Academic Senate Minutes
April 22, 2021
3:00 – 5:00 with free the fifties
Via Zoom

Abstract

Agenda – Approved. Minutes of 4/8/2021 – Approved. Special Student Report – Andre Beard. Chair Report. President Report. Provost Report. From EPC: Electrical and Computer Engineering MS name change – First Reading completed. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. From EPC: THAR Concentration in Dance Discontinuance - Approved. Vice President for Student Affairs Report. From EPC: BM Music Composition Concentration – Approved. From APARC: Program review policy revision - 7 year program review cycle – First Reading completed. Associated Students Report. Resolution in Support of AAPI Community and Related Curriculum – First Reading completed. Statewide Senator Reports. Staff Representative Report. From FSAC: Revision to the RTP Policy – Approved. Request for motion to reconsider endorsement of AFS/PDS Teaching of Sensitive Materials statement – motion made and approved. Motion to refer statement to FSAC approved.

Present: Jeffrey Reeder, Laura Krier, Carmen Works, Bryan Burton, Wendy Ostroff, Richard Senghas, Sam Brannen, Michaela Grobbel, Wendy St. John, Doug Leibinger, Ed Beebout, Angelo Camillo, Florence Bouvet, Rajeev Virmani, Viki Montera-Heckman, Rita Premo, Izabela Kanaana, Adam Zagelbaum, Kevin Fang, Rick Luttmann, Amal Munayer, Cookie Garrett, Judy Sakaki, Joyce Lopes, Wm Gregory Sawyer, Erma Jean Sims, Noelia Brambila-Perez, Chase Metoyer, Kate Sims, Elita Virmani, Emily Asencio, Paula Lane, Hilary Smith

Absent: Sakina Bryant, Karen Moranski

Proxy: Krista Altaker for Jordan Rose

Guests: Fawn Canady, Deborah Roberts, Jenn Lillig, Kari Manwiller, Richard Whitkus, Stacey Bosick, Andre Beard, Hollis Robbins, Michael Suarez, Catherine Nelson, Catherine Fonseca, Katie Musick, Kim Purdy, Merith Weisman, Laura Alamillo, Farid Farahmand, John Palmer, Melinda Milligan, Susan Pulido, Victor Garlin, Briana Moreno Sanchez, Laura Williams

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 4/8/2021 – Approved.

Special Student Report – Andre Beard

> "My name is Andre Allen Beard from Fresno California. My pronouns are he and him. I graduated in 2020 with my Bachelor's in English and with the single subject credential concentration. I'd like to start off by saying thanks to Sonoma State for accepting me. What I would like to discuss is diversity. I didn't get accepted to

Fresno state, which was my hometown university because I'm from Fresno, but one thing I love about Sonoma State is the opportunity to expand your ideas. I was born in 1992 and I always tell people about the case of Rodney King and George Floyd. So, one thing I like is my experience at Sonoma State, I feel, has been welcoming and inviting. Where I come from, my family background, we use a lot of the white language to white people but I say, as far as what I love about Sonoma State and what you do for your students is you need a raise like, a million dollar raise. You do too much for your students and my professors bent over backwards, just to make sure that I can be here. I'm an independent self-sufficient person, because I had to be for survival. I don't ask people for anything because I'll get let down a lot. My professors, when was in a situation like I'm going to jam and might not be able to recuperate, they understand I'm a human being. Because one of my professors has a family that looks like me, she can understand what somebody can go through. Professor Michael Suarez, who's here, I even broke down in front of him emotionally because I trust him with a certain side of me I wouldn't give to other people. Professor Victor, she was my teacher who got me into this program. She gave me all the advice that I could get for lesson plans curriculum that gave me an understanding of the industry, how the school works as a whole. Dr. Mason is like a father me because he'll give me the real thing, he doesn't have to sugarcoat certain things and he'll give it to me as an unapologetic black man way that only I probably would understand. There's a lot of other professors I wish I could go through, but the thing that I wanted to focus on is y'all and thanking you all for your voice, you don't just say something, you actually stand by what you say. Thank you."

The Chair said thank you very much Andre for being here, for sharing those words with us, and congratulations on graduating and best of luck to everything that you do. We'll use Andre's words to center our actions and our thoughts today keeping in mind that what we're ultimately about is serving our community, our educational disciplines, our students and all of this is interconnected.

