

**Academic Senate Minutes**  
May 6, 2021  
3:00 – 5:00 with free the fifties  
Via Zoom

**Abstract**

Agenda Approved. Minutes of 4/22/2021 Approved. Special Student Report. Chair Report. Information item: Credit Hour Policy. Provost Report. President Report. Reconsideration of AFS/PDS Statement on the Teaching of Sensitive Materials – endorsement not approved. From EPC: Name change for Electrical and Computer Engineering –Second Reading - Approved. Vice Chair Report. Vice President for Student Affairs Report. From APARC: Program Review Policy revision – Second Reading – Approved. Resolution in Support of AAPI Community and Related Curriculum – Second Reading – Approved. Associated Students Report. Statewide Senators Report. CFA Report. SAC Report. FSAC Report. APARC Report.

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

**Proxy:** Laura Monje-Paulson for Wm. Gregory Sawyer

**Absent:** Angelo Camillo, Cookie Garrett, Joyce Lopes, Viki Montera

**Guests:** Catherine Nelson, Jonathan Smith, Liz Burch, Napoleon Reyes, Jenn Lillig, Stacey Bosick, Gurkirat Sandhu, Katie Musick, Gina Baleria, Hollis Robbins, Kari Manwiller, Richard Whitkus, Lauren Morimoto, Arcelia Sandoval, Damien Hansen, Sadie Pettit, Laura Alamillo, Melinda Milligan, Catherine Fonseca

**Approval of Agenda** – request from FSAC Chair to remove Department Chair policy from agenda. **Approved.**

**Minutes of 4/22/2021 – Approved.**

**Special Student Report - Gurkirat Sandhu**

“My name is Gurkirat Sandhu. I am currently a sophomore at Sonoma State University and as of right now I'm undeclared, but this upcoming semester I'm planning on majoring in computer science. I came to Sonoma State University because of my sister. She was the one who recommended me and she was also a graduate from Sonoma State. She told me about how great of a school this is and how you can have more networks and people to meet, and it could open more career opportunities. As of right now Sonoma State has helped me with so many opportunities - from the resources they provided me from LARC and the Tutoring

Center to all the classes they helped me get and just giving me the knowledge of what to do in college because I'm a first generation student, so I didn't really know much about what to do and how to proceed in college, so they were the guidance for me, to be there for me. They also provided me with a lot of scholarships, like the wine industry scholarship and I got so much help from my wonderful advisor Amal. She helped made my transition to college much easier too. I've had a wonderful experience at the university because I've able to be educated from all the classes I'm taking and they tell me a lot about the new world and all that stuff. I also met lifelong friends from Sonoma State University and consider them as my family so that's great. Right now, my plan for my career is to get a degree in Computer Science and trying to major in Computer Science is my plan for next semester. I have used the resources that EOP has given me basically to help myself up, to increase my grades and be better, so I academically improve. There's going to be challenges in the future, but EOP and Sonoma State ensure me that any challenges I have they will be there to help with anything, so that's a college that not many people have the opportunity to have and I'm grateful for that. What I would like to see from Sonoma State and what could be improved would be having more diverse people come to Sonoma. It will be a more unique for more diverse people to come and it will be an experience for them to be a part of the moment. I would also like to see a safer space for people of color, so they could come together and not feel like a minority, so they can feel the family. Thank you for listening."

The Chair said thanked him very much for being here and thanked him very much for sharing his time with the Senate. We appreciated hearing your words and we will use that to ground our meeting.

### **Chair Report – J. Reeder**

J. Reeder said he would talk about three things briefly, a little bit about commencement, a little bit about communication and a little bit about well-being. Commencement is graduation, of course, and is what everyone does who completes a degree. Commencement is the formal ceremony around recognizing and honoring graduation. We struggled since the beginning of the pandemic with how to recognize the graduates of the class of 2020 and he thought we collectively made the right decision to defer that until later on and we all had the expectation or thought or hoped that that it would be completely back to normal or some kind of back to normal at this time, but we have for the graduates of the class of 2020 and the graduates of 2021, what colloquial people are calling a car management. But it's a chance to create a space to honor our graduates and for them to see their faculty one more time before they head off into life. The reason he was bringing it up here is because, as faculty, part of part of what we do is recognize and applaud our students at that moment, and he wanted to thank all everyone in advance, who are participating, either in the what we're calling the platform party, which is where we'll line the walkway where students walk forward to go up on stage and receive their diploma cover and hear their name called out, or in any other capacity. Obviously if you're distant or for whatever reason it's impossible to attend, then of course, that's everybody's circumstances. But he wanted to give big thanks to everybody who is participating and also a thanks for the flexibility as we plan this. The way that we're doing it this year is, we believe, is the best possible way to honor

our graduates and also be safe and aware of the continued presence of the pandemic and the necessity of following county health guidelines. Within that space we have a good two weekends of ceremonies coming up.

