MINUTES OF THE RESEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

5200 N. Barton Avenue, M/S ML 34   
Fresno, California, 93740-8014

Office of the Academic Senate

Ext. 8-2743

November 1, 2018, 9:00 a.m.

Members present: Sankha Banerjee, Tamás Forgács, Rohan Jadhav, Jenna Kieckhaefer, James Marshall, Anil Shrestha, Keith Story, Vang Vang, Wes Wise

Members absent: Gitima Sharma

(1) Approval of agenda (MSC).

(2) Approval of the minutes of 10/4/18 (MSC).

(3) Communications and Announcements

(a) Claude Laval competition update (Forgács). No applications for the award as of Monday, but the deadline is 11/15/18. We will plan for them to come in, and so our next meeting will be used to discuss the applicants and then rank them. Tamás Forgács will divide up the workload and email members of the committee the applications to review prior to the next meeting.

(4) Discussion items

(a) Progress reports on the three ongoing projects, and voting on documents that are ready

i. Action letter for more support of junior faculty (Gitima Sharma, Rohan Jadhav Keith Story): They have started a Google document, and will be setting up a meeting to discuss this item in the near future.

ii. Rubric development of Sabbatical review (Sankha Banerjee, Jenna Kieckhaefer, and Wes Wise):

* To be eligible for a sabbatical you have to have worked at Fresno State full time for six years, and have tenure. Your application is reviewed first by your department, and then the college is the one who would award or not award the sabbatical. The deans only have so many sabbaticals to award, and so if there are unawarded meritorious sabbatical applicants they are then to be reviewed by a university committee per the APM. Previously deans may have traded unawarded sabbaticals amongst themselves, instead of a university committee. Our job is to make a recommendation to the Provost.
* We started talking to a few departments regarding how they review sabbatical applications. Additionally, we started a document/rubric from the language in the APM. Something else that should be considered is whether or not the applicant has had one before, or who hasn’t had one in the longest amount of time. A member asked if previous sabbatical’s results and output needed to be considered, and we are uncertain as to whether it states that in the APM. The group is generally in favor of considering the previous sabbatical awardee’s productivity during the sabbatical. Additionally, it seems very difficult to compare apples to oranges across different departments and colleges. With that in mind, we may want to consider some element of a lottery to keep the process fair. Sabbatical applicants also only need to apply to improve one area, like teaching, and so having a rubric that lists many areas might not be appropriate. The group will continue to discuss these issues.

iii. Letter to the Senate on reviving APM 328 (Tamás Forgács, Anil Shrestha, and Vang Vang): The group looked at the letter, and there was discussion about who would sign the letter. We decided that the letter would be signed by the committee without listing names. All members in the group indicated via vote that they were in favor of this.

(b) Meeting times for next semester (Forgács): Didn’t have time to discuss this, but we will each review our schedules and be prepared to consider meeting times at our next meeting.

(5) The meeting was adjourned at 9:56 am.