

## Academic Senate Minutes

March 18, 2021

3:00 – 5:00, Via Zoom

### Abstract

Agenda amended and Approved. Minutes of 3/4/2021 Approved. Special Student Report. Chair Report. Consent item: Revision to Spanish MA – Approved. President Report. From EPC: Engineering A3 Waiver – First Reading completed. Provost Report. Resolution on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters – Second Reading – Approved. By-Law Change for URTP membership – Second Reading – Approved. AFS/PDS Joint Statement on Teaching Sensitive Materials – Second Reading – Endorsed. From SDS: Syllabus Checklist for Diversity/Inclusivity – K. Altaker – Request for Endorsement - Second Reading - Endorsed. From APARC: Letter regarding Syllabus Policy and Syllabus Policy revision –E. Virmani - Second Reading – Approved. EPC Report sent in via email. Good of the Order.

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

**Absent:** Viki Montera-Heckman

**Proxies:** Laura Monje-Paulson for Wm Gregory Sawyer

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

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

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

### Special Student Report – Maricruz Ovideo

“Thank you for having me for the student spotlight. My name is Maricruz Ovideo. I am a fifth year here at Sonoma State and I will be graduating in a few weeks. My majors are Spanish and Human Development, double majoring. I'm a proud first generation woman of color and me being here for five years could not have been done without CASSE, especially EOP and their generosity and all of the unconditional support, personal growth and professional growth that they have

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

think about your words and we'll use those as we make decisions today and, as we guide our curriculum, as we guide our discussions.

### **Chair Report – J. Reeder**

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

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

**Consent item: Revision to Spanish MA – Approved.**

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

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

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

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

A member said there was a good deal of material in the packet about the history of this. Apparently some years ago, the Chancellor decided that all majors should be confined to 120 units unless there were some special reasons to make an exception. A number of campuses did request exemptions from that 120 unit CAP for their Engineering programs. All it says in the documentation was that Sonoma State did not make that request. It isn't clear to him why we didn't and why we couldn't. It seems a better solution to this problem than it would be to get a waiver and then enable the program to go to 128 units. It would give them more units to accomplish their goals, instead of just for this proposal.

F. Farahmand from Engineering responded that this is a great point. The previous administration, President and Provost, were very adamantly against increasing it over 120 units. There was absolutely no support from the President and Provost, therefore, the department could not really request going over 120 units at that time. We were bonded as a campus that we must stick with 120 units. Because of that decision, the department had to cut back units of the program. Right now, there are campuses which have more than 120 units for Engineering. 120 units is definitely doable, but harder in terms of equity which could be a major issue for students being able to graduate in four years. Anything more than 120 units really puts students in jeopardy, of not being able to graduate within four year. If they fail any courses, basically, they have to stay one extra semester. That's how it's worked out currently. This is almost 15-16 units every semester.

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

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

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

The student rep said she agreed with the sense that Sonoma State is a very special place, but disagreed with a student having to add an extra year or add an extra semester. She's a student that has to add an extra year, and she's not happy about it.

She's not happy about it because there was a lack of resources from the University itself to let her know what kind of classes she needed to take. Speaking to the Engineering students themselves, they feel the same way. Engineering is already a very, very rigorous major to have, but know that this is something that they talk about and can get them out in four years at Sonoma State.

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

### **First Reading completed.**

### **Provost Report – K. Moranski**

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

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

We now are officially an HSI. What happened is that the Department of Education releases a standard for the percentage of Pell eligible students and students from underrepresented minorities and Latinx students and we had no trouble meeting the percentage of Latinx students, but we have had trouble meeting the percentage of Pell eligible students. Last week, the Department of Ed notified us that we had met that threshold, and so we are now officially an HSI campus and are eligible for Title III, Title V grants. This is a huge milestone for this campus, so kudos to everyone who has recruited and supported our Latinx students and our Pell eligible students. Now we can apply for grants to support those populations and students.

In continuity planning a lot is happening right now. We've had faculty forums, student forums and are in the process of having staff forums related to repopulation for fall. That is what we're focusing on. The situation continues to change.

**Time certain reached.**

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

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

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

A member asked who the current CCJS internship coordinator was.

The Provost said she hoped the Senate could reach a couple of points of agreement as we move forward. One of those points of agreement is that our first priority is always to ensure that students are not harmed either by preventing them from graduating or putting barriers in the way of them graduating or by putting them into situations where health and safety concerns are present. Our other priority is that we, as a campus need to work on the way we do internships and we need to find better ways to do our internships. This is a campus wide discussion. It's not one department, it's not one school, it is a campus wide discussion. She hoped that, in the spirit of shared governance, where we talk together and agree on a path forward, that we can do that with internships. The third thing about the process.

