would like to discuss it and the AS would like to get their viewpoints. We have a bunch of other things we are working on, such as standing against anti-blackness resolution. We

have a lot of our students coming to us and feeling overwhelmed with being targeted by students, faculty, staff, everybody on campus or they want us to understand that they're going through a hard time right now. One of our representatives told us that students are on the border of dropping out now because online is really hard for them. We're trying to navigate different resources on how to better support our students and how to get to them in a timely fashion, that way they don't end up at that point. We still have the Basic Needs Initiative and we'll be looking for a Student Government Coordinator, as well as someone that will take over the Basic Needs. There's a bunch of restructuring. To go back to that resolution, she was hoping to get it on the Academic Senate agenda. We are also hoping that we will have an administrative letter to support it. She hoped the Ex Com would allow her to bring this forward for discussion.

The Chair said we will be happy to look at, consider, and discuss all those matters. Please bring them to Ex Com first and then as appropriate we will bring them to the full Senate. N. Brambila-Perez said she had a quick question. We're hoping to get this resolution, if it passes this Monday, when we meet, on the next Academic Senate agenda. What she could show is a draft, although it's not approved. A member said one thing he's seen in the past, if there's a timeliness issue, is maybe the Chair could consider this, if a draft gets out of your group, maybe it could be circulated amongst Ex Com members by email, they could say, yes it's ready to bring forward to the Senate or not. The Senate Analyst said another strategy is, if you find a Senate member that can vote, they could offer it from the floor. That has happened in the past too, but you'd have to find a Senator who can vote to ask for it to be presented to the Senate.

The Chair of FSAC said if by chance the student resolution has some direct link to a faculty governance committee, could they go through that committee to help move it forward? If it has anything to do with FSAC, for instance, we meet next Thursday and in that case, if it were ready, it could come to FSAC next Thursday, we could act on it, and perhaps move things forward. She was suggesting that as another route.

APARC Report – E. Virmani

E. Virmani said APARC has been talking a lot about APARC's role in assessment - what responsibility do we have in terms of the labor of assessment, changing the culture of assessment at SSU and how can we embed assessment more strategically and intentionally across committees. We've been having conversations about potentially approaching chairs of various committees and talking about ways in which each committee is engaged in assessment or what areas of assessment they touch. Something that is coming down the pike is a seven year program review cycle consideration that we would like to bring forward, hopefully, in the next couple weeks.

3:50 reached. The Chair led us in archery stretches.

Posthumous Degree Request for Lisa Dunwoody – K. Fang

K. Fang said GEP is advancing a request for a posthumous degree. One thing that we know is that this is somewhat of an unusual request compared to other similar requests, and we have tried to follow the policy in spirit, although as we'll see there is one difference here. What makes this request different is that Miss Dunwoody is not a current student, but a student at SSU back in the fall of 2003. She passed away in late 2019 and we received a request from her husband inquiring whether a posthumous degree was possible. We do know that it is somewhat of a situation outside of the policy, but we figured we would go up the chain to see what everybody else thought. Lisa was student from 2002- 2003. She had completed, we believe, the entire major except for an internship requirement. She was enrolled at an internship and took an incomplete in the fall of 2003 and did not complete that at a later date. That was the really the only thing standing in her way from completing the degree in her lifetime. She was, by record, a very strong student while she was here with a 3.5 GPA and made several Dean's lists. We actually don't have anybody who could speak about her personally, as we have no faculty left that from that period, but at least from her record she seemed like she was a strong student and it unfortunate that was she was unable to find a way to get that last requirement complete. Had she been a current student when she passed, she got beyond the unit threshold, where we would consider the difference between a posthumous degree and a posthumous certificate.

The Chair said our policy doesn't have a time limit limitation and so in Lisa's case she would have been eligible had this gone forward in 2003. His assessment of it is that she would still continue to be eligible. A member said he was not opposed to this at all, but he did think we're going to have to waive our rules, because the policy states the student has to be a matriculated student.

The Chair asked is there any objection to waving our rules, or do we need to take a formal vote on waving our rules. Seeing no objection, we shall wave our rules. Back to the matter of the posthumous degree request, is there anyone opposed to moving the request forward to the Senate. No objection. It was approved for the Senate Agenda.

EPC Report – E. Asencio

No report since EPC had not meet since Spring break.

A member said he had been researching the Engineering A3 waiver issue and getting deep into the weeds and now he's getting reports from people who know that Engineering got a waiver back in 2013 when they reduced to 120 units. They got the waiver by claiming to combine several courses to meet the condition very much like they are now. That's very confusing and he asked that someone to go back and find out exactly how what happened when they reduced 120 units. E. Asencio said she would look into it.

FSAC Report – P. Lane

P. Lane said she wanted to share that the department RTP criteria revising that individual departments are doing are coming in fast and furious. We're very excited about that. This is the call to tell people they should be looking at theirs, and if they haven't looked at them in a long time, they should check them out. We've received two or three this week. We set a date of April 1 because we wanted to really help our sister departments get stuff in. If your department is considering doing something and you've been talking about it, we need as soon as possible.