Communication is something that he wanted to mention because it will continue to be an issue as we move forward into the next year, and so, as this is the penultimate, the next to the last Senate meeting that he will be presiding over, he wanted to say that it has been a goal this year is to ensure that we have good communication, even despite the fact that we're often physically distant or disconnected from each other. It's not always been possible, we haven't always been able to have ideal communication venues and strategies and flow of information, but he thought the more that we can intentionally remind ourselves that this is a potential source of issues or problems or concerns or miscommunication, the more that we intentionally recognize that, the more we'll be able to overcome problems of communication.

The last issue is well being. In this forum he had talked about the Zen 10 and the free the 50's and he thought it will also again be important for us to remind ourselves to take time for and to create space for well-being and by creating space for well-being, he thought that it falls a little bit on all of us to take that leadership role in creating that space, because very often, we wait for others to create that space for us. A lot of times he is in a meeting and thought, oh well, maybe somebody will say let's take a break. He thought it's wise for us to step up and say that any one of us has the right, and the authority, or at least the welcome space where we can request or ask for or even demand that necessary time for us to take care of ourselves. Those are things that he has seen that are potential issues that could continue through this year into the future and that he wanted everyone to be conscious and aware.

### **Information item: Credit Hour Policy**

J. Reeder said we have an information item in our agenda which somewhat relates to the well-being aspect, which is an information item on Credit Hour policy. It's an update from the Chancellor's Office. Our accrediting body also tell us that we need to have a credit hour policy That's included in your packet as an information item so feel free to look at that and consider it.

### **Provost Report – K. Moranski**

K. Moranski said she was the bearer of glad tidings today. We have just learned a few moments ago that SSU graduate student in Biology Julianne Bradbury has won the CSU three minute thesis 2021 grand slam competition. (*virtual applause*) This may be the first time that we have participated in the three minute thesis competition in recent years, and so this is super exciting. She won the whole thing, so we are very, very proud of her and the Biology department for their work in mentoring this student. In addition to that, last week at the CSU wide research competition three SSU groups of students won first place in the research competition. (*more virtual applause*) (K. Moranski kindly provided this information)

### **FIRST PLACE:**

**Student Researchers:** Alex Dewey, Jonathan Calderon Chavez, Vincent Valenzuela, Antone Silveria, Colin Quinn

**Faculty Mentors:** Dr. Gurman Gill and Dr. Matthew Clark

**Department:** Computer Science (Undergraduate)

**Project Title:** "Using Machine Learning to Measure Biodiversity from Sound Recordings"

**Project Link:** [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bpxb\\_7Mmx5U](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bpxb_7Mmx5U)

**FIRST PLACE:**

**Student Researcher:** Madeline Sanchez

**Faculty Mentor:** Dr. Brent Hughes

**Department:** Biology (Graduate)

**Project Title:** "Monitoring the Salt Marsh Habitat Use and Foraging Habits of the Recovering Southern Sea Otter (*Enhydra lutris nereis*) in a Recolonized Ecosystem"

**Project Link:** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hMEVr74wAZ0>

**FIRST PLACE:**

**Student Researcher:** Allison Northey

**Faculty Mentor:** Dr. Daniel Crocker

**Department:** Biology (Graduate)

**Project Title:** "Adrenal response to ACTH challenge varies with life-history stage and body reserves in molting adult female northern elephant seals (*Mirounga angustirostris*)"

**Project Link:** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EWcei2B9pzw>

K. Moranski said we are rocking the research!

It is really wonderful news for Graduate Studies at Sonoma State and demonstrating undergraduate research at Sonoma State and demonstrating that we are making progress and making an impact, so this is pretty awesome. The other good news today is that the SETE situation that we have dealt with the last couple of semesters, where we had problems with the system and the security of the system, have been resolved by our hard working team in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. They have worked on the problems and have now corrected those problems, so they have tested and retested and the SETEs are coming out. SETE email messages were merged, so a student now only gets one email message for all the courses that they're enrolled in. They don't get four email messages, leading to email fatigue and lack of response to the SETEs. We're hoping that the single message helps them to do it all at once and get them done. That was successfully delivered. In those messages which were sent and received by students, links to SETEs are also visible to students within Canvas, and this is another way for them to complete their SETEs, and we are seeing steady responses coming in successfully and the system does not violate confidentiality or appear to be violating confidentiality as had been the problem in a couple of previous semesters, so we are making progress on the technology front as well. My final announcement was sent out earlier this week as a notice to campus and to faculty particularly about the change in leadership in Faculty Affairs. AVP Deborah Roberts is going back to the faculty and will be in our Nursing faculty starting in the fall semester. With that information and our shared services work to reduce budget deficits, we are merging some of the logistical