Chair Report – J. Reeder

J. Reeder said in his report he would share two things. One of those is something that he had touched on before which caused him a lot of worry and trepidation. It's one of the most worrisome potential sets of data and statistics that we have available to us about how higher education is responding, and how the public is responding, around higher education during the pandemic. We've seen that within the last year enrollment in the Community College system is dramatically down. We always know that the Community College system is a source for open access to higher education. It's a source for second chances. He said he got his second chance start in a Community College and he was forever indebted and grateful to Del Mar college and Corpus Christi Texas. There are so many hundreds of thousands, millions, of students that have gotten their start through the California Community college system. It's definitely part of open access and it's extremely worrisome that applications are way down. Something that we should be aware of or concerned about is another parallel, but opposite statistic, the University of California system, which is the highest tier in our state's higher education system, experienced record setting applications this year. More students applied to every single one of the UC campuses than any year before ever in history, and that includes the Medical Center.

In some ways, this is partly because of changing application criteria such as standardized testing. But it's also potentially a very worrisome harbinger of inequality and access to our education as the UCs become more competitive and the Community Colleges are becoming less attended. Hopefully, this is a one off that will spread itself out after a few years, and hopefully the generation of first-time, first-year students applying this year will make up this difference, but he worried that if we don't collectively, as higher education professionals, work towards making sure that this doesn't become an exacerbation of systemic inequalities that it could have a detrimental effect to our society. He saw the CSU as uniquely positioned to be able to address the needs on both ends - provide a high quality meaningful education, completing four year degrees, graduate degrees and also remaining accessible to large numbers of students. This is a call to awareness and call to action in that area. The other thing that he wanted to point out is that it has just been made public that the UC system and the CSU system have jointly indicated that they will be requiring the COVID vaccines if and when those vaccines are FDA approved. It's good to see this guidance coming out consistently for UCs and CSUs and that takes some of the pressure off us to create our own made to order individualized responses.

President Report – J. Sakaki

J. Sakaki said thank you to Andre for speaking today. She appreciated the comments and wished all the best to him. This has been a full, busy and trying week. She followed the trial of Derek Chauvin for the murder of George Floyd and watched with worry and with hope. When the verdict (guilty on all three charges) came out, it's one step towards racial justice, it's one step towards accountability, but we still have so much more work to do. She thought about the emotional and psychological toll on our Black students, our faculty, staff, and colleagues and other folks of color who have experienced violence and racism that goes on and on, beyond just what we could see recorded. We see these incidents more because there's such a prevalence of video, but these are not new and it just goes to show why we need to keep doing the work that we are doing at Sonoma State to educate and to educate broadly and to be inclusive and to be diverse in our work, in our communities and to have students like Andre and many others come to our campus and then leave our campus and do the great work important work of teaching and working with people all over in our communities, in our state, in our nation to make a difference because we still have some heavy lifting to do.

She wanted to pause to share a little bit. She was appreciative of everyone, and how we've been holding some discussion sessions, and she wanted everyone to continue to be there for each other, because when we go through something together, it can hit people in different ways. Some of my presidential colleagues within an hour of the verdict, they were writing to their campus. She couldn't do that. She had to just sit with the outcome and absorb it and think about what it meant and what it felt like. Her reflection ended with what she wrote to the campus, that she is filled with hope because of our students, because of the next generation. It's not only the work we will do, but it's what we teach to our students and what they will do for the children of the next generation in the future.

The announcement came out about one o'clock today that the UC and the CSU together are going to require vaccination once it is approved and no longer in emergency use authorization. We anticipate that that will be soon, and that's why the timing was now to get this out, so that people could prepare. Students who are not in our area, wherever they are, could get their vaccinations now because they would know the requirement and when they return to campus they would be vaccinated. We have been working to try and get a vaccination center on campus. She believed Rite Aid is going to be having two days next week on campus for vaccinations and we're hoping that they'll be available to help us in the fall with anyone who might not have received their vaccination and wants to return to campus. This will be effective for fall 2021. It is joint between the UC, the CSU. The Community Colleges are still contemplating that as well, but it was really done for the health and safety of not just students, the faculty and staff and all of us, but we want to really get this pandemic behind us. More details will be coming about what it actually means. There will be some exemptions for medical and religious reasons, but we want everyone to take this seriously and help us all be safe, so that we continue the good work that we need to do for our students. We want more students back, because we know it makes a difference. Students are more are able to be successful and continue with their studies, if we can be back in person.