A member asked do the criteria change for those faculty or who are mid process? The Chair said it doesn't work that way. Although presumably a department should make sure that they don't radically change things midstream because that would be unethical and unprofessional. The candidate's file is cumulative, but the RTP processes is annual. A member said he was on FSAC when we first started doing these and had to vet them all coming through and that was one of the things that was bound in part by the contract. The contract says we have to use the same standards for all the faculty in a cycle. His understanding was every time we've come back to that to revisit it, it has been still holding true that the contract wouldn't allow us to have different standards for people. Everybody in this cycle has to go by the same set. P. Lane said when we get to the item on the agenda, which is the RTP policy revisions, you'll see that in one document we have lovingly called the continuity clause and a place for discussion about that there is, in fact, for the RTP question and a wonderment as to how we might think of previous versions and current versions, so hold on to that thought for the RTP revision discussion. A member said he is going to be on the URTP subcommittee next year and he's glad because that doesn't seem right. If a department really didn't like someone they could just suddenly dump huge requirements on them the last week, such as we suddenly decided everyone has to have five papers a year and then oh you don't, sorry, you're out. He thought that was really dangerous. People should have clear expectations of what's required for tenure and promotion and then that shouldn't be changed.

From EPC: THAR concentration in Dance discontinuance, From EPC: THAR Concentration in Acting Revision, THAR Concentration in Technical Theatre Revision, THAR Concentration in Theatre Studies Revision – E. Asencio, S. Horstein and T. Bish

E. Asencio said from EPC's perspective the Concentration in Dance discontinuance is related to the new BA Dance program which has already been approved at the Chancellor's Office level, so this is just discontinuing the concentration and that was unanimously approved EPC. The other new concentrations are mainly driven by accreditation and needs and EPC approved those unanimously as well.

S. Horstein said the one of the drivers of this curriculum revision is the fact that we're pursuing accreditation for the Theater Arts program. The other driver is trying to be in compliance with EO 1071 which says that all concentrations within a department have to share at least 50% common core. We were close-ish but not really there and it's been a good process getting that together, because it makes us

stronger as a department. Those are the two main things that are driving this. A couple significant changes that you may have noticed already is for accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Theater, we have to require six units of production work. Currently a lot of our students work on production, sometimes out of the goodness of their hearts, and are sometimes for fewer variable units, but we were trying to rectify that with this revision. We've also included the Freshman Learning Community in the curriculum, since we typically advise most of them into it anyhow. The Chair said on behalf of all of us, he thanked Theater Arts for all of the work that you've put into this, this is a huge process and it takes a lot of work. He wanted to recognize that and be grateful for it.

THAR Concentration in Dance Discontinuance – Approved for Senate Agenda.

THAR Concentration in Acting Revision, THAR Concentration in Technical Theatre Revision, THAR Concentration in Theatre Studies Revision – Approved for consent calendar.

SAC Report – H. Smith

H. Smith said SAC has formed our priority registration subcommittee and have received some applications and at our next meeting we are looking forward to having Sean Johnson come and talk about some of the issues with priority registration, so that we have a clear head before we dive into those applications.

CFA Report – E. J. Sims

E. J. Sims said she invited all of the members to our CFA general meeting and Executive Board meeting next Wednesday, that is April 17th at 12 noon and all of unit three Members are invited to come. We will have updates from board members about statewide issues. CFA is having its Spring assembly - a statewide meeting - to be held from April 6 through the 10th. This Assembly is an opportunity to make policy decisions, resolutions and pass those from CFA Caucuses. We will have the election of statewide officers, so we're looking forward to that. We are going to have a CFA bargaining meeting, and this is open to anyone on the campus who'd like to come and hear about the CFA bargaining proposals and we will also share the CSU proposals. We'll have two statewide presenters. Kevin Weir, who is the Vice President of CFA will be at that meeting, and also, we will have the AVP for the Council of the President's sharing that information. They will be joined by our own Elaine Newman, who is a statewide representative to the bargaining team. We're negotiating for a fair contract with the CSU and we've been pushing very hard on a number of issues, so if you have questions or want to hear an update and information about the bargaining effort of CFA, it's going to be on April 21st from noon to one, and you will get a zoom invitation to that meeting. Every spring we do a retirement webinar. It's scheduled for two different days - April 15th and the 16th from 3:00 to 5:00pm. Jonathan Karp, who is our resident expert on all things related to retirement will be conducting those seminars. Some of you may not be aware, but CFA always participates in Lobby Days. Those are scheduled for April 19th through the 21st and this is our opportunity to talk to state legislators about increasing the funding to the CSU, about issues that are related to our faculty and our librarians,

coaches and counselors as well, and we will also be talking to them about co-sponsored CFA legislative bills. It's a great chance for CFA to build relationships with the statewide legislators and also to meet with the Legislative Caucus.