functions of Faculty Affairs with our HR department. We'll be working on doing that over the summer and make that a seamless transition. We are going to keep some kind of position in the Provost office to work with faculty on RTP issues which we see as a fundamentally an academic enterprise and to make sure that our hiring of faculty continues to prioritize diversity, equity, and inclusion. More to come on that as we move forward and we will seek input from shared governance and advice from a variety of voices on campus to make sure that the decision is as faculty friendly and supportive as it possibly can be, and it is our goal as we move forward to make sure that faculty are fully supported in every aspect of their work through this new model. Jeff Banks and herself will be working closely together on this merger of operations. She is already receiving some thoughts from faculty about the nature of the position that is remaining in the Provost office, and if anyone has further thoughts feel free to email [provost@sonoma.edu](mailto:provost@sonoma.edu). We will take your advice and counsel, as we move forward.

A member said we used to have to an AVP in addition to a Provost. Was the position that Interim Provost Moranski was in before ever filled, because it sounds like we're going to have zero in a short while. K. Moranski said we won't have zero. There are several interims right now. She is interim in the Provost position. Stacey Bosick is interim AVP for Academic Programs, and of course under her, Jenn Lillig is Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies. We will continue to have on the Provost team, the AVP for Sponsored Programs and will continue to have the AVP for Institutional Effectiveness, Heather Brown, and will continue to have the senior AVP for Strategic Enrollment Elias Lopez. Those four AVPs will continue to report to the Provost.

A member said in regards to this merger between Faculty Affairs and HR, you mentioned that you will look for different forms of feedback. Since we won't have much time left some as this will be a very soon, besides emailing, what are you planning? Will you do a survey that goes out to all faculty and others, looking at an open forum, or what are you planning? K. Moranski said we're talking about that right now. She thought the potential for survey fatigue may be problematic at this point in the semester and so having a forum maybe a little bit better idea, so that we have an hour that is dedicated to getting feedback on this position. We can certainly do that. She wanted to provide forums also for people to comment privately to her about what they'd like to see. We'll get a conversation scheduled.

### **President Report – J. Sakaki**

The President said she had the wonderful opportunity to chat online with the EOP graduates and the SeaWolf scholars, so she apologized for being late. She thanked the committee who is helping us interview the finalist candidates for the Provost position. Those interviews are wrapping up this week. She encouraged everyone who's been at any of the open forums, or in any of the meetings to please use those forms to give us your feedback. Your opinions, as always, matter a great deal, and each one of those will be read. We did do the climate survey and Dr. Jerlena Griffin-Desta tells me that the results are scheduled for release next week, so you should hear something about our climate survey results very soon. Vice President Joyce Lopes has accepted a position at Western Washington university and the President

had just secured an interim and she wanted to announce to the Senate that, Stan Nosek, who served with us as interim Vice President for Administration and Finance in 2017 and then he returned to help us out with athletics will help us out. He was Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance at the University of California Davis and at CSU San Luis Obispo. We're getting a person who is a very experienced administrator, leader and manager, who knows the area well and he will start with us on June 1, so there will be no gap in service. In fact, he will begin briefings with Joyce, so that he won't miss a beat when he comes on board.

Commencement is right around the corner and is such an exciting time. We have over 1500 students that have signed up to participate in our drive through or virtual celebrations. They will all be live streamed, so friends and family can view them from afar, and they can also see their graduate walk across the stage. It is such a critical step having that moment to cross the stage. We will have a beautiful outdoors stage for students who will be dropped off, students will come on to the stage. There'll be an official photo with them holding their diploma cover. All safety measure were approved by the county and hopefully it's not changing, but so far, all has been approved, and we are excited about that opportunity.

The Vice Chair said she appreciated the planning for commencement in these circumstances and that must have been incredibly challenging and not necessarily possible to rely on what was done in the past. She has heard some concerns that faculty were not really involved in the planning of commencement and there wasn't a lot of involvement. Commencement is supposed to be something that the Chair of the Faculty presides over and is a key part of planning for and she was hoping that as we move forward in the future, even when commencement has to be done under strange circumstances that we can make sure that the Chair of the Faculty remains a key part of the planning process.