Provost Report – D. Roberts for K. Moranski

D. Roberts said Provost Moranski is on vacation this week, and so, if there are any questions or concerns to relay for her, she would be glad to do that.

It's been a challenging time for all of us, and so D. Roberts said she may become a little emotional about it. As we in the Sonoma State community address the impact of the verdict in the Derek Chauvin trial and support our Black students, faculty, and staff, we must continue to address the systemic racism that results in violence and death for people of color like George Floyd and Makati Bryant, a 16 year old girl in Ohio. After the Chauvin trial ended, as the lead prosecutor in the trial indicated, accountability in one situation is far different from justice for all. After listening to students in the discussion forum on Tuesday afternoon, she would like to call on all the members of the campus community to be open to sharing their thoughts in the forums, that we continue today and tomorrow. She hoped we can listen with grace and humility to community members who are in pain and act in our roles as educators to do a better job in our classes of acknowledging the impact of the real world. We may not know how to have difficult dialogues; we may not feel comfortable with emotion in the classroom and we certainly don't think we have the skills to address psychological trauma. But she encouraged all of us as educators and as a campus committed to the values of a liberal education to check in with our students where possible, drawing on significance historical moments in the classroom, even a simple acknowledgement in class that momentous events like the Chauvin trial have happened, and that they're affecting the lives of students and their families. This could be enough to help the student carry on and know we care. Thanks to all of you for your commitment to social and racial justice and extending and deepening our caring at Sonoma State University.

Time certain reached.

From EPC: Electrical and Computer Engineering MS name change – First Reading – E. Asencio

E. Asencio said this name change came through EPC and we were inclined to unanimously approve it. We were originally thinking of putting it on as consent, but when we realized, it needed to go through Senate and up to the Chancellor's office. We felt we needed to take a vote on it, so it was unanimously approved. We didn't have any issues or questions. The name change is to more accurately reflect what the program is about. F. Farahmand said this is mainly to reflect the way the program is being offered and the new courses that have been added over the last three years. We believe that the new name more accurately reflects what the program is about, and also the type of courses that we offer. **First Reading completed.**

Questions for the Provost report:

A member said this was not a question, but an appreciation for the conversations and the opportunity to be in conversation on racial justice and the Chauvin trial and beyond. She highly encourage faculty to attend. She attended yesterday and it was such a powerful experience moderated by Jeff Banks and so many critical panelists. It's a real opportunity to be in conversation with each other, and she hoped that we can do more of that.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – J. Lopes

J. Lopes said we are searching for our Athletic Director and those finalists will be coming to campus in the next couple of weeks. Please watch for open forums to attend and give us your feedback and input. It's so critical to ensuring we get the right people in these positions.

From EPC: THAR Concentration in Dance Discontinuance- Second Reading – E. Asencio

E. Asencio said this is something that we need to vote on because it's going through to the Chancellor's office and it's the discontinuation of the concentration in dance for the Theater Arts degree. There's a new BA in Dance program that has already been approved, through the Chancellor's Office and is set to begin. This is the second reading. There's really nothing new to report, there were no questions or issues raised and during the first reading. The Chair asked if there was any opposition to this item. None was spoken. **THAR Concentration in Dance Discontinuance – Approved.**

Vice President for Student Affairs Report – Wm. Gregory Sawyer

Wm. Gregory Sawyer said we had our first student forum on Tuesday. We had our Executive Vice President for Associated Students, Noelia Brambila-Perez as one of our panelists. We also had Rako Fabinor from the HUB as the person who was facilitating the conversation. It was a very passionate presentation, for all that attended. What he really appreciate was that it was no holds barred event and they really talked about their experiences at our university and how they felt when they

got here, how they felt when they entered the classroom, particularly being an underrepresented minority. Those were the majority of conversations that took place. It was absolutely phenomenal and he encouraged everyone to attend. It has been one of those experiences that can that can be a life changing experience. He announced that tonight at five o'clock, we will have our second meeting with students and tonight Tramaine Austin-Dillon will be the facilitator of that conversation, so we do hope that the students will show up once again. The only other piece of news is that in housing, we are now up to 1505 in terms of the number of students that have signed up for housing. The number that we were pushing for was 1950, so we're pretty excited. We got 350 first time first year students, 147 transfer students and we have 963 students who are continuing. Out of that 963 students, 300 of them have never been on campus; they're like a freshman. They've never been here, so they will be our first year students. We do have plans, so that they will go through some of the same kinds of getting to know the campus experiences as our first time students. We wanted to make sure that you knew that and, as we start to develop, we will bring that to the Senate.