Last time we met, we had hoped that we had agreed on a way to proceed in this particular situation that did move back to the department and give that department, the capability of assigning the internship coordination to the to the person who had had it previously. It is inaccurate to say that we did not agree to return that internship coordination to the department to assign it. We went back and forth, with attempts to formalize the agreement that does not appear to have worked and the Department has notified the Dean that she must continue to teach the course and will continue to be the internship coordinator. There are due process procedures in place there that are playing themselves out. There are grievance processes in place, we need to let those play out. Those are contractually guaranteed and are important processes of shared governance, and so we do need to let those processes play out. We need to think about how we move forward as a campus, that we think about how we serve our students well and that we think about how we do a better job with internships, as we move forward.

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

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

The Provost said the course was offered to the department to run. There was an email agreement that, in fact, that would occur. There was a meeting between the department Chair and the faculty member and the Dean, to make that transition. The department turn down the written agreement there and then did not take the



course back. That leaves the students in limbo, so the Dean is now seeing those students through the rest of the Semester to ensure that there's no further disruption to those student's path to graduation and to completion of their requirements. We agreed to follow through on all the concerns that the department raised. We felt we had done that and had returned the four units to the department and the department didn't like the wording of the settlement agreement. This gets into to grievance issues at this point.

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

**3:50 reached.** Natalie Hobson led us in yoga stretches.

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

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

L. Krier said after our discussion in the last two meetings of the Senate, she went back to URTP and FSAC and Structure and Functions to clarify the intentions that they had for their proposed changes and to edit the proposal to make their intentions a little more transparent and to take into consideration the concerns raised in our last meeting. In the packet on page 31, the changes are in red and there's another strike through that's bolder, so you can see them more clearly. What

we changed was that each member from the school is elected from the school and that the at-large member is elected by plurality of the vote. It should probably say elected *by and from* the school.

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

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

**Vote on amendment – Approved.**

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

**Return to discussion of resolution:**

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

But what we what we were presented with was substantively different from what Provost agreed to with us on February 24th.

**Time Certain reached.**

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

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

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

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

A member said looking through the statement and having thought about it and hearing from our guest, the concern is that faculty are not trained appropriately and could provoke an improper response. That was the AAUP assessment when we went through trigger warnings before. It's not that one opposes them, it's that it is not appropriate for faculty to deal with those situations and that we defer to the experts. She felt strongly and passionately that that we defer to the experts. She's had students who have had so many different psychological conditions, and she would not want to make them worse in some way, by doing the wrong thing, so this

document provides us a pathway to do the right thing. It's been vetted by DSS and by CAPS and she supported what CAPS and DSS tell her. We need to put ourselves aside and go with what the experts tell us which is that we can worsen some of these conditions if we're not careful.

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

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

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

**Motion to Call the Question. Second. Approved.**

**Vote on Statement Regarding Teaching of Sensitive Materials – Approved.**

**Time certain reached.**

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

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

**Return to discussion of Resolution**

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

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

**Time certain reached.**

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

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

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

Center and the Hub as well as others in campus leadership. We're currently in communication with Academic Programs.

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

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

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

**Return to discussion about resolution:**

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

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

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

**Time Certain reached.**

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

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

The Chair said there has been some discussion around this item in the past about issues relating to cases where faculty members might not either want to or be able to upload the content into the LMS on their own. He called the Senators attention to the policy revision language. The way that it's worded requires that the syllabus is

to be uploaded to the LMS, but it does not explicitly state that that a faculty member shall do so. Any faculty member that wishes to request or coerce or trade donuts for somebody else uploading it to the LMS, would be okay, according to the proposed policy.

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

### **Return to resolution discussion.**

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

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

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

The Vice Chair pointed out that we have passed a resolution on something very similar to this in the past and that makes it clear that passing a resolution does not

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

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

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

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

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

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

The student rep asked was there any violation in the Deans contract or was there some place where it states that she could not do this. The Provost responded that the



actions taken are consistent with the contract. It's one of those things that is so difficult. When issues arise that put faculty and administration into conflict, the issue that she thought was the most important was that we make sure that students are taken care of. That's where it started and that's where it should end. We will let the processes play out but that's one of the values that is so important here.

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

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

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

**Motion to Call the Question. Second. Approved.**

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

#### **Resolution on Administrative Encroachment into Curricular Matters**

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

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

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

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

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

## **EPC Report – E. Asencio, submitted via email**

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

## **Good of the Order**

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



**Adjourned.**

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