The President said yes, of course, and she heard that and asked J. Reeder to comment on some of his involvement with us. J. Reeder said hopefully he could clarify this some. There's a planning committee, which is the Commencement Logistics committee which is mostly charged with creating the kinds of commencement that we be will be seeing this year and he had been involved in the planning to the extent that it involves meeting with that committee and, generally speaking, he has been involved as Chair. Although, generally speaking, it seems that, in many cases decisions have been taken in the interest of expediency, rather than looking at either traditional practices or past practices or the official or formal role of the Faculty in commencement. We've talked a lot about balance this year and, in many ways, it has been a balancing act where decisions either needed to be made quickly or expeditiously. Broadly, more widespread individuals need to be consulted. There have been cases where we've errored in one direction or the other, and in some of those cases it's meant that there's been planning that has sometimes overlooked the role of the Faculty in commencement. He was largely satisfied with how they've been resolved up until this point and he thought we will see a ceremony or a series of ceremonies that do have participation of the Faculty. The President said thank you and she heard the Vice Chair loud and clear. She noted that some of our sister campuses have changed their plans for commencement a couple times as they were planning. This year has been unlike any other year, as you

can imagine, thinking about whether we could make campuses which are totally virtual be able to acknowledge students in a way to allow them to cross the stage. It wasn't easy because so much was changing in COVID and in terms of getting approvals to do what we finally ended up doing so, yes, she acknowledged that this probably wasn't the as collaborative a planning processes that all would have liked, but we're getting to the finish line and giving a joyous opportunity for our students to be celebrated.

J. Reeder said he thought one of the things that he could add to that is in some ways, we are looking at what we've planned this year and we have a certain amount of luxury to be able to look at the Commencement ceremony that we planned from the perspective of having planned what we're going to be doing in two weeks for the last several months. In other words, the plan that's been developed has been consistent, for the past several months, and in that sense, it's really good because we've been able to work out some of the details and actually get into the level of detail and detailed planning. Whereas there are campuses such as Cal State Los Angeles, just today, completely changed their commencement format for this year and that is a major disruption. Certain decisions are going to be made on a completely emergency basis on that campus just because that's the only way to get things done in the space of a couple weeks. We've had the advantage of having had some months to work on it, so thanks for talking about that.

#### **Reconsideration of AFS/PDS Statement on the Teaching of Sensitive Materials – L. Holmstrom-Keyes, J. Reeder**

The Senate Analyst said when she was doing the minutes for this Senate, she was confused about the motions after the Senate approved reconsidering the endorsement of the teaching of sensitive material statement. She noted that she is looking at the Zoom transcript when she does the minutes or listening to the recording if the transcript is not clear. The motion to postpone the discussion about reconsidering to the next meeting seemed appropriate to her, however, that motion was withdrawn. Looking back closely at the transcript she now saw where we had a problem. A member said "my question is because we had already voted to reconsider, we don't want to postpone our reconsideration we just want to postpone our next steps." This is where the misunderstanding of the motion to reconsider occurred. A motion to reconsider is agreeing to actually reconsider a decision, you cannot approve the motion to reconsider and then not reconsider the decision. Senate approval for reconsidering a previous decision cannot be referred to another body. It is a Senate decision and the Senate needs to reconsider it. Referring the statement to FSAC for review is a separate matter.

The motion to reconsider has already been approved, so the AFS/ PDS statement comes again in front of the Senate, as though it were a new item for endorsement.

Robert's Rules states: every member's right to debate in a reconsideration of a question begins over again, regardless of speeches made previously, if reconsideration takes place on a day, other than that on which the vote to be reconsidered takes place.

The Senate now has the AFS/PDS statement, the Associated Students resolution and the letter from the administration for your deliberations about reconsidering your previous decision. The Senate need not worry about referring the statement anywhere or any next steps. That has already happened. The Senate is reconsidering its endorsement of the AFS/PDS statement on the teaching of sensitive materials.

A member said he was in full agreement that with the Senate Analyst that this is how we should proceed. He wanted to point out, now what is before us is endorsing this statement or do we not endorse it. He pointed out that not endorsing it does not mean we are for trigger warnings or anything. It just means we don't endorse this statement. We might endorse a different statement or not, or you might decide, we want trigger warnings or not, but that's not what's on the table right now. What's on the table is, do we endorse this statement as it stands. We can say no, we don't endorse it, we could still say later we don't want trigger warnings and that it's completely separate issue. Right now, it's just this statement, do we endorse it or not.

The Chair said at the time that we debated and discussed it and, at the time that we endorsed it, the other two documents were not in existence. Those other two documents are a response to our endorsement of the AFS/ PDS statement, and specifically the response from the administration calls into question some of the citations and some of the evidence that was presented on the Senate floor to support the AFS/ PDS statement and the AS resolution is calling us to reexamine it.