A member said she had a quick question that was brought up in her department meeting today and, apparently, also in a school meeting earlier, and that was regarding the increase in cheating that faculty have been reporting, especially during online exams. She wanted to check if there's any additional education that has been done with the students about academic dishonesty. She had to deal with 11 cases in just one class, in one exam and what surprised her the most was the reaction of the students. When she discussed the issue with them, there was almost no remorse. Given that now we might keep more online education and classes, is your office preparing to do a video to remind students about academic dishonesty, and that we're taking it very seriously.

Wm. Gregory Sawyer said yes. One of the things that we have talked about, because we have seen the increase coming from faculty and we want to make sure that we heighten that for our students, is a training program that we are working on to make sure that our staff is able to visit with the faculty to let you know what we're doing, so we can help you in the classroom. We also want to make sure that students know that there's potential that one could be suspended or expelled for academic dishonesty. He was not sure that everyone has taken that particular position or stance in terms of how we have communicated that in our division to the students, so we are looking at that. We have seen an increase throughout the nation. Since we've been in virtual mode, the numbers have increased in terms of academic dishonesty, so we are working on that and we will certainly include faculty because we'd like to get information from faculty in terms of things that you thought about and what different forms of academic dishonesty you have experienced. (Faculty, also please see the Dispute Resolution Board webpages for assistance: http://senate.sonoma.edu/forms/drb)

The Chair said he believed that CTET is also working in some of their some of their workshops with ways to optimize assessment testing, in particular, that would that would center on ways that rely less on facts that could be easily be looked up.

Wm. Gregory Sawyer said we are seeing a lot in terms of papers. It's much easier for folks to be able to cut and paste something off of the Internet and then claim it as their own material. The other thing too is that we want to get ideas from the faculty because they deal with this on a regular basis. We do have Turnit-in and that helps many faculty to find out if somebody has cheated that way, but we are looking forward to having collaborative input to see what do faculty think that we need to do and where are the areas of academic dishonesty.

The member followed up by saying it is mind boggling that websites, like Course Hero and check.com are still legally allowed to operate, given that in many cases it's clearly a breach of our intellectual property. She thought that the CSU was in conversation about trying to figure out what to do. She thought that will help with some of the other academic dishonesty that she's been experiencing.

Wm. Gregory Sawyer said we are, as a system, trying to take on these larger companies that do provide information so easy to grab to use in the classroom. We felt if we can do it as a system we can put our voice and muscle as the CSU behind that.

Time certain reached.

From EPC: BM Music Composition Concentration – First Reading – E. Asencio

E. Asencio said this is one of those proposals that was unanimously approved at EPC because it's something that was to formalize a concentration that was already happening and to formalize it into the concentration as a BM and based upon the Music Department's accrediting body which indicated that the curriculum was appropriate for a BM concentration. John Palmer has joined us if you have questions directed towards the Music Department. J. Palmer said it was suggested by our accreditation body that our BA in Composition was essentially a BM because of the intensity of the program and the number of units, and so we have converted it to that and in doing so, we have added actually added about four units to it. It is resource neutral. Those new classes are being taught for the other BM concentrations anyway. There's actually very little change in what will happen in the department and students who were in the BA in Composition as they are basically already being passed into the BM, pending approval.

Motion to waive the first reading. Second. Approved 19 -2.

A member noted that there was one element of concern in the student learning outcomes part. Is it the expectation that all students in this degree plan go to graduate education. J. Palmer said no, there's not an expectation, but the degree as a BM would prepare them for graduate school. A BM has more cachet in applications for graduate school in composition than a BA and it would simply make their applications stronger.

Vote on BM Music Composition Concentration – Approved, 21 – 0.

3:50 reached. Professor Hobson provided us with a video of yoga. (https://youtu.be/oAj5N5omzTA)

From APARC: Program review policy revision - 7 year program review cycle – First Reading – E. Virmani

E. Virmani said she was here to introduce this item and then she would hand it over to Naga Damaraju and Catherine Fonseca to explain it in further depth. The basic premise is that UPRS is proposing an extension of the program review cycle from five to seven years and APARC is completely on board and has reviewed the policy carefully and given unanimous support.

A member said this is a wonderful proposal. In his experience program reviews are rarely done every five years, anyway, so this is more reflecting reality, so it's a great thing.