A member recalled that we were discussing departmental RTP criteria changing during a probationary TT faculty member's time under review over several years. Back when we first established explicit departmental RTP criteria for almost all departments and vetted them (and he was on FSAC, even as chair during some of that process), we were required by the CBA to have the criteria change for *all* probationary faculty or those up for promotion, regardless of year of entry. If departmental criteria were established or changed for *anyone*, they were effective for *everyone* being evaluated, regardless of where in the process they were, or when they came in. The same criteria had to be used for all. He recalled this issue of changing departmental criteria came up several times as the bargaining contracts came up for renewal. He knew that many faculty would like to see probationary faculty have the option to stick with whatever RTP criteria prevailed at time of hire, or be able to opt to move to newer ones. Given that issues such as intellectual property rights and academic freedom are now being addressed in the proposed CBA, and given that articulating those issues and topics such as departmental RTP criteria are areas still seen as within the purview of faculty governance, is there someone we could reach out to at CFA or on the bargaining team to work with us as we develop RTP policy revisions, and to help the CBA bargaining team and faculty governance work *collaboratively* and not at cross purposes.

E. J. Sims said CFA does have its bargaining proposals on our statewide website, if you'd like to see what we're proposing. We will do everything we can to get our proposals passed. Kevin Weir would be a great one to talk to and, of course, Charles to as the CFA Statewide President could also speak to those issues. Kevin is leading our bargaining team.

Candidates for Graduation for Senate consent – J. Reeder

J. Reeder said approving the candidates for graduation is one of the most important things that we do and, at times, it might seem routine, but it is something that very clearly faculty have the authority over. We have the sole right of determining when students who are candidates for graduation are in fact ready for graduation. **He asked if the candidate list on the team drive could be approved for the Senate consent calendar. Approved.**

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

P. Lane said it was with great pleasure, she was bringing the RTP policy revision documents forward to this body right now. We've been working on it in FSAC for two years, we have sought feedback, and we have tried to shed light on portions. What we've provided for you is a preamble to help you think through what our thinking was. There is a document showing the changes, with some questions to the side. The original document is all highlighted and then there is a new form. She thought it was safe to say these are not huge changes. It was first and foremost about the organization and separating policy from practice. We have tried to organize it in

what we think of as a more logical order. We thought of dependencies for documentation that might help, but we learned that dependencies need to be part of a policy. There is a plan that next year FSAC would write a handbook about how to go through the RTP process. This is our attempt to after two years to bring this forward as the new Sonoma State University RTP policy. It has to comply with the CBA and we believe it does. We welcome feedback and she was hoping that this can be an item at the Senate so that faculty can start looking at those question bubbles and have a discussion. We've tried to bring forward what we think might be questionable, or that we are not deciding what it should be, for instance, the continuity clause is one of those things. Should a faculty member have the ability to use a former RTP document based on when they came in. We have discussed how a we as a campus might do that at length. We hope that the side by side document that shows a lot of movement of pieces from one place to another and we're ready to discuss any item whatsoever, but especially the ones we think that faculty need to comment on.

A member asked what the yellow highlight were indicating. P. Lane said that is the text we did something with.

A member noted that in the preamble it mentions "regular tenure track." He wondered what they meant. It was noted that term was in the current RTP policy.

The Student Rep said she noted that student evaluation and teaching effectiveness are highlighted. Is there any change in including those? P. Lane said the CBA is very clear and at the same time vague. The CPA states that the SETES must be provided, they must take place each year. The faculty member does not have to use them, and that is based on the department RTP criteria. Whether the department has standards for the numbers that you have to reach, whether the department has what they want to do with them, the CBA is clear that they must be provided, and neither the CBA or the RTP policy declares in what way they have to be used or how often.

On the point about "regular tenure track" faculty, a member thought it might relate to administrators who have retreat rights.

A member asked about the periodic evaluation. FSAC recommends keeping the current 2-4-6 cycle for performance review to reduce workload for periodic reviews. She was wondering about that specific comment because it's not making sense. P. Lane said the periodic does not go all the way up the chain. We wouldn't want to add work to people and we keep it in the same way. This is in compliance with the CBA and what people told us they wanted, the number of reviews and the type based on what we have, so we didn't increase workload, but we didn't decrease it either.

Approved for Senate Agenda. P. Lane requested that we ask Senators to be sure to read the documents before the Senate meeting.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

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

Consent Items: THAR Concentration in Acting Revision
(<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:1106/form>)
THAR Concentration in Technical Theatre Revision
(<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:1352/form>)
THAR Concentration in Theatre Studies Revision
(<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:1267/form>) Candidates for Graduation - on team drive

Business

1. Engineering A3 Waiver request – Second Reading – E. Asencio TC
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. From FSAC: Revision to the RTP Policy – First Reading – P. Lane TC
4. Posthumous degree request from GEP for Lisa Dunwoody – K. Fang TC 4:00
5. From EPC: THAR Concentration in Dance Discontinuance
(<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:2228/form>)
– First Reading – E. Asencio TC

Approved.

Adjourned.

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