A member asked if amendments could be made to the statement. The Chair said this is simply a statement from a committee. The only thing that the Senate can do at this point is either endorse it or not endorse it. Since it doesn't belong to us, we can't amend it. It's a statement made by those two committees. If we don't endorse it, those two committees have still given their imprimatur to the statement, it still remains their opinion, he presumed. But at the Senate, what we can do is either endorse it or not endorse it.

A member said we didn't have the full picture when it first came to the Senate, and in fact, were given misleading information. That to her was all the Senate really need to know. We made a decision without having a full set of information. We could eventually, at some point in the future, endorse a different statement or something else that comes forward, but it seems that it was premature to endorse the one that did come forward with the lack of information and the incorrect information that we had.

**Motion to rescind the previous endorsement. Second.**

**Point of order** - what we're doing right now is deciding a yes or no vote on endorsement. We do not need to move to not endorse. At the end of this discussion we're going to vote yes or no on endorsement.

**Motion withdrawn.**



The Senate Analyst said this is not unusual in Robert's Rules. It's just that we've never done it before. The statement has already been referred to FSAC, so don't worry about the statement. All the Senate needs to think about is whether you want to endorse it or not, that's it.

A member put language in the chat (The following is a Best Practices statement regarding teaching sensitive material developed by AFS and PDS, with input from CAPS and DSS.) As the statement stands, he didn't think that the Senate objected to it because it says there was input and there was input. But he thought the problem was at our Senate meeting an individual claimed that there was a signing off or something by CAPS and DSS and that apparently is not accurate. It doesn't say that in the statement. We might endorse such a statement, maybe we don't need DSS and CAPS to sign off on a curricular matter.

The Chair of FSAC said in an attempt to start over as a member of this body, since we're discussing this document, there's more research that many of us have done in looking at some of this as one might expect. Senator St. John has provided some very interesting comments to her and places like the University of Chicago don't allow trigger warnings of any sort. When you start to look at what sister institutions across the country have done, there are probably a lot more examples that could help us and we could see other things that people have dealt with. She didn't find this particular document that useful and was glad it's going to another body to work on. The endorsement of this current one, just as it stands alone seems inadequate and not in keeping with the times.

**Motion to call the question. Second. Vote 14 – 5. Debate ended.**

**Vote on endorsing the AFS/PDS Statement in the Teaching of Sensitive Materials – Yes = 3, No = 16. Failed.**

3:50 reached. The Chair provided a video of exercises.

**From EPC: Name change for Electrical and Computer Engineering – Second Reading – E. Asencio**

E. Asencio said because this item is going all the way to the Chancellor's office is why we bring it up before Senate as a business item. She didn't believe there were any questions or comments during the first reading.

**Vote on name change: Yes = 17, No = 0. Approved.**

**Vice Chair Report – L. Krier**

Structure and Functions is still reviewing the bylaws, but we will not be able to bring it to the Senate this year. We're just trying to get through it all, and she would welcome ideas or thoughts from people about who should perhaps review or have a chance to get feedback on the revisions before it does come to Senate.

## **Vice President for Student Affairs Report – Given by L. Monje-Paulson for Wm. Gregory Sawyer**

L. Monje-Paulson said we are wrapping up the semester, just like everybody else. Our students are shifting gears and focusing heavily on all their finals and final assignments. We did have our housing application deadline reached on May 1 and as of May 4<sup>th</sup>, we've had a couple more applications come in since then, but as of May 4<sup>th</sup>, we had 2036 applications to live on campus for next year. We are very excited about that and particularly excited about our 1187 returning Sonoma State students who will be moving on to campus. We will be thinking and planning for how we can welcome them back and providing an appropriate kind of on-campus experience, knowing they've been students here for at least a year, but may not be familiar with our campus in the way that we would expect many of our returning students to be. For our first-time, first-year students, we have 620 planning to live on campus and for our first-time, transfer students, we have 229. We obviously have a lot to do a lot more work to do with our first-time, first-year students. That's a pretty small cohort of students, but we will take them, we will love them and we're very excited to have students back on campus. The only other update is that we, as a division, recently learned that we're going to be recognized again this year as one of the most promising places to work in Student Affairs. It's an honor to receive that recognition any year, and for three years in a row, it's very, very exciting. It's become such a guiding light for us during this time to think about some of the values and priorities that are recognized through that award and how our commitment to that remains strong.