C. Fonseca said in UPRS we've informally observed that programs coming before UPRS need more time to substantively engage with the action plans laid out in their previous review cycle, as well as the broader self-improvement process components that are integral to why program review exists. Extending the program review from once every 5 years to 7 years will allow time for program improvement and there's also the short term benefit of adding some flexibility for UPRS because, without this shift and without it taking effect, in the fall UPRS will actually be facing a pretty serious backlog of reviews, as a result of COVID and the pivot to remote instruction. Programs have been dealing with a lot and have been delayed, understandably so, in their program review process. Since those programs will still require review by UPRS in addition to programs already regularly scheduled in the upcoming semesters, will definitely need this additional two years added. It will certainly help us alleviate the backlog that will be facing UPRS in the coming years, and it also just generally adds flexibility into the schedule for disruptions. In the previous year, UPRS actually made the recommendation to APARC to consider drafting a seven year extension because of the Kincaid fire. Because we're facing a new reality of ongoing disruptions at least seven year gives us a little more wiggle room. There was a question that came up in Ex Com about how did we arrive at five years to begin with. Provost Moranski was there at the meeting to give some context and shared that this was generally standard at the time, so when we started to draft a program review policy in the early 2000s, that was just the number that was used. When we created this proposal, we found that, certainly, there has been a change in the landscape, since then. A total of 10 CSU campuses, including our own, are on the five year cycle, three other campuses do program review every six years and then the remaining 10 campuses are all a seven year cycle. There's certainly considerable precedent to moving to a seven year cycle.

A member noted that one other factor that might have been affecting the five years was several cycles ago we had found that some of our programs hadn't been doing, as many of the reviews while others did, especially those that were driven by external accreditation. There was also as a campaign to get all of us through within five years because there had been some that had hadn't been done for quite some

time. Maybe that five year push to be compliant ended up also getting institutionalized for five years rather than shifting to what we see is more typical pattern. Overall, though the package is clear, it makes sense.

A member said she very much appreciated the work and had two questions for clarification. One is the way the policy talks about the process of program review, point II.3. Who is supposed to write the written summary and responses. This is the point regarding the review of self-study and the external reviews and other reviews. Regarding point eight which concerns the point about combined program reviews, her question was whether minors are also considered to be programs within a department that could be reviewed separately. Because the policy is talking about the choice, as usual, if the department contains several programs, they may be reviewed concurrently or separately.

First Reading completed.

Associated Students Report – N. Brambila-Perez

N. Brambila-Perez said this recent Monday at the AS Senate meeting we approved and we got into a partnership with the Student Affairs offering awards, and so we hopefully expand that with the years that come by recognizing our student leaders and also others who have created partnerships and who have you know helped us here at the University. The Associated Students approved the Creation and Implementation of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement and also approved the Creation and Implementation of a Promising Practice Guideline for Land Acknowledgement. Those are two different ones.

A lot of the work that we have been doing so far has surrounded around social justice and how is it that we can support our students in that way. The AS is expecting the Senate to, hopefully, reconsider the teaching sensitive material statement. She took it upon herself to ask students at-large that are not involved in any organizations here on campus and ask them how they would feel regarding a content warning when professors are showing graphic material in classes. She talked with a total of 327 students. Most of their questions were, why is it so hard for faculty to do this for us. Many others reported back saying many professors at Sonoma State already do give content warnings and so why can't the rest of faculty join with the rest of their colleagues. Something else that other students told her is why can't they center the conversation around requiring the content warning instead of talking about what if scenarios that can happen to faculty. She thought what the general population of students were saying, after showing them the statement that was brought up by AFS and PDS, that it was fraud in many cases, and the last thing that we can do for our students it's just have a conversation, especially regarding content warnings and if we should require it or not. Those faculty who are not on board could come to the students and let us know, an appropriate way to do that is to come to the Associated Students meeting on Mondays. Students don't feel like there's any justification for faculty not to do that. These are not words coming from our student leaders, just students at-large, students who just come to their classes and go out of their classes. We're still pushing. We won't drop it. We appreciate the partnership to be creative with a lot of

you and we really, really value that, so hopefully we can make it very student centered and create something that will work for all parties.

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

J. Reeder said the resolution is in the Senate packet and he was bringing this forward. He circulated a version of this resolution to several key stakeholders around campus as a draft and got input for this resolution and, in particular, it was welcomed. It seemed as an important resolution for us as a body, as a campus to take a stand with Asian-American and Pacific Islander communities and condemn harassment, violence and micro aggressions and including what we would do in our teaching and in our curriculum.

The final resolve clause also calls on us to direct resources and support toward the development and delivery of academic coursework in Asian American studies. Now an earlier version of this that circulated was much more prescriptive and specified certain kinds of coursework and quantity and dates, but it was felt that it would be much more organic if this were an institutionally driven, faculty driven, curricular driven decision about exactly what and by when the resources and support in the development of academic coursework in Asian American studies would take, so that has framed the wording as it is right now. There was some discussion of the correct form for Senate resolutions in general. **First reading completed.**

Statewide Senator Reports – W. Ostroff, R. Senghas

W. Ostroff said she had a few things to report this week, one is that we got word from the Chancellor's Office that the Higher Education Opportunities Act is a condition of the CSU receiving student financial aid from the Federal Government, so they're really asking our support in relaying the message that we need to provide students access to course material information and costs associated with the schedule for each term, and we need to do that no later than the first date of registration. What that means is if we haven't ordered our books for next semester and students are already registering for classes, they may be registering for a class not knowing how much that class is going to cost them in materials and books. If we have not ordered our books yet, we are out of compliance which could put in jeopardy our student financial aid from the Federal Government. She didn't even know if our deadlines are aligned to be in accordance with this. She thought our textbooks are due after our first registration date, but we can all tell our constituencies and departments that we represent, that it's not just for us, and it's not just for some of the reasons that were often cited such as students with disabilities and access, which are also very good reasons, but there is a third reason to order our textbooks and our course materials sooner, and that is for our students to be able to get federal funding for financial aid.

The second thing she mentioned was that on Wednesday April 1th the CSU Council on Ethnic Studies met with the Chancellor's Office to continue discussions about the new ethnic studies GE requirement. They had some concerns. The CSU council on ethnic studies, regarding the title five change, just wanted to make sure that ethnic

studies faculty are included in the campus implementation processes. We have been told that they wanted to talk about the AB 1460 implementation to be sure that the effective implementation of the requirement includes professional development activities such as workshops, webinars, ethnic studies faculty led discussions of best practices, and models for learning outcome development. They also wanted to address concerns that have come up from some ethnic studies discipline faculty particularly American Indian and Native American studies, who felt that they're being left out of the requirement implementation. The Statewide Senate is looking forward to ongoing conversations to ensure successful implementation of the ethnic studies requirement. We have an Academic Affairs committee at the Statewide Senate level and this work is within their charge, so they're going to be taking this up and creating a space, so that they can continue to speak to the Chancellor's office and the CSU Council on Ethnic Studies. There's another meeting that's in the works talking about respecting and engaging disciplinary expertise, so again, that tension that we're walking sometimes between who controls the curriculum and that the Faculty experts should control the curriculum. This is to alert you that those conversations are continuing and continuing in earnest.

R. Senghas said we just had those intermediate meetings, but a lot of work ends up happening right before our main plenary, which will be coming up in a couple of weeks, so you'll be hearing more soon.

The Emeritus Rep said he wanted to point out to the Senators that shortly before this meeting he posted to Senate-Talk about the history of Asian Studies here at Sonoma State that was provided by some of our emeritus faculty who were involved in programs in earlier times.

Staff Representative Report – K. Sims

K. Sims reported that over the last few weeks, the Staff Council has had some wonderful visits and discussions with a number of campus partners. On March 16th, there was a meet and greet with David Chun, the new Chief Information officer and Associate Vice President for Information Technology. We also had a visit from President Judy Sakaki that was really interesting and wide ranging. On April 13th, we had a presentation from the President's Sustainability Advisory Committee on the new solar power grid and the sustainability pledge with Claudia Luke. The Staff Council invites leaders of the various departments and committees on campus to come and introduce themselves and their programs or engage in discussion with the Staff Council. We would be very pleased to have you come and have a fruitful conversation.

From FSAC: Revision to the RTP Policy – Second Reading – P. Lane

P. Lane said we find ourselves here on a second reading, towards the end of the second year of working on the RTP policy revision. Our purpose has always been more clarity, a stronger organizational structure, of course, always compliance with the CBA. Members may recall that we conducted two types of fact finding from our colleagues. One was a request for an anonymous survey, so we did a Qualtrics survey and we used a Canvas survey, where we could see who was writing what.