## **From APARC: Program Review Policy revision – Second Reading – E. Virmani, C. Fonseca**

E. Virmani asked C. Fonseca to address questions that came up at the first reading. C. Fonseca said a couple questions came up regarding the the larger policy, not necessarily specifically to the seven year extension aspect, but she was happy to answer those clarifying questions. There was one question around section II subsection A number 3, where it lays out the steps of program review and that second step of external review report, who then writes the written summary and responses to the external review and self-study. That actually is later clarified in the policy and so the review of the self-study document and external review is done by both the School Dean or Deans and the School Curriculum Committee. They are the parties tasked with responding. The second question was around combined program reviews. That's roman numeral VIII and the question of minors came up. Where do minors fit into program review in general, and in Roman numeral VIII subsection A, it states that "If a Department has more than one program (i.e., undergraduate and graduate, degree-granting and certificate, or others), the programs may be reviewed concurrently or separately. If reviewed concurrently, the Department shall prepare its report so that the components can be separated for individual assessment." What we might see might be undergraduate and graduate degree granting and certificate or others and those programs then could be reviewed concurrently or separately, so minors fit into that other category mentioned. The Provost commented that the Chancellor's Office does not put minors into the degrees database. While minors often go into the major discussion of

minors, in program review minors often go into the major that they belong to. If there was a biology minor, it would be part of the undergraduate biology program. But the CSU doesn't do minors as a separate degree program and so it's just wrapped up in the undergraduate degree from which it derives. A program would not have to do a separate program review for every minor. It has to be clear, because we don't want programs trying to write or think, they have to write program reviews about minors.

A member said does that mean, then, that those minor programs where no major program exists in that field could select to write a review, if the program wishes to do that. The Provost said yes, all alone minors could do that.

**Vote on Program Review policy revision – Yes = 20, No – 0. Approved.**

It was clarified that the revision will be in effect in Fall of 2021.

**Resolution in Support of AAPI Community and Related Curriculum – Second Reading – J. Reeder**

J. Reeder said the resolution has three resolved clauses and a rationale. The three resolve clauses we discussed two weeks ago, and the final resolve clause calls on the university to direct resources and support toward the development and delivery of academic coursework in Asian American studies. As he said two weeks ago this doesn't prescribe or specify how that happens, or when that happens, but rather it allows it to be an organic process that is driven from our shared governance structures.

A member asked why Asian American studies and not just Asian studies. J. Reeder said it's related to AB1460. AB1460 specifies Asian American studies as one of the four groups in the Assembly bill, so specifically focused on the experience of Asian Americans in in this country and the lived and historical experiences of the Asian American Community. The member said so the resolution includes the Pacific Islander community, are they included in Asian American studies? J. Reeder said in the language that's presented in AB1460 Pacific Islanders are not included, but there are a number of interesting concerns, particularly around how demographic data is collected and reported in in IPEDS, for example, Asian Americans, Asians and Pacific islanders are grouped together for IPEDS data and yet AB1460 specifies Asian American. The part of the resolution that deals with curriculum specifically says Asian American and the part that deals with anti-racism and anti-bias rhetoric harassment is more general. It's Asian American and Pacific Islander communities. The member said he didn't mean this to sound facetious, but Pacific Islanders include Samoans and Hawaiians. A very, very large group of people who he didn't think are the people being attacked on the streets. He had not seen Pacific Islanders being attacked. He's seen Asian Americans being attacked and was wondering why we're including Pacific Islanders in the resolution. Are they being attacked because of COVID?

J. Reeder said he didn't think the perpetrators of such crimes and such violence take the time to identify exactly who it is that they are attacking or creating an unsafe space for. There are many Samoans, many Hawaiians, and many Pacific islanders

that could be identified as Asian or Asian American and therefore are at risk of being attacked.

A member said nobody stops and asks what exact ethnicity are you, and there are so many overlaps between Pacific Islanders, especially Hawaiians. She used to live in Hawaii and for a long time in that community if there are attacks on Asian Americans, there are attacks on Hawaiians. There's not a lot of ways to piece that out at any given point. It's just about perceptions of what race somebody is and so, of course, nobody stops to ask. A member said as long as we're talking about who looks Asian, who doesn't, he pointed out that the Alaskan Eskimos who are Native Americans are genetically Asian and they look like Asians and they're often taken as Asians. His husband is an Eskimo and he is often assumed to be Japanese. People come up to him on the street and start talking Japanese. How far are we going to go here.

J. Reeder said the sense of the resolution captures kind of the concern that you justifiably shared. It would be unwieldy and awkward to include all of the possible iterations of potential sources of violence, bias and aggression in our resolution. The point is as well taken.