We have brought forward changes, with pages that show you what has been changed, what stayed the same, how things have moved around. That was the first set of five documents that came to the Senate. We are now presenting to the Senate a new version that we approved today. We took into consideration all of the feedback from the first reading. We believe that we've been quite responsive to anything people have told us. We have offered to remove language that people have suggested is confusing. We have removed examples that have been given because it is our experience, both as long term faculty and from the questions that we keep getting, that the examples end up becoming the policy. The RTP policy is the policy that tells people what the criteria is, what the actual parameters are, what is expected, and what has to be provided, but it does not say the specifics of each of those and we have refrained from providing that level of detail. FSAC has received close to nine department RTP criteria revisions this year. We are asking departments to determine for themselves the very specific things which makes your department different or unique, everything from the publication numbers to the actual periodicals that you believe your colleagues should be trying to publish in. Or maybe that isn't what your department wants to do. We have fought hard to have the ability to let the departments decide for themselves over the years at Sonoma State, so it's on departments to clarify and specify. It is not the URTP position or business of saying exactly what all of the things are that need to be done. This latest version is as cleaned up as we can provide.

The Chair said he thanked FSAC, on behalf of everybody, for all of the work. This has been a project that's involved literally hundreds of hours collectively of work to prepare this revision, so thanks to everybody on FSAC and to all of the associated committees who have contributed to this. It's also been a collaboration between faculty as well as the AVP of Faculty Affairs and the CFA.

A member said he was looking at the draft, so maybe it's changed in the in the final document, but at our last meeting some Senators expressed the opinion that probationary faculty should be able to choose to apply the RTP version that was in effect when they were hired. Otherwise, in the final year as they come up for tenure a department that didn't want them could change the criteria in such a way that it's impossible for them to meet that criteria.

R. Whitkus said it has to be “when appointed.” That is the CBA language, so we have to maintain continuity with CBA. We can't say “when hired” since “when appointed” are the same thing in terms of RTP. We maintain with the CBA that we're not going to change the “when hired” though, as the continuity clause reads, a candidate has the choice when they go up to say, I want to be held to the criteria that were in effect when I was first appointed in this position or I want to be using the criteria that are currently available at this time. We liked the candidates to be able to do this in consultation with a department chair, simply because the department needs to know at the beginning of a review cycle what criteria are being applied to the candidate. They have to, in some way, notify the department what criteria they are choosing at that particular time, and if the Senate wishes, there is a modification that could be put in there. Instead of saying the department chair, the candidate will apply the criteria of their choice and notify the department RTP committee at the

beginning of the review cycle. Either way, it's the same thing. A department can't cut the legs out from underneath them because the candidate is choosing.

A member said it does state very clearly that the candidate has the option to apply. She was less clear whether the candidate will apply the chosen criteria in collaboration with the department chair at the beginning. "In collaboration with the department chair" usually gets us in some trouble, but she understood what FSAC was getting at so she didn't know if some clarification needs to be made there.

P. Lane said it should be no problem. We can change the current platform OnBase for the person to be able to upload the criteria. Faculty have to read the criteria anyway, for each candidate, so you might be reading for two people in the same department that are using two different RTP criteria, but so be it. We felt strongly and it is our feedback that people want this option, so it may complicate the review process a little bit. OnBase will have the criteria because the way it is now it must be put there, so you may be reviewing a candidate from the same department and they would have two different years of a department's criteria.

Vote on RTP policy revision – Approved 18 – 0.

Request for motion to reconsider endorsement of AFS/PDS Teaching of Sensitive Materials statement – J. Reeder

J. Reeder said this is a request for motion to reconsider our endorsement of the AFS/PDS teaching of sensitive material statement. You will have received a message from Senate Analyst Holmstrom-Keyes about this, and this is something that we've never done in our Senate before which is specifically a motion to reconsider a previous decision. The genesis for this request is that when we discussed the AFS/PDF statement, it was believed that the representation that was made in support of the statement included some information which may have been either misleading or out of date. This has subsequently been brought to our attention by two documents. One from the Associated Students and one from the Administration, which has been signed by several individuals that were cited in support of the statement, but actually have spoken against the statement. So, with that new information, two things are happening. One has happened, and that is as Chair he invited, formally, FSAC Chair Lane, as FSAC is the standing committee over which oversees these matters, to re- examine and reevaluate and potentially develop a position on the statement, and then the second thing is what we're doing right now, which is potentially having a motion to reconsider. The motion to reconsider can only be brought by somebody who voted in favor of the original motion. Only one of those 17 people who voted in favor of the endorsement can bring the motion to reconsider. He asked for questions about the process and/or a motion to reconsider.

A member said he was looking at the joint statement and the joint statement claims that there was input from CAPS and DSS and he thought that that's accurate. The problem is that at in our discussion of this someone claimed that the final document was looked at by CAPS and DSS and it turned out not to be true, but the statement we endorsed does not claim that the final document was looked at by them and it

only claims that there was input. He thought that's accurate, so he wondered what we're reconsidering.

The Chair said that the original document is written in a manner which is carefully worded, but he believed that at the time that we were discussing it as a body and the discussion did center largely around the alleged or supposedly CAPS and DSS support of this statement, he believed that was one of the main factors which may have either influenced or contributed to the results of our vote, and for that reason, he was bringing it forward to reconsider.

A member said she wanted to argue that no matter what was said, in the document itself, the information about DSS and the reference to DSS stands in and of itself as a a very big part of the logic and the argument put forward by the statement. She was of the opinion that, regardless of what was said on the day of the vote, the very document itself makes strong reference to such anchors as part of the argument, such as should a person find something objectionable there's a good chance that they might have a condition called PTSD and PTSD can only be diagnosed by a professional and if someone has a professional diagnosis, they should be dealing with professionals and DSS would be where one would go for such help. The fact that such a paragraph exists in the statement is evidence enough of the way in which the argument was made. The argument is based on a kind of a naming of the problem with a faculty members course being connected to having a diagnosed issue. It has to be removed from the statement. We were told that the implication was that DSS also agrees that this diagnosis should be linked to or could be linked to when, in fact all other evidence says an official diagnosis has nothing to do with this. Having PTSD is not where this argument is supposed to go. What in fact people thought they were saying is there's a problem with trigger warnings, and faculty members should not have to do anything about it and that's what's at the core here. The link to DSS makes it appear as if there's a clinical thing happening to the person who has the problem with the issue, so it needs to be removed if, in fact, in the statement that entity does not support that logical conclusion.

Motion to extend the meeting by 10 minutes. Second. Approved.

A member said we have two levels of pragmatic effect we're trying to deal with here. One is what's the function of the statement regarding whether we have trigger warnings and how is that going to be incorporated as practice. In our pedagogy then the second pragmatic effect that we have is the Senate's endorsement and we're seeing that on both levels, it's problematic. DSS and other folks have expressed concern with the version that came out afterwards, so regardless of what it says and whether we got input or not. The statement is something that needs to be revisited and then secondly, we then need to think about the pragmatic effect of the Senate endorsing that problematic document. He encouraged members to simply say do over. He wanted the Senate to go through whatever parliamentary procedure as quickly and easily possible, to reverse the endorsement for now and let's hand it back to committee and get a better, more useful document that will be more likely to be adopted by our colleagues. As a disclosure he noted that he uses trigger warnings in his courses and uses them in a few different ways. Some because of the teaching materials, but also as an anthropologist when we're dealing with human remains,

it's got nothing to do with PTSD. It's got to do with cultural respect, and these are people's remains that we're dealing with and people have all kinds of cultural practices about when and when not to be looking at these things or sharing these things. It doesn't have to have anything to do with PTSD, it doesn't have to do anything with trauma. We just should be mindful of what we're using.

Motion to reconsider the Senate endorsement of the AFS/PDS statement on teaching sensitive materials. Second.

A member said we still need to figure out exactly what we are doing here. This idea of a do over or the idea of reexamining, it's pretty clear that there are two issues, at least, which are the issue itself about whatever you want to call this trigger warnings and we can make a plan for all of that, and the other one is the document that we endorsed that we now find problematic. We just need to decide if we're going to ask it to be revisited. Do we need that document to be changed and or refuted by this body, as opposed to endorsed by this body in its current form.

Point of order - we have a motion on the floor and the motion on the floor is not to remove our endorsement, the motion was to reconsider our endorsement. If we pass this motion, all we are agreeing to do is reconsider. We're not saying we don't endorse it we're not saying we do; we're saying we're reconsidering period and that's on the floor now and we shouldn't be discussing anything else.

Vote on motion to reconsider the Senate endorsement of the AFS/PDS statement on teaching sensitive materials – Approved, 17 – 0.

Motion to postpone reconsideration discussion to the next Senate meeting. Second.

Motion withdrawn.

Motion to refer AFS/PDS statement to FSAC. Second. Approved.

Adjourned.

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