**Vote on resolution – Yes = 20, No – 0. Approved.**

### **Resolution in Support of AAPI Community and Related Curriculum**

**RESOLVED:** That the Sonoma State University Academic Senate stand with members of the Asian, Asian-American, and Pacific Islander communities and unequivocally condemns all forms of anti-Asian and anti-Pacific Islander rhetoric, harassment, violence, and microaggressions. Be it further

**RESOLVED:** That Individually and collectively as a university community we direct to stopping AAPI hate, rhetoric, harassment, violence, and microaggressions through our teaching and curriculum, and furthermore pledge to use our voices and positions to increase understanding and reduce xenophobia on our campus and in the community. Be it further

**RESOLVED:** That in response to the aforementioned increase in reported incidents anti-Asian and anti-Pacific Islander rhetoric, harassment, violence, and microaggressions, and in response to the intent of legislation and CSU policy stemming from AB 1460, that Sonoma State University direct resources and support toward the development and delivery of academic coursework in Asian American Studies.

### **Associated Students Report – C. Metoyer**

C. Metoyer said this upcoming Monday Associated Students new Board of Directors will be sworn in. Our current Execs and Senators will have time to make closing remarks and you guys are all invited to join us. We will be approving some last business items and we'll be closing down since finals will be approaching. If you

need any help from us, you can contact Noelia, Christina Gomez or Justin Aronson. They will all be serving as Execs for next year.

### **Rationale of Resolution**

The Chair noted that whenever we have a resolution, which includes the resolve clauses and the rationale, the resolve clauses are what we're approving and what moves forward unless we separately and specifically include the rationale. As we discussed briefly last time we intend for the rationale to be a part of the resolution as well. He asked for a motion to approve the rationale to be included as part of the resolution.

**Motion to include rationale with resolution. Second. Vote Yes = 18, No = 0.**

**Rationale:** The Sonoma State University Senate, according to its own constitution, serves as the primary consultative body in the University in formulating, evaluating and recommending to the president policies concerning curriculum and instruction, and additionally serves as the primary body through which members of the faculty may express opinions on matters affecting the welfare of the University. Harassment and violence against Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) persons, families and communities have increased since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic and this nation's history of white supremacy, misogyny, systemic racism and colonialism undergird the environment of hate, intolerance, and violence against Asian Americans. The increase in hate crimes against Asians is a direct result of white supremacist, anti-Asian xenophobia that has persisted in North America for centuries to keep Asian Americans as "perpetual foreigners."

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

W. Ostroff said this was the last reminder that they're looking for CSU faculty experts in ethnic studies serve on the CSU Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) for ethnic studies. The deadline is tomorrow by noon, so we have to make sure we get a voice on that committee.

There are two processes involving ethnic studies going on right now. There is the certification process and the articulation process. There's been some confusion about the specifics so we were sent a summary of what's happening right now. First the courses for ethnic studies area F are going through the same certification process as any courses for any other GE area. The process is authorized by section 5.2 of the CSU GE breath policy, so this review is an online system. Community colleges submit courses on an annual basis, which are considered for GE. The courses are compared against the standards for those course areas. In this case there are five core competencies created by the Ethnic Studies Council, passed by the CSU the Statewide Senate and put into CSU policy. Also, the requirement that these courses are only offered with an ethnic studies discipline prefix in the same manner as required for CSU area courses. This certification process is done, mostly by articulation officers, but they do refer questions to discipline faculty when necessary. Right now, an ethnic studies faculty member from Cal Poly Pomona is assisting with that certification process. Several thousand courses go through this process every

year, so it's not an automatic approval, not all courses are approved. Then there's the second piece, which is the process for development and oversight of transfer model curriculum, or TMC, articulation pathways into the major. This is done by a committee of discipline faculty, typically department chairs, who determine the lower division requirements for transfer into a CSU major. Discussions are now beginning about creating a specific ethnic studies transfer model curriculum and this is the group that we're trying to fill. The FDRG is going to engage in this discussion, along with department chairs. The Chancellor's Office is supportive of these discussions, and we expect that ethnic studies department chairs, program directors and faculty will participate actively in that transfer model curriculum.

R. Senghas said he had two things. The first one is coming from the Academic Senate at CSU Fresno. They passed earlier this week, a resolution calling for the COVID vaccine to be included in the required vaccinations for the CSU. What we've been hearing about generally for the CSU is that they're waiting for FDA approval before requiring it, but what the Faculty at CSU Fresno said was regardless of the FDA approval, they want to add it in. They thought that was necessary to have a safe environment.

The other thing is that the CIO, the Chief Information Officers Council met and they're the folks that handle tech at the statewide level across all the campuses. A couple of the things that came up out of their meeting on the 15th of April are that the technology issues that were surfaced by COVID were actually seen as only highlighted by COVID, but actually we're reflecting some fundamental equity issues. We have students with different accessibility and now they're trying to treat the responses to that as a system. One thing among the things they're considering doing is since they can't give students equipment because that's against state rules about giving away state property, what they can do is long term loans where the universities would actually retain technical ownership. The student might be given a laptop for however long. They're finding that actually hotspots are the issue of accessibility, more than the laptops. That turned out to be a bigger issue than they had anticipated, so they're looking at trying to help with this on a larger system level.

There are some issues that have to do with web accessibility. We've been seeing that some software can be used to try and flag documents. Canvas or other websites might be more or less accessible. There's actually a pending lawsuit against one of our sister campuses about web accessibility and it is potentially a class action suit, so they're looking at this quite seriously because some of these concerns. Some of the issues around how they're responding and what information is uncovered is starting to deal with security issues. What we see is any time that any information about somebody's vaccination status raises HIPPA concerns and that's a whole other set of things that they have to be dealing with. They're looking at that kind of issue. They can't ask us if we're vaccinated.

Some of the software that they're using to determine how accessible sites are, are giving false positives about problems and so we still need human attention for those sites and we'll need to be doing that as faculty members. Any systems that we're putting in place that are trying to help deal with some of those false positives, we'll

need to figure out how to gracefully handle it when the tools aren't working. Maybe somebody tried their best to handle it well, but they're getting flagged as doing it wrong. We don't try and figure that stuff out, but those tools only caught 25% of the things that makes things accessible. Please keep that in mind if students come in and say, it's not accessible and you say, I ran it through, we've got to listen to them. They're paying attention to issues about cyber insurance and mitigation for ransomware. All that kind of stuff is just coming under regular security issues, but they're watching for those kinds of things. They're continuing with all the procurement issues that deal with accessibility and other issues. Then they have other hot topics. All this is quite complex and often problematic.

### **CFA Report – E. J. Sims**

E. J. Sims said CFA is going to be holding an unemployment benefits workshop. It's going to be held on May the 12<sup>th</sup> from 1:00pm to 3:00pm for any of our lecturers who would like to register for the unemployment benefits. The registration is on our statewide website and an announcement email went out about it today. It will also be sent out again on Monday. We're hoping most of our lecturers are eligible during summertime and winter break to apply for unemployment benefits. On our statewide website you're will find information about the CFA unemployment rights guide. There's also a handout of from the CFA webinar presentation as well, and a sample application. There's also a list of the addresses and the end dates of the semester of by which people can apply. In the case of Sonoma State, the date that lecturers are eligible to start applying for unemployment compensation is May 27th, which is the end of the spring semester, and also the end of the academic year. Please spread the word and encourage lecturers to take advantage of the unemployment benefits. During our CFA spring Assembly we passed, with overwhelming support, two resolutions, the first, a resolution in support of comprehensive immigration reform. The link to that was included in the agenda for the CFA meeting that was held yesterday. It's also on our statewide website. The other resolution that was passed, and the Sonoma State chapter endorsed this as well, is a resolution calling for CALPERS fossil fuel divestment. She thanked everyone who participated in our April 21st campus bargaining meeting. We had three statewide presenters come to share the bargaining proposals that CFA has presented to the CSU. We're always bargaining for a fair contract. We know that when we fight, we win, so we're excited about the proposals. We're very fortunate to have one of our own members, Elaine Newman, who is on the statewide bargaining team, and she is making regular updates at our CFA Wednesday general and executive board meetings. The proposals that we are supporting focus on rights, respect and justice for faculty, fairness in the evaluation process. Lecturer longevity and job security is one of our proposals as well as job security for coaches, workload rules for instructional faculty and improved counselor student ratios. There's also a proposal on academic freedom, library flexibility and cultural taxation, which is getting faculty, who are doing exceptional service and supporting our underrepresented students, which is called cultural taxation, exceptional service awards. The CFA Sonoma participated in the Lobby days. Every spring we lobby the California legislators to talk about bills, that we are co-sponsoring. There are five of those.

### **SAC Report – H. Smith**

H. Smith said the Student Affairs committee continues to try and untangle the big wax ball, that is the Priority Registration policy and hope to be working with APARC and other stakeholders on campus to help to understand that better.

### **FSAC Report – P. Lane**

P. Lane said FSAC is very excited to report that Richard Whitkus has agreed to be the new chair of FSAC in the coming year. We are excited to say that we have been quite successful in getting departments to submit their RTP criteria revisions. We are busting at the seams for this and we have another special work session so that we can accommodate all of them. We're trying to get to everybody before the end of the academic year. In the next two weeks, we will review History, Philosophy, Biology English, Literacy Studies, Elementary Education, etc.

### **APARC Report – E. Virmani**

E. Virmani said APARC is working on priority recommendations. If you have ideas about ways you'd like to see SSU prioritize lecture working conditions, if you have strong ideas about that, please email her, so that APARC can be sure to include some of those ideas. We're working on more than just that, but that's an area that we feel like we need more input.

**Adjourned.**

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